

A Sentence-Outline of C. S. Lewis's MERE CHRISTIANITY

by James D. O'Reilly

An Irish priest, philosopher, theologian, and physicist, O'Reilly (1916–1978) regularly lead discussions of *Mere Christianity* with groups of lay people. For them he prepared this sentence-outline. Lewis's chapter titles are enclosed in {}.

BOOK I: RIGHT AND WRONG AS A CLUE TO THE MEANING OF THE UNIVERSE

1. **{The Law of Human Nature}** From the way in which people argue over each other's conduct we may conclude that they accept the existence of a moral law which makes a real distinction between right and wrong. This conclusion is not invalidated by the fact that a few people show no moral sense at all, and others disagree about the morality of some actions. However, it is also true that though people accept the existence of a moral law, they are conscious of violating it, as it shown by their frequent excuses for their conduct.
2. **{Some Objections}** It will not do to say that this moral law is nothing but a herd instinct. On the contrary, the moral law will often be found deciding between competing instincts, and at times, even moving us to take sides with the weaker of two impulses. The moral law itself must lie beyond instinct. Neither will it do to say that rules of morality are no more than conventions which we have inherited. Granted that moral laws are received from our elders as are conventions, but this does not make the two identical in nature. On the contrary, we observe that though conventions may differ *toto coelo* from

one country to another, the same may not be said of systems of morality. Further to the point is the fact that we judge one morality to be better or worse than another, showing that we appeal to some objective standard of morality. But one convention is neither better nor worse than another. They are simply different.

3. **{The Reality of the Law}** From the fact that people disobey the moral law we conclude that the moral law is not a statement of what people in fact do. It is a statement of what they should do. To say that the moral law is a description of that conduct which is convenient or profitable to individuals or to society as a whole is to contradict the facts. The law often prescribes what is very inconvenient to the individual. Even when what is prescribed may nevertheless be convenient to society as a whole, there remains still the problem of explaining a law which dictates that one should "convenience" society as a whole. No, the moral law is simply beyond and apart from the fact of what we do and whether it is easy or hard to do it.
4. **{What Lies Behind the Law}** The fact that the moral law is something lying beyond the observed facts of human behavior throws light on what it is that lies behind all the other observed facts of the universe. With regard to this latter there are broadly two views. One maintains that nothing whatsoever lies back of observed events. The other insists that behind observed events lies Mind. Observation itself, even scientific, is powerless, by its very nature, to decide whether any thing or nothing lies behind events. By hypothesis such an entity would not be observable. Some kind of inside knowledge—insight—alone could settle the question. It is significant that in the only class of events where we do have such inside knowledge—the observed actions of ourselves—we find evidence of a law beyond our actions. Is it not fair to presume that there is also

such a power back of those events of which we have only outside knowledge?

5. **{We Have Cause to Be Uneasy}** Some will retort that when you accept a power back of events you are turning the clock back. To which we respond that nothing could be wiser than retracing one's steps when one has gone astray. Perhaps our age has gone astray? Note that this power of which we speak is not the God of the Christians, known from Bible or Church. This power is known from unaided reason. That it is beautiful is clear from the artistry of the universe. That it is good we know from the moral standard it imposes on us. Hence this power is our greatest comfort. But alas, our failure to obey the moral law immediately puts us at odds with this power, which then becomes our greatest terror. Such is the human dilemma, that we are at enmity with a good power which lies back of events. From this dilemma only the God of the Christians can rescue us. We must have confronted the God of Reason and the fact of human sinfulness before we can appreciate the relevance of the Christian's answers. The Christian religion may be a thing of unspeakable comfort but it begins in dismay.

BOOK II: WHAT CHRISTIANS BELIEVE

1. **{The Rival Conceptions of God} The Christian concept of God** As against atheists, the Christians insist that a God exists. But the Christians reject the pantheistic notion of God which places Him beyond the level of good and evil, a kind of impersonal world-soul. On the contrary they insist that He is quite definitely "good" and "righteous," and so far from being Himself a constituent part of the universe, He is, in fact, distinct from the universe and its maker. Those who object to such a notion of God on the grounds that a good God could not

have created a world so full of evil as this one is, are on shaky ground inasmuch as their objection rests fundamentally on an appeal to some absolute standard of goodness with reference to which they judge this world evil.

