

# ***OUT IN THE OPEN***

***Ongoing***

**(Featuring works written since August, 2011)**

**- 81 Pages -**

***By***

***Francis William Bessler***

**Previous Volumes (1-8)  
+ an Overview Volume  
Featured a Compilation  
of  
The Complete Written Works  
of  
Francis William Bessler  
From 1963-2011**

**Previous Volumes  
Compiled in April - June, 2011**

**Featuring  
Original essays, stories & songs  
In  
Chronological order.**

**Copyright by  
Francis William Bessler  
Laramie, Wyoming  
- 2011 -**

# OUT IN THE OPEN

By Francis William Bessler

Written 4/8/2011

## **Refrain 1:**

**Out in the open – it's the best way to find God.**

**Out in the open – truth does not depend upon applause.**

**Out in the open – no devil can exist.**

**Out in the open – there's no room for sin.**

Well, my friends, I'm no guru,  
but I don't think I need to be.

When I simply look at life,  
it's all I need to be free.

Let others read lots of books  
if they believe that will help;  
but I think that if that's all they know,  
what they know will be more like Hell. **Refrain 1.**

I'm told I should fear Satan  
and I say, why should I?  
It's clear Satan can't exist  
when I'm standing beneath a sky.

Just look out as far as you can see  
and all devils disappear.

So just keep looking outward  
and you'll never need to fear. **Refrain 1.**

I learned long time ago,  
back when I was a child,  
That the only truth anyone needs  
is found in the wild.

To the degree, I can be  
one with the deer and antelope  
is the same degree I can find peace  
and that wonderful thing called hope. **Refrain 1.**

I think it's good to know  
that we're all the same.  
I don't need you and you don't need me  
to share a common fate.  
The truth we both need  
is out there in the universe.  
Just become one with the All –  
and let that be what we rehearse. **Refrain 1.**

And when I die what will happen  
to this thing I call my soul?  
It will just continue on  
on the merry path I know.  
Wherever my souls goes,  
it will stay among the stars.  
Freedom's only belonging to All  
whether that All is near or far. **Refrain 1.**

**Refrain 2 (several times):**  
**Out in the open – it's my favorite phrase.**  
**Out in the open – it lets my nights look to day.**  
**Out in the open – it's the way I want to go.**  
**Out in the open – it's the best way to know.**

# INTRODUCTION

*Hello Again!* Welcome to this **ONGOING** Volume of a personal writings series I called – and am calling - ***OUT IN THE OPEN***. I will not offer much of an explanation of that – except to say that previous volumes reflected writings completed until this time of August of 2011 – though all writings were complete as of June, 2011. I will leave it at that. If for some reason you are unaware of previous writings, and find yourself curious about them, I suggest referring to a Microsoft CD of the same name that contains that entire series – though it is possible that some editions of that CD will contain this volume to the time of the creation of a CD. The sum of all 9 volumes of the past is 1,189 pages. If you wish a copy of the previous ***OUT IN THE OPEN*** pc CD, consider yourself welcome to contact me at one of my addresses closing this Introduction. If I can make a copy, I will.

A few have asked me to keep writing my thoughts in the forms I have selected for writing in the past – namely: ***song, essay, and/or philosophical story***. **Are you going to continue writing?** Some have asked that; and my answer has been: ***I don't know. Maybe!*** Well, this volume is intended to contain any ***maybe*** writing. If I write something, I will simply add it to this **Ongoing** volume - until such time that I consider it complete - which can happen at any time. Who knows when that will be, but when it does, I will add a **THE END** at the end - to replace any previous **TO BE CONTINUED**.

I will begin this volume, however – not with a **song or an essay or a story** – but with a ***simple quip***. Where it will go from there is anyone's guess. It may end with the initial quip, but probably not. With each addition, however, I will change the date of this introduction to comply with the last update; though let me say for the record, that I am starting it on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

In any case, welcome to my **ONGOING** volume – Volume 10, as it were - of my complete ***OUT IN THE OPEN*** writings series.

***Onwards!***

*Francis William Bessler,*  
4746 E. Skyline Drive, # 108  
Laramie, Wyoming 82070  
307-742-6868 ([willieb@wyoming.com](mailto:willieb@wyoming.com))  
December 31st, 2011

**Note:** Today, December 31st, 2011, I am ending this series; though if I discover some song or essay of the past that has not been included, I **may** amend it. When I started this **ONGOING** volume, for instance, I had yet to discover (or rediscover) several works of the past - all of which have been added to this most recent issue. I found a poem or song called **GOD** at one time in some papers I had stashed away, So, I added **GOD** to this volume. Later I found a couple of old poems that I found stashed away among some pages of a photo album. Those two poems (or songs) - one called **SMALL** and another called **ANITA** - have been added. Accordingly, if I discover other works of the past, I may amend this volume to include them. Otherwise, it is my intention to let this be it.

The final entry is one called **WISDOM** which also features a last song - **SEVEN, SEVENTY, & SEVENTY**. Upon reaching the rather poetic age of 70, I consider this to be a good time to cap it off - and write no more. I have written quite a bit as it is - and though I could write a lot more - I think it would be good to call it "**done**" just so I can know that any issue of CD of my entire **OUT IN THE OPEN** writings will be complete - subject only to grammatical type corrections I may find in reviewing any work - and, of course, a possible addition of a past work - though I strongly suspect that I will not even allow that. I am rather anxious to consider it complete - and so it will take quite a "lost article" to amend the series.

With that, I leave you to this final volume of my entire **OUT IN THE OPEN** writings series. Enjoy as you will; and thanks so much listening!

Gently & Gratefully,

*Francis William Bessler,*

**P.S. Decided on another "final entry" on August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012.  
See final entry of INDEX: *EUGIENISM***

# INDEX

A Starting Quip .....	8
<b>LUCKY ME</b> – essay + song with same name .....	9
<b>Our Growing Economic Mess</b> – an editorial (9/10/2011) .....	15
<b>Report to Homesteader Museum (of Powell, Wyoming)</b> .....	16
<b>Drink To Be Free</b> (a poem) .....	20
<b>GOD</b> (a poem) .....	21
<b>STILL ALIVE</b> – essay + song ( <b>Life</b> ) .....	23
<b>MY HOLISTIC VIEW OF LIFE – short version</b> .....	29
Short story (Parody) + song (poem)	
<b>MY HOLISTIC VIEW OF LIFE – long (complete) version</b> .....	34
Short story (Parody), song (poem) + essay	
<b>HELLO, EVERYBODY</b> - song on my 70 <sup>th</sup> birthday .....	52
<b>SMALL</b> - about a couple of "lost" songs: <b>SMALL &amp; ANITA</b> .....	54
<b>WISDOM</b> - including	
<b>SEVEN, SEVENTEEN, &amp; SEVENTY</b> - a final song .....	57
<b>EUGIENISM</b> .....	67

# ***BEWARE!***

***PEOPLE WHO DO NOT THINK FOR  
THEMSELVES RUN THE CONSTANT RISK  
OF BECOMING SLAVES OF OTHER  
PEOPLE'S THINKING!***

Francis William Bessler  
Laramie, Wyoming  
August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011



# ***LUCKY ME!***

By  
Francis William Bessler  
Laramie, Wyoming  
September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011

## **ADMISSION**

I am a Naturalist at heart and believe strongly that the ideal is to embrace the Natural. How could that not include myself? I think we are born as Natural creatures which possess an inner drive to know ourselves, but those who want to rule cannot rule unless they have something to offer. So in order to have something to offer that we have not in ourselves, they ban the Natural because what they have to offer can't be Natural – or it would not be needed. The craziness that goes forward, then, is society makes rules that override a drive within us all to know ourselves. Truly sad when what we are is far more superior than what those who want to rule can offer us.

## **AMONG THE LUCKY**

I am not the luckiest person in this world – but that is mostly because there is no such thing. There is no ***luckiest*** person in the world. There are only lucky ones and unlucky ones. Granted, there are degrees of lucky and unlucky, but how is it possible to be that single one who is luckier than all the rest – or that single one who is un-luckier than all the rest?

Bypassing having to be the luckiest person in the world, then, let me settle for being among the lucky. Now, that I can handle. I will admit – I want to be on the lucky side of the picture. I want to look at that guy that is me and say – hey, lucky one, how are you doing? I sure do not want to look at the one that is me and feel compelled to look away for looking at a sorry mess. Who would want that?

Let us investigate, however. Why are some of us lucky – or see ourselves that way? And why are some of us unlucky – or see ourselves that way? I think it is mostly a vision thing. I think to be lucky, one has to start out being happy with what they see. True luck, then, begins with some instruction that dictates that one is fortunate. ***Luck – at least enduring luck - can never happen if one begins with an instruction that one is unfortunate because luck, in practice, is a movement.*** One is either in some flow – or out of it – or in another flow – or out of it. It is as simple as that.

The key to having luck, then, is to ***pick the right flow***. Get into the right stream – and then like a log floating in a stream, you simply ***go with the flow***. Don't fight it. Just go with it. It is so easy if you know the process. Likewise, it must be very difficult if you are of a chosen mind to think it is not easy – or should not be easy. If you think a course should be hard – and then you fail the course – why should you complain if you do not succeed?

Therein is the difference, I think, between easy and hard, lucky and unlucky, fortunate and unfortunate, blessed or damned. It all depends on how you see things that determines if life will be easy or hard, lucky or unlucky, fortunate or unfortunate – or

blessed or damned. In all likelihood, however, scratch the last 3 of my comparisons – and settle only on the 1<sup>st</sup> one – easy or hard.

Hard, I think, is just another way of saying “struggle”. I think some are absolutely convinced that there must be struggle in life and that life without struggle is without purpose. I suppose that is because much of religion has been dictating that since time began.

It all begins, though, I think with being taught that you are less than what you should be. Why should I have to struggle if I am right as I am? Why should I have to be better than another – at anything – unless I do not find myself content with what I am? Why must I make some effort to become other than I am? Why am I not right – just as I am?

***Why am I not right – just as I am?*** Is that the right question, however? I do not think so. Forget the ***why*** and ask the question again. ***Am I not right – just as I am?*** Should I have to struggle? Not – why should I have to struggle? Should I have to be better than another? Not – why should I have to be better than another?

***At least in my case, when I dropped the “why” and asked questions without assuming a why, Hard became Easy, Unlucky became Lucky, Unfortunate became Fortunate, and Damned became Blessed; and once I embraced Blessed, Fortunate, and Lucky, Hard became Heretical.***

Why? Now, there “why” is relevant. By dropping the why, I did not begin by assuming that I am not right in the first place, in terms of worthy. And when I asked myself “if” I should consider myself unworthy, I found – and find – myself answering in the negative. Me? Unworthy or lacking in mystery or miracle? I can find no proof that I am lacking. So, according to my vision, I am as worthy as anyone – simply for being part of a truly wonderful, worthy creation. Should I not consider myself very fortunate then? I do; and since fortune translates as luck, presto, I find myself on the lucky side of the picture of life.

What does most of the world know, though? Correct me if I am wrong. Most people have swallowed – hook, line, and sinker – the common directive that life should be hard. Thus people have to “make their luck”. It won’t happen unless they do.

In fact, however, many may end up with “made luck,” but that does not make them happy. **Made luck** is not the same thing as **born luck**. I was “born lucky” – though I had to realize it. I have not made myself lucky. I have not “made my fortune”. I have not sweated with the last ounce of my sweat and endured the “hard” and become successful. I have simply realized that life itself is a gift beyond imagination – and I had nothing to do with it.

That, I believe, is the basis of true luck or fortune – to know that life is a gift and to treat it as such. Of course, it is to each, his or her own – as it should be – but I think that when true luck is so easy when it only depends on saying “thank you” for the gift of life, it is truly sad that so many depend upon themselves for their luck and their success – and when they die, their luck and success go to the grave while they cannot but continue to insist on making their own luck – or creating their own fortune.

## QUESTIONS & ASSUMPTIONS

It has been said that none of us is an island – and I certainly agree with that in that we are really all alike. In fact, that idea of not being an island unto myself has been one of the most endearing and driving thoughts of my life; however, in another way, I think each of us should be an island. Each of us should absolutely demand that each of us has the right to ask what questions we want – not be told, in a way, what questions we should ask.

The key, I think, to finding true answers is to be free to ask our own questions. I think there is nothing more important in life than the freedom and the willingness to ask questions; and it is best to resist letting others suggest the questions you should ask - and never let another pose a question that is really based on an assumption within it – because such a question is really more of an assumption than a question. **When we start with an assumption – posed as a question – not much truth can follow.**

I offered an example before. Another who might want me to believe that I am sinful will not ask – am I sinful? – but rather **why** am I sinful? The latter is really not a question but an assumption. The person seemingly asking the question is really “telling” us that he believes all are sinful – and then implies we agree with him that all are sinful by assuming we agree with him. I am not supposed to question his assumed belief that we are sinful. I am supposed to first agree with him that we are sinful and then “speculate” about **why** it is so. In fact, however, the assumption that we are sinful in the first place may not be true – and personally, I am one who believes it is not true.

I am not sinful. Therefore I do not have to answer **why** I am sinful. If you believe you are sinful, then you should ask – **why am I sinful?** But don’t assume that I agree with you in the first place that I am sinful. **Do not pretend you are asking a question when you are really proposing that I follow some course you have planned for me.**

### ***IT’S A REASON I’M LUCKY***

Why do I make this argument? Again, **why** is appropriate here because I am not misleading with an assumption within my question. One of the reasons I have realized how lucky I am in life is because of my commitment to **ask questions**. I think there is a direct correlation between being lucky and asking questions – but the questions have to be your own – or my own – or that of the one searching in life.

How many of us have dealt in life with some supervisor offering us that we must do as they say and not ask questions. I know my dear ole Dad was somewhat guilty of that. If he could not give me an answer as to why I should do or not do something, he’d say – even though lovingly – **never mind why – just do as I say because I am your father.**

Another ploy to get people to follow a certain course without insisting on true answers for some conduct is – **never mind – it’s the will of God**. That is supposed to quell any rightful questioning and let the one who is seeking to command to get his (or her) way. If you can’t answer a question, just respond with some misleading notion that someone in true authority is commanding it. Thus we often get things like: **It’s the will of God** or **the Bible says it’s so** or **the Koran says it’s so** or **the Book of Mormon says it’s so** or **Jesus bid me to do it**, etc.

People often claim that such and such a document or writing is the **Word of God**. A true lucky person will not let someone get away with claiming that something is the

**Word of God** without some proof that it is. If one believes without proof of claim, then it is all so likely that what is really true will never be known. That is the great tragedy of accepting some claim without questioning it. **In accepting some blind position as definitely true, one may very well deny and neglect a true paradise at hand – because we can really only dedicate ourselves to just one thing at a time.** If we commit ourselves to an erroneous position, then we can only deny what is true; and how smart is that?

## AN ISLAND THAT IS ME

I began this little essay with an admission that I am a Naturalist who believes in the essential goodness of life itself. Well, I did not say it quite like that, but it is true. I live in amazement of the created world and that includes the amazement of me. I shake my head every day – wondering how it can be; but no matter how much I wonder, I can never figure it out. I have long realized, however, that I do not need to figure it out. Let me believe that I am good – essentially and inherently good – because that is all I see around me. I am simply an island within a sea of goodness. All around me is good. So, how could the little me that is in the middle of my eternal world not be good?

Now, some might think of an island as being one that is isolated from some main land; but that is not how I see an island. **The island that is me is not isolated from some main land of good far away, but rather is one that is surrounded with goodness, no matter where I look.** I have no need to set sail to some far away land in search for some fantastic adventure because all that is in that supposed far away land is already right where I am – on my little island – and in the little island that is me.

I am not alone, however. Each of us is a little island, surrounded by the goodness of all that is. No one needs to go anywhere else to find love and fulfillment because all that might be elsewhere is already there in you. You simply need to see yourself as part of that wonderful goodness, not apart from it. ***You are surrounded by the Goodness of All. Why not surrender to it and not fight against it?*** You want to find a wonderful you someplace else; but that is because you do not know that you are already the wonderful you that you want to be elsewhere. ***Heaven is only realizing you have already arrived.***

## *Lucky Me!*

A song by  
Francis William Bessler  
September 3rd, 2011

### ***Refrain:***

***Lucky me – I am in love with myself.***

***Lucky me – I have no need for help.***

***Lucky me – as I go forward in this life,***

***I am among the lucky because of my sight.***

I'm a little island in a sea of good.  
I believe that I'm among a great brotherhood.

All I see around me is filled with mystery;  
and I'm engulfed within the scope of all Eternity. **Refrain.**

A long, long time ago, Jesus said I should know myself  
because he realized self-denial is really hell.  
It's foolish to deny that I'm part of everything –  
when knowing that I'm part of it all  
should make me want to sing. **Refrain.**

And when it comes for me my time to pass along,  
hopefully I will pass in peace, singing this very song  
because what's in store is only more  
of what I will have left behind.  
The wonder will continue  
and the whole world will still be mine. **Refrain.**

**Ending:**

**Sing it out, everyone!** Then **Refrain** a few times.

Then:

**Yes, I am among the lucky because of my sight.**

**I am among the lucky because of my sight.**

-----

**Note:** If you wonder about my claim that Jesus urged us to know ourselves in the 2<sup>nd</sup> verse, I am basing that on a verse within the much ignored **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS**. In my writings within my overall series I call **OUT IN THE OPEN**, I deal a lot with trying to research some of the banned gospels of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century, namely **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS** and **THE GOSPEL OF MARY (Magdalene)**. Rather than offer any more on that in this essay, I refer you to my greater **OUT IN THE OPEN** writings. For what it's worth, however, here is the verse I reference in my song above.

**Verse 3: Jesus said: If those who lead you say to you: "See, the Kingdom is in heaven", then the birds of the heaven will precede you. If they say to you: "It is in the sea," then the fish will precede you. But the Kingdom is within you and it is without you. If you (will) know yourselves, then you will be known and you will know that you are the sons of the Living Father. But if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty and you are poverty.**

***LUCKY ME!***

-----

***THE END***

# Our Growing Economic Mess

An Editorial for the Laramie Boomerang

By

Francis William Bessler

- Printed September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2011 -

This is about our current economic mess - growing unemployment and growing national debt.

