

El camino del medio * La via di mezzo * The middle way * La voie médiane * O caminho do meio * Środkowa droga * Keskitie * ཉམ་ཐོང་ལུ་ལོ་ལོ་ * Orta yol * Keskmine tee * Der Mittelweg * Середній шлях * A közérút * De middelste weg * Средният път * Stredná cesta * Srednja pot * Η μέση οδός * Medium humum * യഥാർത്ഥം * Den midterste vej * Vùng trung gian * बौद्ध चकारस्य * Серединный путь * 中道 * 중간 방법 * Calea de mijloc * 中庸之道 * Jalan tengah * Titinanyigba la * الطريق الوسط * It-triq tan-nofs

Alternative tip for young people: Don't consume different sexuality, but cultivate it!

With a modern image of Jesus, that above all

- on the results of German Protestant Jesus research for 250 years
- and on the results of research by church critics and opponents of the church

based, which were and are generally very high-quality scientific.

First a few personal words

I remember my first communion class 74 years ago: the priest did it at least partly himself, and he told us about the curse of original sin, with which all people have been burdened since the fall of Adam and Eve. He also said that one consequence of this curse was shame, that is, that we had the urge to at least cover our private parts. And he also said that Jesus redeemed us from original sin through his death on the cross. I asked somewhat boldly that we should actually be freed from this curse and that the problem of shame should no longer exist. If there is salvation, then this problem should also be solved. I don't remember what the priest's answer was, at least as I remember he was just beating around the bush. And so even today all church people still talk

around the topic. But somewhere I still had the problem in my head. You can see in this booklet what I have come up with so far. This has nothing to do with faith and certainly nothing to do with magic, we just have to behave according to our nature. In any case, I think that I was on the right track with my question and my assumption about salvation through Jesus.

Introduction: Fake morality and real (sexual) morality: The “few cases of abuse” are just the tip of an iceberg.

If there are enough of these MeToo stories today, why shouldn't they also have existed 2000 years ago - I think that they were even worse back then than they are today, women and especially girls were downright blackmailed into "sexual immorality", an indication of this is the story of the beautiful Susanna at the end of the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament of the Bible. Above all, there was no free media back then that could uncover such things at some point.

The thesis of the concept of this booklet is that human beings have a high potential for genuine morality, but that this high potential has unfortunately not only not been utilised in theology and education since time immemorial, but has even been downright destroyed. See also page 21!

So how are girls today - quite specifically - made to do voluntarily what they were brutally blackmailed into doing two thousand years ago and not even realise how they are being downright screwed? The scam is actually quite simple: sexual self-determination is emphasised, which is actually a nice thing. But this includes freedom of choice between at least two options. Firstly, those who have nothing to do with high morals offer the moral model (or rather "un-moral model") of "sex before marriage with different partners" until "the right one" is found, and secondly, the oh so well-behaved and highly moral "do-gooders" offer the moral model of a body-hostile, repressed asceticism à la monks and nuns as an alternative. So young people really do have a choice, and nowadays they usually have a very free choice. But which one? Since the moral model of the do-gooders "asceticism à la monks and nuns" is completely unattractive and unworldly for young people from the outset and therefore undiscussable - they don't want to become nuns and monks, they just want to find the right partner - they naturally orientate themselves more towards the "un-moral model of finding a partner", which is also that of the green and red sexual information in schools or the commercial company "BRAVO", and not towards the moral model of the do-gooders' total suppression of sexuality. This is where the frequent youth promiscuity comes from, which many young people are ultimately not happy with.

This is how manipulation works to thwart high morals - especially on the part of religions, whose moral model is above all that of the do-gooders. To put it bluntly and clearly, girls are virtually driven into participating in the contempt

for women, or rather, in the making fun of women! And the boys and men join in, what else are they supposed to do? As an aside, the result is also a guilty conscience on the part of the "participants", at least at some point - and that's intentional. Because a guilty conscience is also part of the business model of religions, unfortunately also of our current one ...

