

# Commentary

## ACIM® Text (CE)

### *T-2.XII, The Mastery of Love*

The underlining, italics, and footnote formats are explained at the end of the commentary. Also see 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.

## Overview

This section continues the discussion about the basic conflict between love and fear. While it stresses the absolute truth that, since fear is nothing and love is everything, there can be no true conflict, it also stresses that we, the Sonship, have a unique ability to believe in illusions. So we experience conflict. We experience our awakening as a very long process extending over millions of years, when in reality we have never left home. The section goes back and forth, stressing first the absolute truth, and then the necessary experience we have of gradualness and even conflict in our own minds.

## Paragraph 1

We have already said that the basic conflict is one between love and fear, and that the proper organization of the psyche rests on a lack of level confusion.<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>The section on psychic energy should be reread very carefully, because it is particularly likely to be misinterpreted until this section has been completed.<sup>2</sup>

The section begins with a statement of two important facts that have been established:

1. The basic conflict is between love and fear.
2. The proper organization of the psyche rests on a *lack of level confusion* (1:1).

In other words, we need to be certain we understand these two points before continuing. The second sentence advises us to reread Section XI “very carefully.” I believe this is because these two points were made in that section. I wish Robert had inserted one of his “pronoun clarification” footnotes to explain the latter part of 1:2, which reads, “because it

<sup>1</sup> T-2.XI.10:3: “The basic conflict is one between love and fear.” T-1.28.1:1: “Miracles are a means of organizing different levels of awareness.” T-2.XI.6:4: “If the psyche contains fearful levels from which it cannot escape without splitting, its integration is permanently threatened.”

<sup>2</sup> “The section on psychic energy” is the previous section.

is particularly likely to be misinterpreted until this section has been completed.” What is the “it” we are likely to misunderstand? And which section is “this section” that we must complete? Is he referring to Section XI that he advises us to reread, or to Section XII that we have not yet completed?

The “it” could refer to “the *section* on psychic energy.” But more likely, it refers to the more immediate referent, “psychic energy.” That is the topic of the previous section, and the topic he wants us to be certain we understand. In that light, I’m fairly certain that “this section” refers to the one he is talking about, Section XI, and not to Section XII, the one we haven’t read yet. So I would clarify Sentence 1:2 to read this way:

The section on psychic energy should be reread very carefully, because the mind’s energies are particularly likely to be misinterpreted until the previous section has been completed, that is, fully understood.

So, let’s consider the first fact he points out concerning the basic conflict. Psychological theories have traditionally seen the basic conflict in the psyche as one between good and evil, the superego and the id, or primitive (lower) and advanced (higher) needs. In every case, the conflict has been seen as between two levels or aspects of a human being. Nothing divine has entered the picture. But Jesus asserts that the conflict is between creation (which is divine) and miscreation (which is the misuse of a divine capability). As long as God is left out of the picture you are almost certain to misinterpret “the proper organization of the psyche.”

To properly understand the human mind it is necessary not to confuse levels. It’s essential, for instance, to realize that the deepest level of the subconscious is the miracle level. If that is left out of the picture (again, leaving God out) you will inevitably confuse levels.

I believe these are the things he wants to be sure we understand before he goes any further. It would be a good idea for you to reread that previous section to see if you agree with my summary points. I know it’s long and that you may find it boring, but do it anyway. It’s clearly important. Be thankful that he takes time in XII.1 to give us the two main points!

## Paragraph 2

2 It has already been said that you cannot control fear, because you yourself made it.<sup>3</sup> <sup>2</sup>Your belief in it renders it out of your control by definition. <sup>3</sup>For this reason, any attempt to resolve the basic conflict through the concept of mastery of fear is meaningless. <sup>4</sup>In fact, it asserts the power of fear by the simple assumption that it need be mastered at all. <sup>5</sup>The essential resolution rests entirely on the mastery of love.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> T-1.48.25:1: “You can never control the effects of fear yourself, because you have *made* fear and believe in what you make.”

<sup>4</sup> This means mastering (becoming highly proficient in) love—becoming a master of love—rather than trying to master (or subdue) fear.

The basic conflict is between love and fear, so we might expect that we must somehow master our fear. But that is not the case.