I think much of our current economic mess is due to a "de-industrialization" of America - mostly from closing our manufacturing plants and "shipping" them off shore, so to speak. **Now, we can argue about why that happened, but I think it is because it happened that Americans are seeing growing unemployment - and an accompanying growing national debt. If people are losing their jobs, then naturally they have no income to pay taxes. That means that government income through taxes is being reduced.**

So what do we do now? As I see it, we either get back our lost manufacturing - our previous base - or we change to allow government run programs to take over where industry has failed.

I do not see that it is very likely that America can regain its manufacturing base - for having released it to others who can do it for much less than we can. So that option seems to be out. That leaves more government employment and naturally, greater taxation to pay for it. Industry had its chance to prove that it could supply jobs, given tax breaks. It has demonstrated that it is either unwilling or incapable of doing what it promised.

Currently, I am mostly on Social Security and that income is not taxed; but to put America back to work - and require work on the part of the able collecting unemployment beyond some initial term of allowance - I would be willing to be taxed as my part of the bargain - as long as every income is equally taxed without allowance for deductions.

When America could rely on greater manufacturing to resolve recessions, it worked back then; but now that we cannot increase what we no longer have as a base, we will just have to figure out another way. There is lots of infrastructure work to be done, for instance; and the unemployed could be compensated for work in that arena. A certain percentage of all income could go to pay off the national debt. With all of us paying something, that debt should be reduced to 0 rather soon; and after that, we could live within a balanced budget. It might work. What do you think?

Thank You for listening,

Francis (Frank, Will) Bessler  
Laramie, Wyoming

*Note: The print in bold was included in my original submission, but to keep my letter within a maximum of 350 words per Laramie Boomerang requirement, I deleted that part in bold. FWB.*

**Report to  
Homesteader Museum  
of  
Powell, Wyoming  
on my writings  
as featured in my pc CD:  
*OUT IN THE OPEN***

By  
Francis William Bessler  
(Native of Powell, Wyoming)

**September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

**From:**

***Francis William Bessler  
4746 E. Skyline Drive, # 108  
Laramie, Wyoming 82070***

Born of Leo & Clara Bessler, Powell Wyoming: Dec 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1941 –  
the 7<sup>th</sup> of 8 children born of Leo & Clara.

Attended school in Powell through high school, graduating in May of 1960.

Subsequently studied for the Catholic ministry in Wisconsin and Colorado for  
6 years – until I was dismissed by faculty of St. Thomas Seminary in Denver  
in May of 1966 because my “**thinking is not that of a Catholic priest**”.

While studying for the ministry, however, I began my questioning approach  
to learning about life by writing about my thoughts. In fact, it was some of  
my early writings questioning Catholic dogma that led to my dismissal from  
further study at St. Thomas. The searching and questioning and writing has  
continued though – from the earliest saved writing of 1963 to now.

Phone: 307-742-6868

Email: [willieb@wyoming.com](mailto:willieb@wyoming.com)

**To:**

***Homesteader Museum  
P.O. Box 54  
Powell, Wyoming 82435***

Phone: 307-754-9481

Email: [homesteader@bresnan.net](mailto:homesteader@bresnan.net)



Regarding Accession# 11.24

About my CD: ***OUT IN THE OPEN***

I thank you, **Homesteader Museum** of Park County of Wyoming, for including my work – ***OUT IN THE OPEN*** – among the many artifacts of various citizens of Powell down through the years. You asked that I provide some “historical information” about my own contribution. I hope the following satisfies that request. Thanks for asking.

I consider it (***OUT IN THE OPEN***) to be somewhat of an “*intellectual diary*” of my own progression in life. Though I did not start out to write such a diary, it just so happens that such is what has happened. I have always loved searching for truth – especially soulful or spiritual truth; and I have found myself expressing in some written form various notions that I have considered in my search for the truth. In a very big way, writing has been a main way I have used to both question and resolve various issues for myself. ***OUT IN THE OPEN*** simply features those various writings in the order in which they were written – from my first saved writing of 1963 to current time – in 7 main volumes + an 8<sup>th</sup> that features only my songs in alphabetical order. The format is Microsoft Word. Access to my CD is by personal computer (pc) only.

When I compiled this work in the early months of 2011, I did not intend on writing anymore; but I have recanted on that intention and will be adding to an **ONGOING** volume that features new articles as I consider and complete them. Thus, I plan on that final volume to not be completed until my passing from this earth. When that happens, another can add “**THE END**” to that volume. To date, that new volume already has 3 somewhat brief entries.

I decided to do an **ONGOING** volume for two reasons: some have requested that I do so and I have decided that my quest will not be finished until my soul passes from this world. For those two reasons, then, I intend to add to an **ONGOING** volume as I write new items. Each compilation of the entire CD will differ then in that only the most recent compilation will include the most recent version of the **ONGOING** volume. If at any time any one is interested in the most recent state of the **ONGOING** volume, ask and you will receive. I will copy the entire work – including the latest **ONGOING** volume – and send it along.

In addition, the series features an **OVERVIEW** volume, which attempts to summarize the entire writings effort by featuring the **Introduction** and **Epilog** of each of the main 8 volumes. In all, excluding the **ONGOING** volume, the entire work is 1,189 pages long.

In summary, long ago as a kid I began questioning how some can consider that life is not Divine. **My early thoughts led me to the conclusion that - first of all – Existence has to be Infinite because it cannot end, making all of life of the Infinite – and therefore, necessarily Divine.** If life is truly of the Infinite and Divine, then it cannot be “undone” by anything that is finite. Most traditional religion teaches that mankind “undone” or “undid” what an Infinite God set in order. My thinking is that it is impossible that a finite being can undo what an Infinite entity has done – or is doing. Thus, my thinking has led me to challenge the entire concept of sin against God because if mankind cannot “undo” anything that God has done and is doing, then it follows that mankind cannot sin against God.

One of our great stupidities as a human race, I think, is that we have believed that man can undo what the Infinite has done and is doing. **It is such false pride, I believe, that has led to a sense of undo power on the part of mankind and what's worse – an incorrect sense of isolation from God.** Traditional religion, for the most part, is about various traditions attempting to “restore” to God what God has lost via some assumed violation of God by mankind; **but if God cannot be violated because God is Infinite, then restoration to God is nonsense.**

**Not only is “restoration to God” nonsense, however, but so also is the idea that life is somehow lacking in worth.** If Existence is truly Infinite – and equating Infinity with God – then all Existence must be Sacred. *My writings – down through the years – accent the necessary inviolable sacred character and status of life as well as challenge various traditions that have taught that life can be violated and that “restoration to God” is somehow the “main purpose of life”.*

Mostly, my writings are about the essential sacred of life, however I do consider non spiritual themes as well – such as a political notion now and then and even medical issues like arthritis and cancer. In short, I question everything about which I write – using **song, essay, and philosophical story** to do it. Over the years, I have written 140 poetic type commentaries about life, a lot of essays, and 6 various length stories. Of course, if I add to an **ONGOING** volume, additional songs, essays, and stories may be added in time.

As I have progressed in life, I have always maintained the right to be wrong. ***I think that right is perhaps our most precious of all rights – the right to be wrong – as long as an incessant desire to be right goes along with it.*** I do not have any right to be intentionally wrong, but I do have a right to be unintentionally wrong. That means I can be wrong, but I should not fear being so as long as I make every effort to be right. That is how I have tried to live my life – from my days as an eager student at Powell High – to now; and that is what my writings of **OUT IN THE OPEN** are all about.

**Most importantly, my writings are opinions – nothing more and nothing less.** They are the speculations of a single person. I gladly admit that; but what adds to my gladness is belief that all writings are opinions. Some want to mask their writings as something other than opinion and call them perhaps *scriptures*, but in the end, all writing is opinion; but then that is but another idea that I consider “opinion”. Needless to say, I treasure opinion – both my own and that of everyone else. It just goes with the territory, I think. If you claim to favor opinion, then that means all opinion – and that means respect for other opinion.

Sadly, this world is filled with people who think their thoughts are or should be law and have no regard for opinion. It must be as they say because, of course, they are infallibly right. Well, I claim no such infallibility. Consequently, I have respect – and, I think, true freedom. People who think they are infallible have a terrible burden of thinking they have to think for all. Such cannot be free because of an insistence on tying others to themselves. **I try not to tie anyone to me and let everyone think for themselves; but I do have opinions - and that is what OUT IN THE OPEN is all about.**

Let me finish by saying that it is at least partly due to my analysis of “lords” and “masters” that I have long suspected that Jesus could not have been the “lord” that much

of tradition has assigned him to be. I could never tie Jesus down to be my “lord”. I would never do that to a true friend because to do that to him or her would be to deny him or her that precious thing called “freedom”. I see Jesus as a true champion and “master” of freedom. **I am given to believe that Jesus was not a lord, as so many think he was, is, and will be - but rather a true master of freedom – and my writings occasionally argue for such a case.**

**Thank You for listening, Homesteader Museum in Powell, Wyoming.** I appreciate it. My writings mean a lot to me, but then I wrote them for myself in order to find my way in life. Perhaps they can help others as well. If so, be my quest. People are free to copy or print any of my works they wish; and if additional copies are desired, as long as I can, I will provide. Let’s just say: *Ask and Receive!* OK?

Thanks Again!

Gently,  
François William Bessler  
**A proud son of Powell, Wyoming, U.S.A.**

## **Drink To Be Free**

By Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011

I'm told by some I drink too much  
because I've always at hand - water or such.  
The more I drink – of non alcoholic beverage, that is –  
the healthier I am for lack of physical sin.  
The more I drink, the more I drain  
various poisons from my system. For me, that's plain.

So, drink at will, my friend, so you can pee;  
because the more you pee, the more you're free.  
It doesn't matter if you sit or stand;  
your system will thank you and understand.  
Treat your body like it is your guest  
and all of your days will be well spent.

It's ok to gulp now and then – in a minute  
as long as you do not make it a habit.  
Take it easy as you drink, but drink a lot  
and you will find yourself without need of pot.  
A glass of water for every non water you drink  
and I think you will find it will help you think.

So, be healthy, my friends, and let it flow  
and I think you will love what you come to know.  
Keep a glass in your hand of a beverage that's grand -  
being aware you are alive in this wondrous land.  
While you sip, toast with one who is near;  
and you may just find that everyone's dear.

# GOD

By  
Francis William Bessler  
Norcross, Ga.  
November, 2001

*Note: As noted above, I wrote this one in November of 2001 – shortly before moving from Norcross, Georgia to Laramie, Wyoming; however I lost it for a time as it was “shoved” in a box with other items for my move to Wyoming. Upon moving to Wyoming, I put the box with this song in storage and promptly forgot it. Today – October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 – I just happened to be reviewing the contents of that box. Though I trashed over 90 % of that box for lack of any current interest in it, I did keep this poem and am adding it to my ONGOING volume of my general writings series I call OUT IN THE OPEN. I still agree with the notions this poem expresses. So I am keeping it as I wrote it. FWB (10/13/2011).*

Let me offer you some thoughts about God –  
One Which I have always found dear.  
We all have thoughts – and these are only mine.  
Let me make that perfectly clear.

For me, God is not a person in a body like that of man.  
It's only a Presence.  
God is not a person with heart and head and hands.  
It's only an Essence.

For me, God is an Essence, a Beingness,  
but not a being that moves from place to place.  
God is the Energy in All that gives us each  
a chance to have a face.

God is not a judge of that created.  
It's only the Force of and within Creation.  
God is in All – always has and always will be.  
That thought should cause us jubilation.

If man is damned, he damns himself  
by thinking he can lose the Divinity he calls God.  
If woman is damned, she damns herself  
by acting like she is holier than clod.

Clod or dirt has as much of God as any person or beast –  
and all are made of sand.

God is in the sand as mysterious energy  
that forms that which we call the land.

But be it land or sea, God is there –  
and in the air and all about.

There is no place where God is not.  
For sure, about that, we should have no doubt.

All should shout and proclaim joy  
as life is blessed because God is there.  
God is there and here – in you and me –  
in all that is; so, let us care.

Let us care about the life we have  
and embrace it as a gift for a gift it is.  
We know not how it came – or how it will go;  
but we can know it's right and show it with a kiss.

# Still Alive!

(An essay of 6 Pages – including a poem)

By

Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

October 19<sup>th</sup> – 21st, 2011

*Be that as it may, I am still alive!* Those are words that **Robert O'Brien**, a current director of a play I am in, wrote for me to say. I play the part of a 3,000 year old mummy by the name of **Kharis** in a **Frankenstein spoof** play called **I WANT MY MUMMY** – written by someone named Tim Kelly. In that play, I utter the words: *Be that as it may, I am still alive* – expressing an idea of an old Egyptian mummy being still alive. That is pure fantasy, of course; but on the other hand, I think there is some truth to it.

Of course, the body of that mummy has really been dead for 3,000 years – in this case; but how about his (or her) soul? Is there something about the old Egyptian mummy that is *still alive*? I think so; and I think that almost everyone I know and have known in my life thinks so too. I think we all have some sense about us that imagines we will continue in some way after we die.

In my case, I cannot imagine that I did not come into this world as a soul without a previous happening too; but strangely most people I know and have known pay no attention to that idea. I guess they are satisfied to think that they began as souls when they were born into this life; but I have long ago tossed such an idea as having almost no probability of being true.

To claim that my soul came into existence concurrently with my body is to imply that my soul is not independent of my body. If body and soul came into being at the same time, then it is likely they are dependent upon one another for their beginning. I do not believe that my soul originated simultaneously with my body because I believe that my soul came into my body – being independent of my body before it entered it. To enter my body, it had to exist independent of my body. How could it enter my body if it did not exist previous to my body – or at least independent of my body?

Many – if not most – might argue that their soul began its life at the same time that their body began, however when their body dies, their soul will continue on. Sorry! That picture puts me in mind of my soul being a blip – though a blip with a future at least. But an entity without a past and only a future? It just does not register as rational to me; and though others may consider the irrational as good enough for them, it is not good enough for me – because in all likelihood, the irrational is also probably untrue.

For what it's worth, I have speculated about the **“real beginning”** of a soul in other works, but I do not want to spend any time addressing that notion here. All this little essay is about is my idea that life is probably a chain of links – not just one blip that comes from nowhere and goes nowhere – or comes from nowhere and goes to somewhere. It is impossible for me to fathom such an idea of having no beginning prior to this current experience of life and having no future after this experience – or having a future without a past. **An event in isolation makes no sense to me.** So I choose not to think seriously about such a prospect.

## A Link Within a Chain

It may not be a precisely apt comparison, but I see life – and especially my existence as a soul – as a chain of links. I can see the past in terms of links that have been completed, however I cannot see the future links of my chain of life because they have not happened as of yet. In that way, my analogy lacks somewhat; but I think it does serve to express the likelihood of the life of a soul – given that a soul somehow survives death to enter into a new experience after death. My analogy also lacks a bit because it does not address how a soul began – or begins – in the first place. I cannot imagine a chain without a beginning. Can you?

As a soul, I am coming and I am going. I see no way around that; but that provides some really worthy vision as I see it. It tells me that I can determine my future by choosing how to go in this link of life – and then, in a way, define my future by the way I live today. This **“soul power”** is the main power in which I am interested. I cannot see that any other power is of any real benefit to me as a soul. What does it matter what the rest of souls do – related to my existence as a soul?

I am not claiming another’s conduct is of no importance to me, but I am claiming that another’s conduct is – or should be – of only slight importance – compared to my own conduct for my own sake. **In other words, my main concentration in life should be on what I am and do – not on what someone else is and does – because, quite frankly, it is me that I have to inherit – not someone else.** Therefore, it is only wise to get me right while encouraging others to get themselves right as well – according to how each perceives what is right for them. Needless to say, what may seem right for one may seem as wrong for another.

## Life Hereafter

Realistically, if souls continue after the death of their current body, where would they go? That is the huge question that almost everyone tries to answer in their own way. How would you answer that question? Where do you think your soul is going after it leaves your body? I can think of few questions more important or more exciting to resolve than that one; and I think the wise person will try to answer it the best they can so as to best prepare for life hereafter.

***Hey, Will, where do you think your soul is going after it leaves your body?*** Imagine for a moment that we are sitting around a table sipping coffee or coke or whatever and you ask me that question. I’d say, ***I don’t know where I will be going, but far more importantly, I am fairly certain about how I will be going – in terms of attitude.***

Why do I say that? I say it because the life I have been living in this incarnation – if you wish to call it that – has clearly told me that my attitude is far more important than my surroundings or details and plans for a day. Every day I get up, the first thing that comes to mind is not – **what will I do today?** It’s - **how (in terms of attitude) will I do whatever it is that I intend to do?** I don’t claim to be unaware of being where I am, however. Of that I am very aware. I only claim that the awareness of where I am is overwhelmed with an awareness of being in general.



In my case, I tend to spring out of bed – almost always naked because that is the way I will have slept, knowing myself as a worthy vessel of life – and I will proclaim: ***Thank you, God, for my wonderful life!*** I begin each day almost never focusing on where I am or where I am going, but on the wonder of the current moment. I try to focus on the gift and miracle of life in general – not what I will be doing or where I will be going in the day ahead. Such detail is relatively unimportant. I try to be aware of the whole of which I am a part, too, and not get caught up or trapped in details.

After springing from my bed and getting to my feet, I tend to wash my face and brush my teeth, have a little breakfast, put on some clothes, and take at least a six mile walk; and while I am doing all of that, I am still of the same mind with which I awoke in the morning. I try to be aware of the wonder of my life all day long. Then I end the day with sleep, with the same prayer with which I began it – to only start and continue again the next day in the same way.

**If you wish, it is this evidence of daily life that tells me how it will be for me in the next link of my soulful existence. My next link is likely to be just like my last link because I have repeated the same general link in my life for as long as I can remember. What is the likelihood that a “next link” will change when change – for the most part – has not occurred in the past?**

I am not saying I can't change – because I certainly can change if I see a need to do so. I am only saying it is unlikely I will change because change has been mostly lacking in my past. I find that prospect extremely comforting because it tells me that my future is – or can be – at least primarily in my hands; and it will likely be determined mostly by attitude because it is mostly determined by attitude now. Soul wise, then, it is likely to be in the hereafter as it is now; and it is for me to select my own hereafter by the way I choose to live today.

## **A Horizontal Chain**

I say that I see life as a chain of links, but that might conjure an image of a series of steel chain links, coupled together – which I do not wish to imply. My chain is not a series of oval links, coupled together, but of little paths perhaps, connected by little interrupts. Each day begins with a bit of a pause and ends with a bit of a pause – or interrupt. I sleep. I wake and do something. I sleep again.