But there is an attractive MIDDLE WAY without any danger of a guilty conscience, namely not to consume different sexualities, but to cultivate them. And this is also popular with young people, and how, see foreword 2! This (middle) way would therefore be the way of consciously overcoming shame while at the same time advocating high morals, i.e. that sexual intercourse is only allowed in marriage. But this middle way is not only stubbornly concealed from young people with all kinds of excuses or even directly denigrated. For example, that shame is the cornerstone of sexual morality and that transgressing the rules of shame is disgusting and also a sin from a religious point of view.

Okay, the vast majority of "religious people" are not "moral offenders" themselves, so they don't get their hands dirty with "active criminality". But if it is only ever about forgiveness and consolation for a life after earthly death, then prevention, i.e. preventing bad deeds from happening in the first place, is of less or even no real interest. Indeed, malicious people could even accuse the "people in charge of our religion" of acting according to the saying "The fence is just as bad as the stealer", i.e. that they have no real interest in people acting morally from the outset, because they earn more from immorality if the corresponding deeds are then repented of and the church people can promise forgiveness and consolation for a better life after an earthly life that is as painful as possible. **The religions cause problems, so to speak, where they then step in as (enterprising) saviours.** Isn't that somehow the same as doctors doing nothing to prevent their patients from contracting diseases on occasion, because curing these diseases is a more profitable business model than sensible medical care to prevent the diseases from occurring in the first place? But thank God this is not the case in medicine, because today it is obviously all about overcoming diseases from the outset!

But I have not found any comparable serious scientific research on whether today's education of young people in shame has any "moral nutritional value", and there is probably nothing here either. Yet the nudism movement, for example, has had quite good experiences. The task of moral education, which is about effectiveness, could therefore be to do further research into the ideals of nudism so that a conscious ethical attitude can be added. This would even correspond to our faith, according to which shame is the sign of a curse (from the fall of man) and Jesus actually overcame this curse - if we live sinlessly. But our "religious functionaries" (and I think this pejorative word is appropriate here) are not interested in any of this. This could be seen as an indication that a real sexual morality for young people is clearly not wanted by our religion -

nor by other well-known religions, because they do the same. If that isn't unscrupulous sloppiness! And isn't that somehow just as criminal as if the religious functionaries themselves were the perpetrators? **Efforts to establish a "true belief in God" are pure mockery.**

Of course, religions are to a certain extent also business enterprises that want and need to generate income. Unfortunately, this can also lead to a certain degree of operational blindness towards dubious practices, simply "because that's the way it's always been". But once the religious functionaries are made aware of how things really work, the scales should fall from their eyes and they should be ready for a change as quickly as possible. But today's religious officials are obviously not seeing the light at all. That can only mean that they don't want to think about whether what they are doing makes any sense and whether it is above all in the spirit of the one who died a torturous death on the cross, i.e. in the spirit of the real Jesus. And we should only be committed to him - and no one else! But more about that later!

One task of our Christian religion in particular would therefore now be NOT TO BE AGAINST EVERYTHING, BUT TO BE FOR THE RIGHT THING. And here you could accuse the churches of not wanting to do exactly that - on the grounds that they are a cult religion and that ethics, for example, are none of their business (of course they don't say it that clearly, or only rarely, but I've heard such sayings).

And another thing about the business model: thanks to the church tax, this aspect of religion has largely been pushed into the background, because the money now comes by itself without the church people having to preach a reason for wanting it. But it is still true in religions: The more the believers have personal problems, the more commercially advantageous this is for the churches, because the stronger the hope for a better afterlife becomes or became. At least in the past, believers did indeed largely behave according to this business model. (You probably know the proverb: "In old age, whores become pious." Or: "And when he came to old age, he sang pious psalters.")

And on the subject of sexuality and sin: Actually, everything that happens in non-marital sexual intercourse is sin and even grave sin. I don't want to make it difficult for someone who lives in a relationship that is actually considered sinful according to strict religious criteria, that's not the point at all. I just want something to be better from the outset, and I don't think people whose relationships don't conform to the rules of our religion can have anything against that either.

And please don't misunderstand me here: Of course, just overcoming shame and leaving out swimming trunks and bikinis, for example, doesn't help at all, because of course it's not enough to leave something out; young people in particular need to be taught morality from the spirit. But a sham morality remains a sham morality and a sham morality can never become the basis of

a real morality! And the goal must be that a real morality succeeds, and if we are successful here, then the iceberg that is "under the cases of abuse" will also disappear.