Sentence 2:1 reminds us that we have already been told we *cannot* control fear, first said back in T-1.48.25:1, where it adds that we “believe in what [we] have made.” Then, 2:2 makes it clear that it is our *belief* in what we make that “renders it out of [our] control by definition.” Therefore, the idea of mastering our fear is meaningless (2:3). Even *attempting* to master our fear is an unconscious admission of fear’s power over us (2:4).

So if the solution to the basic conflict between love and fear is not mastering fear, then what is it? Simple: the mastery of love (2:5). But maybe mastering love isn’t so simple. What happens while we learn to do it?

### Paragraph 3

<sup>3</sup> In the interim, conflict is inevitable. <sup>2</sup>The reason for this is the strangely illogical position in which you have placed yourself. <sup>3</sup>Since we have frequently emphasized that correction must be applied within the level that error occurs, it should be clear that the miracle must be illogical because its purpose is to correct the illogical and restore order.<sup>5</sup>

3:1 answers my question above: What happens “in the interim” while we are learning to master love? The basic conflict, love vs fear, continues. That should seem obvious. If we have not yet mastered love, we must still have fears, and they conflict with love. The shift from fear to love could happen more rapidly, as we’ll see a bit later, but for now, it’s a relief to recognize that having an interim in which conflict remains (diminishing over time, hopefully) is anticipated.

The Course tells us that love is our nature, so mastering love should come—well, *naturally*. But why does it take us so long? Jesus says it is because we have placed ourselves in a strangely illogical position (3:2). Miracles are an expression of reality, an expression of the truth, of the logical state of things. By nature we are masters of love. Nevertheless, in the position in which we’ve placed ourselves, miracles must appear *illogical*. This is so because we are in an illogical state. Correction of our state has to be applied *on the level of our error*, so “the miracle *must* be illogical because its purpose is to correct the illogical and restore order” (3:3). It seems to contradict our logic, but only because our logic is skewed.

We are convinced most of the time that we really are bodies, separate from one another. We believe that time and space are inflexible realities. Death is inevitable. The

---

<sup>5</sup> T-1.42.6:2-3: “True correction cannot be undertaken except within a dimension. Otherwise, there has been a confusion of levels.” See also T-1.48.23:3, T-2.VII.3:4, T-2.VII.11:6, T-2.VII.12:2, and T-2.IX.4:7. How is the miracle “illogical”? Jesus will explain later (T-3.II.1:2) that it is illogical because it is an “out-of-pattern” time interval. In other words, it does not follow logically from the pattern established by the past, being meant to *correct* that pattern. The past pattern itself was illogical, in that it did not follow from God’s premises. And its correction—the miracle—is also illogical, in that it does not follow from the *past’s* premises.

world is real, it is *reality*. The past is what it was and is unchangeable. Bodies can communicate, minds cannot. Fear seems inevitable in this world. It rarely occurs to us to question any of these things. Miracles fly in their face and ignore them all! No wonder there is continuing conflict. It isn't just all these illusions that bring about fear in us; we are even afraid of miracles because they threaten our imbedded psycho-cosmology. We have an established idea of how the world works, or doesn't work, and how our mind works. It takes a while to undo it all. And thanks okay..

## Paragraph 4

4 Two concepts which cannot coexist are nothing and everything. <sup>2</sup>To whatever extent one is believed in, the other has been abolished. <sup>3</sup>In the conflict, fear is really nothing, and love is really everything. <sup>4</sup>The unwillingness to let one's darkness be seen, or to submit error to light, is a way of denying that the separation ever occurred. <sup>5</sup>Like all pseudo-solutions, this kind of distorted thinking is very creative but false.

If “nothing” is what’s so, “everything” can’t be what’s so; you have one or the other, but not both (4:1). In the basic conflict we are discussing, love is everything and fear is nothing (4:3). If you believe in fear *at all*, to that extent you’ve abolished love. But if you believe in love at all, to *that* extent you’ve abolished fear (4:2). Love and fear are mutually exclusive.

This is not to say that you must pretend you have no fear, or in any way deny that you are experiencing fear. You have to look fear in the face and declare that it has no basis in reality. You need to “submit error to light,” acknowledge your error and allow the light to shine it away. If you recall, just a few pages back we were told that the first step in the correction process is to “Know first that this is fear” (T-2.IX.12:3). Don’t deny the fear you are feeling. *Know* that it is fear. Then, bring it to the light. What is the light? Love.