2. **{The Invasion} The entrance of evil** Admitting there is a God we must squarely face the fact that there is evil in the world. Its presence constitutes a problem. The solution is not likely to be an easy or an obvious one—good solutions seldom are. Reality is usually much more than one would have guessed. The Christian answer is to say that this is a good world gone wrong. Against this stands the answer of Dualism which says that there are two supreme powers, one good, the other evil. The evil in the world comes from the bad power. The answer of Dualism is not satisfactory. As soon as you make a distinction of a good and a bad power, you make an implicit appeal to a standard by which each is judged, and then you are back to a single supreme being. Furthermore, there is an inherent contradiction in the very notion of an entirely evil being seeking evil for its own sake. Evil is not a positive entity. It is the defect in a good being, it is lack of goodness. An evil being could at the worst only be a fallen good being. Evil action could only be the seeking of truncated goodness. But there is an element of truth in Dualism. There is an evil power all right, but it is not *supremely* evil. It is a good power that has fallen, a fallen angel, a devil. This is what Christianity asserts.

3. **{The Shocking Alternative} The incarnation of God** Did God then permit this invasion of evil into His good world? Yes, He did, in the act in which He decided to create free beings. Freedom could not be freedom unless it included the possibility of man's choosing evil. A reasonable guess as to the nature of the evil choice is that it took the form of seeking to be independent of God—pride. Such a choice is bound in the end

to come to nothing since we are made for God and cannot live without Him. But if God permitted evil to happen, He also moved to overcome it. This He did in various ways: through the promptings of individual consciences, through the collective conscience of pagan peoples, through a progressive revelation made to a chosen people. But most of all, God moved against the forces of evil by coming to earth Himself, becoming incarnate! The claims of Christ to forgive sin in His own name, to have come to judge the world, to be God in fact, make Him either a knave, a fool, or truly what He claimed to be. The evidence is all against the first two. He is God.

4. **{The Perfect Penitent} The atonement** The purpose of God in coming to earth was not just to teach. He also came to atone. In looking for an explanation of atonement, we must be careful to distinguish between the fact of the atonement and the theories of atonement. A Christian is committed to the first. He may pick and choose in regard to the second, though no explanation will be free of mystery. It seems better to say that God paid our debt for us than to say he was punished for us. Man can return to God only by repentance. But sinful man needs help to repent. God must help us by repenting with us. But He can only do this if He is human. As man He could atone, as God He could do it perfectly. We need a God-man to make atonement possible.

5. **{The Practical Conclusion} Reconquest** We share in the glory of Christ's atonement by entering into His humility and sufferings. This we do through belief, baptism, communion. We lose the glory of Christ by neglect and sin. Of this we are assured by the authority of Christ. Christ comes to us through His sacraments in a physical way, not just a moral way. His use of material means accords with our material nature. We must not be scandalized. He may reach out to non-

Christians in other ways. This whole slow strategy of reconquest is out of respect for our freedom. He will not compel.

BOOK III: CHRISTIAN BEHAVIOR

1. **The Three Parts of Morality** Moral laws are not arbitrary restraints on human conduct but rather necessary rules for the running of the human machine. To speak of them as "ideals" is misleading, because so many ideals either vary with personal taste or are not necessary at all, whereas morality is the same for all and is a necessity. Better to think of morality as "rules." Moral rules are concerned with three domains: order and harmony *between individuals living in society*, order and harmony *within each individual*, and the *general purpose of human life* as a whole. Morality is most often taken to refer to the first of these. This is owing to the fact that disorder on the social level is quickly apparent to everybody, and agreement on rules is more readily reached in that domain. Yet the problem of morality on the personal level, though more difficult, cannot be passed over without imperilling social morality; and the problems of personal morality in turn cannot be solved without turning to the question of the general purpose of human life. It is in its answers to the third question that Christianity is most distinctive.

2. **The "Cardinal" Virtues** Another way of subdividing moral laws is on the basis of certain pivotal or 'cardinal' virtues. *Prudence* is a virtue which directs the mind in the choice of the good to be done—note that religion is a matter of mind and intelligence. *Temperance*, though often limited to mean abstention from liquor, is concerned with the moderate use of all things which are good. *Justice*, commonly associated in our

minds with courts of law, extends to honesty and fair play in all domains of life. *Fortitude* is not confined to the courageous endurance of evil but includes also the active assault upon it. All of these virtues are habits of acting in certain good ways, rather than the good actions themselves. For the emphasis in moral matters is primarily on the sort of character out of which we act rather than on our acts, and the virtues are perfections of character. God wants more than obedience to rules. He wants the sort of character from which such obedience follows. When he refuses the sinner admission to heaven it is because the sort that the sinner has become makes heaven an impossibility for him. Not even God could admit the non-virtuous.