And my belief is that this is possible, if only it is really wanted in the first place, especially as it would also be in the spirit of the real Jesus!

2. implementation according to the rules of good science in a pedagogical concept in 3 stages:

1. information about "difficult life situations" of young people
2. research into the causes of the mishaps and idea of a solution
3. experience of success with an alternative pedagogical approach with young people from completely different cultures and development of a concept

Foreword 2: After a lesson, a pupil once came up to me and said wistfully that I was very right in thinking that sex belonged in marriage and that orgasm was so important. Unfortunately, she had done it differently because she hadn't known any better and she was very annoyed about it because it had been the wrong thing to do. "And I had wanted it myself!" she said. I interlocked the index and middle fingers of my two hands, looked at them briefly and asked if "that" hadn't done it too. She replied: "Of course, but nobody says that..." So now I'm saying it for others who want to do it better from the start - and as clearly as possible!

I would like to start by pointing out that I came to some approaches by chance or through a certain casualness on my part, I'm thinking here of the conversation with the mother on page 18 - or the conversation with the pupil I just mentioned.

At school, I didn't really dare to make such recommendations openly by interlacing my fingers, and I didn't think it was necessary. But after my active time as a teacher, I started talking to girls or young women about how they could do it properly, where I did it with my fingers. I had my first conversation along these lines a few years ago with a female student who I saw sitting on a park bench near the university in Fes during a trip to Morocco with an obvious fellow student. Somehow I was itching to talk to the two of them, saying that I had been a Catholic religion teacher in Germany and that my most interested students had been Moroccan girls (they really were), and whether I could talk to her about what had interested these students.

Of course, the one with the hijab wanted to know! So, following the motto that we didn't know each other anyway and that we would never see each other again, I freely told her about my idea that this Jesus was not at all interested in religion, but that he had witnessed how women were blackmailed into

prostitution with the two-witness procedure and how he wanted to change that by publicising it - and how he was then killed for it by judicial murder. After all, his opponents also turned it into a religion in order to cover up Jesus' real commitment. And even today, there would be no interest in the real morals of young girls in particular, only things would be different today than they were back then. They would only ever be told about a pseudo-morality of shame, but this would only lead to senseless fears, for example, I have never seen girls start having sex because they enjoyed being naked on a beautiful beach (where this is common). With the right awareness, even nudity is not a problem - and above all, they can even find out which man is the right one for them just with skin contact and without penetration!

After all, only light touches are needed to experience an orgasm, which is what it's all about - if it's the right partner, there's no need for penetration. Only, I said, everyone should know about it and want it too... **And I can still see how her eyes became brighter and brighter - yes, that was obviously what she was dreaming about, somehow I had struck something in her soul... And a Muslim woman with a hijab, that head covering that only leaves her face exposed! If that's nothing!**

I had a similar experience with a young female waitress in a small guesthouse in Bali, with whom I struck up a conversation when she brought me breakfast - and with such bright eyes too!

Finally, I was particularly impressed by the conversation I had with a North German high school graduate travelling around the world, whom I met while visiting the catacombs with the bones of the Franciscan monks who died a long time ago under the Franciscan church in Lima (Peru). When I told her about the orgasm test and interlocked our fingers - we had long since returned to the fresh air - I realised that this went against her morals, which she obviously wanted to live by. Then I said: "Yes, if you forbid everything, you'll only end up having everything done ..."

And in a split second, so to speak, her face lit up and her eyes began to shine and I had obviously "won her over" - she immediately came along on a tour of the city, which I invited her on because we could talk just as well and see something of Lima at the same time.

Of course, I wondered why these three girls (to me they were girls who obviously had no "male experience") seemed so euphoric about my ideas. I remember another pupil who came to me after a lesson and told me about her upcoming visit to the gynaecologist. At first I didn't understand what she wanted, but when I asked her about it I learnt that she just wanted to get "it" over with and had now found someone "for it" and wanted to do everything right - as I know today. But at the time, I simply didn't have the imagination to realise that this could be the reason to start having sex. Anyway, my impression - looking back - is that the girl was really in trouble, she didn't

make a happy impression on me at all. And now I realise that the three girls seemed so euphoric because they were also in such or similar distress, from which I had now freed them as if from a burden with the idea of an alternative. Of course, I don't know whether I have made a fundamental difference here. After all, I have probably come across a concept of high morals that should also resonate with young people in our time and that I can also generalise, especially because the girls came from different cultures. So when it comes to sexual morality, you can't always be against something, you have to be in favour of something, and to do that you have to give young people, and girls in particular, tips on how they can live high morals with joy and intelligence right from the start! This is what I have tried to do from page 12 onwards.

