

CHAPTER FIFTEEN Jesus Names in ACIM

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

(This chapter is adapted from a separate paper.)

The name Jesus is not used in ACIM, either in Volume I, *Text*, 622 pages, or in Volume 2, *Workbook For Students*, 478 pages, except in one quotation. The name Jesus occurs sixteen times in Volume 3, *Manual For Teachers*, 88 pages, and is there limited to a total of five pages. Under a section entitled *Does Jesus Have a Special Place In Healing?* the name occurs eight times, seven on page 55, and once on the following page. Under Sections entitled *Jesus — Christ* and *The Holy Spirit* the use is four times on page 83, once on page 84 and three times on page 85. These counts include the title listings. The last two sections are in an addendum called a *Clarification of Terms*. This avoidance of the name of Jesus, and relegation to five pages of text in the rarely consulted third volume, is an indication of the state of mind of the spirit author.

The seventeen occasions of the use of the word Jesus in ACIM are from a mass in excess of 480,000 words. The word Christ is used 365 times, while the plural possessive “Christ’s” is used 89 times.

Claims were made that the Christ of ACIM is Jesus, and that this Christ explicitly identified himself as Jesus. I shall show that both claims are false.

This paper is not intended as a theological dissertation. Therefore I do not examine the meaning of the name Christ as it is used in ACIM, except in a peripheral manner as demanded by the specific illustration.

I identify each case of use of the name Jesus. I examine its context, and attempt to understand the significance attached to that use.

FROM THE TEXT

Jesus #1:

In speaking of the Holy Spirit ACIM states:

“Pg 67: The Bible says, ‘May the mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus,’ and uses this as a blessing. It is the blessing of miracle-mindedness. It asks that you may think as I thought, joining with me in Christ-...”

Commentary:

In order to isolate identify of the author, and show that he is not Jesus, we must examine both the biblical and ACIM context.

The quote is from Philippians 2:5 — **“Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.”**

This is from the King James Version. The context is an exhortation by Paul to the Philippi Christians that they give of themselves in service, as Jesus gave of himself. This verse was used by the author of ACIM because its phrasing provided a vehicle of illustration. However, the author changed the mental association in order to accomplish his purpose. Examination of alternate translation shows how he would not have had the same convenience of choice if he had not used KJV.

The Revised Standard Version, in verses three through eight, has this text:

Do nothing from selfishness or conceit, but in humility count others better than yourselves. Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others. Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross.

The concept from our traditional text is that all be willing to give for one another, regardless of one’s social state in life, and not find an excuse to avoid service by counting another person better in possession. This was the kind of mind Jesus displayed when he humbled himself to death on the cross. Paul was asking the Philippians to have this attitude of unselfish devotion among themselves. By taking on this attitude of service one joins with Jesus.

The author of ACIM employs the verse to a new definition which he calls miracle-mindedness. Miracle-mindedness is a state of mind, just as Paul’s exhortation was to a state of mind. But now the author alters the concept because he defines miracle-mindedness differently from mere service to others. He uses this miracle-mindedness to introduce a more profound relationship between himself and the student.

This more profound relationship is a request for the student to think as he thought.

“It asks that you may think as I thought, joining with me in Christ-...”

This instruction is more than to have the same attitude in service. The author requests the student to join with him in imitation of thought, not in emulation of service.

But the author himself does not make this request. When he says “It” we do not know if he assigns this invitation to the Bible or to miracle-mindedness. We cannot be sure from the context. The inference is that he is calling upon miracle-mindedness to produce this change in thought in the student.

He clearly separates Jesus from himself when he asks the student to join with him in Christ. If he intends that this Christ is Jesus, he and Jesus cannot be the same identity.

In following discussions I shall show that this Christ is not Jesus, but a state of mind different from Jesus which the author repeatedly invokes.

The author clearly does not identify himself as Jesus.

This is the only use of the word Jesus in the **TEXT, Vol I**. Nor do we ever meet it in the **WORKBOOK FOR STUDENTS, Vol II** of ACIM.

Thus we never meet the name Jesus again through 1100 pages.

This is a most notable, remarkable, and important omission of Jesus in the revelation of ACIM. This glaring absence shows a deadly difficulty for the author. He does not identify Jesus throughout this long text.

Now on to other examples, all found in the **MANUAL FOR TEACHERS**.

FROM THE MANUAL FOR TEACHERS

We next meet the name Jesus on page 55 of the **MANUAL FOR TEACHERS**. This comes 1088 pages after the lone biblical quote on page 67.