Correspondingly, I see eternal life in the same way. My soul starts in some sleep, awakens to a life in a body, lives that life, leaves that body when that body dies, then sleeps again – only to repeat the process again and again and again. But be it one life or many lives strung together, I probably determine my own course – though subject to many influences, of course.

The really important notion in all of this is that I will continue as I previously ended. As I end one day, I will likely begin the next day. Just living life tells me that. If I go to sleep angry, I will probably sleep in anger and awake in anger. If I go to sleep in peace, I will probably sleep in peace and awake in peace. **As I end one day, I will likely begin the next day; and taking that to its rational conclusion – as I end one life or incarnation, I will likely begin a next life or incarnation.** The absolute wonder – and promise – of that is that each has it within him or herself to be master of their own life and decide their own destiny.

I think Jesus would agree. In the wonderful **Gospel of Thomas** (banned in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century by Emperor Constantine and his bishops, but only recently in 1945 discovered anew) – which I reference considerably in other of my written works – in Verse 18 (of 114), Jesus was asked by a disciple about the end of life. *Tell us how our end will be* requested a disciple. Jesus said: *Have you then discovered the beginning that you inquire about the end?*

In other words, the end of one experience of life naturally marks the beginning of another. It stands to reason, then, that if you want a different beginning to come, you better focus on making the upcoming end in accordance to the new beginning you wish to experience because the end of one experience marks the beginning of another. Makes sense, right?

Do I want to find peace in a next life? Then, realistically, I better find it in this life in order to find it again – or continue it – in a next life. Do I want to be a soldier for some cause in a next life? Then, realistically, I should prepare for that next adventure by practicing being a soldier in this life. *It is all up to me – or should be; and the wise soul knows that – and then chooses a corresponding destiny.*

### **Repeating Kharis!**

Remember my mention of **Kharis** – the 3,000 year old mummy I play in a current play? **Kharis** claims he is still alive in the play – perhaps just having been resting in his coffin for the last 3,000 years. I think it provides some worth while pondering. What if Kharis is still alive? Or what if he did die and has come back to life? Would it really matter? In either case, he would just be *continuing* from a previous existence – and would be continuing as the same soul as he ended in his last experience.

Personally, I like the notion; and life now tells me it is likely – given that my soul continues on after my eventual death in this one. *Kharis, I trust you were a peaceful lad in the last life because you seem to be one in this life.*

One of my fellow actors suggested that I put more of a warning growl in my portrayal of Kharis for the current play; and I told him that I don't think Kharis would have a growl because he probably had no growl in his last adventure – 3,000 years ago. At least “my” Kharis probably lived and died in peace.

But Kharis does warn the audience that they are about to enter the famous **House of Frankenstein** – implying they should be careful not to get caught up with something that has happened before. Such a warning is just fine. **Life should be full of warnings, but also free of constraints. Let each do as they choose and let each chance what they will. Risk is simply part of this wonderful adventure we call LIFE!**

*Or so, “my” Kharis & I Believe!*

**A poem about Life as I see it follows on the next page. Enjoy as you will.**

# LIFE!

A brief poem

By

Francis William Bessler

October 19th, 2011

*Note: Notice the emphasis on “all”. I do believe that “inclusion” as opposed to “exclusion” is the key to finding peace and contentment. Thus, my emphasis on “all”.*

As Jesus said very long ago,  
as we sow, we will reap.  
Judgment is really only continuing  
**all** we choose to believe.  
If I choose to believe  
Life is full of junk and sin,  
then that’s how I will carry on  
and how my life will likely end.

And how one life ends,  
the next will start the same.  
If I end a life in shame,  
then shame will be my next state.  
It’s **all** up to me  
how I choose to live and go;  
and it’s **all** up to me  
just what I want to know.

As for me, I have chosen  
to see **all** life as good  
because I believe  
**all** are of a great brotherhood.  
My God exists in **all**  
and that makes us **all** the same;  
and that leads me to believe  
that **all** creation’s great.

That is how I define  
this thing we call Life.  
It is **not at all** complicated  
if I simply open my eyes.  
As long as I remain grateful  
for my lovely humanity,  
my **Lives** will **always** be full  
throughout eternity.  
**Or so I Believe!**

**Still Alive!**

-----

**The End**

# ***MY HOLISTIC VIEW OF LIFE***

## ***Shortened Version***

**(5 Pages)**

**Complete Version: 18 pages**

By

Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

Written Oct. 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – Nov. 11th, 2011

### **Note:**

Sometimes, a little story can tell a complete story all by itself; and sometimes, a poem can do the same; however an intellectual analysis via essay can be helpful too. Personally, I like all three literary formats, but many do not. So this is to provide an abbreviated version of perhaps a much more serious version. Suit yourself. If you would like to see the Expanded Complete Version, ask and you will receive. The Expanded Version includes a Preface this one does not include – as well as an essay featuring the following sections enumerated below. **My objective is to present what I call a “Holistic View” of Life. Essentially, that is a view that sees all life as holy because God – being Infinite – must be in all life.**

It is my opinion, too, that Jesus was not really the Jewish Messiah that most Christians think he was – but, in fact, was a proponent of the “Holism” that I advocate. The Expanded Complete Version offers my reason for believing as I do. I will leave it at that for this abbreviated version.

For those who wish to audit the Expanded Complete Version, simply ask and you will receive. I guess you could say the Expanded Version is perhaps only for those who see some significant sense offered in the Parody and Poem included in this Shortened Version. Now, before presenting my Parody and Poem, here is a list of sections by their titles discussed in the Expanded Complete Version:

- 1. Divisionism 2. Holism 3. So What? 4. Can The House of God Be Divided?**
- 5. A Holistic Heaven 6. The Tale of Jesus 7. The Jesus of Thomas**
- 8. The Resurrection of Jesus 9. Life After Death.**

**Now, Onward with this Shortened Version: Enjoy as you will.**

# AN IMPOSSIBLE TALE

## A Parody

By

Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

November, 2011

A long, long time ago, there was a fellow named God who made a huge square house in the middle of a forest. This house was a thousand feet wide and had only one eight foot wide entrance – right in the middle front of the house. God spent much of his time in the beginning gloating about his house because he was really proud of it. After all, he made it. So, why shouldn't he be proud of it? Oh, by the way, God was a blonde or light haired fellow.

Then one day, God decided he was lonely. He did not like being alone. So he made a dozen or so little blondes and told them he wanted them all to be happy with him in his thousand foot house - which for a million years or so, they were; but then one day one of them decided he was going to assume control over half of the house. One of God's little gods, then, decided to rebel against his father and claim half of his father's house for his own.

This little god, named Satan, told his father, God, that he was going to divide his father's house and that he, son – Satan, was going to take one half of the house to himself, including half of the original eight foot doorway. Now, there would be two apartments instead of one house and two four foot doors instead of one eight foot door. The same doorway space would be used for doors. It's just that there would be two doors in that space instead of one.

And God said to himself: *That's mighty confusing, but I guess I will have to let it be because I made my son to be able to decide for himself. Thus, if he wants for there to be two doors and two apartments within my original house, then I have to go along with it.*

Satan decided, too, that he did not like to look like his father anymore. So he went out into the forest and found a very dark muddy pool and drank heavily of it so his light face would be darkened by the muddy diet; and it happened just as he thought it would – his whole body turned a dark brown. Satan felt very good about this change of color because it would distinguish him from his father even more.

Amazingly, Father God was a very easy kind of guy. He let a son, Satan, take half of his house for his own; and God would have to stay with some of his other little gods – and some little goddesses too – all by themselves on God's left side of the divided house.

In time, however, Satan decided it was not right for him to be alone. He was not powerful enough to make sons and daughters of his own – like his father, God, however. So if he was to have anyone come live with him, they would have to come from his father's side of the house. So, bad son, Satan, tried to lure one of his brothers, Michael, to the dark muddy pool in the forest to get a companion. He did not want to be alone anymore. Michael, however, chose not to go with his brother, Satan. So, Satan lured another of his brothers, one called Bedlam, to the dark muddy pool and Bedlam followed

his brother's lead and drank heavily of the dark muddy pool – and like Satan, Bedlam turned dark himself.

Now nighttime came and Bedlam decided it was time to go home to his father and be with all his brothers and sisters by the fire; but when God saw that Bedlam was not blonde anymore, he knew he could not allow Bedlam into his side of the house for fear that he would lead other of God's sons and daughters to drink of the dark muddy pool and become like his bad son, Satan. So God told Bedlam that he could no longer live with his father and that he must now go live with his brother, Satan. Needless to say, Satan was overwhelmed with joy. He would have a companion.

And God found the situation very convenient too. From then on, he could punish any of his growing household that disobeyed an order. They could no longer live with him and his obedient sons and daughters. They would have to go live with the bad son, Satan, and would only be allowed to drink of Satan's dark muddy pool because to be like little Satans, they would have to look like him and become dark like him.

So it went on like that for a billion years. God would have a little god or goddess and those that obeyed him were allowed to stay with God, but those who disobeyed father God would be turned away from God's left side of the house and have to join the bad son, Satan, on Satan's right side of the house.

Then after a billion years passed and God and Satan battled one another for a son or daughter of God, God decided it was not right for Satan's brood to have to live with Satan. So he devised a plan to have a son, one he called Jesus, who was blonde, to sneak over to Satan's side of the house with a huge pail of clean water and have any of them drink of it who wanted; and those who would drink of the clean water would turn blonde again and be able to come back home to God.

God, indeed, was very proud of himself. He had found a way to bring his family back home to him. It was determined for all time that any child who wandered into the forest and drank of the muddy water and had to live with Satan could be "restored" to God's side of the house by listening to God's son, Jesus. All any lost god or goddess has to do is drink of the clean water Jesus supplies; and presto, restoration to Paradise.

# Can The House of God Be Divided?

A Song or Poem

By

Francis William Bessler

Oct. 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – Nov. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011

**Note: Consider this to be a mixture of poem for the verses and song for the refrain.**

***Refrain:***

***Can the house of God be divided?***

***Can it be split in two?***

***Is it possible for God to be on one side  
and missing from the other's view?***

***If the house of God cannot be divided,  
then this is the story, friends,***

***You are in the house of God;***

***and that house can never end.***

A long, long time ago,

Jesus said, Heaven's everywhere.

He said that the Kingdom's spread upon the earth  
though men don't seem to care.

Don't be fooled, he said,  
if others claim it's here or there.

Just open your eyes and heart  
and look around and be aware. ***Refrain.***

Jesus said, if Heaven's up above,  
then the birds will precede you.

He said, if it's in the sea,  
the fish will get there before you do.

But the Kingdom's inside of you, he said,  
and also outside, it's true.

Just know that you're a son of God  
and be delighted with the view. ***Refrain.***

So many think that God

belongs to only some.

But we're all God's children  
and that means God belongs to everyone.

Some believe that when they die,  
they will see God face to face;

but God's not a person with eyes and ears.

It's simply a Presence that's everyplace. ***Refrain.***



You can't divide the Infinite  
for how can you divide what has no ends?  
If you think you can divide what has no middle,  
tell me how it can be done, my friend.  
In truth, no one can lose God  
because Infinite Division is an impossible deed.  
If God cannot be separated from anything,  
then God must be present in thee. *Refrain.*

*Yes – in life – as in death –  
and as in any life that may proceed,  
If God cannot be separated from anything,  
then God will always be present in thee.*

*Thank you so much for listening!*

***MY  
HOLISTIC VIEW  
OF LIFE  
Shortened Version***

-----

***THE END***

# ***MY HOLISTIC VIEW OF LIFE***

**(18 Pages)**

By

Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

Written Oct. 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – Nov. 11th, 2011

## ***Preface***

The following features three literary formats: story, song, and essay. Consider them all “food for thought”. They represent opinion – nothing more and nothing less; however if they offer nothing in substance of themselves, they should demonstrate that all writing is opinion. My thoughts about God and Life are opinions, but so are the thoughts of everyone else. I think it is important to realize that; and I think it is for lack of such recognition that many writers down through history have been taken much too seriously; and by taking various dictators of thought too seriously, many have surrendered their freedom – and maybe even their souls.

Life indeed is a very serious matter; but I think it is very important to allow no one to be taken more seriously than another. Each of us has a mind. Let each of us use that mind to review what we will in order to make up our own minds; but let us do just that – make up our own mind and not let another dictate what they think we should know.

Also, I will reference Jesus in the following, but where Jesus is presented as offering some sort of guidance, let it be known that my sources for my claims are mostly from two gospels of or about Jesus that most know nothing about: **THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS** and **THE GOSPEL OF MARY MAGDALENE**. I reference these gospels considerably in other writings as well; but I think it good to realize that these two gospels were among some banned in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century – by the authorities of the day – and for the most, only exposed and rediscovered in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Those authorities of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century were not interested in letting each make up his or her own mind about the truths of life. They were about dictating what people were to know and believe. Those authorities did not agree with the representation of Jesus in the Gospels of Thomas and Mary – and concluded they had the right to ban them. It is at least partly due to such arrogance that the world has been “dictated” only one view of Jesus – that of Jewish Messiah; however, there were other views that did not consider Jesus to be of such character – like the Gospels of Thomas & Mary. Or such is my personal opinion.

Relatively speaking, I will not spend much time on Jesus, however, in this effort – though I will ponder a few Jesus related issues. I have treated “my” interpretation of Jesus in many of my writings and will not go into detail in this one; but suffice it to say, I do not believe that the Jesus most think they know is the Jesus who really lived. If you wish to review more of my thoughts on the “real Jesus,” consider other of my writings in my digest of writings I call OUT IN THE OPEN. OK?

With that, let me proceed with my “trilogy”: a parody, a song, and an essay discussion following the parody and song. Thanks so much for taking the time to review any of what I am presenting. Please keep in mind it is only personal opinion – even as I do believe it reflects the truth. Believing does not make it so, but thinking for yourself is by far the best way to go. Or so I believe. FWB (11/11/11)

## AN IMPOSSIBLE TALE

### A Parody

By

Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

November, 2011

*Note: That which you are about to read is untrue. Names have not been changed, however, to convict the guilty. Half kidding! I am serious, however, that my story should “convict the guilty” – at least somewhat. Who are the “guilty”? It starts with those who wrote the story of Genesis in the BIBLE – without admitting it was but a story – and it ends with those who choose to believe a story is true without requiring proof of authenticity.*

*Genesis was probably written by Jews, however, offering tales to inspire their own to remain true to their faith. So it was probably not written for ones outside their faith. Consequently, they probably decided not to offer it as a story, but as factual in order to inspire loyalty to their tradition. To offer Genesis as only a story would not have served to inspire loyalty. So the writers probably decided to leave out a notion that their tale was fiction.*

*The story of Genesis, however, has been believed by other than Jews. In time, that little Jewish story has served as genesis for at least two others faiths – Christianity and Islam. So what may have been intended as a vehicle for Jewish loyalty has become a vehicle for justification of other religions as well. Sadly, a tale about one so many of us know as “God” has been used to – not so much inspire loyalty to some regimen of claimed authority – but to command loyalty – often under the pain of banishment and even death.*

*When I was a kid, I believed the tale of Genesis was a factual tale of God too – because I had not yet realized that God cannot possibly be the kind of “gent” defined in that tale. Genesis somewhat defines God as someone that can be located in one place and not another. Thus, the God of Genesis can ban some from his presence and include others. A thinking person should be able to analyze such a claim and realize it can’t be true. If God is truly Infinite, that means that God cannot be one place and not*

*another. Infinity requires Presence everywhere. Thus a true God cannot banish some from his presence. An Eden – as a home of God – cannot be here today and gone tomorrow. God’s home cannot disappear because someone in God’s home chose to “disobey” God. Where is this Eden that allegedly existed upon the creation of man – and just as mysteriously “disappeared” upon the disobedience of man? People ought to require those who tell tales to prove their stories if belief in those stories is a requirement of what is called “salvation”.*

*When someone claims that Eden really existed as an early paradise for mankind because God was present in that place, ask them where is Eden now? The tale of Genesis claims that Adam and Eve were expelled from Eden for “disobeying” God, but it was not argued that Eden ceased to exist. God did not “disobey” himself. Did he? So God must still be in Eden. Right? So, where is this Eden where God still is?*

*Be that as it may, let me offer my own “unbelievable” tale; and judge for yourself if the original tale should be anymore “believable” – keeping in mind that I am admitting up front that my story is pure fiction.*

A long, long time ago, there was a fellow named God who made a huge square house in the middle of a forest. This house was a thousand feet wide and had only one eight foot wide entrance – right in the middle front of the house. God spent much of his time in the beginning gloating about his house because he was really proud of it. After all, he made it. So, why shouldn’t he be proud of it? Oh, by the way, God was a blonde or light haired fellow.

Then one day, God decided he was lonely. He did not like being alone. So he made a dozen or so little blondes and told them he wanted them all to be happy with him in his thousand foot house - which for a million years or so, they were; but then one day one of them decided he was going to assume control over half of the house. One of God’s little gods, then, decided to rebel against his father and claim half of his father’s house for his own.

This little god, named Satan, told his father, God, that he was going to divide his father’s house and that he, son – Satan, was going to take one half of the house to himself, including half of the original eight foot doorway. Now, there would be two apartments instead of one house and two four foot doors instead of one eight foot door. The same doorway space would be used for doors. It’s just that there would be two doors in that space instead of one.

And God said to himself: *That’s mighty confusing, but I guess I will have to let it be because I made my son to be able to decide for himself. Thus, if he wants for there to be two doors and two apartments within my original house, then I have to go along with it.*

Satan decided, too, that he did not like to look like his father anymore. So he went out into the forest and found a very dark muddy pool and drank heavily of it so his light face would be darkened by the muddy diet; and it happened just as he thought it would – his whole body turned a dark brown. Satan felt very good about this change of color because it would distinguish him from his father even more.

Amazingly, Father God was a very easy kind of guy. He let a son, Satan, take half of his house for his own; and God would have to stay with some of his other little gods – and some little goddesses too – all by themselves on God’s left side of the divided house.

In time, however, Satan decided it was not right for him to be alone. He was not powerful enough to make sons and daughters of his own – like his father, God, however. So if he was to have anyone come live with him, they would have to come from his father's side of the house. So, bad son, Satan, tried to lure one of his brothers, Michael, to the dark muddy pool in the forest to get a companion. He did not want to be alone anymore. Michael, however, chose not to go with his brother, Satan. So, Satan lured another of his brothers, one called Bedlam, to the dark muddy pool and Bedlam followed his brother's lead and drank heavily of the dark muddy pool – and like Satan, Bedlam turned dark himself.