3. alternative image of Jesus

A professor of mine, the Jesuit Father Rupert Lay, once said that the story of the sinner in the Gospel of John (Chapter 8) was truer than the rest of the Gospel of John. Here Jesus saves from stoning a woman who was allegedly caught in the act of adultery, i.e. having sex with a man who was not her own. The question naturally arises as to when does it ever happen that a woman is caught having sex like this, then by two men (as was the rule), who then immediately run to the court, so that woman is actually killed? This never happens in practice, at least not so easily! And when it does happen, it was a set-up story - that everything had been arranged so that the woman took part in the sex without knowing about the background and was caught and the partner was able to escape undetected - and so the woman (and only the woman!) could be stoned.

Everything in this story points to the fact that this was not about a moral problem, but rather that an example should be made of a prostitute who was somehow insubordinate to her "protectors" (or rather pimps) - also as a warning to them other women so that they wouldn't get the idea of making any antics.

Another story in the Bible on this topic is the story of the beautiful Susanna in the appendix to the book of Daniel in the Old Testament: Here a woman is blackmailed directly by two men - also using such a "two-witness method". So she is given the choice: "Either you have sex with us (which meant getting into prostitution), or we report you because we saw you having sex with a man who is not yours, then you will be executed."

Jesus must have heard such blackmail stories because of his friendship with prostitutes - and he told them publicly and thus denounced the men in question (later "sermons" were made from these that only had a very rough

and vague connection with Jesus' commitment). . We know what happened to him (because the mafia behind it at the time didn't put up with it).

And the priests and theologians of his time didn't want to know anything about this background and looked the other way and thus covered up the mafia.

I now think that we have encountered the real Jesus and his real concern here. This would also correspond, at least externally, with what Protestant German Jesus research has discovered for over 250 years: that the New Testament does not report on the real Jesus, but that the Jesus of the New Testament is largely an invention. The real Jesus was most likely completely different than how we know him. And then what I have come to here would fit in: the real Jesus was concerned with overcoming blatant grievances in the relationships between men and women, which were obviously common practice at the time.

And the same mafia that killed Jesus also cleverly ensured that the memory of him was distorted, because they then naturally wanted to prevent any memory of him - for example by ensuring that a biography of Jesus with all the miraculous stories was published came about from a virgin birth and from a resurrection and ascension, as we also know them from the god religions that were common at the time. Therefore, there is also a lack of reasonable information about who wrote the New Testament, why it was written and where it was written. In any case, theologians have long known that the New Testament is not a real biography of Jesus, but rather reflects the faith of the early church, although it is completely unclear how this came about. They also know that the names of the authors of the Gospels are incorrect. If everything had been "okay" here, we would definitely have this information today.

And what does that have to say to us today? It's simple: Back then, women were consciously blackmailed into having sex - today it's done more elegantly through manipulation, as I described at the beginning of the introduction. And today's "religious officials" have just as little interest in change as those back then - and they also look away from what is really happening. And preach forgiveness and redemption in a future life after the earthly life.

Conclusion: No, we do not need a new Jesus, but the spirit of the real Jesus must finally rise again and become effective and the spirit of any falsifiers and deceivers must be overcome! And they do exist - right from the beginning! For those who had killed Jesus had of course not given up when they saw that his cause was continuing! They carried on, but now with different tactics. But more on that later.

4. The original Jewish religion was actually not a typical religion at all, but an attitude to life with a super-modern image of women - and the decline into a religion.