That process continues like this:

Fear arises from lack of love.

The only remedy for lack of love is perfect love.

Perfect love *is* the Atonement.

The current paragraph, #4, is saying much the same thing. You do have “darkness” in your mind that needs to be brought to the light. In your mind, in your thinking, the separation *has* occurred. That’s why you experience fear! Acknowledge the fear, and then open your mind to the love of God. That love is the remedy for fear. That love *is* the Atonement.

Trying to hide your darkness is a “pseudo-solution” that never works (4:5).

Course students are always asking, “What does it mean to accept the Atonement?” Well, “Perfect love *is* the Atonement” (T-2.IX.12:6). Therefore, to accept the Atonement is to accept perfect love. Accept that God perfectly loves you. You really are wholly lovable, and you are *surrounded* by the love of God (Read over Lesson 264!). When we truly accept God’s perfect love, love’s everything erases fear’s nothingness.

Jesus keeps repeating this to us:

There was the “correction formula for fear” back in Chapter 1:

“Turn immediately to me by denying the power of the fear, and ask me to help you replace it with love.” (T-1.48.13:5)

And there was the Atonement prayer in Chapter 2:

I would like to pray that my will be united with thine, recognizing that thy perfect love will suffice (or correct) for my imperfect love.

I pray that my fear be replaced by an active sense of thy love. (T-2.IX.14:2, 4)

Love shines away everything unlike itself. The reality is that love is all there is. “God’s will is all there is” (T-31.IX.5:1 (CE)).

We must realize that this shining away happens *to the extent* that we believe in love. So our experience of it *seems* gradual. What we eventually will recognize is that you cannot have both love and fear. If one is real, the other is not.

## Paragraph 5

5 The separation *has* occurred.<sup>6</sup> <sup>2</sup>To deny this is merely to misuse denial. <sup>3</sup>However, to concentrate on error is merely a further misuse of legitimate psychic mechanisms. <sup>4</sup>The true corrective procedure, which has already been described as the proper use of the spiritual eye (or true vision), is to accept the error temporarily, but only as an indication that immediate correction is mandatory.<sup>7</sup> <sup>5</sup>This establishes a state of mind in which the Atonement can be accepted without delay.

Having said that it is a mistake to deny that the separation has occurred (4:4), Jesus now flat-out says, “The separation *has* occurred.” (5:1). In the next section he says that it “occurred over many millions of years” (T-2.XIII.3:1). And yet, later on, he will tell us “The full awareness of Atonement, then, is the recognition that the separation *never* occurred” (T-6.III.5:5, my italics).

This seems like a contradiction, but he explains himself very well in this paragraph. He is really saying the same thing he said above when he told us not pretend that we have no fear or darkness in our minds. It is a “misuse of denial” (5:2). How can our mistakes be corrected if we won’t admit we have any mistakes? We *are* having an experience of separation that has been going on for millions of years.

As I said previously, this does not mean that we should “concentrate on error” (5:3). Recognize it, but don’t focus on it. We have a “corrective procedure.” Accept our error *temporarily*, but “*only* as an indication that *immediate* correction is mandatory” (5:4).

<sup>6</sup> The Course will later say, “The full awareness of Atonement, then, is the recognition that the separation *never occurred*” (T-6.III.5:5). These two statements need not be seen as in conflict. The Course is clear throughout that something did happen, which resulted in the universe of time and space. So we should not deny that something happened. What we should deny is the *reality* of what happened.

<sup>7</sup> See T-2.VI.8-10 and T-2.VIII.8.

Immediately, turn to God and pray that your fear would be replaced with a deep awareness of God's love; *that* is accepting the Atonement (5:5). When we become aware of fear, don't wallow in it; *immediate* correction is *mandatory*!