3. **[Christian] {Social Morality}** Christian social morality is more concerned with reminding man of old principles of conduct than with formulating new ones. It is more concerned with general principles than with specific programs. Elaboration of detailed programs is rather the business of the Christian laity of each generation than of the Church. The social principles of the New Testament give one a picture of the Christian society as one in which (a) all have an obligation to work and there is no room for parasites (b) there is subordination or classes with the consequent obligation of obedience to authority (c) everything must be done with cheerfulness. Thus, Christian society is in some respects socialistic, in others aristocratic. Disputes on the matter arise only when people fasten attention on one of these to the exclusion of the other. Our modern economy has departed from the system of earlier Christian times by its adoption of investment of money based on the motive of interest taking. Is this, perhaps, a betrayal of Christian principle? The New Testament lays emphasis rather on the charitable disposal of surplus wealth—even at the risk of personal security. To criticise Christian social principles as leftist is to set oneself up

as a judge, whereas Christian social morality presents itself to us as a Master to be obeyed. To have a Christian society, we must first want to obey Christian social principles, not pick and choose among them. To want to obey, we must first be Christian in our personal moral life.

4. **Morality and Psychoanalysis** Christian individual morality sets before us a technique for becoming the sort we ought to be. But so too, it seems, does psychoanalysis. It is necessary to make a clear distinction between their different roles, and that we be able while borrowing the scientific conclusions of psychoanalysis—usually sound—to refuse to commit ourselves to the philosophizings of psychoanalysis—often erroneous. Our free moral choices are the subject matter of Christian moral principles. But these choices are exerted upon a raw material of feelings and impulses which are neither rational nor free, and sometimes very abnormal. It is the business of psychoanalysis to detect and remove the abnormal impulses and feelings. Once this is done, Christian moral principles are at hand to help one make a free moral choice from what is left. God judges us by our moral choices viewed in relation to the kind of raw material of feeling and impulse from which each person has to work. It is the succession of such free choices that make us creatures of heaven or hell—not the arbitrary election of God. The adverse effect of a wrong choice upon a man's soul is proportioned to his subjective guilt rather the objective enormity of the evil done. Right choices lead to goodness and peace, but what is right and what is wrong is clearly perceived only in the measure in which we are already good. Only those who are awake can know what sleep is. Only the good can recognise evil. The bad are blind.

5. **Sexual Morality** Chastity is not to be confused with modesty. Modesty is a rule of propriety in dress, conduct, etc.

which may change with the times, but chastity is a rule which is the same for all times; “either marriage with complete faithfulness or else total abstinence.” This rule is so opposed to sexual instinct that either the rule is wrong or the instinct is depraved. Christianity insists that the latter is the case. For one thing, whereas most other instincts go slightly beyond their biological purpose, the sex appetite is in ludicrous excess of its function. The eager reception accorded a strip-tease act on a stage by the average audience would be rated as madness if it were given to the unveiling of food, unless the audience were made up of persons who had been starved of food, which is hardly the case with sex in this age. For another thing, perversions of the food appetite are rare, those of the sex appetite many and hard to cure. If, as some allege, the mess has been caused by hushing up sex too much, how is it that the past twenty years of ventilation of the subject has only made matters worse? But in fact, Christianity has not put the hush of shame around sex itself, but around the deplorable state into which the sexual instinct has gotten itself. Curing the disease is difficult. We must first want to be better, and even this comes hard. Subtle propaganda insists that unrestrained sex is ‘healthy,’ but the opposite is the case. Indeed, there is no desire which does not have to be restrained by some principles. Those who allege that restraint is impossible have forgotten how people show themselves capable of surmounting difficulties when they know that they have to. God’s help is always at hand for those who are willing to make the first move. Those who contend that restraint is psychologically harmful are confusing subconscious repressions—admittedly harmful—with conscious self-discipline, which ennobles.