The original Jewish religion was essentially not a religion as we understand it today, but rather a very enlightened and humane attitude to life, even in our current sense. Everything only became a typical religion when the attitude to life was forgotten or suppressed, probably because those who were in charge soon had more advantages (as happens in all religions at some point). In any case, the original Jewish religion (or attitude to life) is the only religion (to use the term "religion" here):

- **which is about true monogamy.** What is meant is monogamy, which is not forced, but which happens and is striven for completely voluntarily and with joy and which is not only lived after marriage, but monogamy which is really real, that there is only one sexual partner in the whole gives life (except in the case of widowhood). This means that it is not just about living in this monogamy, but also about the preparation by renouncing instincts before marriage. So the morality of monogamy must be made so attractive that it is also desirable for young people.

- **And if this monogamy is really lived in general,** then the vision of a harmony between people without fears and in unclouded humanity is also realized, made concrete by the paradisiacal utopia of nudity. The story of paradise in the Bible should never be viewed as a historical event (nor should other early stories such as the story of creation). It is certain that the authors who wrote it perhaps 3,000 years ago never saw it as "literally" as we used to be taught in our children's religion classes and as some sects still see and teach it today. Rather, it is a story against prostitution in fertility cults in honor of some deities that were common at the time the story was written - so such a fertility deity is behind the snake. Of course, "worship" through sexual intercourse also means a violation of the utopia of true monogamy, and the result of this is "shame of hiding body parts." This also means that the message of the Adam and Eve story is that this shame will be unnecessary as soon as the utopia of true monogamy is realized.

- **Belief in God is of secondary importance.** Because a god was basically only constructed in order to have an authority for his own people that stands behind the idea of monogamy, and ultimately also to have an argument against the other gods that these less human cults supposedly had to worship. More about this in the notes starting on page 36.

- **Above all, the Jewish religion is the only religion in which women also have the right to experience orgasm.** In order for true monogamy to really work, it is of course important that the woman also achieves sexual fulfillment, that is, that she also experiences orgasm. This does not mean the orgasm, as

the psychologist Wilhelm Reich sees it, which can be achieved with all sorts of technical tricks, but rather an orgasm that arises almost spontaneously from the harmony or soul mateship of two people, i.e. only with the lightest of touches and, above all, without penetration, in principle even when fully clothed. (Note: This orgasm should also be a goal today, because according to information in the newspaper DIE WELT, at least two-thirds of all women never experience a real orgasm in their entire lives. For information: The real orgasm has nothing to do with this moaning and Screaming, which we sometimes know from porn films, but is most comparable to an earthquake or even sneezing.)

If this isn't a fantastic religion that was devised back then against inhuman religions and that today has what it takes, all other religions, which in the end are often just cultivations of traumas suffered coupled with folklore and superstition (why then are the business interests and power structures of the respective ones Religions and the need to separate yourself from others) would be overcome! However, I have the impression that even Jews usually have no idea about it.

The problem at the time of Jesus was that this Jewish "original religion" had already been clearly "buried" or at least largely forgotten in his time, and so no one from the authorities who were in charge at the time cared about it anymore sheared. The Jewish religion had largely congealed into a cult - and sexual abuse had almost become the norm. So this house builder or building contractor Jesus (for "construction contractor" see "Jesus ideology") must have come across this and seen a blatant discrepancy between the claim and reality of the Jewish religion and tried to bring the Jewish "original religion" back to life awaken. He must have been very well received by his normal fellow human beings, but there must have been many in the establishment of this religion who had absolutely no interest in that.

In any case, with my knowledge as a theologian and after 30 years of professional experience as a teacher, I have tried to combine the ideals of the old Jewish utopia into a positive concept in this work so that they are accessible to young people. Because young people still have ideals of such utopia and would like to live it if they only knew how.

And I think I'm not so bad here! Unfortunately, everything wasn't fully developed when I was a teacher.

5. A girl talks about how she does this herself with the cultivation of sexuality.

"Aren't we a lying society when it comes to sexual morality? Nudity in public is frowned upon and is even punishable, but if you do it right, it can be completely harmless fun and a sign of real emancipation! But sex with