## Paragraph 6

6 It is worth repeating that ultimately there is no compromise possible between everything and nothing. <sup>2</sup>The purpose of time is essentially to serve as a device by which all compromise in this respect can be abolished. <sup>3</sup>It seems to be abolished by degrees precisely because time itself involves a concept of intervals which does not really exist. <sup>4</sup>The faulty use of creation has made this necessary as a corrective device. <sup>5</sup>“And God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son so that whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish but have eternal life” needs only one slight correction to be entirely meaningful in this context. <sup>6</sup>It should read, “And God so loved the world that He gave it to His only begotten Son.”<sup>8</sup>

Jesus seems to like his statement that “there is no compromise possible between everything and nothing.” and so he repeats it (6:1). Or perhaps he repeats it because he knows most of us won't grasp how important it is, and how accurately it sums up his message about love and fear. *No compromise is possible*. Learning this lesson—abolishing all compromise in respect to love and fear—is the whole purpose of time (6:2)!

To us, it seems as if we abolish compromise by degrees, gradually learning to let go of fear and to replace it with love, first here, then there, with this person, then that one, gradually expanding the range of our fears we are willing to transcend. We seem to be compromising all along. But if no compromise is possible “ultimately,” even our gradual progress is illusion or at least misperception. This occurs because of the illusion of time, which “involves a concept of intervals which does not really exist” (6:3). Our diminishing compromise and time itself are mutually supporting illusions. When our compromise is over, time will end, and we'll realize neither one ever existed except in our minds.

That's not to disparage time. It's a “necessary corrective device” (6:4), as was just pointed out in 6:2, necessitated by our miscreations. The “slight correction” Jesus gives to the famous verse from the Gospel of John, verse 3:16, seems to be based on what was just said about time and our miscreations. We miscreated the world of time. God chose to assign a new use to it, and gave it to His Son (us, not Jesus) as a device by which we can give up our compromise between fear and love, gradually, *easing* into it rather than being forced into an immediate, unequivocal decision.

---

<sup>8</sup> John 3:16 (KJV): “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” This passage is here applied to mean that God gave us, His Son, the gift of *time*, so that we could slowly, by degrees, give up all compromise between everything and nothing, and thus return to Him.



## Paragraph 7

7 It should be noted that God has begotten only one Son. <sup>2</sup>If you believe that all of the minds that God created *are* His Sons, and if you also believe that the Sonship is one, then every mind *must* be a Son of God, or an integral part of the Sonship. <sup>3</sup>You do not find the concept that the whole is greater than its parts difficult to understand. <sup>4</sup>You should therefore not have too great of a difficulty with this. <sup>5</sup>The Sonship in its oneness *does* transcend the sum of its parts. <sup>6</sup>However, it loses this special state as long as any of its parts are missing. <sup>7</sup>This is why the conflict cannot ultimately be resolved until all of the individual parts of the Sonship have returned. <sup>8</sup>Only then can the meaning of wholeness in the true sense be understood.

Just in case we don't understand how "God...gave His only begotten Son" to the world (which has long been understood to refer to God's gift of Jesus to the world<sup>9</sup>) can be switched to "He gave it [the world] to His only begotten Son," where the Son is *us*, Jesus goes into an extended explanation of what the term "Son of God" means in this Course. He emphasizes that God has only *one* Son (7:1). Each of us (regardless of sex) is a Son of God.<sup>10</sup> There are billions of us, but if we accept the idea that the Sonship is one, then all minds must be parts of this singular Sonship (7:2). We can all agree that a whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Likewise, the one Sonship "*does* transcend the sum of its parts" (7:3–5). It is to this one Son (the Sonship) that God gave the world and time.

But this only applies to the completed Sonship. As long as any of its parts—any of the minds that God created—are missing, the basic conflict between love and fear "cannot ultimately be resolved" (7:6–7).

Note the world "ultimately" in 7:7 and 6:1. I believe they refer to the same time, or rather, the end of time, which is the ultimate in terms of our return to our Oneness with God. There is no compromise possible between fear and love, between nothing and everything. This apparent "basic conflict" will be totally resolved, or erased, at the ultimate end of things, when "all of the individual parts of the Sonship have returned" (7:7).