6. **Christian Marriage** Christian teaching conceives man and wife as two halves combined into a single organism by a union which is not just sexual but total. Though Christian

churches may disagree on how awful a thing it is to sever this organism, they agree that severance by divorce is not just a simple matter of readjustment of partners. Justice demands that partners be faithful to their vow by which all lovers end by taking seriously what was begun in passion and when they were “in love”. It is no excuse to say that they are no longer ‘in love’ for the promise was not to stay ‘in love,’ but rather, to ‘love.’ ‘Being in love’ is a feeling which cannot be the subject of a promise, rarely lasts, and is no basis for a life together. To ‘love’ is an act of will, strengthened by habit, able to last and is the subject of the promise. Novels and the cinema may try to tell us that the thrill of ‘being in love’ can last forever. In truth, such thrills are only meant to start us off, and then by their death push us on to the discovery of something better—love of a mature kind. But though the Christian eschews divorce for himself he may not prevent others who do not share his conviction from seeking divorce under civil laws. Within the organism of Christian marriage, the husband is the head. Someone must have the deciding vote as between two disputants. That it should be the husband is arguable from the fact that women instinctively despise hen-pecked men, are ashamed to be themselves accused of bossing their husbands, and, as a class, are by nature partial to their own children. Now the head of a family must be able to exercise impartiality towards his own household so that a union of heads of different families into a state may be possible. Fathers possess this impartiality, mothers do not.

7. **Forgiveness** This virtue though difficult is central to Christian behavior. To know what it involves we need only to analyse what we mean by loving ourselves, for the Christian rule is that we should love others as we love ourselves. Loving myself does not mean that I am fond of myself and think well of myself, very often I do not. But when I hate, it is my sins I hate

and not myself. As to myself, I hope and wish to be better. This is the pattern for love of others. The sure sign of having missed it is to find ourselves disappointed when the bad story about another turned out not to be true. As love of myself is compatible with punishing myself so too is love of others. Hence the falsity of some forms of Christian pacifism. “Killing” is not the same thing as “murder.” You can love the enemy whom you kill in war. The basis of our love of self is that we are ‘selves.’ That is why God loves us and why we must love other ‘selves.’

8. **{The Great Sin} Pride** Pride is the worst vice since it is inherently anti-God. Because of pride’s wish to rise in power above any other, it is essentially competitive. Other vices can coexist with friendship, but pride stands for enmity. Pride prevents its possessor from knowing the true God inasmuch as the true God is He who is greater than any other. The proud man’s God is a phantom God whose role it is to approve of the proud man’s worth. In the end it is himself that the proud man worships, and in this way pride enters into the very heart of religion. (To take delight in praise is not pride in so far as it acknowledges some dependence on others. It is delight in self to the point of disregarding the praise of others that is dangerous. ‘To be proud of’ usually means to stand in admiration of and is good. God hates pride not because it hurts his own pride, but it hurts the truth which is that He really is the top. To be humble does not mean to be greasy, obsequious.)

9. **{Charity}** This refers not just to almsgiving but to love in general. Charity is a disposition of the will, not of the emotions. To love is not the same thing as to like. Where natural likings exist we must encourage them within the bounds of reason, but it is love primarily that we must cultivate. The way to set about the task is to begin to act towards others as if we

really did love them. We will end by really loving them. Conversely, hateful actions towards others tend to breed increased hatred. This is true in our relations with both God and man.

10. **{Hope}** Hope in a future world is necessary for effectiveness in this. One must look farther ahead in order to achieve what is closer to hand. Too often we are trained to look to this world and thereby fail to detect behind our earthly longings our secret wish for that which earth cannot give. Thus, when we fail to find satisfaction in some earthly joy we either go in search of other equally vain joys, or we give up seeking altogether. Instead, we ought to learn the Christian truth that earthly joys fail us not because they are a snare, but because they are meant to suggest to us the real happiness beyond earth. Those who sneer at “playing harps” in heaven are too ignorant to penetrate beneath the Bible’s symbolism which alone could describe the world to come.

11. **{Faith}** Faith, in the first meaning of the word, viz. the accepting of Christianity on the strength of the evidence for it, is indeed a virtue. Not that one need be praised for accepting evidence, but that it takes strength to fight off the non-rational moods in which we feel tempted to abandon the conclusion. In this sense, faith is the art of holding on to reason in spite of mood. Such faith is developed by reflection on what one believes and by prayer. To approach the second meaning of faith we must note that every attempt to live the Christian virtues shows us our helplessness before God. In equal contest with Him we would be defeated. We cannot earn anything from Him.

