

**What Do the ACIM Urtext And Helen's Original Shorthand Notes Have
to Say about Sex?**

(and other thoughts about the ACIM Urtext)

By Scott Perry
October 6, 2005
(rev. 4/12/08)

What Do the ACIM Urtext And Helen's Original Shorthand Notes Have to Say about
Sex?
(and other thoughts about the ACIM Urtext)

The Human 'Condition' of Sexuality. I have been a student of ACIM since 1989, and I must confess I cannot count how many times I've delved into ACIM looking for answers on sexuality, only to be stumped again and again. I also must admit, upon first reading the Urtext in 2005, I was pleasantly surprised to find all sorts of stuff on this in this much less "stuffy", but highly disorganized early draft of ACIM.

In the Urtext I was at first a bit shocked, and then ultimately relieved to see the "voice" of ACIM, which I regard as Jesus' voice, finally talking about this subject which still seems so taboo to so many, and which seems to me to almost to be an oxymoron to use the terms 'Jesus' and 'sex' in the same sentence!

Here is what I found in the Urtext about sex:

(2003, UPE-Ready edition¹, pg. 33):

"The only VALID use of sex is procreation. It is NOT truly pleasurable in itself. "Lead us not into Temptation" means "Do not let us deceive ourselves into believing that we can relate in peace to God or our brothers with ANYTHING external."

The original Urtext paragraph I have just quoted has a very different *feel* to it from the 2nd edition quote into which it was eventually edited. This paragraph appears to have eventually been reworked and combined with other Urtext paragraphs to appear in the 2nd edition as:

"The confusion of miracle impulses with physical impulses is a major perceptual distortion. Physical impulses are misdirected miracle impulses. All real pleasure comes from doing God's Will. This is because *not* doing it is a denial of Self. Denial of Self results in illusions, while correction of the error brings release from it. Do not deceive yourself into believing that you can relate in peace to God or to your brothers with anything external."

Sex Can Be a *Miracle Impulse*. Following is another meaningful paragraph about sex that I found in the Urtext (2003, UPE-Ready edition¹, pg. 38):

"The sex impulse IS a miracle impulse when it is in proper focus. One individual sees in another the right partner for "procreating the stock" (Wolff was not too far off here), and also for their joint establishment of a creative home. This does not involve fantasy at all. If I am asked to participate in the decision, the decision will be a Right one, too."

(Here the reference to Wolff appears to be a reference to Dr. Charlotte Wolff, a renowned psychiatrist. The “T” being referred to in the last sentence of this quote appears to be a reference to the “Holy Spirit”.)

The Urtext includes a grand total of 49 scattered references to the word sex throughout its first 100 pages or so. There is also one interesting reference to sex found in Helen Schucman’s original shorthand notes, made available to us through Ken Wapnick’s writings, which I will go into below.

In the Urtext, no further usages of the word “sex” occur in the approximately 500 pages that follow the first reference-rich 100 pages. Aside from the paragraphs and sections about sex in the Urtext that I am quoting directly in this article, most of the other references to sex found in the Urtext are far more brief and only secondary to other subjects being discussed in their various sections. Accordingly, in order to present the Urtext’s teachings about this matter in a more unified way, I have tried to summarize them here. Generally they boil down to this:

Sex can be a “miracle impulse”, but only under certain circumstances. These circumstances include:

1. When it is used without mixing in fantasy.
2. When procreation is its primary aim.
3. When it is accomplished with true recognition of the “creative worth” of both self, and of the other, and others, in a certain kind of an “impersonal *miracle-minded* way”.

Sex as a Mistake. Above are the ACIM-Urtext teachings about the *appropriate* use of sex. Regarding the *inappropriate* use of sex, the Urtext describes how inappropriate sex will usually result in guilt, depression or fear. The entertaining of sexual fantasies is also included as one of the various types of the inappropriate uses of sex, due to its inherent unreality.

Regarding how to guard one’s self against falling into the temptation to use sex in inappropriate ways the Urtext advises (2003, UPE-Ready edition¹, pg. 33):

“You were right in telling B.(Bill Thetford) to invite Me to enter anywhere temptation arises. I will change the situation from one of inappropriate sexual attraction to one of impersonal miracle-working.”

Thus far, the truly miracle-minded use of sex has only occurred once. The one available reference to sex found in Helen Schucman’s original shorthand notes may be the type of material that might one day give some future theologians a whole new view of the phrase “immaculate conception”. This reference was apparently edited out of the rough Urtext itself during the initial transcription process between Bill and Helen. In these notes Jesus described his mother Mary’s role in the moment of his own conception, by describing her here as “*The only one that (has yet) conceived without any lack of love.*”

By this seemingly high standard, it would appear that in the history of all of mankind, only once has mankind succeeded in a wholly “miracle-minded” physical joining through sex accomplished without any hint of fear, and in full recognition of miracle-minded love in one and all. Also according to this standard, Jesus’ life itself was the result of this one wholly successful union. If that is not a statement of the redeeming outcome of true miracle-mindedness, I can’t imagine what might be! For those of us who may still feel that our experience of sex might in some way still spiritually fall “short of the mark”, perhaps we can now take some comfort in the realization that by ACIM’s standards, we are certainly not alone in “falling short” in this. It would seem to be a rather common error amongst us mortals down here.