Jesus #2:

This is a Section titled:

DOES JESUS HAVE A SPECIAL PLACE IN HEALING?

This use of the name Jesus is limited to the Section heading. Below the title, we find the name Jesus seven times on two pages. The name Jesus in this section is limited to these two pages.

Jesus #3 and #4:

“God’s gifts can rarely be received directly. Even the most advanced of God’s teachers will give way to temptation in this world. Would it be fair if their pupils were denied healing because of this? The Bible says, ‘Ask in the Name of Jesus Christ.’ Is this merely an appeal to magic? A name does not heal, nor does an invocation call forth any special power. What does it mean to call on Jesus Christ? What does calling on his Name confer? Why is the appeal to him part of healing?”

Commentary:

Note that he here uses the phrase *Jesus Christ* and not merely the name Jesus. In this paragraph the Christ of ACIM does not identify himself as Jesus. Jesus is here described as an object of appeal, not an identification.

The author disclaims that an appeal in the name of Jesus can heal, when he says that *a name does not heal*. He also denies that prayer (an invocation) can call forth any special power.

The historical records states, among other possible citations:

John 14:13 - “Whatever you ask in my name, I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.”

John 16:23-24 “Truly, truly, I say to you, if you ask anything of the Father, he will give it to you in my name. Hitherto you have asked nothing in my name; ask, and you will receive, that your joy may be full.

The Urantia Papers state:

p.1952 - “Hitherto have you made all your requests in my Father’s name. After you see me again, you may also ask in my name, and I will hear you.”

p.1639 - “I have come forth from the Father; if, therefore, you are ever in doubt as to what you would ask of the Father, ask in my name, and I will present your petition in accordance with your real needs and desires and in accordance with my Father’s will.”

These flat contradictions are clear evidence that the author of ACIM cannot be Jesus. He baldly denies the promises Jesus gave to us about prayer in his name, and about his power through our invocation.

Continuing with page 55:

Jesus #5:

“What does this mean for you? It means that in remembering Jesus you are remembering God. The whole relationship of the Son to the Father lies in him. His part in the Sonship is also yours, and his completed learning guarantees your own success. Is he still available for help? What did he say about this? Remember his promises, and ask yourself honestly whether it is likely that he will fail to keep them. Can God fail His Son? And can one who is one with God be unlike Him? Who ascends the body has transcended limitation. Would the greatest teacher be unavailable to those who follow him?”

Commentary:

The discussion here deflects direct identification of the Christ of ACIM with Jesus. Identification must be inferred from the theological presentation, and the presentation is open to many different interpretations. Jesus is implied as an entity different from the author, as someone who went through a process to achieve *completed learning*.

This growth of Jesus, required by ACIM, may be compared to the teachings of *The Urantia Papers*.

p.1331 - Christ Michael did not progressively become God. God did not, at some vital moment in the earth life of Jesus, become man. Jesus was God and man — always and even forevermore. And this God and this man were, and now are, one, even as the Paradise Trinity of three beings is in reality one Deity.

Therefore, the Son mentioned in this paragraph from ACIM would not be Jesus.

Again on page 55:

Jesus #6 and #7:

“The Name of Jesus Christ as such is but a symbol. But it stands for love that is not of this world. It is a symbol that is safely used as a replacement for the many names of all the gods to which you pray. It becomes the shining symbol for the Word of God, so close to what it stands for that the little space between the two is lost, the moment that the Name is called to mind. Remembering the Name of Jesus Christ is to give thanks for all the gifts that God has given you. And gratitude to God becomes the way in which He is remembered, for love cannot be far behind a grateful heart and thankful mind. God enters easily, for these are the true conditions for your homecoming.”

Commentary:

Here the author of ACIM boldly states that the name Jesus Christ is *but a symbol*. The author does not acknowledge Jesus as a personality who *stands for love that is not of this world*. He acknowledges only the symbol. Hence, in this presentation the author of ACIM logically cannot identify himself with Jesus, since both are personalities, and he does not acknowledge Jesus as a personality.

At the bottom of page 55 and to page 56 we meet this statement:

Jesus #8:

“Jesus has led the way. Why would you not be grateful to him? He has asked for love, but only that he might give it to you. You do not love yourself. But in his eyes your loveliness is so complete and flawless

that he sees in it an image of his Father. You become the symbol of his Father here on earth. To you he looks for hope, because in you he sees no limit and no stain to mar your beautiful perfection. In his eyes Christ’s vision shines in perfect constancy. He has remained with you. Would you not learn the lesson of salvation through his learning? Why would you choose to start again, when he has made the journey for you?”