Now nighttime came and Bedlam decided it was time to go home to his father and be with all his brothers and sisters by the fire; but when God saw that Bedlam was not blonde anymore, he knew he could not allow Bedlam into his side of the house for fear that he would lead other of God's sons and daughters to drink of the dark muddy pool and become like his bad son, Satan. So God told Bedlam that he could no longer live with his father and that he must now go live with his brother, Satan. Needless to say, Satan was overwhelmed with joy. He would have a companion.

And God found the situation very convenient too. From then on, he could punish any of his growing household that disobeyed an order. They could no longer live with him and his obedient sons and daughters. They would have to go live with the bad son, Satan, and would only be allowed to drink of Satan's dark muddy pool because to be like little Satans, they would have to look like him and become dark like him.

So it went on like that for a billion years. God would have a little god or goddess and those that obeyed him were allowed to stay with God, but those who disobeyed father God would be turned away from God's left side of the house and have to join the bad son, Satan, on Satan's right side of the house.

Then after a billion years passed and God and Satan battled one another for a son or daughter of God, God decided it was not right for Satan's brood to have to live with Satan. So he devised a plan to have a son, one he called Jesus, who was blonde, to sneak over to Satan's side of the house with a huge pail of clean water and have any of them drink of it who wanted; and those who would drink of the clean water would turn blonde again and be able to come back home to God.

God, indeed, was very proud of himself. He had found a way to bring his family back home to him. It was determined for all time that any child who wandered into the forest and drank of the muddy water and had to live with Satan could be "restored" to God's side of the house by listening to God's son, Jesus. All any lost god or goddess has to do is drink of the clean water Jesus supplies; and presto, restoration to Paradise.

# Can The House of God Be Divided?

A Song or Poem

By

Francis William Bessler

Oct. 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – Nov. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011

**Note: Consider this to be a mixture of poem for the verses and song for the refrain.**

***Refrain:***

***Can the house of God be divided?***

***Can it be split in two?***

***Is it possible for God to be on one side***

***and missing from the other's view?***

***If the house of God cannot be divided,***

***then this is the story, friends,***

***You are in the house of God;***

***and that house can never end.***

A long, long time ago,

Jesus said, Heaven's everywhere.

He said that the Kingdom's spread upon the earth

though men don't seem to care.

Don't be fooled, he said,

if others claim it's here or there.

Just open your eyes and heart

and look around and be aware. ***Refrain.***

Jesus said, if Heaven's up above,

then the birds will precede you.

He said, if it's in the sea,

the fish will get there before you do.

But the Kingdom's inside of you, he said,

and also outside, it's true.

Just know that you're a son of God

and be delighted with the view. ***Refrain.***

So many think that God

belongs to only some.

But we're all God's children

and that means God belongs to everyone.

Some believe that when they die,

they will see God face to face;

but God's not a person with eyes and ears.

It's simply a Presence that's everywhere. ***Refrain.***

You can't divide the Infinite  
for how can you divide what has no ends?  
If you think you can divide what has no middle,  
tell me how it can be done, my friend.  
In truth, no one can lose God  
because Infinite Division is an impossible deed.  
If God cannot be separated from anything,  
then God must be present in thee. *Refrain.*

*Yes – in life – as in death –  
and as in any life that may proceed,  
If God cannot be separated from anything,  
then God will always be present in thee.*

## DIVISIONISM

**Most religious people I know base their salvation on an idea that God is only one place and not another. Their salvation is based on the idea that they are on the side of God – or God is on their side. It is really a sophisticated way of looking at things.** As I see it, civilization is all about competition and some winning and some losing. In matters of the soul and salvation, it is only taking the idea of competition to another level. It is saying that the soul that has been “saved” is the soul which has – or will have – won; and the soul that lacks being saved is the soul which has – or will have – lost.

**So, salvation is defined in terms of winning and losing – like all else in civilization; but what is at the base of winning and losing? One thing – some form of division.** Those who win are divided from those who lose – or are separate from them. Thus, most traditional religion reduces to a form of **Divisionism for the soul**. There are – or must be – winners and losers – just like there is in civilization. It is like a civilized rule or order. There must be winners and there must be losers. Religion, for the most part, simply applies that civilized rule to matters of the soul.

But what is the issue of division that determines winners and losers in matters of the soul? God – of course. **Those who win and are among the saved are those who have – or will have – gained the favor of God. Those who lose and are among the damned are those who have – or will have – lost the favor of God;** however, in all this manipulation - and probable fabrication - of things, it is assumed that God is like one of us – a person that is separate from other persons in order for some persons to win his favor and others to lose it. If God is not a person and cannot be related to or with like he is a person, poof – there goes the entire notion of salvation – in most traditional senses.

If you question or doubt what I am saying, just ask a traditionally religious person about God. Almost everyone of them will speak of God like he is an individual with whom they can have a personal relationship. **I spoke to God; and God spoke to me –** but all within a personal frame of view. That is because they believe that God is

separated from them as an individual – just like all individuals are separated from each other. **They simply see God as “one of them – as in like one of them”.** So, God becomes for the traditionally religious a person to whom they must appeal for salvation and from whom they believe they will be granted some privilege of salvation; and, of course, it will be a person to person thing. They will be “with” that person of God in the end; and those who fail to “win” salvation will be left out in the cold – apart from the personal God the saved will know forever and ever and ever.

Most traditionally religious people I know and have known are what I think of as **Divisionists. Their salvation is based on being separated from the losers as much as being part of the winners.** In various ways, they see themselves as being aligned with God and those who disagree with them as being aligned with Satan; but in their minds, there is a clear wall of separation between them and those they think of as damned. They who are not them belong to that side of life that is headed by that despicable one they call Satan; but that despicable one is absolutely necessary in order for them to think they can be among the saved. **Being saved would mean nothing at all if there is nothing to be saved from – and so most of whom I call Divisionists would create a Satan if they thought one did not actually exist.**

I know the mindset of what I call Divisionism because I used to think that way. In my youth, I saw myself as “winning for the Lord” or “defeating an enemy of the Lord”. I was in the middle of all that winning and losing nonsense. I was once one of them. **Perhaps that is why I know them so well. I was once one of them; but then one day, I thought about the reality of Infinity – and I could no longer think that way.** I changed from what I see now as being a “**Divisionist**” to being what I think of myself today as a “**Holist**” – or a believer in “**Holism**”.

## HOLISM

What is **Holism**? Of course it is different for different people, but I think of Holism as a basic belief that **there is no actual separation between God and anything because an Infinite God must be IN Everything. Holism is belief in a Oneness with God because God must be in us; and there is no possibility of being separated from something inside of you.** There is no wall of separation between the so called “saved” and “damned” because there is no such thing as damned – related to God. And that is what most traditional religion is all about – that which is related to God. It is not so much relations among humans as it is a “relationship with God”.

**I guess I would agree that I sense a “relationship with God,” but where I differ from most traditionally religious is that my relationship with God is not “special”.** Every single human being as every single animal as every single plant as every grain of sand has the same “relationship with God” as I do. I am special in no way – related to God, that is. I certainly am special related to different people, but I am not special related to God; and that is what my “Holism” is all about. **There is no “wall of separation” between God and anything because there can be no wall of separation. Why? Because of that wonderful idea called “Infinity”.**

Of course I could be wrong. Again, I admit that; but rationally I am probably right in that there must be an Infinity – or non ending existence – because it is unfathomable to imagine that existence can end. If you think it can end, put yourself to the test. Can you



imagine a reality that ends with some sort of wall and nothing beyond that wall? Not me. Though I have difficulty imagining no end wall, I have far more difficulty imagining an end wall; and I think most would think the same as me – if they allowed themselves to ponder the issue.

Anyway, since there must be a non ending Infinity, there can be no wall of separation between that which is Infinite and that which is - like me – only part of the Infinite. Still, I am part of the Infinite because there is no way anything can be outside of the Infinite.

**How can anyone be not among “all that is”? All that is – which is the Infinite – must also include little ole me – and little ole you.**

It is that sense of “inclusion” as being among the Infinite that is part of my “*new security*”. Rationally, I know that there can be nothing separated from the Infinite because the Infinite must be in all and everywhere. That dictates there can be no “Satan” in traditional terms as one “opposed to God”. **How can anything really oppose that which is inside of them and cannot separate from them?**

Also, as a note, “**personality of God**” disappears with the idea of Infinity. There is no “person” God because the entire idea of personality is caught up with individuality; and individuality is caught up with the idea of being separate from what is not me. **If God cannot be separate from anything that is, then it follows that God can’t be a “person”.**

Sorry! I will never know God like I thought I would in my youth. **I will never see God “face to face” because God has no face for me to approach.** Those who think of God as a person are the ones who think they can see God face to face; but as a “Holistic” minded person, I know a person to person relationship to or with God is impossible; and with that impossibility, face to face goes away.

And why would I need some “face to face” encounter with God anyway? **If I no longer live in belief of winning or losing God, why would I need or want a face to face with God? Only true Divisionists can think that way.** Only those who think of themselves as “divided” or “separated” from God can think that way. Knowing now that there must be Infinity and that there can be no separation between the Infinite and all within the Infinite, I am no longer into winning or losing God. **I simply cannot lose God because you cannot lose that which is in you. Can you?**

## So What?

So what? I will tell you why it is important to me to have the belief of **Holism** that I do. **It destroys false fear.** Others can fear what they think of as Satan because they can believe such a critter can exist – and if he can exist, he probably does exist; but for me, **Satan is an impossibility. He can’t exist because God can have no opposition.**

In my little parody of the **BIBLE**, I offered Satan as one who could “take away something from God”. That is how a Divisionist thinks – that God is a person from whom something can be stolen; but a Holist cannot think that way because God is not a “person” from whom something can be stolen.

Of course my parody called for God being a person who personally fathered Satan and Michael and Bedlam. That too is wrong. That whole notion of God being my personal father is based on the idea that God is outside of me in order to create me. It is God as an individual creating another individual; but a Holistic sense of God cannot go

with such an idea. **How can something that is inside of you create you like you are outside of it?**

Anyway, for a Holistic minded person – such as I define Holism – I cannot fear a Satan because of a certainty that a Satan cannot exist. Satan is a fabrication of the Divisionists. They need a Satan – and thus they allow for one; but Holists do not need a Satan; and therefore, they do not need to allow for one.

Beyond not fearing a non-existent Satan, what is good about Holism? **Let me count the ways – in every single thing that is created or is within creation – including me – and you – and everyone. It is All Good because there is no lack of God in any of it. It is celebrating not only yourself, but every human being and every animal and every plant and every grain of sand because all have the same wonderful mysterious quality that is called God.** We do not have any more answers as to how it – and we – all came about; but we do not need to know the answers either. We are – and if there is a life hereafter – we will be; **and our Holism says that we will continue with God as we continue in our own mystery and wonder.**

Personally, as I have written about in other works, I believe in the existence of a soul coming into a body, living in a body for a time, leaving that body upon death of body, resting as a soul for a time, then repeating with another incarnation. So my perceived future is in tact. **I am in Heaven Now because I see everywhere as Heaven. Thus when I return – if I return – I will likely continue the perception and the belief of Holism.**

I entered this life with a bit of a fear of Satan because I probably entered it as somewhat of a **Divisionist** who needs a Satan to make sense of winning and losing salvation; but hopefully I will exit this life as a true *Holist*, knowing that there is no real division between God and anything – and what's more important – there is true union between God and everything. *And that may be my advantage – as I live the rest of this life in peace, depart it in peace, and return in peace as the one I was.*

## Can The House of God Be Divided?

**Can the house of God be divided?** I think not. The house of humanity can be divided, but not the house of God. **God's house is Infinite; and that which is Infinite cannot lose anything it contains.** God could never have “lost Satan” or Satan could have never “lost God” – or God could never have “separated from Satan” or Satan could never have “separated from God”. I called my little parody at the front as an **Impossible Tale** because it is just that. God is not a person, being Infinite, and being Infinite, God could not live as a person in a house like the God in my tale did.

There is no such thing as a “door to God” or to “God's house” because all reality is the house of God – and all reality needs no doors. God can't “enter” one house and not enter another. God can't go in and out – as a door implies. God can't go up a mountain or come down a mountain as if God was not already up the mountain or down the mountain. God can't live only in a left side apartment and be totally absent from a right side apartment. God can't be absent from where an alleged Satan might live. **God is Presence – Infinite Mysterious Presence – but Presence; and God is not a “person” that can locate one place and not another.**

Satan could never have “stolen from God” part of God’s house, allowing for some kind of “retrieval” to get what was lost back. **God can’t lose anything. Therefore, God has no need to “recover” what he lost.**

I think we need to keep in mind that early tales of Satan were by writers who were trying to make sense of things. In having no idea of Infinity – or a God that must be Everywhere – their God had to be a person like they were. It is claimed that God made man in his image; but the real truth is that man has fashioned his ideas of God based on his own image – and therefore has created a God to be like him.

But who that senses that God is a person like he is can live without a foe? Most of us face some sort of opposition in life. **Individuality – given focus upon it - almost compels a sense of opposition; and opposition translates to winning and losing. If one must lose, there must be losers. If one needs to win, there must be losers. It is all part of the great picture of Divisionism.**

Some need that I guess. I once did; and I should never forget that. I no longer need it, but just realizing I once needed it should tell me it has its place. So I won’t moan about belief in Satan anymore than I think the true Jesus moaned about a belief in Satan. **I think, however, that most early Christians who lived in the time of Jesus did believe in a Satan – and the need of or for one? Why? Because they were Jews – and Jews taught Satan as they taught “Divisionism” – that life is “divided” between good and evil, or between Godly and ungodly.**

And that is probably the basis for the execution of Jesus. He probably opposed the whole notion of Satan – and he paid with his life for doing so. Given that Jesus died for opposition to the notion of Satan – which Judaism at the time demanded - how likely would it have been that so called “disciples” would have chosen to follow his lead?

Allegedly, Peter was so scared of being considered a friend of Jesus that he denied he was a friend of Jesus three times on the night before the crucifixion of Jesus. If Peter was so scared of the same fate as accorded to Jesus, just imagine how scared the others were? I think therein is the real reason why the Jesus that has survived is not the Jesus who lived. **Fear of the same fate can be a terrific motive for not repeating the same tale.** But who knows?

## A Holistic Heaven

What is a *Holistic Heaven*? It is very simple. **It is merely finding Heaven where you are based on the Holiness of everything, everyone, and everywhere.** It may seem absurd to claim that everyone is holy, but for a *Holistic* person, it is so. **The problem is that not everyone believes they are holy; and that is why they go about doing all sort of seemingly unholy things.** When one man murders or executes another for whatever reason, that does not alter the holiness of the agent because the holiness is not about conduct. **To be holy is merely to be in and of God. Since God is in all, then all must be in God; and that makes everyone – even a thug – holy.**

I think the basic problem with people in the world – but not the world itself – is that most confuse holiness with conduct. **I am not holy because of what I do. I am holy because of what I am.** This is not an idea that has been easily understood by people of history, however – including it seems many who surrounded Jesus. I do believe that

Jesus tried to teach that everything is holy because of the universal presence of God in everything, but he tried to teach it to Jews who were probably pretty much stuck on their own idea of holy. That is just a guess, mind you; but my reading of Jesus is that he tried with all his heart and mind to teach that the so called ***Kingdom of God*** is not the kind of kingdom people were expecting. His listeners – mostly Jews – were looking for another kind of kingdom – an earthly kingdom whereby they were the rulers of others like in the time of Jesus, the Romans were the rulers of the Jews.

In **expecting and wanting** an earthly kingdom whereby one set of people rule another set of people, most in the time of Jesus simply missed out on the real Heaven that Jesus was trying to teach. They were looking for a messiah who could be defined as a **new Moses – one who would rule with power and commandments**; but they did not get a new Moses in Jesus. They got one who preached not power or command over another, but ***love & forgiveness – and mastery***.

## The Tale of Jesus

I believe that **expectation** is the main driver in how people see things. The Jews were “**expecting**” an earthly kingdom which was a continuation of all the kingdoms of mankind – power oriented and domination intended; but you see **Holists** do not look for power over others or domination of others. Why? Because they have no need to power over others or dominate them – because they are happy in themselves.

**Divisionists** are the ones who lack peace and being happy with themselves – mostly because they do not realize they are already whole as they are. Thus they go about thinking that they need something or someone outside themselves to complete them. **Holists do not need something or someone outside themselves to complete them because they know they are already holy by virtue of being of and in God.**

I think one of the greatest ironies of all history is that Jesus may have taught **Holism**, but has been construed as a **Champion of Divisionism**. I think he taught that no one needs a messiah because no one is really lost, not really being “divided” from God – though if one thinks he or she is lost, in effect, he or she is; however, he – Jesus – has been made a messiah or savior or someone to give to another what they lack – the very thing he probably taught against. **Now if that is not irony, what is?**

And more than likely the biggest reason why history has been so confused about Jesus and his real mission is that some of those supposedly closest to Jesus simply misheard him; but in large, the real story of Jesus was not told – or was probably not told; and that is why we who have followed after Jesus have misunderstood him as well. **When people who surround a principal figure get him wrong, how can anyone following in history get him right?**

Did Peter know Jesus? Let me put it this way. **I think it as likely that Peter knew Jesus as a lot of people know me.** Who really knows me – though there are lots of people who know “about” me? All those people who know me are my friends too. I truly love them and they truly love me; but that begs the question – ***is loving me knowing me?***

Now, if one of my “friends” who loves me deeply but doesn’t really “know” me for what I am takes over for me, what is likely going to be the result? Others will get their message – not mine – even as their message will be wound up in my name because of

their friendship with me; and it will all be sincere too. My friends in not knowing me but thinking they do would carry on in “my” name knowing they really are true friends; but the message they would be telling could be completely missing the mark.

And that is what I think is the **tale of Jesus**. Very few understood him; and many who did misunderstand him – thinking their friendship with him amounted to understanding – went about preaching the very thing Jesus taught against – namely that anyone needs another to be holy. If Jesus was truly a **Holist** and not a **messiah** – and I think he was – a **Holist**, that is – the world has long been following the wrong trail. The trail they have been following is one laid with authoritarianism – the very thing that a **true Holist** could never advocate.