12. **{Faith}** When a man realises his bankruptcy on the score of mere moral effort he comes imperceptibly into a new relation of faith with God, that despite his nothingness as a

creature, God will share his Sonship with us. Our moral effort continues but not now as trying to earn anything from God. Works continue but in faith. Misunderstanding of this point lies back of the exaggerated conflicts on salvation by faith or by works. You cannot separate the two, and though Christianity may start with much emphasis on morality and works of virtue, yet it ends with something more than morality—faith.

BOOK IV: BEYOND PERSONALITY

1. **{Making and Begetting}** There is a tendency to exalt religious experience at the expense of theology. There is, of course, a sense in which the former is more real. But though theology has the unreality of a map, it has all the usefulness of a map, whereas personal experience does not lead one anywhere. In line with the preference for experience is the muddle-headed thinking of modern England which looks on Jesus Christ primarily as a great moral teacher, the founder of a new social order. True, he is all that, but much more is he the purveyor of theological doctrine. Foremost in this theological doctrine is the statement that Christ is the Son of God, begotten, not made, and that we are called to become sons of God through Him. For it must not be forgotten that as creatures of God we are simply made, not begotten. Things that are made do not share the life of their maker, but merely reflect his nature. The lower orders of creatures do this in a very imperfect and limited way. We who stand highest in the scale are images of God in the fullest sense, but we still do not share his life. This we would do if we were to become sons of God.

2. **{The Three-Personal God}** Christians will agree that the God who lies behind everything must be more than a person. But they mean by this that he is super-personal, unlike

some others who would look on God as something less than personal. Furthermore they believe that human souls can be taken into the life of God, yet not as some others would explain it—in such a way that we are absorbed in the divinity. In the Christian view, we remain ourselves. As lines are contained in surfaces, and surfaces in volumes, as higher geometrics contain within themselves the concepts of lower geometrics, so does the super-personal nature of God contain in itself our more limited mode of personality. In God three persons share the one identical nature. We are as little able to imagine such a God as we would be able to picture a geometry of more than three dimensions. The ordinary Christian begins to enter into the life of the three-personal God when he draws near to Christ and begins to pray to the Father through Christ. Getting to know beings of lower orders is comparatively simple. The initiative is all on our side, and the beings passively submit to our scrutiny. Animals are more elusive and less easily known on that account. With people we have to win their confidence before they open up to us. They can refuse to be known. Approach to God is the most difficult of all. It is not possible without a complete surrender on our part to him. He gives himself only to those who are individually good and are united in love to their fellows. The way to the God-life is through the corporate life of the Christian community.

3. **{Time and Beyond Time}** Some Christians wonder how God can attend to all of us at the same time. The difficulty vanishes as soon as we cease to think of God as being in time at all. There is no question of ‘same time’ with him. As the author is out of the time of the novel which he writes by being in his own time, so God is out of the time of his creatures by not being in time at all. It is for this reason that it is perfectly useless to fit Christ’s earthly life in Palestine into any time-relations with His life as God beyond space and time. It is not a period in

God's history. God is not in history. In the same way, God's foreknowledge is in agreement with the freedom of our actions. To Him all acts are eternally present, though to us they may be "what I am going to do".

4. **{Good Infection}** The effect does not have to come after the cause. The two may be coeval. When we say that the Father begot the Son we do not deny thereby that each existed from eternity. The thought is just as old as the thinker, and the relation of Father and Son is of that sort. The Father expresses Himself in the Son. From eternity, Father and Son are drawn to each other by love. As love between human persons takes shape in corporate embodiment, so does love in God issue forth but in a Person, the Holy Spirit. By sharing the life of the Son we are drawn into the love of the Father and the Spirit is born in us.

5. **{The Obstinate Toy Soldiers}** God the Son became man to enable man to enter God's life. Our egocentricity makes us oppose any merger of our life with God's. So God took a human nature in Christ, accepted the suffering which that implied, even death, and rose triumphantly. In Christ humanity has been redeemed in principle. It remains for us to make redemption a fact by becoming partakers of that redeemed humanity, by laying ourselves open to the saving grace of Christ.

6. [This short section contains "Two Notes" relating to the previous section.]