Commentary:

Again, the author of ACIM does not identify himself as Jesus. Here Jesus is again used as an object of discussion. Again, the author differentiates between Jesus and Christ’s vision. He clearly separates this Christ from Jesus, and adds to further confusion on whether this Christ is a personality or a state of being.

Another use from page 56:

Jesus #9:

“This course has come from him because his words have reached you in a language you can love and understand. Are other teachers possible, to lead the way to those who speak in different tongues and appeal to different symbols? Certainly there are. Would God leave anyone without a very present help in time of trouble; a savior who can symbolize Himself? Yet do we need a many-faceted curriculum, not because of content differences, but because symbols must shift and change to suit the need. Jesus has come to answer yours. In him you find God’s Answer. Do you, then, teach with him, for he is with you; he is always here.”

Commentary:

Here an explicit statement is made that *this course has come from him*. This course must mean *A Course In Miracles*, although the author does not exactly say so.

But is the “him” Jesus? To determine “him” we must refer to the preceding paragraph, a paragraph that comes between Jesus #8 and Jesus #9.

“No one on earth can grasp what Heaven is, or what its one Creator really means. Yet we have witnesses. It is to them that wisdom should appeal. There have been those whose learning far exceeds what we can learn. Nor would we teach the limitations we have laid on us. No one who has become a true and dedicated teacher of God forgets his brothers. Yet what he can offer them is limited by what he learns himself. Then turn to one who laid all limits by, and went beyond the farthest reach of learning. He will take you with him, for he did not go alone. And you were with him then, as you are now.”

I separate this paragraph into two strands because of the different emphasis in the two parts.

My commentary becomes difficult if I am to avoid theological issues. However, because of the statements made in this paragraph I must engage in brief discussion. I shall list the statements separately in order to show that the “him” who offered the Course is not Jesus.

From this list we shall also be able to see that the Christ of ACIM once again does not identify himself with Jesus.

“Yet we have witnesses.”

The author does not say who these witnesses are. How grateful we all would feel if he would do so. Recurrently, and repeatedly, throughout ACIM, the author refuses to make explicit identifications that would take the material of the Course beyond inference and deduction.

“It is to them that wisdom should appeal.”

Since we do not know the identity of these witnesses we might be in grave spiritual danger if we make our appeal to them. These unidentified witnesses might be Lucifer and Satan.

“There have been those whose learning far exceeds what we can learn.”

Again, who are *those*? If this is Jesus talking he is stating that the learning of *those* far exceeded his learning, or what he can ever possibly learn. This admission would be contrary to the illustration I offered above about the perfectness of Christ Michael as the Creator.

If this is another personality talking he is admitting his own limitations, not those of Jesus. Did the learning of Lucifer and Satan far exceed the learning of Caligastia? Probably. Caligastia has yet to learn his lesson.

“Nor would we teach the limitations we have laid on us.”

Who is *us*? What limitations? Who laid these limitations? Again, if this is Jesus talking he was limited as God.

The *Urantia Papers* are careful in their discussion of the limitation of Creator attributes.

p.235 - The divine natures of these Creator Sons are, in principle, derived equally from the attributes of both Paradise parents. All partake of the fullness of the divine nature of the Universal Father and of the creative prerogatives of the Eternal Son, but as we observe the practical outworking of the Michael functions in the universes, we discern apparent differences. Some Creator Sons appear to be more like

God the Father; others more like God the Son. For example: The trend of administration in the universe of Nebadon suggests that its Creator and ruling Son is one whose nature and character more resemble that of the Eternal Mother Son. It should be further stated that some universes are presided over by Paradise Michaels who appear equally to resemble God the Father and God the Son. And these observations are in no sense implied criticisms; they are simply a recording of fact.

The author of ACIM certainly is not talking about the limitations of Creatorship, but rather about his limitations as a created being. The framework of discussion is of subservience to higher authority which can impose limitations. The author chafes under this imposition.

Were these the rules for righteousness imposed by God upon his Created Planetary Princes? Limitations which the author of ACIM would not now teach?

Obviously, this paragraph is a massive theological entanglement buried in nebulosity and vacuity.

I now come to the second strand. A change in emphasis takes place which alters the subject of discussion. The author changes from the plural “we” and “us” of the first strand. He now uses “he,” “his,” and “him.”

“No one who has become a true and dedicated teacher of God forgets his brothers. Yet what he can offer them is limited by what he learns himself.”