The big question is – am I right in believing Jesus was a **Holist** and not one of **messianic leaning**? Or am I wrong and Jesus was truly of **messianic leaning** – meaning he believed that others need some outside grace to make them **whole**? As Shakespeare might put it – **ah, that is the question?**

I admit it is all very confusing; but I do believe that it is somewhat explainable too. I think it good to keep in mind that Jesus lived in a day when and where there were no newspapers or printing presses – or maybe even pen & ink. In fact, it is unlikely that much of what he taught was actually written down; and much of what we have of him was written ages after he died. **Much – but not all.**

Personally, I think that one or two may have jotted down a Jesus saying or teaching during his life; and that may be why Jesus never wrote anything himself. Perhaps Jesus had a kind of secretary who took notes. I have long found it odd that Jesus did not write anything himself – or at least we have no evidence of any Jesus writings; however, **if Jesus spoke and someone else wrote, that would go a long way in explaining why we have no actual writings of Jesus.**

I have referred to a gospel called the **Gospel of Thomas**. That work offers only a series of “**Jesus said**” statements – as if someone had taken notes of what Jesus said at the time he said it – or soon thereafter. That might suggest – and I think it does – that **Thomas was a kind of secretary to Jesus** because it is a “**Book of Thomas**” that offers the Jesus said statements. None of these statements include any kind of narrative as to what Jesus may have been doing, however. They only offer what Jesus said in terms of his counsel to others.

It is all conjecture at this point in history, of course, but I conjecture that the first work about the teachings of Jesus was probably the work of Thomas – which, as I have argued, may have been written as notes during the life of Jesus. All the other gospels were written long after the death of Jesus, perhaps basing much of their commentary on a **Jesus said** statement from the **Gospel of Thomas** and then winding various “**Jesus did**” narrative around that while at times altering the Jesus said statement to comply with something they were trying to offer.

Like I say, it is hard to say about that, but personally I think that is what happened. I think the **Gospel of Thomas** was used by the others who wrote gospels that would eventually be accepted within the **Christian BIBLE** to define Jesus according to their own view that he had likely been the Jewish Messiah that Judaism had been expecting. In doing that, however, they confused the teachings of Jesus with their own teachings that were mostly Jewish based – based on Mosaic Law and tradition. People like Peter probably did not know Jesus like Thomas probably knew him and in time would confuse

what should have been a very simple **tolerant Christianity** with a very confusing and often **demanding Christianity**.

No one within traditional Christianity wants to hear such a speculation, however, because time has invested too much in a demanding Christianity they have come to know and love. The Heaven they have been promised depends upon their acceptance of that demanding Christianity – and that is a hard thing with which to deal. If traditional Christianity is not “**real Christianity**,” then it would be too much to bear; and perhaps it would be for many.

Be that as it may, I do believe that the Christianity that Jesus professed within the **Gospel of Thomas** was in general a “*love your life because you are a son of God*” type message, but the **Peter Christianity** that has survived and has been promoted is the “**believe in me or be damned**” type of message. Nowhere in the **Gospel of Thomas** is there an indication that Jesus thought or taught that humankind is lost in sin and needs some redemption from without for salvation; but in the gospels of the **BIBLE**, it is exactly that message that is promoted. **You must believe in Jesus and must believe he is the only son of God and that you can only receive some needed grace of salvation through Jesus. That is the underlying theme of the four gospels of the BIBLE.**

What that says to me is that something happened between the writings of Thomas and the writings of the others. I think it fair to assume that something was probably the death of Jesus and perhaps a few decades of being without Jesus. In other words, **time corrupted the initial message of Jesus**. No longer was it taught that we are sons of God and should be safe and secure within that idea. After the death of Jesus, the message became that each of us is lost and needs the grace of Jesus to – in a way – be restored as a son of God. **The Jesus of Thomas taught that we “are” sons of God and should rejoice in that. The Jesus of post-Thomas taught that we can become sons of God if we accept Jesus as our personal savior.** Quite a difference, huh?

There is like a canyon between the *Jesus of Thomas* and the **Jesus of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John** – who could all be considered as protégés of Peter. **The central surviving authority that comes out of all the gospels of the BIBLE is Peter.** That, to me, suggests that it was Peter who mostly corrupted the message of Jesus – because he had the most to gain by changing the teaching of Jesus from “*you are a son of God*” to “*you can become a son of God*”. To become something, you need help to do so. Peter probably realized that without Jesus around that if people were to “become sons of God,” they would need his help – claiming of course that he was only the successor of Jesus and that seeking souls had to go through him to get to Jesus – and of course, to God beyond Jesus.

And just like that, in my opinion, the true message of Jesus that we are already holy and need no saving grace was flip flopped to the exact opposite. That is the underlying suggestion that I get from comparing the **Gospel of Thomas** to the other gospels. **The Jesus of Thomas taught independence, in terms of self-worth. The Jesus of post-Thomas taught dependence;** but again, that is but a personal reading. I do admit I could be wrong, but with Thomas in the picture, a different Jesus emerges for me. Without Thomas, there would have been no way to suspect that a Jesus teaching might have been corrupted – possibly and I think, probably, headed by the grand patriarch himself, Peter.

**When Jesus was alive, Christianity was not authority based – based on reading the Gospel of Thomas. After Jesus died, Christianity became authority based –**

**based on the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, & John.** What happened to change things so dramatically? I suspect that Thomas departed Israel for other lands – to share his ideas of Jesus with some in other lands. With Thomas gone, it became open season for Peter to drive his own agenda, claiming to represent Jesus and speaking for Jesus; and the rest, as we say, is history.

## The Jesus of Thomas

Let me feature a verse from the **Gospel of Thomas** that I think suggests that Jesus may have believed in the need of each of us to become our own masters through wisdom and not through the grace of another. I do not wish to belabor the point, but this verse, I think, is extremely telling in that it would not be found in the other gospels because that would undermine the message of those gospels that we need some wisdom or grace from another that we cannot find in ourselves to become a master. The key thought here is “master” and being your own master by virtue of knowing what Jesus knew, but not following Jesus without knowing what he knew. I can become like Jesus – a master on my own – by listening to his tale of life and understanding it. It is his tale of life, though, substance wise, and not his telling it that is important. It is wisdom – not from whom we learn the wisdom – that is important. It would not matter if Harry or Harriet or Jesus offered the wisdom. It is the wisdom itself that matters.

*Verse 13: Jesus said to His disciples: Make a comparison to me and tell me whom I am like. Simon Peter said to Him: Thou art like a righteous angel. Matthew said to Him: Thou art like a wise man of understanding. Thomas said to Him: Master, my mouth will not at all be capable of saying whom Thou art like. Jesus said: I am not thy Master because thou has drunk, thou has become drunk from the bubbling spring which I have measured out. And He took him, he withdrew, he spoke three words to him. Now when Thomas came to his companions, they asked him: What did Jesus say to thee? Thomas said to them: If I tell you one of the words which He said to me, you will take up stones and throw at me; and the fire will come from the stones and burn you up.*

I think this is important because of the **anti-lord message** it offers. Dependence upon Jesus is not what Jesus taught in Thomas, but rather independence of all by virtue of knowing the same wisdom that Jesus knew. Jesus told Thomas that he, Jesus, was not the master – or lord – of Thomas because in listening to Jesus, Thomas had become his own master.

I offer this as illustration of my claim that the *Jesus of Thomas* seems canyons apart from the **Jesus of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John** – all of whom would have me believe that I have to rely on the merits of Jesus to gain salvation. Not so here. I must depend on my merits – not on those of anyone else; and I certainly do not need to offer some obedience to some authority to gain that wisdom – and independence.

Notice, too, that after Jesus told Thomas that Jesus was not the master – or lord – of Thomas that he took Thomas alone into a kind of private session and shared some little tidbit with him which he did not share with the others – including our friend, Peter. Peter was not included in this private session because – as Thomas offers later – Peter would

become angry if he heard what Jesus told Thomas. Of course, this comes from a book by Thomas and should be seen somewhat as self-serving, but I think it also suggests that Peter did not know Jesus as well as did Thomas; and I suspect that Peter would have become angry to hear that Thomas knew Jesus better than Peter.

Also, notice that when Jesus asked the disciples to tell him what each thought of him, Peter answered with a response quite different than his response to that same question in the other gospels. The other gospels have Peter answering something like: **You are the Messiah and the Only Son of the Most High**. In this verse, Peter answers: **You are like a righteous angel**. It could be seen somewhat as “brown nosing” to compare Jesus to an angel, but it is hardly going so far as to say he is some **“Only Son of the Most High and a Messiah”**. Of course, I am paraphrasing, but you get the gist of it. Right?

From **“brown noser”** before the death of Jesus to **“arrogant commander”** after the death of Jesus – that, I think, is the road Peter traveled in the saga of Jesus. In this little verse, it is implied that Peter did not even know Jesus well enough for Jesus to take him into his confidence – but in the gospels to come – long after Jesus would pass – Peter claims that he called Jesus the Messiah and that Jesus acknowledged that claim and proceeded to **“give the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven”** to Peter. That followed with the likes of: **Whatsoever you will bind here on earth shall be bound also in Heaven and whatsoever you will decide is unimportant will be considered as unimportant in Heaven**. Again, I am paraphrasing, but at least some of you may get the picture that Peter may not have been the great confident of Jesus he claims he was, but one lacking in wisdom though sincerely believing he possessed it – to the degree that Jesus would choose him among all the apostles to lead Christianity after Jesus would depart.

The *Jesus of Thomas* emphasized one’s need to decide for himself by virtue of wisdom. The *Jesus of Peter* would go forward to claim that he had the right to decide for others – in the name of Jesus and Heaven itself. That, to me, is **AMAZING ARROGANCE**; and it seems it was with such arrogance that Christianity was led after the death of Jesus. **I repeat though: that is only my personal opinion.**

This is only 1 of 114 verses found within the **Gospel of Thomas**. Like I argue, I think it tells of a very different Jesus than the Jesus of the other accepted gospels of the **BIBLE**. **Which Jesus is most correct? That is for each of us to decide.**

For what it’s worth, I would encourage all to go to their book stores or libraries and secure a **Gospel of Thomas** and enjoy making a study of it. Also, I would highly recommend another gospel – **The Gospel of Mary Magdalene** – for study too. If you wish, I can provide a Microsoft Word CD containing both gospels and my interpretations of them – along with what details I know about their origin, eventual banning in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century, and subsequent rediscoveries in somewhat recent years. The **Gospels of both Thomas and Mary** and my interpretations of them can be found in my CD: **OUT IN THE OPEN** – which also includes all of my writings from 1963 to 2011.

## The Resurrection of Jesus

Did Jesus rise from dead after he was crucified? I wish I knew, but the answer I have to give is **I don’t know**. I suspect not because there is no reason why he should have – from a *Holist* point of view. Will I rise from my grave when I die? I have no reason to believe that I will – but why would I do so? If I am as comfortable with life



and death as I should be – within my naturalism – **why would I want to deviate from the natural and somehow choose to reenter the same body?** I suppose it is possible, but in the world of probability where I live, I sure do not see it as probable.

For the same reason, I do not think that Jesus would have found it of any benefit or advantage either. On that basis, **I suspect that Jesus did not really rise from the dead – body and soul intact; however, it sure is possible that his soul may have “manifested” in some apparition sense.** I do not claim any personal experience as to having seen any “apparitions” in my life; but I do believe they are possible – partly because of the experience of some who have seen them.

I just happen to have a strong belief in the soul – and that souls exist independent of bodies. Of what are some souls capable in terms of presenting themselves to souls within bodies? I do not know because I have had no experience along that line, but I am convinced that **soul presentation is possible** – and soul presentation as an image others can see is completely within the realm of possibility to me.

For instance, apparitions have been noted in such places as Fatima (Spain?), Lourdes (France), and Guadalupe (Mexico) where some have claimed to see a Lady in apparition form. It has been assumed that the “Lady” is the mother of Jesus, Mary; but regardless of identity, I have no reason to believe such is not possible. Who knows? Maybe I will “appear” to someone after I die. Beware! Oh ye of little faith!

Other than Jesus, however, I know of no other case where someone dead has been claimed to rise from his (or her) death bed and spring to life with an apparition like body. The story that is told of Jesus in the regular gospels is that he rose from the dead, but that his new body was not like his old body – in terms that his “new body” appeared “glorified” and could elevate into the air – as it was claimed happened when Jesus would depart the earth for heaven later on. **That, I think, is to suggest no body at all – but a soul manifesting as a body – just like the ladies of Fatima, Lourdes, and Guadalupe.** I doubt that those ladies had bodies either.

Now, if the stories that were told about Jesus had him living among his friends in a “normal” way – with just a regular body – then that would be a different story entirely. Could that happen? I really doubt it, but again, why should it? **If death is only part of the wonder of life, why would anyone want to return in a same body and live again?** In the case of Jesus, it seems he was rather anxious to go – and not stay. That suggests he was anxious to get on with being a bodiless soul; and perhaps such is the case of most souls who have finished with an incarnation. For the most part, they would be anxious to get on with their next experience and not dally with an old one.

Imagine for a bit, though, that Jesus did appear in apparition form to some of his friends after he died. Would that not suggest he had risen from the dead? I know if someone I knew in life, died, and then appeared to me in some manifest way, I would be inclined to believe he (or she) had risen from the dead; but I bet that if I were to look in my friend’s grave, I would find a body.

But it is said that some looked and did not find a body in the case of Jesus. Maybe, but my guess is that Jesus was taken from the cross and disposed of like an ordinary criminal, though another tale was told, knowing perhaps that no one would find a body to dispute that other tale. I admit I am guessing though. I do not know what happened in the case of Jesus; however, since those who told about him were of **Messianic Mosaic Bent** and probably saw Jesus as **Jewish Messiah and Mosaic Champion** and not what I

think he was – a ***Champion of Holism*** – I tend to suspect a bit of exaggeration – and even blatant fabrication - on their parts.

Say that I was one to see an apparition of Jesus after he died, would I not be one to exaggerate and claim it was by his grave that I saw him – and when I looked, there was no body. I do not know; but I suspect that even those who reported their apparitions of Jesus did not know either. **It would not surprise me if they never even looked for a corpse for having assumed there was no corpse.** If I really believe you are the full you as you appear to me, why would I even suspect that another part of you lies elsewhere?

Of course, some of the gospels of the **BIBLE** claim otherwise. They claim that Jesus made it clear that he was in his normal body form by telling them to touch him and watch him eat. A spirit would not eat. Only a body would eat. That makes sense, but because Jesus did not stick around for long and **“rose into heaven,”** I think they really saw an apparition of Jesus. If Jesus had returned in his normal body and lived in a normal bodily sense in the real world, then I would have reason to believe he returned in full form from the dead; but lacking that, I can’t imagine he did – even though others claim he did, probably to advance their own agenda.

I think it worthwhile to keep in mind again that lots of people exaggerate in order to impress others. **I saw Jesus and he was just like you and me.** Really? If that were so, why did he not stick around to impress more than just a few? Appearing in mere apparition form might have been somewhat convincing that death does not end it all, but how much more convincing would it have been if Jesus had stuck around and resumed his craft of being a carpenter. Now, that would have been convincing!

If someone were to come to me and tell me they saw our mutual friend, Jesus, returned after dead, I’d have to question why the visit did not include me – that is, if I were really a friend of Jesus too. In that, I guess I would be like Thomas who was presented as needing to see to believe. I suspect the one who told that story was only trying to anticipate my argument and, as it were, cut it off at the pass; however the one who told the story that Thomas needed to see to believe very conveniently presented Thomas confronting a risen Jesus and pressing his flesh to prove that it was really flesh and not just some “spiritual manifestation”. I would have probably done the same thing if I had written that story. Call it an author’s license to exaggerate if you wish.

**Exaggeration and fabrication aside, however, personally I love the tale of the resurrection of Jesus – if even in apparition form – because it lends confirmation to the notion that souls continue after they die – or pass from a mortal body.** I have little doubt that Jesus lived again after his crucifixion – but I tend to believe he was just continuing his life as a soul – not really starting again – just as I will when I die – and you too, of course.

## Life After Death

That brings me to my conclusion – life after death in a ***Holistic*** sense. I do not believe that life is unholy – any life; and I accept death as part of the wonder of life. I do not see death as somehow some sentence that happens only because my life was not as it should have been. That is for the **Divisionists** to ponder. Their lives may not be as they think they should be – or should have been – but I do not see life in the same way.

What happens to a **Holist** soul when it dies – or when its body dies? Again, I do not know; however because I have a terrific confidence in the holiness of all life and all death, I have no reason to fear it. If death were to come to me because of some injustice that I may have done, then maybe I would fear it for some fate after death; but I am guilty of no injustice to another soul – of which I am aware. So, I merely look to have another joyful experience when I pass from this world to the next; and even if I were guilty of some injustice to another, personally I think my main judgment would be to continue with my sense of disrespect – for all that matters.

As I see it, we souls are all the same in that we all continue on after death. Jesus is not the only one to survive death. We all do – or will. **Virtue has nothing to do with it. Virtuous or vicious, I will continue; and virtuous or vicious I may intercede in another's life.** As there are tales of quiet spirits – perceived as angels - appearing now and again, there are also tales of somewhat mad spirits – perceived as devils - returning too. Death has no hold on any of us; or so it seems. Neither is it likely that death stops a spirit from continuing as it was before death.

Since I have tried to live my life as a Holist, it is only reasonable to assume that I will continue as a **Holist** when I finally pass from my current body. If all is holy as I believe, then it won't matter where I go because where I go I will find the holy. Not a bad way to go, huh? I do not know if I will linger about after I die. I may be like Jesus and want to get on with life in the spirit and be gone from the life I will have left behind; but I may also stick around and visit a few just to see how you are all doing. I wonder!

*Thank you so much for listening!*

# ***MY HOLISTIC VIEW OF LIFE***

-----

## ***THE END***

# ***Hello Everybody***

A song by  
Francis William Bessler  
December 3rd, 2011

## ***REFRAIN:***

***Hello, Everybody, it's time to smile.  
Hello, Everybody, your time's worth while.  
Hello, Everybody, know you are a mystery.  
Whether you're a boy or a girl,  
you're a son of Divinity.***

When I look out a window  
to see a tree leafed in green,  
I become aware  
of a greater truth that is unseen.  
All that's in that lovely tree  
is also found in me.  
The tree & I are one  
as we both share eternity.

## ***Refrain.***

When I look up into the sky,  
I see a sun shining bright;  
and I become aware  
that all's dependent upon the light.  
All that's found upon  
our wonderful, plentiful earth  
depends on the light of the sun  
for its very birth.