7. **{Let's Pretend}** As in the fables so in Christianity, what starts as pretense ends by becoming reality. You try to act as if God were your father—and not with the phony kind of pretense but with real earnestness. You soon find that the Son of God is at your side helping you to really become a child of God.

Though the immediate and obvious source of that help may be found in nature, books, experiences, other Christians, yet it is Christ who is ultimately using these agents to transform us. So far from being a man who died two thousand years ago, he is the God-man living and active in us, and it is the inmost reaches of our being that he is changing. While we are able to control only our actions, he is able to modify what we are. Our contribution is to let him do it to us.

8. **{Is Christianity Hard or Easy?}** The whole aim of Christianity is the transformation of our being, and not, as is commonly thought, to make us behave better while all the time remaining our natural selves. To the lazy mind the reform of behavior might seem to be the easier task, while the surrender of ourselves to be transformed seems to demand our all. But it turns out in the end that the latter is the easier while the compromise which many of us would like to attempt is impossibly hard. True, Christ asks us to take up a cross, but he promises that the yoke will be sweet. Church activities such as missions, social service, etc. are often looked upon as ends in themselves, but in fact they are only means to the principal goal, the transformation of human nature. It is possible that the activities of the entire universe are geared to nothing less than this same goal, that we be drawn to the Father through the Son.

9. **{Counting the Cost}** God's wish for us is that we should be perfect. In this he resembles the dentist who is not interested in relieving our toothache unless we are prepared to let him do a complete job on our teeth. We must not be alarmed at God's demands. He will help our first faltering steps. Nor must we desire to stop short after we have made a little progress. That would be fatal. His plan is that we should go all the way, and after all, it is what he is planning for us that will be best for us, not what we would like to do. Having let God into

our house to do some repairs, we are not to be surprised if we find him remodelling the building. He wants a palace in which to dwell.

10. **{Nice People or New Men}** If the aim of Christianity is to transform our being radically, why are not all Christians nice people and all non-Christians nasty people? In the first place, not all Christians are one hundred percent Christian. You find all possible degrees of Christianity. In the second place, what we call “niceness” is partly an accidental heritage. Some start out with more of it, some with less. The person with a nasty disposition may yet be a better Christian because he had less niceness to start out with, while the person with the nice disposition may owe his niceness to an inherited temperament more than to any effort put forth as a Christian. In the third place, the aim of Christianity is not the production of maximum niceness of nature. God’s plan is that our natures, nice or nasty, would be surrendered to him to be transformed in their being. But he will not force us. We must submit freely. Paradoxically, it is the nice person who may have the harder struggle to surrender, because he will be complacent about his niceness. Whereas the nastier person, having no illusions about himself, will be more ready to submit. The poor will more easily enter the kingdom. Niceness is fine but it could ruin us with pride. Redemption is not mere improvement nor is being Christian identical with being nice.

11. **{The New Men}** Viewed as a transformation of human nature, Christianity might be considered as the closing stage of evolutionary development. Looking back over the history of past stages of evolution, we often indulge in guessing what the next stage might be. But if the past is any criterion, we might look for some quite unexpected development. What we might expect is not just a difference, but a new kind of

difference, not just a change but a new way of changing. The next stage in evolution might not be evolution at all. This is in line with what Christianity might seem to promise. From creatures we are to become sons of God, and the change is not evolution from within, but transformation from without. Sexual reproduction will play no part in our future increase—indeed there was a time in the past when it was unknown. Whereas past stages of evolution were determined, this stage is freely willed. Christ is the prototype of the new life. We become new by being incorporated in him. Past stages have been very slow. This last stage is moving very fast. The stakes are now the highest. By consenting we stand to reach the infinite; by refusal we risk total loss. Samples of the new man have begun to make their appearance—they are very different. Nor ought we to make the mistake of thinking that because new men are all patterned after Christ therefore they will all be monotonously the same. Quite the contrary. It is oneness in Christ that more than anything else truly brings out the self in a person so that he is uniquely himself and not like any other. Indeed, it is the falling back into one’s natural self that makes for sameness. The lower we fall the more do we become conditioned by the physical and the organic in us, and the more does propaganda replace personal ideals. It is when I give myself up to the Personality of Christ that I first begin to have a real personality of my own. But in giving up our ‘selves’ we must not be aiming at the improvement of our ‘selves.’ Our motive must be to seek God for his own sake. The transformation of our self will follow. We must really lose our ‘selves’ in order to find salvation.

THE END