We may wonder if we have to wait that long for the conflict within ourselves to be resolved. I don't think so, yet in a certain sense, that is true. If we are all part of one another, if "I cannot go without you, for you are a part of me" (Song of Prayer, 1.V.3:9) is 100% true, if, indeed, "God *has* begotten only *one* Son" (7:1), then how *can* the conflict ultimately be resolved, "*until* all of the individual parts of the Sonship have returned" (7:7). I suspect that the more completely any one of us "individual parts of the Sonship" returns, ending the conflict within our "partness" and recognizing that we remain as God created us, parts of that one Sonship, we will become aware, perhaps more and more

---

<sup>9</sup> Modern translations usually say "only Son" or "one and only Son" omitting the word "begotten," which has been used to indicate that God somehow gave birth to Jesus (tying into the concept of the Virgin Birth). That word had no real basis in the original Greek, *monogenes*, only generated.

<sup>10</sup> You are welcome to substitute the word "child" here if you wish; it makes no difference to the argument.

acutely aware, of all the parts of us (the one Sonship) who have not yet “returned.” We return, we become aware of the totality of Love and let go of all fear, but as we do, we become aware of everyone else (all the parts of our Self) who has not yet awakened. Only when all parts of the Sonship have awakened “can the meaning of wholeness in the true sense be understood” (7:8). Until then, there will be a longing in every awakened mind to see that wholeness restored.

It reminds me of a saying that used to be spoken by a devout Christian named Bob Pierce, who founded World Vision, a service organization to provide for Korean children who were affected by the Korean War: “Let my heart be broken with the things that break the heart of God.” The Course says of God:

What God does know is that His communication channels are not open to Him, so that He cannot impart His joy and know that His children are wholly joyous.<sup>2</sup>This is an ongoing process, not in time but in eternity.<sup>3</sup>God’s extending outward, though not His completeness, was blocked when the Sonship did not communicate with Him as one.<sup>4</sup>So He thought, “My children sleep, and must be awakened.” (T-6.VI.7:1–4 (CE))

As we awake in God we will share that divine sense He has that something is missing. Our brothers and sisters sleep, and must be awakened.

## Paragraph 8

**8** The concept of minus numbers has always been regarded as a mathematical rather than an actual expedient.<sup>2</sup>Yet it represents a major limitation on mathematics as presently understood.<sup>11</sup><sup>3</sup>Any statement which implies degrees of difference in negation is essentially meaningless.<sup>4</sup>What can replace this negative approach is a recognition of the fact that as long as one part (which is the same as a million or ten or eight thousand parts) of the Sonship is missing, it is *not* complete.<sup>12</sup><sup>5</sup>In the divine psyche, the Father and the Holy Spirit are not incomplete at all.<sup>6</sup>The Sonship has the unique faculty of believing in error, or incompleteness, if it so elects.<sup>7</sup>However, it is quite apparent that so to elect *is* to believe in the existence of nothingness.<sup>8</sup>The correction of this error is the Atonement.

The meaning of 8:1 seems to be that, while negative numbers are useful in mathematics, there really is no such thing. Nobody has minus two apples! I was not aware that

<sup>11</sup> As documented by Alberto Martinez in *Negative Math: How Mathematical Rules Can Be Positively Bent* (2005), negative numbers, now taken for granted, actually created a deep philosophical divide in mathematics, especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This rift was never truly resolved. Opponents gradually died off, and negative numbers slowly became accepted for their practical value in calculations.

<sup>12</sup> These sentences describe Jesus’ replacement for the current approach to negative numbers. His point is that negation doesn’t really have degrees. You cannot really have different degrees of nothingness. Therefore, one Son missing from the Sonship (-1) is the same as a million Sons missing (-1,000,000). In both cases, the Sonship is incomplete.



mathematicians ever viewed them as “a major limitation” (8:2), but I suspect Jesus knows better than I do. This is an offshoot of the “no compromise between everything and nothing” line of thought. In reality, there cannot be any “degrees of difference in negation” (8:3). Nothing is nothing, and “more nothing” is meaningless. He then applies this to what he said above about the wholeness of the Sonship being incomprehensible until every individual part has returned: “What can replace this negative approach is a recognition of the fact that as long as one part (which is the same as a million or ten or eight thousand parts) of the Sonship is missing, it is *not* complete” (8:4). One part missing is the same as a million parts missing in the sense that in either case the Sonship is incomplete.