Is the author of ACIM here referring to Jesus or to himself? If he means Jesus then Jesus is severely limited by what he learns! The limited learning of Jesus conditions what Jesus can teach his brothers! Thus we can see how the author defames and denies the power of Jesus if the student comes to such conclusion. If the author is not Jesus then he is the one who is so limited.

“Then turn to one who laid all limits by, and went beyond the farthest reach of learning. He will take you with him, for he did not go alone. And you were with him then, as you are now.”

Here the author again changes emphasis. He states that he took action to exceed those limits which were placed upon him.

This really is a complaint. The author objects to those limitations. He states that he had the power to exceed those limitations. What he means by *the farthest reach of learning* is another of those nebulous introductions of thought which befuddle the thread of concepts.

Where was this personality, who was he, and how were we with him then? If the author of ACIM is the one who laid all limits by, not Jesus, then the *he* and the *him* must be the author of ACIM.

By the time one has progressed through the conceptual confusion of this paragraph one is isolated from the Jesus of the preceding paragraph. Then the *him* we are attempting to identify in this intervening paragraph is not the Jesus of the preceding paragraph, although the author leaves us with mere fog in our attempts to determine his meaning. That probably was his purpose. Yet again he left the reader to infer, while deflecting good, solid thinking. But nowhere is there a specific identification of the author with Jesus.

“Jesus has come to answer yours.”

Once again this is a third-person use which avoids direct identification of the author with Jesus.

The obscurity of phrasing throughout this paragraph (and much of ACIM) merely reinforces our conclusion that the author of ACIM cannot afford to specifically identify himself as Jesus.

The next section on Jesus comprises two pages out of 1188 pages of text. The name Jesus is used four times in this section.

Jesus #10

Page 83 begins with the title: **JESUS CHRIST**

Presumably, the author of ACIM will now, after 1183 pages, give us his definition of Jesus. He does not.

Jesus #11 & #12:

“The name of JESUS is the name of one who was a man but saw the face of Christ in all his brothers and remembered God. So he became identified with CHRIST, a man no longer, but at one with God. The man was an illusion, for he seemed to be a separate being, walking by himself, within a body that appeared to hold his self from Self, as all illusions do. Yet who can save unless he sees illusions and then identifies them as what they are? Jesus remains a Savior because he saw the false without accepting it as true. And Christ needed his form that He might appear to men and save them from their own illusions.”

Commentary:

Here the author states that Jesus, the man, was an illusion. According to this author, Jesus, this illusion, saw the face of Christ in all his brothers. What was the CHRIST Jesus saw in all his brothers? Apparently Jesus had to see this Christ in his brothers before he could identify with it. Thus the author explicitly states that Jesus earlier was not Christ, and later acquired identity with this Christ according to this recipe. According to *The Urantia Papers* Jesus was not Christ, and therefore would not have identified himself with this CHRIST, or any other Christ.

According to this ACIM teaching Jesus became one with God AFTER he identified with this CHRIST. Such teaching is gross perversion of all Christian belief and the teachings of *The Urantia Papers*.

These statements are supremely important to our understanding. Obviously, the term Christ is used once again in conflicting conceptual terms. Here the author invokes one sense to mean a state of being, *the face of Christ*, and not personality. But the use confuses us. The author turns around and implies personality in the illustration. Jesus identified with this Christ. Was this Christ a state of being or was it personality? We cannot explicitly determine the meaning of the author.

The author then switches subjects in the last sentence. He introduces us to another Christ. This other Christ needed the form of Jesus *that He might appear to men and save them from their own illusions*. Obviously, the author is differentiating between this other Christ and Jesus. This other Christ needed the form of Jesus. The other Christ, of course, is Caligastia.

Truly, this is an exact and precise statement, one of the most clear sentences in the entire Course. The author had to take on the appearance of Jesus to accomplish his ends. He did so by assuming the name Christ. This is the Christ who will save men from their own illusions. But this is not an identification as Jesus. The author states explicitly that he takes on the form of Jesus.

Indeed!

Jesus #13:

“In his complete identification with the Christ - the perfect Son of God, His one creation and His happiness, forever like Himself and one with Him - Jesus became what all of us must be. He led the way for us to follow him. He leads you back to God because he saw the road before him, and he followed it. He made a clear distinction, still obscure to you, between the false and true. He offered you a final demonstration that it is impossible to kill God's Son; nor can his life in any way be changed by sin and evil, malice, fear or death.”