different partners is accepted, it is now considered normal and a sign of emancipation, we even get instructions for it in school today! But it often brings fatally unhappy relationships and often lifelong trauma, and people laugh at girls who believe everything here and allow themselves to be bullied into it and so join in - you just have to google "blonde jokes". Even the so-called proof of love is out of the question for me, it's all just a sign of stupidity. Even though many people say that "that", i.e. penetration without marriage or without a marriage certificate, a woman should also have something behind her as a sign of her maturity and adulthood - I don't have to have anything behind me here, I really don't need that, and I'm not horny either. And also: Take a look on Google under "auction" and "virginity" to see what prices some girls are offering their virginity on the internet, so what's the value of it! And most girls throw something so precious away like a dirty rag. But with or without money is out of the question for me, I'm not a naive and stupid bitch, etc., who lets myself be told all sorts of nonsense, such as that sex with someone else or with someone other than the real husband is a sign of special enlightenment and emancipation is. And I don't have a slave mentality either! During the times of slavery, female slaves were always used as sex slaves by their owners, and when their youthful charm wore off at some point, they were paired with some male slaves in order to bring slave offspring to the owners as birthing machines. So what countless women and girls were forced to do as slaves in earlier times, girls today do exactly the same thing voluntarily; there seems to be something like a slave mentality in them. But not in me! Because for me this is all abuse of sexuality. People used to talk about sin, but this word has gone out of fashion today. For me, this sex without marriage is more typical of a slave. Actually, what I'm saying here is also clear to my friends, but why do they still start having sex? Who has manipulated them so that they seem to care so little about their honor and their dignity and their level?

In any case, I want to live real monogamy and real love in my life. In doing so, I definitely follow nature, and because nature has arranged it so that children can be 'created' through penetration, for me penetration belongs in marriage. Incidentally, the Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset said that sexual intercourse with the background of real love is particularly fulfilling if it can or even should "materialize" in a child. And if I'm going to have sex, then I don't want just any rabbit hopping, I want a real party!

However, doing nothing at all and, above all, being dismissive of everything that has to do with sexuality is simply unrealistic and that's not possible! Because whoever is AGAINST EVERYTHING here will one day be taken by surprise by reality and end up doing EVERYTHING. I just want to take a sensible MIDDLE PATH: not suppress the sexual difference, but rather cultivate it. That's why I'm definitely open to paradisiacal nudity - especially in the presence of genuinely moral men, where this is possible and isn't

misunderstood. Because our usual fear of nudity is only an indication of our insecurity in matters of sexual morality, it prevents normality between the sexes and does not help at all for real morality and, as a typical irrational fear, is only an instrument of power (especially... religions!) and a typical damage to civilization that prevents real emancipation. It is also a sign of mental illness. How much I would love to take part in such a naked cycling day if (<https://basisreli.lima-city.de/radler/radlerinnen.htm>) were accessible to me somewhere. That is a sign of successful emancipation! Of course, you have to make sure that you are not misunderstood; that is part of emancipation. And I would even practice driving freehand beforehand so that I could at least raise my arms up every now and then and spread my fingers in the V sign against the philistines, i.e. the victory sign! Of course you have to be able to talk about all of this and I think I can talk because I simply have good arguments. And if you can't talk sensibly here, you can talk to me!

But that's not all! I also know that two-thirds of all women never experience a real orgasm in their lives - and I don't want to be one of those people where the man just sticks his cock in and then pulls it out again like a slave and I don't get anything out of it and only feel boredom or even reluctance. So I want to experience orgasm and not with just any man and sometimes with hide-and-seek and with cheating and with lies and hypocrisy, but with my husband and whenever we both feel like it! Yes, what burns inside you when you're really in love? Nothing is burning "inside", everything that burns is just the outside. So the inside is out of the question under no circumstances, it has time until marriage! And I also know that the orgasm experience is only possible with touching the outside and without penetration, i.e. only with light skin contact, simply because I can feel completely comfortable naked with a man without fear and can really let myself go with him. Nature has even given us girls the great opportunity to test without penetration: All the nerve cells that are responsible for orgasm in women are located on the surface of their genitals anyway, i.e. H. Penetration is not necessary at all for them to test it. Whatever orgasm doesn't happen without penetration doesn't happen with penetration either.

In addition, the woman is very afraid, especially the first time, whether what she is doing without marriage is the right thing. I've also heard that a quarter of girls have such a bad first time experience that they get fed up with sex. And this fear prevents *Continue in the text "The Middle Way" at www.michael-preuschoff.de*

Note: The author has a degree in Catholic theology and was a professional school religion teacher before his retirement. - hpreuschoff@gmx.de