Then he performs a neat flip-flop. He points out that in God’s mind (“the divine psyche”) there is no incompleteness. The whole psyche of God consists of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father and Son do not experience incompleteness (8:5). It is inconceivable to them. But the Sonship has a rather unfortunate “unique faculty of believing in error, or incompleteness” (8:6). The Sonship can choose to do so. Yet believing in incompleteness “*is* to believe in the existence of nothingness” (8:7). The whole argument about negative numbers has proven the point that nothing is not something that can exist! You can’t have -2 apples, nor can you have -2 parts in the Sonship!

So another definition of the Atonement is to recognize that the Sonship *cannot be incomplete* (8:8). It never was and never will be. I (we, the Sonship) remain as God created me (us). The Workbook hammers this home by repeating the lesson, “I am as God created me” twenty-nine times, in Lessons 94, 110, 112, 120, 132.15:2, 139.10:3, 162, 176, 201 to 220, and 237! Do you think He wants us to get this? It does not mean simply that you or I, as “individuals,” have been unchanged since the day of creation. We were not even individuals on the day of creation. We were then parts of an unbroken and unbreakable whole, the Sonship. Every other one of the billions of “individuals” who have ever or will ever appear on this planet (or any other planet or plane of being) were, and are, parts of the “you” who remain as God created you.

To accept the Atonement is to accept that Oneness, being the “At-one-ment” of our consciousness. It means we realize that what happens to anyone is happening to me. It means that all I give is given to myself. It means that my mind remains in perfect creation with every other mind because, in reality, it is all one mind.

The more I think about this, the more I realize in how many ways I don’t believe it! I still think of myself as imperfect. Don’t *you*? I think of myself as having a long way to go yet. I think of myself as limited by time and space. As vulnerable to the world around me. As a work in progress.

In a way, those things are certainly true. I *am* a work in progress, and there is a measure of self-forgiveness in that thought. The Course says we need to be happy learners, which means being content to be a work in progress, a learner, not yet a graduate. Jesus tells us that we are on a journey home—but takes care to remind us that it is a journey without distance to a place we never left!

I suggest you read over Section T-14.II, “The Happy Learner.” It talks so clearly of the contrast between nothing and everything, and the *seeming* process we go through in learning that nothing is nothing, everything is everything, and only the truth is true.

## Paragraph 9

9 We have already briefly spoken about readiness.<sup>13</sup> <sup>2</sup>But there are some additional awarenesses which might be helpful. <sup>3</sup>Readiness is nothing more than the prerequisite for accomplishment. <sup>4</sup>The two should not be confused. <sup>5</sup>As soon as a state of readiness occurs, there is always some will to accomplish, but this is by no means undivided. <sup>6</sup>The state does not imply more than the potential for a shift of will. <sup>7</sup>Confidence cannot develop fully until mastery has been accomplished.

Most of you who read this are “ready” to wake up. You want it and maybe wonder why wanting it isn’t enough. Being ready “is nothing more than the prerequisite for accomplishment” (9:3). It’s not accomplishment; don’t be confused about that (9:4). To be *ready* to wake up certainly means you have *some will* to accomplish it, “but this is by no means undivided” (9:5). Our “learning” really consists in *unlearning*, in ferreting out all the ways we are *unwilling* to wake up and letting go of them. In Chapter 6, Section VII.C, “Be Vigilant Only for God and His Kingdom,” Paragraph 1, speaking of the Holy Spirit, Jesus says:

He sorts out the true from the false, and teaches you to judge every thought that you allow to enter in the light of what God put there. Whatever is in accord with this light He retains to strengthen the Kingdom in you. When it is partly in accord with truth, He accepts it and purifies it. But what is out of accord entirely He rejects by judging against. (1:4–7)

Being ready is just having “the potential for a shift of will” (9:6). We then go through the sorting process in our thoughts, but while our will is still divided, we cannot achieve full confidence in our progress (9:7) or in the solid truth that we really do remain as God created us.

---

<sup>13</sup> See T-1.26.7:3, T-1.46.10-11, and T-2.VIII.2.