## ***Refrain.***

When I look out into space,  
I'm sure no end can be;  
and I realize that all must be  
lost within Infinity.  
No one can know where it ends -  
anymore than where it begins.  
Just be happy you're part of it all -  
and to that, just say, Amen.

## ***Refrain.***

When I look into the future,  
I see that same ole tree  
that is in my present now  
and shares my mystery;  
and I know the tree & I  
will go forward as we've done,  
knowing that we are among  
Life's blessed sons.

***Refrain (2).***

***Ending:***

***Yes, whether you're a boy or a girl,  
you're a son of Divinity.  
Whether you're a boy or a girl,  
you're a son of Divinity.***

# SMALL

By

Francis William Bessler

December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011

It's funny how old gems are discovered by surprise - or found when not expecting to find them. That happened a few days ago when I was looking through an old binder to review some printed pictures I filed away in 1998. Among those printed pictures, I found a copy of an early email I had written to my oldest daughter, Anita, in celebration of her 28<sup>th</sup> birthday - May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1998. In that happy birthday email letter, I found two songs I had written much earlier, but thought I had lost because they were found in a little black book that I have since misplaced - or lost.

It seems, however, that in 1998 I had not lost that little black book - because in my email of May 18<sup>th</sup>, 1998, there were two lost songs: one I called **SMALL** - which I had written at Christmas time in 1965 - and another called **ANITA** - which I had written in 1971 when Anita was only one year old.

The little song, **SMALL**, meant a good deal to me because Mom told me that Dad cried a little when he read it. That was the Christmas of 1965. I gave a copy of **SMALL** to Mom & Dad for that Christmas and then returned to Denver where I was living at the time. It turned out to be my last visit with Dad because in July of the next year, 1966, he would be killed in a pedestrian/auto accident at the age of 59. Dad was the pedestrian.

To be honest, I do not remember writing the song, **ANITA**, probably because Anita was only a year old when I wrote it - thereby being too young to react to it like Dad reacted to **SMALL**. I will include **ANITA** in this little essay, however, because I included it in my happy birthday email to her on May 18<sup>th</sup> of 1998. Perhaps the two songs were "**lost together;**" and so I am deciding they should be "***found together***" as well.

In reviewing my letter of 1998, I am a little taken that I seem to have a habit of losing things - and then finding them by surprise later on. I also mention that Anita and I have lived in separation because of being separated (divorced) from Anita's mom, Dee. Since I mention it in the letter below, Dee and I married in 1967, but divorced in 1977 - when Anita was only six. Regardless of why Dee and I divorced, Anita has always known that love for her has never been an issue. Dee and I both love Anita - as Anita loves both of us. Perhaps it is a bit of a testament that people can love and divorce and retain their love of a child in spite of separate lives.

Without further fanfare, then, let me feature the email of May 18<sup>th</sup>, 1998 below - which will include both "lost" songs. It always amazes me that when you least expect something, a surprise often happens. I was looking for printed pictures when going through an old binder, but found among those printed pictures a copy of the following email letter to Anita. It's fun to write songs or little ditties that mean a lot at the time they were written, but it is as much fun to find such ditties when not even looking for them. In

some ways, that is life, I guess. That which you do one day may come back to either haunt you for a caused injury or delight you for an earlier happy moment. In the case of this article, it was delight. So, if you will, let me share a little of that delight. OK?

## Happy Birthday Letter - May 18<sup>th</sup>, 1998

My Dearest Anita,

Here's wishing you a beautiful birthday. In fine remembrance of the occasion, here are a couple of poems I wrote long time ago. I have often wondered if I have a copy of a poem I wrote in 1965 that Mom says made Dad cry. It's a poem called "Small". Well, I found that poem and several others I have written down through the years this weekend in a little binder. Along with "Small," I found "Anita". I thought that for your 28<sup>th</sup> birthday, I would share them with you. Enjoy them, My Lovely Daughter! You know they came (and come) from my heart. Though things did not turn out like I wanted them to in regard to Dee and you and I, still the sentiment is there; and I think that's very important. We have had to love apart from each other, but make no mistake about it - we have loved and stayed in love. Right?

### *Small*

Written by Frank Bessler in 1965

Reach up, reach up and clutch the clouds.  
So say the people today.  
Be smart, be bright - and break away from the crowd  
and you'll find the world  
on your silver lined plate.

**But I want to be small  
and not have to reach so high.**

**I want to be small  
and give the world my dime.**

**I want to be small  
and be my father's child;  
for only if I'm small  
will I be tall.**

Be a man, be a giant - and cut down your foe.  
So say the people today.  
Shoot them, smash them - keep them off your toes  
and you will be master  
of your own fate.

**But I want to be small  
and let the sun be my stove.  
I want to be small  
and enjoy the quiet of a grove.  
I want to be small  
and not overlook my neighbor's cries;  
for only if I'm small,  
will I be wise.**

Be kind, be yourself - and cling to my hands.  
So does my Lord tell me.  
Be truthful, be honest - and obey my commands  
and give of yourself  
very generously.

**So, I want to be small  
and from vain ambition refrain.  
I want to be small  
and brilliance not feign.  
I want to be small,  
letting God be my fate;  
for only if I'm small,  
will I be great.**

## ***Anita***

Written by Frank Bessler in 1971

Anita, my sweet little child, I'm loving you all the while  
I'm holding you close in my arms, and enjoying your sweet little charms.  
Anita, my pretty girl, my love for you unfurls.  
I'm trying to be a good Daddy and make your Mommy happy.  
Anita, as you are growing,  
it's good that I am knowing  
my love for you is strong; so your hurts won't be very long.  
Anita, I will always be near, when life causes you tears;  
but more than that, my dove, you can always count on my love.  
Anita, my pretty princess, you're gaining a lot of finesse.  
Soon, you'll end being a baby, and blossom into a fine young lady.  
So, Anita, my sweet little child, I'm loving you all the while  
I'm holding you close in my arms, and enjoying your sweet little charms.

**Though you were only 1 when I wrote this, Anita, I loved you with all my heart and  
mind and soul. Know what? I still do. Happy Birthday, My Colorado Princess!**

**----- ALL MY LOVE, DAD -----**



# ***WISDOM***

**(8 Pages)**

By

Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

December 31st, 2011

Amended with a final idea - Equal Divinity - on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012

## **Preface**

We come to the end of a road. This will be the last article to be included in my greater ***OUT IN THE OPEN*** writings. I am calling it ***WISDOM*** because that is where I started - or with which I started back in 1963. I have lost the original ***WISDOM***, but in this article I will try to retrace it a bit - though in a different format than the original. The original was written in allegory story form. This "remake" at the end of 2011 will follow an essay/song format. I think, though, that it is worthwhile to try and recapture my original story - and then see where we might go from there. OK?

## **My Original Story**

I won't go into detail because I do not even remember much of the detail myself, but the original story was about an angel who was convinced perspective is at the heart of all conduct - both good and bad. He believed that all of the conflict within mankind was due to people being led to believe they are no good. He opined that if one is taught he or she is no good, then the practical end of such an instruction is that he or she will do precisely as they are led to believe they are. That was the basis of his ***wisdom*** - if you want to call it that.

I called my angel of wisdom by the same name - Wisdom. I must admit he was a very impractical angel, but be that as it may, such was his perspective. He thought that it would be a good idea to try and instruct two children of the world of man that they are really the same as he was - angels - and then the two children could go forward and become teachers themselves.

Well, that was the gist of it. I forget the names of the two children he selected for his "experiment," but he changed their names anyway. So, their original names could only be found in the first chapter of the story.

The children he selected for his experiment were a twin brother and sister about the age of twelve. This duo was a very pleasing and well behaved couple of kids. So, angel ***Wisdom*** really was dealing with great material in the first place. He did not have to

"convert" this brother and sister to his peaceful and kind ways because they were already of that sort; and that was his story anyway. He believed that everyone is born of peaceful and kind character, but is only instructed later to be other than that. **Wisdom** only encountered two peaceful kids before they would become otherwise. He might have selected twelve year olds because it would be too late for thirteen year olds to still be innocent; but talk about a coward in a way. How hard is it to urge someone who is already at peace to stay with his peaceful ways?

No matter. Our angel, **Wisdom**, was only about emphasizing what was already true of his two pupils. How would you emphasize the present **innocence** of an innocent girl - or innocent boy? Well, **Wisdom** decided he would do it by renaming them. So he renamed the girl to **Innocence**. Then he opined that the way for anyone who is really **innocent** to stay innocent would be to **practice innocence**. His way of doing that was to always act the same way with everyone. Don't act one way with one person and another with another person. It is such confusing behavior that allows for one who is really innocent in the beginning to lose that innocence and become, as it were, a devil.

So, **Wisdom** renamed the boy **Simplicity** to emphasize simplicity as the necessary practice to retain innocence. Then **Wisdom** decided that his two pupils needed a "new uniform" with which to go out into the world. He asked his two pupils to disrobe to ready themselves for their "new uniform". Then he dressed them with an invisible robe he called a **sanctimonia**. Now, they were no longer naked; however, they had not seen themselves as naked without clothing in the first place. The idea there was that no one really needs a covering to know and practice innocence, but if it helps, it doesn't hurt to imagine one is covered.

The point there is to always be conscious of your own purity in order to retain it. A **sanctimonia** was only to emphasize that anyone dressed in innocence should be aware of their state of innocence in order to retain it. It is the awareness that is the robe. To lose awareness of innocence is really, in effect, to lose innocence - even though a body may have never changed. If you think it changed to assume some guilty state, in effect, it did change.

Anyway, that was the story. It was a bit of a short story - although I think it numbered 100 pages or so. How I ever got a simple story like that to take 100 pages is a good question. I had **Wisdom** and **Innocence** and **Simplicity** conversing a lot. So, that took up most of the space. Later I would write other stories and it was always the same - the characters talked a lot more than they acted.

Refer to my earlier stories in this set of writings within my entire **OUT IN THE OPEN** writings to confirm that, if you wish. My characters are always talking - as in the story of **DAVID & BELINDA** and its sequel - **ALL'S WELL WITH THE WORLD** - or in the story I called **INTO THE LIGHT** which features a young lady in her 30s "mastering" to a young man in his 30s. I called the lady by the name of **Priscilla** and her student by the name of **Lance**. The point is that all my stories - except my last short one which I just wrote last month or so - feature a lot of talk among the characters. My last story is a parody and I did not suit it with a lot of talk, but everything else I have written features characters that talk, talk, talk. My parody that I called **AN IMPOSSIBLE TALE** is a parody of the Garden of Eden story; and if you remember - there was very little talk in that one too.

# Is *WISDOM* Right?

The big question is - **is *Wisdom*, my angel of *Innocence*, right?** Are we as human beings really already "right with God"? Has various tradition that preaches the contrary wrong? If *Wisdom* is right, then it would seem all spiritual teaching that offers that man and woman lost their innocence due to some act of disobedience to God is wrong.

What is **innocence**, spiritually speaking? In my opinion, it is simply man being devoid of inherited sin. That is what it is. It is man being dressed in Divinity. That is what it is. It is man living in a state of the presence of God. That is what it is. It is man being "right with God". We are simply innocent of being separated from God - if *Wisdom* is right.

Is it possible we will never be closer to God than we are right now? Is it possible that we have been mistaken in the first place in assuming that God is a person rather than simply an Infinite Presence? Why have we believed that God is a person and not simply a presence? I think the answer to that is those ignorant of God have assumed that their speculation that God is a person like they are is correct. Separation from God makes sense if you think of God as being an individual who can relate to all others as individuals; but it makes no sense if God is really Infinite and thereby necessarily **IN** everything. So, what is the truth? **Is God Infinite Presence - or Individual Person?**

And how about *Wisdom's* idea of *Simplicity*? Is simplicity - defined in *Wisdom's* terms - necessary to retain innocence? Why should I have to act the same to stay innocent? Why can't I conduct myself one way at one time and another way at another time?

Well, simplicity is not so much acting the same in all situations as it is practicing only innocence at all times. In effect, that translates as being shameless with others as one is with oneself. It translates as doing only in front of others what you delight in doing alone - and not doing alone what you would be ashamed to do in front of others. It is simply extending shamelessness when alone to that same shamelessness when with others. That is really what simplicity is all about. It is only finding Heaven everywhere - and acting like Heaven is everywhere. Would you carry on in a certain way if you knew you are in Heaven? If you argue to yourself that you would not conduct yourself in such a way if you knew you were in Heaven, then don't do it anywhere. That is simplicity.

## The Way Of Innocence

Am I really innocent of being separated from God? Or am I only imagining that I am innocent? In any case, I believe in innocence. I believe in it because the contrary of separation from God makes no sense to me. I believe in it because, upon reviewing life itself, I find no evidence that life itself is not a miracle. I believe in it because I cannot look at my breast and imagine that the wonder of creation and God is not happening there. I believe in it because I am amazed by the idea that within me a heart is pumping and that wonderful organ is delivering life sustaining blood throughout my body.

Did my heart just happen without some wonderful design? I cannot believe it could have. Who designed my heart in the first place? Whoever or whatever it was did a fantastic job; and I am so very grateful for the artistry. I look at my hands - and I say, Wow! They work - just as designed. It's a miracle! I look at my eyes. They see - just as designed; and I shout - it's a miracle! I look at my belly - and I feel my belly - and I know my belly is good. Who designed my belly? Not me, for sure, but again, whoever or whatever is the benefactor deserves my gratitude. I feel my genitals. They swell a little in my hands when I hold them - just as designed; and I say Wow! It's a miracle!

## Innocence & Nakedness

Let the debate go on! Am I really as innocent as I think I am? - Or is my nature swallowed in sin? Am I really one with God? - or is God way over there and I have to yell to get His attention? Is God really a guy with penis and testicles - or is God a Mysterious Presence within all penises and testicles and vaginas and breasts? Are only Jews children of God - or are Egyptians children of God too?

When I was a child, I was taught that God favored Jews over Egyptians. It was right there in **THE BOOK**. God was for the Jews - and God selected one called Moses to lead his favored Jews out of the land of Egypt into the "favored" land of Israel. Then I asked myself - can it be true? Could a real God favor some over others? If I were an Egyptian in that tale of one being favored over the other, how would it have been if I had been an Egyptian? Those who believe in favoritism ought to take just one moment and ask that question of themselves - and then, how would they answer the "question of favoritism"?

Also, however, when I was a child, I had available to me a field. I grew up within a farm outside of Powell, Wyoming. I am not sure why I was so bent on dealing with the issue of favoritism and innocence and guilt, but I was; and one of the ways I resolved the issue - or issues - was to withdraw to one of our fields, take off my clothes, and be one with the fields. I was, in fact, innocent - and my going naked taught me - or at least confirmed in me - that I am.

Lost naked among the beans and beets, the truth was obvious. If I were standing there naked with a Jew and an Egyptian, there would be no way that God would - or could - select one of us over the other. But it took being naked to drive the lesson home; and that is why going naked is so terribly, terribly important. **It shows with compelling evidence that we are all the same.**

## An Exit - and an Ending: With A Song & An Idea!

It's time for *Wisdom & Innocence & Simplicity & I* to take our wonderful naked equality and depart the land of writing - at least for this **OUT IN THE OPEN** adventure. I began in Volume 1 of this 10 volume effort to claim that everything I write is personal

opinion. That has not changed. All that you have read is only opinion - nothing more and nothing less; **but opinion is wonderful.** It is what allows us to separate truth from error. I think I am really innocent of separation from God. I think all are innocent - and none are guilty; but that is only my opinion.

**Seeing really is Believing, however.** My greatest investment in my life has been my own nakedness. I will admit that; and I am extremely proud to admit it. Nakedness has been my greatest friend in life because it is really not just going without clothes, It is, in fact, **GOING WITH NATURE** - and perhaps everyone can admit somewhat, Nature is quite a companion. Isn't it? And since personally I equate Nature with God because an Infinite God must be IN all things and must be everywhere, I can also add as a "companion" - God.

I have featured lots of song in this **OUT IN THE OPEN** effort; and I am going to end it with a song - about turning 70 as I have just done - and looking back. In my case, looking back is also looking forward because I simply expect more of the same in the future of what has been in my past. I like what has been in my past. So there is no reason to believe I will not like what is in my future - even that mysterious future that extends beyond death; but after the song, I will close it out with an idea. Standby!

## SEVEN, SEVENTEEN, & SEVENTY

By

Francis William Bessler

Laramie, Wyoming

December 25th, 2011

Note: Now that I have reached 70 - on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011 -

I can write the following song, though, in truth, perhaps I have always been "qualified" by believing one age to be the same as another. It has been said that **what goes around comes around.** I agree. I think that says it all.

Life is very simple, even if we perceive it as otherwise.

A next step is only a repetition of a previous step -  
unless one chooses to step in a different direction.

At any time, we can change; but as importantly,  
if something is working, it makes no sense to change it -  
regardless of how many so called "wise men" suggest otherwise.

**REFRAIN:**

(Repeat refrain as often as you choose)

*Seven, seventeen, and seventy,  
they are ages I have known;  
and I am so very grateful  
for all that they have shown.  
No matter how old I become  
or how young again I may be,  
I do believe I will always be  
seven, seventeen, & seventy  
for all eternity.*

When I was only seven,  
I loved to take off my clothes  
and body paint with mud  
from my head to my toes.  
I guess I knew as a little child  
that I am part of everything.  
Body painting with mud  
was only showing that I believed.

When I was seventeen,  
not much had changed.  
Though my body had matured,  
I still retained my childish ways.  
I still loved to cast man's clothes aside  
and into the hills I would run,  
knowing it's only right to be proud  
of being God & Nature's son.

When I was seventy,  
with spouse and children in arrears,  
I was still consumed in the joy  
that I'd known through all the years.  
I was still that little kid,  
within Nature, yearning to be free  
to show my soul that I know  
all are equal in Divinity.

I'll always be seven,  
no matter how old I grow to be.  
It makes no sense to me  
that seven is less worthy than seventy.  
Life should always be a miracle,  
no matter what the age.  
To treat it the same is the way  
I believe of being a sage.

Some think that a child  
should be inferior to an adult;  
but I think those who think that way  
live life like it's at fault.  
To separate lives because of age  
is to split what's good in two;  
but I've found that splitting good  
can never lead to the truth.

I've tried to live as an adult  
as if I am still a child,  
loving the sensual in me  
and insisting on no guile.  
Sex has been a part of my life  
but mostly only to conceive;  
and I do believe that is why  
my senses have liberated me.