If the Christ of ACIM has been redefined, as its adherents say, then this Christ cannot be Jesus. In fact, the author tells us explicitly that Jesus became completely identified with this Christ. Again this implies a spiritual state, not a personality. Thus, according to his argument, Jesus became identified with this concept the author introduces into his presentation. The name Christ did not become identified as Jesus.

Jesus could not have become identified with this Christ unless this Christ was something different from Jesus. And this Christ was *the perfect Son of God, His one creation and His happiness, forever like Himself and one with Him*. Jesus was not this Christ, this *perfect Son of God*, until he identified with this Christ. Again we see the blasphemy, denying the status of Jesus as Creator and God. Again we see the confusion in concept. This Christ is different from Jesus be-

cause he did not become like Jesus; Jesus became like this Christ. In other words, this Christ was first, and Jesus was second, since Jesus identified himself with this Christ. Thus Jesus led the way for all of us to follow this Christ. Jesus then leads us back to this God. Thus Jesus became the example of how we should follow this Christ and this God.

The author of ACIM is positively making Jesus subservient to this Christ. Since this Christ is someone other than Jesus, the author makes Jesus subservient to this state of being, or other being. Since the author is the Devil, this CHRIST, and since he is making Jesus subservient to this CHRIST, he is making Jesus subservient to himself. That is exactly what he wishes he could do.

We now go to page 84. This is still under the section titled *JESUS CHRIST*.

Jesus #14:

“Is he God’s only Helper? No, indeed. For Christ takes many forms with different names until their oneness can be recognized. But Jesus is for you the bearer of Christ’s single message of the Love of God. You need no other. It is possible to read his words and benefit from them without accepting him into your life. Yet he would help you yet a little more if you will share your pains and joys with him, and leave them both to find the peace of God. Yet still it is his lesson most of all that he would have you learn, and it is this...”

Here we have an explicit statement from the author of ACIM that Christ takes many forms with many different names. Jesus is not unique. But, again, we have no direct identification of the Christ of ACIM with Jesus. How could a *spirit personality* identify with one, if there are many forms with different names?

Page 85 has still another section defining **THE HOLY SPIRIT**

This section has three references to Jesus, all on one page.

Jesus #15:

“Jesus is the manifestation of the HOLY SPIRIT, Whom he called down upon the earth after he ascended into Heaven, or became completely identified with the Christ, the Son of God as He created him. The Holy Spirit, being a creation of the One Creator, creating with Him and in His likeness or Spirit, is eternal and has never changed. He was ‘called down upon the earth’ in the sense that it was now possible to accept Him and to hear His Voice. His is the Voice for God, and has therefore taken form. This form is not His reality, which God alone knows along with Christ, His real Son, Who is part of Him.”

This paragraph offers more obfuscation. Jesus apparently became completely identified with ‘the Christ,’ the Son of God, as He created him. I am not sure who created what from this twisted sentence. But the author of ACIM is not identifying himself with Jesus.

In all the theological teaching in ACIM which describes the attributes of Jesus, Jesus is subjected to a secondary role, inferior to this Christ.

Jesus #16 & #17:

“The Holy Spirit is described throughout the course as giving us the answer to the separation and bringing the plan of the Atonement to us, establishing our particular part in it and showing us exactly what it is. He has established Jesus as the leader in carrying out His plan since he was the first to complete his own part perfectly. All power in Heaven and earth is therefore given him and he will share it with you when you have completed yours. The Atonement principle was given to the Holy Spirit long before Jesus set it in motion.”

Here the Holy Spirit has established Jesus as the leader in carrying out His plan, making Jesus subservient to the Holy Spirit. Again there is no identification of the author of ACIM with Jesus.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The author of ACIM never identifies himself as Jesus.
2. All ascriptions of authorship are to this “Christ” and not to Jesus.
3. The sadly mistaken notion that ACIM was written by Jesus, a notion that conditions our eternal survival, was based strictly on assumption, out of use of the word Christ, exactly as the author intended.
4. In all cases in which Jesus serves in a functional role in ACIM, and not merely as an object of reference, he is made subservient to another being, or a state of being.
5. The vast body of text of ACIM uses inference and deduction to lead the student into a swamp of conceptual confusion.
6. The appeal of ACIM, as with all other channeled materials, is on emotions and feelings, not on rigor of thought or righteousness.
7. As I illustrated above, (Jesus #1), the concentration of ACIM is on self, and not on service.
8. Study of ACIM shows the acute difference between the light offered by *The Urantia Papers*, and the darkness offered by ACIM.
9. All those who adhere to the teachings of ACIM have placed themselves in eternal jeopardy. Such individuals cannot discern the difference between light and darkness.