A Miracle Worker Must Have An Understanding About Sex. One final significant remark from the Urtext regarding sex.... The Urtext states that an understanding in the *area of sex* is something that a Miracle Worker **MUST** have. Specifically, the Urtext reads (2003, UPE-Ready edition¹, pg. 32):

“Sex.... is an area the miracle worker **MUST** understand.”

Regarding the rationale for the eventual editing out such things as this and the other 49 uses of the word “sex” that first appeared in Helen’s notes and the original Urtext, but were methodically edited out by the time of the publication of the 2nd edition of ACIM in 1992, all of these deletions of this specific subject material were made, despite the Urtext’s specific teaching that a Miracle Worker **MUST** have the proper understanding of sex.

An indication of the importance that the Urtext seems to place on such a *proper understanding of sex* is the fact that no other physical activity is so frequently and thoroughly discussed in the Urtext. Why was all of this material edited out? Perhaps it was left out because it was felt that had it been included in the first published versions, then others such as prospective publishers, or the press might have seized upon it and reacted in some negative fashion to it. The reasons for these systematic deletions are things that for now, we will only be able to guess at.

Without a proper understanding of how ACIM views error, undoubtedly there are some non-students who would quickly condemn the teachings of ACIM about sex as puritanical. In fact, these ACIM teachings about sex could all too easily be used by some who might not yet have fully studied ACIM to only increase their levels of guilt and fear concerning sex, which is obviously not the intent of ACIM at all.

One Urtext quote that may be of comfort to anyone who might be wondering if the recent release of the Urtext into the public domain might cause any problems for ACIM is (2003, UPE-Ready edition¹, pg. 577):

“This time (with this teaching) there will be no failure, no loss of truth, no misunderstanding and no misinterpretation. I will direct its growth as it reaches from the paper on which it was written into the hearts for which it was intended. Be comforted by this: It will be impossible to make any mistakes in its connection which will endure. I am watching over it with all the care I have for all my brothers in salvation. I understand what it can do for them, and I will make sure that it does it, and does it perfectly.

Do not be concerned about starting. You have started. Do not be concerned about growing. You have grown and will yet grow more. And above all, do not be concerned about my love for you. There will not be one of you who will not be sure this year that I am with you, was with you when you came, and will never leave you.”

The contrast between the different editions regarding the teachings about sex being discussed here is only one example of the many differences in tone between the original ACIM Urtext version and the published 2nd edition version of ACIM. One good thing about the editing that was done between the original Urtext version and the final published version is the fact that all of the editing seems to have been done with a consistent faithfulness in so far as only re-organizing and editing, and never really “adding” anything that wasn’t already there. It seems to me that most of the editing that was done by both Thetford and Wapnick was definitely needed in order to make for a more readable work.

That having been said, I’m still glad that such things as the ACIM Urtext are now finally available for those people, such as myself, who are willing to put up with the unkempt nature of an original draft manuscript. Studying this somewhat scattered manuscript is far different from the beauty and logic found in the polished 2nd edition of ACIM that so many of us have now come to study and to love. I feel that Ken, Bill and Helen did a magnificent job in their re-organization of the unkempt urtext in transforming it into the stately 2nd edition. Still my study of the Urtext has enabled me to pull out this information about sex, and other various bits of wisdom. As for myself, I feel that the discovery of all of this new information in the Urtext has made my explorations there, well worth the time I have spent in studying it.

Personally I’m quite glad that the published 2nd edition of ACIM was the first version of ACIM that I ever came into contact with. I know for certain that, never could I have stuck it out as a student of ACIM, if rather than the 2nd edition, instead somehow I had first come across the rather unwieldy, scattered and unkempt manuscript of the original ACIM Urtext, and probably neither would anyone else. As such, it would have probably died as a sort of a still-birth, and never survived to become the spiritual classic that it is today.

Few students of ACIM ever imagined that the release of such amazing new information would ever be the result of the copyright litigation between Endeavor Academy and F.A.C.I.M., that seemed to drag on interminably during the late 1990's and early 2000's. Perhaps this is just another reminder, meant to show us that even such a seemingly dark cloud can still have a very miraculous lining.

Note: To find the Urtext and more articles on ACIM by Scott Perry, you can visit:

<http://miraclevision.com/miracle.vision.press/>

Bibliography.—

1. **2003, UPE-Ready edition:** The edition of the ACIM Urtext that first became publicly available on the UPE (Urtext for Planet Earth) website in 2003 (see link above).
2. **Absence From Felicity:** Author- Kenneth Wapnick. Publisher- Foundation for A Course In Miracles. Copyright- 1991. Pg. 233.