Let others do as they will,  
but as for me, it's clear.  
I will continue being a little child  
for the rest of my wondrous years.  
And when I die, I will become  
one to start all over again  
and body paint with mud  
to make of my new life a friend.

## EQUAL DIVINITY

So, am I (and *Wisdom, Innocence, & Simplicity*) suggesting that everyone go naked? **NO!** I am only suggesting an idea of *Equal Divinity*. If one is doing it because of expressing equal Divinity in all, then going naked is expressive of the Ideal of Equal Divinity; but if done outside of that framework, then going naked is only going without clothes.

The important issue, however, is not going without clothes. It is *going with Nature*. It is assuming that Nature is all good - and if Nature is all good, then so are all within Nature. **Nature must be All Good because It must be found within an Infinity that is All Good.**

How many people think in terms of Infinity, however? How many pay it no mind at all? How many are aware that It probably is so and choose to lose themselves within the scope of an almost definite scope of never ending reality?

Those who are mindful of the idea of Infinity, however, can see that an Individual God within that makes no sense - in terms of there being a God with a personality that can favor one created being over another - or even one idea over another. Personality, by itself, requires "definition;" but an Infinity cannot be defined or limited - by the very virtue of definition. Accordingly, how can an Infinite God be a person? That which is "indefinable" cannot be defined. Can it? **Therefore, an indefinable God cannot be a person.**

If there is a God, that God must be equal to Divinity; and since Divinity must also be Infinite, then all within Infinity - and Divinity - must be equally Divine. That is the idea and message of Equal Divinity. No one can understand it because no one within Infinity can stand outside Infinity to look upon It; but given that galaxies go on and on and on - as it seems most within the study of astronomy believe - **the reality is probably Infinity; and Infinity is probably reality.**

So, what does that do for the idea that God can be one place and not another? What does that do for the idea that there can be a Heaven where God is and Hell where God is not - if God must be Everywhere?

In one of my songs - *THE MYSTERY OF GOD* - I declare: **The Mystery of God is all about. The Mystery is within. The Mystery of God is all about. That's why we can have no sin. The Mystery of God is all about. That's why I sing this hymn. The Mystery of God makes me shout - I'm glad I can have no sin!** But I can have no sin because I can not be separated from Infinity - which God is. That is the idea of Equal Divinity.

**I can sin, however. It's just that sin is not within me.** That is a very important distinction. If sin is defined as **maligning another** and not **separation from God** - then I can sin. I think, however, that the way is made very difficult for one to sin - or malign another - if one has a sense of Equal Divinity. I think, in the end, the biggest reason people malign one another and insist on being better than one another is that they lack a sense of Equal Divinity.

**Conflict happens because one thinks he - or she - is better than another.** That sense of being better often coincides with a notion that one is linked with God but the other of inferior quality is not. Thus, we have politicians claiming to be "inspired by God" to drive their campaigns and sports figures being "inspired by God" to win their games over other sportsmen who theoretically lack being "in with God". That carries over into battlefield after battlefield. This general is more inspired of God than that one. Marching on to war has a sense of "doing it for God" that inspires all the soldiers within a given army to march on - to kill in the name of God - and even to risk being killed in the name of God.

But is God in any of it? Probably Not! In that same song - *THE MYSTERY OF GOD* - I offer that **Pastor Billy claims he wants to die so he can see God face to face,**



but Billy doesn't seem to realize, his God is really IN the human race. God is not some person standing over there, begging for my applause; but God is the Presence in all Everywhere. If I know myself, I will know God. Pastors and sportsmen and soldiers everywhere, however, want to believe they represent a God that can be pleased; and so they go on with life to simply "please that God".

Well, I have long ago given up the idea of "**pleasing God**;" but I have not given up the idea of "**loving God**". It is easy to love God because to love anything within Infinity is to love God, but that love is not likely going to be rewarded with **Godly Approval** or **Godly Reward** because God is not outside of me to approve me or reward me.

It's good to keep in mind, too, that "approval" or "reward" is as much a mind matter as is "disapproval" and "rejection". **We live in our minds; and in our minds, we pay a price for what we do.** We act in certain ways, but those acts are always retained in our minds. Thus, in a way, we have to pay a mighty mind price for dealing out harm to another - in spite of the justification for some harm for which we are guilty.

If I smack you in the face, do you think I can forget that I smacked you? No! I will be aware of my smacking you - even if I deny I smacked you. In my mind, I will know otherwise. If I raped you, will I be able to forget it? Of course not. I may stand in front of a judge and vow I was never there, but in my mind, I will know otherwise. In my mind, I will have to "pay" for raping you - even if a court of law finds me innocent. If I am a legal judge and I sit in judgment of you for some dire terrible thing you may have done, will I be able to forget that I sentenced you to life or death or whatever? Of course not. **My mind won't let me forget it.** If I am a president or general and I commit my armed forces to some deed to remedy some assumed aggression on me or my nation or people, will I be able to forget that others may have died or become disabled because of my decision to go to war? Of course not. Regardless of any conduct - allegedly good or bad - I will pay for that conduct by having to be constantly reminded of it; and just in having to have something in mind for having been part of it, even if I thought it was the right thing to do, I will have to "pay" in my mind for what I did. Call it a **Mindful Law of Retribution**. No one can escape it..

**Can people really live for the sake of virtue alone, however?** That is the question. Can people really live happily and peacefully simply knowing they are good because they are within an Infinity and God that is All Good? Can people of the future find that enough? Or will we continue to act divisively and insist on separating ourselves from one another under the **guise of Godly favoritism** - that one of us is with God and the other is not?

Time will tell, I guess. Some of us will; and some of us will not. Some of us will claim a sort of **E.D.** - and some of us will not. What is **E.D.**? It's short for **Equal Divinity** - or a sense thereof. What is it that you have? I have **E.D.** Is that a form of sickness? Nope! On the contrary, it's an expression of "**well being**". Some might consider **E.D.** to stand for "**erectile dysfunction**" and only guys can catch it for being the only ones who can have erections - and therefore, erectile dysfunction; but my **E.D.** anyone can catch. It's not an illness. ***It's a way of life.***

Take off mankind - or the ignorance that has been of mankind - and put on **E.D.** And be aware - it is not "going naked" - though going naked is an ideal within it if one is going naked in order to go with Nature and the God within Nature. Put on some new glasses and look at life and yourself and others differently - and put on **E.D.** Stop

thinking that Heaven is a reward for "doing right" and start thinking of Heaven as simply the *Presence of God* - or *Infinity*. Put on **E.D.** and start living like *Life itself is the ultimate "miracle of God" and that Heaven, virtually speaking, is only knowing it - or being aware of it.*

*Thank you so much listening!* I have so enjoyed writing these articles of **OUT IN THE OPEN** to aid myself in knowing about life; and I am also pleased I could share them.

*Farewell!*

**Francis William Bessler (and Wisdom, Innocence, & Simplicity)**

January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012

***WISDOM***

-----

***THE END***

# ***EUGIENISM***

(14 Pages)

By

Francis William Bessler

Written in 1990; Modified 8/22/2012 - 8/28/2012

**Note:** Consider this one another extra, but in reviewing a past work - ***SOULS - ILLUSIONS OR REALITIES*** - written in 1989 and copyrighted in 1990, I have become aware that the final chapter of that work - called **EUGIENISM** - was eliminated when I rewrote the original work into ***UNMASKING THE SOUL***, featured in volume 2 of this series. I dropped the final chapter with the rewrite upon deciding that it really did not fit within my discussion of the soul. I decided to finish the rewrite with a chapter called **SECRETS OF THE SOUL**, but in so doing, the following article was eliminated.

In rereading my original ***SOULS - ILLUSIONS OR REALITIES*** in this month of August of 2012, I am deciding to add the eliminated article as the new final chapter of this final volume of my ***OUT IN THE OPEN*** series. I like the concept of ***Eugienism*** and I am deciding at this latter date to feature the original article about it here - with a few modern modifications. I guess each of us is many things, but one of the things I am is an ***Eugienist*** - which I define below. Perhaps you are too. If so, let's be grateful for each other's company.

Thanks!

***Francis William Bessler***

August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012

## **The Natural & Supernatural**

Several years ago, in 1983 (as offered in 1989), I decided that my perception of life and my perception of the soul needed a name; and so I gave it a name, a name I'd like to pass on to you now. That name is ***Eugienism*** (pronounced u-gee-en-ism); and it's an acronym for "***Everything Under God Is Equally Natural***".

Labels are like hooks we can hang our beliefs on. ***Eugienism***, then, is a belief I can hang my beliefs on. It says a lot and means a lot. **It says I believe in God, or a God. It says I believe in the natural; and it says that I believe that everything within God is "under" God and is equally natural.** That means, in part, that body and soul as entities "under God" are equally natural too.

In my opinion, the single biggest error passed on by tradition is the thought that the body is inferior to the soul and the body is less worthy of God than the soul. It's a lie; and it's a lie of no small significance. That lie leads us to treat the body as Paul of Tarsus would say as a "dirty rag" that can be dumped on at will with no fear of spiritual reprisal or judgment. That lie leads us to failure in any attempt to explain the soul because we

have already defeated ourselves by declaring the soul as outside the natural ballpark and outside natural logic.

We have argued, or have been led to believe, that the body and mind of man, being natural, cannot understand anything of the supernatural. Then we have conveniently assigned the soul to the supernatural so that it can't be touched with the logic of the natural. By choosing to believe, however, that our very souls are untouchable within the boundaries of natural logic, we have shackled and hobbled and handcuffed ourselves by declaring ourselves in need of supernatural guidance.

## Charlatans

The tragedy of this chosen perception that souls are really supernatural beings in need of supernatural guidance is that we expose ourselves to Charlatans claiming control of the guidance we think we need. It's a tragedy because it's a lie. First of all, our souls are not supernatural (please refer back to my work called *UNMASKING THE SOUL* in volume 2 of this series for a discussion of that idea). They are natural; and second, since they are not supernatural, they need no supernatural guidance.

The concept of the natural soul - or the concept that souls come from souls at their origin (again, see *UNMASKING THE SOUL*) - comes easily if preceded with a belief that all things under God (or within God) are equally natural. There is only one "super" nature - and that is God - through Whom or Which all existence is privileged to exist. **There are no supernatural beings - only one Supernatural Being - or if you wish, Supernatural Essence.** Natural logic would tell us this if we care to listen to the instruction.

Natural logic would tell us that Infinity cannot be divided because Infinity has no boundaries or ends. For things to have more of God - or Infinity - than other things, God or Infinity would have to be divisible. There would be no other way that one item could have more of God than another. You would have to divide God into parts with one part containing more of God than another. Given each part is whole for what it is, however, no part could lack God in its individual dimensions. Granted, a flea would have less of what is God than a man, but a man would have less of what is God than an elephant. Obviously, an elephant is not more Godly than a man just because it is larger; and just as obviously, a man cannot be more Godly than a flea just because it is larger. In fact, flea, elephant and man are 100 % full of God, given that an Infinite God or Presence must **IN** everything.

That is just one example of Natural logic telling us that one thing cannot have more of God than another. Another way to illustrate that there can be no more of God in one place than another - which is the same thing as saying there can be no more of God in one entity than another - is to take a yard test. Stand on the left side of your yard and note to yourself how much of God you think is there. Now, go to the other side of your yard and note to yourself how much of God you think is there. Almost definitely, you would not consider the left side of your yard to have more or less of God than the right side. Right? Well, just take that little test and apply it to whatever you wish. No matter where you are - even in a super distant galaxy - it is totally unlikely that God can be more in one place than another.

# Hierarchies

The idea of hierarchies within life is based on the same distorted argument - that one being can have more of God than another. Again, it's all pretty stupid if you stop to analyze it; but most people don't take the time. The common perception - or misperception - is that things are more or less virtuous or worthy depending upon their content of God - the more of God a thing has, the greater its worth. A hierarchical order is then established with the more one has of God, the "higher" that one is - related to God & worth; but it's all nonsense because an Infinite God must be equally in all things - thus making all things of equal worth and of equal divinity, as it were.

If everything under God (or within God, given that God must be Infinity Itself) is not equal, however, or if we perceive life that way, we open ourselves to senseless and illogical rule. If God is truly Infinite and necessarily Everywhere, kings and queens have no more of God than their subjects. Popes and bishops have no more of God than the common faithful. So called archangels and cherubim and seraphim and whatnot have no more of God in them than human souls. So, why act like they do?

# False Hope

The fact is, though, that people need hope and they need something or somebody in which to place their hope. In short, they (or we) need superiors to offer guidance and benevolence. That's all fine and good, but I think it's also fine and good to realize that within the framework of God and under the wide umbrella of God (or Infinity), God cannot choose to act as the superior we think we may need because intimates cannot be superiors. How can something inside of you also be outside of you to offer you guidance? **Those inside cannot command from without; and God is inside of us. Thus, He (or She or It) cannot be the superior we think we need.**

That is not to say, however, that perceived superiors and inspirational leaders don't exist. They just don't exist as prophets or agents from God, but they can and probably do exist within the framework of soulful providences or soulful families or gangs. Leastwise, reason would say they can if souls do, in fact, live outside of bodies and can relate with souls inside bodies as almost all religions teach they can.

*Eugienism* would say that under the umbrella of God or Infinity, there are no superiors or inferiors; but under the umbrella of providences or soulful kingdoms, there probably are - or can be. It's good to be aware that when we pray to God for help, it's not God to whom we are really praying, but to some soulful providence that may be pretending to be the God we think we need.

If we are aware of this, at least we can watch so as not to be misled - or led into the proverbial lions' den. When we pray, "Take my hand, Precious Lord," we should be aware that he (or she or it) who may take our hand is not God or can't be. Again, how can something that is inside of us as God must be also be outside of us to take our hand?

Indeed, that which takes our hand may be a true friend, a true helping hand, but it may also be a fraud. Needless to say, we should discriminate and choose our help wisely.

## Religion & Eugenism

Can religion and *Eugenism* mix? Can a Christian be an *Eugenist*? That depends. If the Christian is one who believes that Christ has more of God than he or she, then, no, that Christian can't be an *Eugenist*. If the Christian is one who believes that Christ and he or she are equally of an Infinite God and Nature, however, then yes, that Christian can also be an *Eugenist*.

Personally, I am that kind of Christian - an *Eugenistic Christian*, as it were, (although I consider myself a *Holistic Christian* too as offered elsewhere in this series - meaning one who believes that all existence is holy because all existence is equally of God). I believe in Christ as a brother, a friend, a teacher, and an ideal, but not as a god anymore than I am a god. **Christ and I are both sons of God, but neither of us is higher on a supernatural totem pole than the other. How could we be unequal if each of us is equally blessed with the presence of an Infinite God?**

## Satan & Jesus

Traditionally, of course, Christ has been assigned the role of a redeemer - as one coming from God as God to restore to Himself souls taken from Him by him we call Satan. Realistically, however, no one or nothing can steal anything from Infinity. That is a preposterous notion, isn't it? It's literally impossible for a finite being (such as Satan) to take anything from an Infinite Being because that would be to say that God Who or Which is Everywhere and in Everything before a theft is not Everywhere and in Everything after the theft. In reality, an Infinite Reality by definition cannot lose anything - or else it wouldn't be infinite. **Infinity encompasses the All because Infinity is the All. How can that which is All lose something inside of It as if it is possible for the All to become less than what it was?**

Satan, then, must be myth, but he's not only a myth - he's a tool needed by many religions to convince their members they need religion to save their souls. **Satan is their personification of evil as God is mostly their personification of good.** The package of the battle between good and evil requires personalities. God exists alright, but not as the "personality" they have defined.

God is not a "personality" because "persons" are such because they are individual entities separate from other individual entities. As Infinite, God can't be an "individual entity" separate from all that It encompasses and inspires. No one can be separate from God because God must be Everywhere. **Thus, since God cannot be separate from anything, God can't be a person. Rather, God must be a Presence that is In Everything - and Everything must contain that which is called God.**

In all likelihood, Satan is the necessary bogeyman against whom spiritual warfare must be waged, but of course, he's only useful as long as he's believed to exist. **Religion can never let Satan die anymore than it can let God win.** Satan is anything or anyone opposed to God; but because God can have no opposition, Satan is null and void.

It follows, then, that if Satan is null and void as a real threat to God, Jesus as redeemer or savior is null and void. **Can a myth do battle with a myth?** Accordingly, Christ must have a different explanation other than that of a redeemer or messiah. Only those who believe that a Satan can exist can also believe that a Satan needs to be defeated. I guess it would depend upon a given personal perception of life and Satan as to whether one would - or could - think of Christ as a necessary messiah or not. Since I see Satan as pure myth, personally I can't see Christ as having to overcome Satan. Again, can a myth do battle with a myth?

That is not to say, however, that just because Satan is a myth that devils are too. Devils probably exist alright, in and out of bodies, and may be the ones responsible for establishing the myth of Satan for trying to scare souls they want to control into a type of prison they conveniently label "salvation". **Devils are liars and manipulators; and their biggest lie is probably Satan. And strangely, or not so strangely, Jesus, as necessary redeemer, is probably also the product of the devils in order to give the phony Satan a phony foe.** By calling on Jesus - a phony foe of a phony Satan - devils can intercede and claim attention. Without a Satan and without a Jesus to counter a Satan, there would be no battle - and if no battle, no need for any intercession and no room for devil spirits to be called upon.

Please don't mistake my argument as an accusation that Christ was a devil. I do not mean to say that at all. **Christ was no devil, but the character religion has drawn of him as redeemer is of devilish origins - or probably so.** The real Christ was a man like all of us. It's only the legend of him that is false. Jesus and Satan as personified parties of the loyal opposition are myth; but Christ most definitely is not. **The war between Satan and God and man and God is not real, even as the war between devils and men of truth is.**

Insofar as the story of Jesus is concerned, I offer a bit of a commentary about that in a section below entitled: **JESUS**. I do believe Jesus would have been very comfortable with my vision of life I call here **EUGENISM**, but I have treated my vision of Jesus considerably in many articles in this complete works series I call **OUT IN THE OPEN**. I will leave an actual discussion of the man we call Jesus to those other works.