## Paragraph 10

**10** We began this section with an attempt to correct the fundamental human error that fear can be mastered. <sup>2</sup>The correction was that only love can be mastered. <sup>3</sup>Even if you are ready for revelation, though, that does not mean that you have in any way mastered that form of communication. <sup>4</sup>Mastery of love necessarily involves a much more complete confidence in the ability than you have as yet attained. <sup>5</sup>Readiness, however, is at least an indication that you believe this is possible. <sup>6</sup>This is only the beginning of confidence. <sup>7</sup>In case this be misunderstood as a statement that an enormous amount of time will be necessary between readiness and mastery, I would again remind you that time and space are under my control.<sup>14</sup>

The first thing we learned in this section is that fear cannot be mastered; only love can be mastered (10:1–2). It occurs to me that the verb “to master” is really used in two senses here. If we think of mastering fear, we mean to control it, limit it, and overcome its effects. But to master love means to accept love, to free it of false limits, and to allow ourselves to be controlled by love. In a nutshell: mastery means to be controlled by love and *not* controlled by fear.

Perhaps you feel ready to engage with mastering love. That mastery, however, depends in large measure on clear communication with God, which is also known as *revelation*. As we learned in Miracle Principle 28, revelations come from the superconscious level of mind, the highest level. Conscious mind is sandwiched between the superconscious and the unconscious. We have learned that the deepest level of the unconscious is the miracle level, but this is not the same as the superconscious. As I understand it, the superconscious is a level of mind that is in direct communication with God; the miracle level of the unconscious is the level of our True Self; it is God’s mind extended as my mind.

Miracle-working, we are told, must not be under conscious control but under Christ-control or God-control. We may get miracle impulses from the subconscious, but we need to be in communication with God or Christ, and have guidance from on high, so to speak, to perform miracles safely and successfully. Jesus says, in 10:3, that although we are *ready* to receive such revelations (communication from the superconscious), readiness does not imply mastery of “that form of communication” (10:3). Most of us, probably *all* of us, do not have a high level of confidence in hearing communication from the superconscious, and mastering love requires “a much more complete confidence in the ability than you have as yet acquired” (10:4). It *is* good if you feel ready for it, because it shows that at least you believe such communication is possible (10:5). Probably, some of us are not even that far along. We all will be at some time, so don’t feel left out.

Being ready is just “the beginning of confidence” (10:6). Jesus does not want anyone to think “that an enormous amount of time will be necessary between readiness and mastery,” however. He reminds us that he is in control of time and space (10:7)! I suspect he gives us all the time and space we need to get home, and no more than that. He talks of

---

<sup>14</sup> T-2.IX.1:3: “I said that Christ-control can take over everything that doesn’t matter.”

how miracles collapse time and space, saving “thousands of years,” according to T-1.47.2:6. I’m reminded again of the concept of “the happy learner” that I mentioned at the end of my discussion of Paragraph 8 above. The very idea that he can *save* us thousands of years can be daunting because it implies that the learning process *may* take that long. If a miracle can save thousands of years, how many years are there altogether? In the next section, he tells us:

Just as the separation occurred over many millions of years, the Last Judgment will extend over a similarly long period, and perhaps even longer. <sup>2</sup>Its length depends, however, on the effectiveness of the present speed-up. (T-2.XIII.3:1–1 (CE))

What’s a thousand years out of “many millions”? We are so focused on the extent of our little lives. *Time is an illusion!* It does not matter how many years anything takes. Lesson 300 says, “Only an instant does this world endure.” Elsewhere he calls those millions of years “the tiny tick of time,” but then tells us, “in that tiny instant time was gone” (T-26.V.3:5–6 (CE)). We have the illusion that it’s going to take *forever*, but when we wake up we’ll realize it was no more than a tiny tick, an instant. That’s the kind of confidence that superconscious communication can bring to us. So, if you feel ready for it, ask for it, open to it, look for it as you go through life. “Where would you have me go? What would you have me do? What would you have me say, and to whom?” If it seems slow to come, choose to be a happy learner. Relax. You are learning, and it does not matter how long it takes. Nothing will be lost; loss is impossible.

The Apostle Paul once wrote words that have been translated as, “Do not be anxious about anything, but in every situation, by prayer and petition, with thanksgiving, present your requests to God” (Philippians 4:6, NIV11). That’s good advice for us all! He goes on to say, “And the peace of God, which transcends all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus” (Philippians 4:7, NIV11). How do we find peace in the seemingly endless process of waking up? In every situation, make your requests known to God.

### 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.*