## Reincarnation & Eugenism

Can a Reincarnationist be an *Eugenist*? Certainly, but only as long as he or she recognizes that the journey of a soul cannot be to achieve more of God down the line than what a current possession would allow. It's senseless to think of life as a battleground to find God. There can be no more of God at the end of a battle than there was at a beginning. Life, or many lives, should not be perceived as echelons of ascending virtue. This, I think, is the error of many reincarnationists - though, of course, not all, including your current author. I am very much a reincarnationist, but I believe I am only

reincarnated for another lifetime of and for another joy. My next joy, however, will not likely be any more virtuous or correct than my current joy. It will be just another joy.

**Who knows what happens after death, but we can know it can't lead to some mystical life of greater possession of God because God, being Infinite, must be in All in all lives.** In truth, there never has been a time or place when or where God has been missing; and there never will be. Life should be seen as a vehicle by which we reach out and become who and what we desire, but not as a vehicle by which we become better in terms of becoming more Godly. No one can become more Godly at one time or place than at another time or place.

## Dear Billy

I am reminded of something I heard the famous evangelist, Billy Graham, say a few years ago. He said he was anxious to die because when he did die, he would be seeing God face to face. Dear Billy could only say that and believe that if he failed to believe that God is already everywhere and in everything. Obviously, Dear Billy lived like so many of his kind of Christian lived - and lives - thinking and believing that God can be found more one place than another. Obviously, Dear Billy does not believe in an Infinite God that must be everywhere and in everything at all times; and Dear Billy has a notion that God is a person as well. How else could he possibly believe that at some time he will be seeing God "face to face"?

But Dear Billy is one kind of Christian and I am another. Dear Billy is one who believed and believes that man can be separated from God. Dear Billy is one who believes that one called Satan could have slipped in between his god and himself or his race - and that somehow another had to eventually slip back into that place of separation and fill the gap, thereby displacing Satan. So, Dear Billy latched on to an idea that there is a Satan in the first place and that Satan has to be displaced in order for man to find God once again.

Of course, Dear Billy is not alone. Many Christians believe in the tale of Satan and many Christians believe that one called Jesus lived to displace Satan and gain back for God what Satan took. Dear Billy, then, represents a Christianity that sees Jesus as a **Messiah** - mostly because he believed and believes in the need for a messiah in the first place. Dear Billy swallowed the entire tale of Satan and also swallowed the tale of Jesus that had Jesus displacing Satan and restoring mankind to God.

## *Another Kind of Christian*

But there is another kind of Christian too - as I have been offering in this article. Not every Christian believes that a Satan even exists - let alone has to be displaced. Some of us Christians are quite convinced that it is literally impossible for any division between God and man or God and anything to occur - and thus the tale of a Satan is total nonsense. If there can be no division, neither then can there be any need to refill some



speculated gap between God and man. Thus, no Messiah could ever be needed - or could even be possible.

When I was growing up, I was taught the tale of Satan; and to conquer this Satan, I was taught a **Messianic Jesus**. I believed it - probably mostly because I was taught it - just like so many of my fellow Christians believed it - and believe it - because they have been taught it. It is not so easy to dispel a teaching when that teaching is the core of dictation of one's life.

Eventually, however, I began to challenge the idea of a Satan. I began to challenge the idea that there could be a place where God is missing. At first, I was terrified to make such a challenge. I even imagined that the one I was challenging - Satan - would come to me in the night and snatch me away before I could make amends. I was really scared it might happen.

And then one night, I was laying next to my dear first wife, Dee, who was fast asleep; but try as I did, I could not go to sleep. I feared to go to sleep because I was not sure I would be allowed to wake because of my challenge to the idea of Satan. I looked over to the window and thought I saw a dark shadow trying to slip through the window. My heart was pounding. My face was wet with perspiration. My time had come! Satan was there to prove I had been wrong to challenge him - and I was about to be taken away to his stronghold.

But I was not going to go without a fight. I sat up in bed and dared Satan to come closer. If he did, I would hit him right between the eyes. I expected the dark image in the window to come closer, but it did not. Then I decided to find out the truth. I got out of bed and turned on the light - and there fluttering in the open window was a curtain - which I had feared was the dark shadow of a Satan.

It was that night that I found my truth - even though I had suspected that truth for quite a few years. I had suspected that Satan has to be myth because of my thinking that nothing can possibly come between an Infinite God and anything; but until that night, I feared I might be wrong. When I turned on the light that night, however, and found my fears had been groundless, I knew with 100 percent assurance that the entire tale of Satan is, in fact, senseless and totally impossible.

What could I take from this experience? Among other things, that those who actually believe in Satan - or that a Satan could exist - can't be trusted to know the truth. Those who base their Jesus on the tale of Satan being correct eventually have one thing to learn - in this life or another - that they are completely wrong.

## Is God Spirit?

Beside knowing that God must be Infinite, I have no idea what God is. I was taught in my youth that "God is spirit and those who worship God must worship Him in spirit". I was not sure what that meant, but it seemed rather impressive. So, for a long time, I went along with it.

Practically speaking, however, many who teach that God is spirit and those who worship Him must worship Him in spirit are the same folk who would have us believe that God can be opposed. They are the same folk who would have us believe there can be a Satan. They are the same folk who take a good deal of pride in claiming a right to

rule and make moral decisions for other folk. They often claim they are "in the spirit" and that is why they have a right to do what they do - as if God is speaking to them and the rest of us must listen. It is as if one who is "not in the spirit" cannot know God and therefore has no way to knowing what God would want.

Thus, it is claimed "God is spirit and those who worship God must worship Him in spirit". That conveniently puts God "out there" and out of reach for the typical "not in the spirit" person and puts the one who claims it in some kind of driver's seat. No one who claims that we must worship God in spirit ever sees him or herself as "out of the spirit". These kind are always "in the spirit" and thus have a way of knowing what they are talking about; and, of course, the rest of us "out of the spirit" types better listen to what the "in the spirit" folks say and command - or else.

## So What?

Personally, I do not know what God being in the spirit really means though. It might be right, but even if it is, so what? It is no longer an argument that has any meaning for me. I am "in the spirit" too by virtue of having a soul. So what about that? Does it matter in the least what my soul is just as long as I love it and cherish it and treat it like the companion it should be. Likewise, does it matter at all that God "is spirit". Why is it relevant?

I am not denying that "God is spirit". I am only questioning why it should matter. Whatever God is, God is Infinite. That is all I know - and perhaps all I need to know. I know that whatever God is, God is **IN** me. That I know. What difference does it make if that which is **IN** me is spirit or something else? Why should I care? **I should only care that whatever I am, and wherever I am, I am holy because whatever I am and wherever I am is filled with that which I call God.**

And that, My Friends, is the real definition of an *Eugienist* - one who believes that all is equally Natural and equally Good because whatever it is, it is of the Infinite - or of that which I think of as, God.

## Atheism & Eugienism

Can an atheist or agnostic be an *Eugienist*? If life is seen as Good, yes. It matters not what we call God as long as we believe it Good. **Good** and **God** are interchangeable, or should be. In fact, **God** is probably an abbreviation of **Good**; although I think that abbreviation is a mistake because it leads to false perceptions.

I think that we have assumed that because we can manage our language and drop an "o" out of a word that we can change the original word represented. In the beginning, there was **Good** and not **God**. We call that **Good, God**, but calling it so does not relieve it of its **Goodness**. To a very great degree, I think, our mistaken notions of sin and hierarchies have created **God**. **God** has not created us - leastwise not the **Good** of the original Infinity and the Infinity that continues forever.

# Jesus

I think it is true that no two people can view a third person the same. I think there will always be some difference of perception between any two about a third person - though the difference may be slight, moderate, or extreme. I think, too, that is what happened with the narrative of the one we call, Jesus. **We have become confused about Jesus because of the many different stories about him - though it is really good to have all that confusion because it is so good to have lots of different stories.**

As a kid, I wondered a lot about why there were four different gospels about Jesus in what is called the **BIBLE**. As I lived and learned about that different perception between any two people thing, it became quite clear. With Jesus, it was - and is - no different. Given that Jesus is a third person that two others are reviewing, no two people will ever see him exactly alike; though each of a reviewing duo may be completely sincere in wanting to know that third person - in this case, Jesus.

Now, throw into a narrative a person trying to make sense out of a personal perspective - and presto, a reviewed person could be completely miscast and his or her character whacked completely out of true perspective.

If two friends of mine were to review me, for instance, you can be sure that each of those friends would see me in a different light - but mostly based on his or her perspective of life. Each of my two friends would judge me based on what they believe is true; and accordingly, two friends could judge me and each conclude to a different perspective.

And I think that is why we have never known the real Jesus. I think Jesus is one of those persons that no two people can ever agree on, but then I don't think any two persons will - or can - ever see a third person the same. No two people can see me the same and no two people can see you the same; and no two people saw Jesus the same - or see him the same now.

Now throw into the mix a major belief or bias that one person of a set of reviewers may have which another may lack - like a belief in Satan. Whether Jesus believed a Satan can exist or not, if Mark believed in a Satan, you can be sure he would fit Jesus in with a Satan - or notion of Satan. If Matthew believed in a Satan, you can be sure he would fit Jesus in with a notion of Satan. If Luke believed in Satan - though his reviewee, Jesus, may not have, you can still be sure that Luke would tell a story of Jesus based on Luke's perception of life - and Satan; and, of course, if John believed in a Satan - or that a Satan could exist - you can be sure that John would write a story about his friend, Jesus, and have Jesus scolding and rebuffing a Satan.

There were more friends of Jesus who wrote about him too. There was a Thomas and there was a Mary Magdalene. You can bet that Thomas wrote about Jesus according to his belief - or non belief in Satan; and you can bet that Mary Magdalene did the same.

If you are wondering where I came up with gospels of Jesus by a Thomas and Mary Magdalene, let me tell you that at one time they existed - but were banned and condemned for seeming hostile to some other views of Jesus.

In the early years of Christianity, there were lots of different stories about the one we call Jesus - including gospels by an Apostle of Jesus named Thomas and one by an Apostle by the name of Mary Magdalene. Almost no one knows of the gospels of

Thomas and Mary because one called Constantine came to power in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century, claimed Christianity as his favored religion, and, in effect, banned gospels with which he disagreed.

It could be argued otherwise, but I think Constantine was blinded by his possession of power. Like anyone else with power would do, he wanted to preserve his hold on his subjects; and so he would naturally choose only those stories of Jesus that would allow him to hold on to his power and justify him in power. **Why were gospels like that of Thomas and Mary banned by Constantine and his band of bishops of the time? Because the gospels of Thomas and Mary did not look favorably upon one having power over another.** That is just an opinion, but I think that is why gospels like those of Thomas and Mary were banned.

But let's get back to the original argument. **No two people are likely to see a third person alike; and if any two, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven people were to write about a single person - whom they all love - there would be as many different perceptions of that single person as there are writers.**

Now, skip forward in a history. Say that only four of a set of writers about a single person are allowed to be published - though more than four were written. What would likely be the consequence of that? Obviously, those writers who are not allowed to be published would never be heard; and their stories left out of a discussion. Now, imagine that the gospels not published and banned from publication just happen to be the most accurate in terms of capturing the character of the man written about. What a shame! Right?

Well, for what it's worth, I think that is exactly what happened with the story of Jesus. **In time, some stories and renditions about Jesus would be banned - thus allowing for a terrible distortion of the man, his purpose, and his real beliefs.**

I am not going to argue here about what I think Jesus did or did not believe. I am only going to offer that some in history chose to ban certain writings about Jesus - and that is one of the reasons Jesus has been as clouded as he is in terms of being understood. When some who believe in a certain perception of Jesus ban all other disagreeable perceptions, then the end result is at least partial blindness. Censorship of alternate views is never wise because the truth may be in the censored articles. It is like having a pie of sections of berries with each section supplying a different berry. By banning a certain fruit of that pie, the entire pie is distorted and no one knows for sure what the original pie looked like.

There is good news about this story of Jesus, though. In time, some of the banned gospels will come to light. In the 4<sup>th</sup> Century, gospels that did not agree with Constantine's need for power were banned and commanded to be destroyed, but some disobedient caretakers of some of the banned works hid them away to keep them from being destroyed - as well as banned.

In 1945, a peasant stumbled upon a huge jar in a cave off the Nile River and out tumbled ancient manuscripts banned in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century - including **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS**. I am not sure of the location of discovery, but earlier by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, another of the banned gospels of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century came to light too. That one is **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARY MAGDALENE**.

**For any who really care to review the different opinions of Jesus, I encourage looking at as many of the original works as possible.** Each of us should be free to

make up our own mind about life and about any who might impact that life. Personally, Jesus has been a very important figure in my own review of life. **I treasure all the different opinions about my hero - though I do not accept any of them unconditionally.** It seems to me rather foolish to think any person can get another person completely right - as I have argued in this chapter. So it stands to reason that as I review any work about any person I love that all reviews are taken, as they say, with a grain of salt.

## A New *NEW TESTAMENT OF GOSPELS*

As a concluding thought in this review of Jesus, personally I think it would be nice to go back and get it right. I think it would be good to retrace to the 4<sup>th</sup> Century and have Constantine put down his sword that would slash all disagreeable gospels and instead collect all gospels under one roof. I would love to see, in a way, a new *New Testament* that would only contain the known gospels of the time and leave out all else. I would love to see all the stories of Jesus collected under one umbrella - and let the reader choose what to believe out of them. Needless to say, since none of the current **Old Testament** feature gospels of Jesus, the new *New Testament* would ignore the **Old Testament** entirely - as if it did not exist.

Neither Peter nor Paul would have any say in this new *New Testament*, either, because neither wrote a gospel. All other books of the old **New Testament** - such as **The Acts Of The Apostles**, **The Epistles of Paul of Tarsus**, and **The Book Of Revelations** would not be allowed because none of them are gospels. I am offering here that a new *New Testament* be comprised of only gospels and all of the gospels for which there is some current record that had been written by the 4<sup>th</sup> Century when many of the gospels were banned. Of course, there would be confusion; but at least it would be worthy confusion. At least, we would begin by declaring that none of the gospels have to be believed - only reviewed for possible wisdom - and let it go at that.

What would our new *New Testament* look like? How about this for some order?

**1. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS, 2. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARY MAGDALENE, 3. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK, 4. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW, 5. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE, 6. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN, 7. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ?**

For what it's worth, I would begin with **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS** because I think it was the first gospel written and all other gospels stemmed from that initial gospel. The reason I claim that is because **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS** is the simplest of gospels, being comprised of mostly *Jesus said* statements. All the other gospels are much more complex, often seeming to use various *Jesus said* statements from **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS** and embellishing from them. It is because **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS** is the simplest of all the gospels, however, that I suspect it was the first gospel written - perhaps as notes of Thomas taken during the life of Jesus.

Of course, I could be wrong on that, but that is how it seems to me. I have read some reviews about **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS**, however, that have it being

written in the late 1<sup>st</sup> Century or early 2<sup>nd</sup> Century. If so, it would not have been the first gospel written; however based on a more complex work likely following a simpler work - and not the other way around - unless there is some definite evidence to the contrary, I would still put ***THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS*** ahead of all others; but, again, that is strictly a personal opinion.

I would follow with ***THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARY MAGDALENE*** because I think it deserves to be featured ahead of others that were initially favored for inclusion in the **BIBLE** simply out of courtesy. Perhaps it is time for the main four to take a back seat in the new order of things - given that for the last 1,600 years they have been alone in a front seat - with not even back seat status granted to any others.

I would follow Mary's gospel with that of Mark because it seems to be agreed among experts that Mark's gospel probably preceded Matthew's - though the **BIBLE** features the gospel of Matthew ahead of that of Mark. Supposedly, Mark wrote his gospel first, then Matthew wrote one of his own, then Luke followed Matthew, and many years after Luke wrote his version of the story of Jesus, John wrote one of his own. After John, I am not familiar with any additional gospels, however I do believe some were written. Thus, if that is so, my new ***New Testament*** would include those gospels as well.

Well, it is a thought anyway. Right? I do not believe that censorship of ideas is good at all. At least a new ***New Testament*** would respect that idea for a start, allowing for lots of wonderful and exciting discussion about life. No two of us can see things exactly the same way. Perhaps it is time that we realized that and recognized that all of us together might be able to put together a pie of different ingredients and different views and begin to celebrate life like we never have before.

## A New Genesis?

Anyway, I am pleased to offer a new word - and the word is ***Eugienism***. It says that ***Everything Under God Is Equally Natural*** - or that everything that is within God is equal. There are no hierarchies, no echelons, no superiors, no inferiors, no special prophets. Everything in life and in existence is natural and equally so. My soul is as natural as my body, though it may spring forth from a different being or species. ***Eugienism*** is a perception that states equality among all creatures - large and small, material and immaterial. As we enter the next millennium of time on this great and wonderful planet, Earth (and as of this writing, August, 2012, we have), perhaps ***Eugienism*** can bring a new Genesis; and Hope can spring Anew!

# *Song of Eugienism*

By

Francis William Bessler

Written August 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012

Listen, My Friend to my song of Eugienism.  
Hopefully you'll find it offers a bit of wisdom.  
It says everything under God is equally natural  
and that nothing created need be supernatural.

Just look as far as your eyes can see  
and what you see is really divinity.  
For whatever God is, It must be In All  
because other than that, Infinity cannot allow.

Love all life because God is in it.  
That's the mantra of a Eugienist.  
Everything that is - is equally of God  
and all is sacred wherever you trod.

It does not matter where you might go.  
It's all the same regardless of show.  
No matter where you are, God is there.  
Just open your heart and dare to care.

Some think to find God they need to die,  
but a Eugienist finds God in all of life.  
God's not a person we can meet face to face.  
Rather, God's only a Presence that's everywhere.

A Eugienist finds Heaven wherever he or she is  
and never has to fret about a thing called sin.  
Sin is only wasting the precious gift of life  
and treating it like it is lacking in light.

A Eugienist cannot live life in shame  
because he or she finds all life worth of embrace.  
Only those can sin who choose to deny  
the goodness of all and the sacred of life.

The truth is not hard unless we make it so.  
Know you are divine and let yourself go.  
There's only good in everything that is.  
That's the vision of a Eugienist.

Nothing created can be void of God  
and nothing can lack - not even the sod.  
A Eugenist finds all of life fine  
and knows for sure, it is all divine.

So, come along if you wish and join with me  
and find yourself swimming in divinity.  
Put on your nature and embrace your fate  
and as a Eugenist, find your life great.

*There's only good in everything that is!*  
*That's the Vision of the Wise!*

***EUGIENISM***

-----

***THE END***



# ***OUT IN THE OPEN***

***Ongoing***

**(Featuring works written since August, 2011)**



# ***THE END***