

The New Testament is a syncretism (a mishmash of beliefs) drawn from the stories of various ancient polytheistic religions:



Unfortunately, the text is somewhat illegible, presumably due to being copied so many times, so here is a clearer version – and, fittingly, translated straight away. So

HORUS 5,000 years ago:

- # born of a virgin
- # Star of the East
- # walked on water
- # healed the sick
- # restored sight to the blind
- # was crucified
- # was dead for three days
- # rose from the dead.

And similarly with
MITHRAS 3,200 years ago
KRISHNA 2,900 years ago
DIONYSUS 2,500 years ago,
from Iran, from India, from
Greece

I think that one 'event' concerning Jesus is probably true, namely the crucifixion. And then 'they' 'built' the other events around it.

The fact that all these myths about gods – from the virgin birth to the 'resurrection from the dead of a son of God' – also apply to Jesus cannot be a coincidence; so many coincidences are impossible.

This overview (which I received from an American friend) doesn't even mention that Jesus' Last Supper with bread and wine, shared with his disciples, never actually took place at all, but was adopted from the cult of Mithras. There, too, there was a similar farewell meal with bread and wine. Is all this not clear confirmation that the biography of Jesus, as we know it from the Bible, is a deliberate and highly contrived fabrication? And why, and by whom?

Is the New Testament a hoax? What really happened 2,000 years ago?

Jesus certainly lived, and he was indeed crucified. But there simply cannot be so many coincidences that all these divine stories – from the virgin birth to the resurrection, etc. (see the overview) – actually happened to Jesus as well; they were therefore attributed to him. But who would do such a thing? It is unlikely that followers would do this; they would be much more likely to write down as accurately as possible what actually happened.

It is therefore far more likely that Jesus' opponents attributed these stories to him, and these would be the very same circles that had also put him on the cross. Of course, this was done in a very cunning way.

And why? We are familiar with the problem from computers: when we delete something, it is still there – a hard drive, for example, is only properly deleted once it has been overwritten with something else. And that is exactly how it was with Jesus: a new story had to be fabricated about him. And this also ties in with what theologians say when they speak of the pre-Easter Jesus and the post-Easter Jesus, and that the pre-Easter Jesus – that is, the one before the alleged resurrection – was a completely different person from the one after the resurrection. And here, then, it is stated quite clearly: the post-Easter Jesus is a deliberate fabrication – originating with Paul, who had insinuated himself among the early followers of Jesus as a self-appointed apostle – in order to erase the pre-Easter Jesus, that is, the real one, as completely as possible.

And why should the real Jesus be erased?

Above all, the way women were treated at that time must surely have been utterly criminal: in the story of Susanna in the appendix to the Book of Daniel, we learn how women were blackmailed into having sex – and even into prostitution: If, under the 'two-witness' procedure of the time ('Either you have sex with us or we'll report you for having been seen having sex with another man, and then you'll be executed'), two men threatened a woman with reporting her if she was not willing to have sex or even to engage in prostitution (you can always find something!), then most women would probably have been coerced into having sex, because they'd rather stay alive – and they would then have felt like sinners as well.

Jesus had now exposed the true culprits in public speeches, revealing that the accusations were all completely fabricated – and that the men were the real perpetrators, acting with the utmost criminal intent.

And, of course, they weren't going to put up with that – so they ensured that Jesus was removed from the scene on false charges.

But find out more in 'Element 2'! And in 'Element 1', you'll discover how Jesus's commitment is being applied in our own time, because attitudes towards women haven't changed that much – they're just different!

The author holds a degree in theology (Catholic) and is a retired vocational school religious education teacher.

www.michael-preuschoff.de, E-Mail: hpreuschoff@gmx.de

Dear fellow pilgrim on the Way of St James!

Since time immemorial, the aim of pilgrimage has not only been to walk the route and arrive in Santiago, but also to discover new ideas to put into practice upon returning home. I think the ideas on the leaflet are certainly worth considering!

And on that note, an OPEN LETTER to the Minister for Education and Cultural Affairs of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany), Ms Ina Brandes

Extreme misogyny and contempt for women in school sex education – instead, ‘phillyne sexual self-determination’!

July, 12th, 2026

Dear Minister Brandes,

Please do take a look at page 10 of the attached article from *Die Welt* – a newspaper that is not generally regarded as misogynistic or contemptuous of women. And misogyny and contempt for women really ought to have no place in our society – yet, unfortunately, that is very much the case! You only have to take a proper look!

So what else could it mean when this article in *Die Welt* cites as the reason why girls do not start having sex that they feel too young and are too shy? The fact that the real reason they don’t start is presumably because they have a natural sense of morality and that having sex would go against their moral convictions (they don’t want to be sluts or stupid, cheap ‘sex objects’) is something the statisticians and editors clearly cannot even begin to imagine: In other words, they hold the view that girls are simply incapable of high moral standards – because they are, after all, too stupid and too driven by their urges; they are therefore denied any capacity for such morality from the outset – it really couldn’t be any more misogynistic! And this seems to be not just the attitude of *Die Welt*, but currently a widespread attitude in our culture towards girls. And with such an attitude, it’s of course not even worth thinking about or developing concepts for how things could be different – because we know from the outset that it won’t achieve anything with these ‘stupid and instinct-driven girls’ anyway. So in sex education lessons today, they only learn how to use the pill and condoms to avoid getting pregnant and catching sexually transmitted infections – and religion just lets everything run its course anyway, merely proclaiming God’s forgiveness and mercy to those who cannot cope with the consequences of their fated lustfulness. Truly, a brilliant pedagogical approach – how to turn a lack of ability when it comes to sensible teaching into a positive educational goal!

Can you imagine how, with this concept, I’d be only too happy to be a teacher today – teaching 10–15-year-olds? To really shake things up, given the mindset of adults and, in particular, today’s sex educators (doesn’t today’s sex education stem from the Reds and Greens?). Isn’t the underlying attitude one of pure institutionalised contempt for women (or rather, ‘contempt for girls’) – and that is why nobody is trying to place girls’ natural moral sensibilities on a rational footing through an appealing concept, so that they are happy to live by it and can even

influence the male-dominated world – and thus ultimately transform our world for the better?

I'm attaching the text to show how things could be different! This text also describes an alternative way in which young people can do things better. And such an alternative is absolutely essential if the concept is to be attractive in practice and actually work!

Incidentally, I haven't been entirely unsuccessful so far: a former (Turkish) pupil remembered me after her failed marriage, recalling how I wanted to base morality in interpersonal relationships on reason rather than on any religion with the hostility typical of religions, and she wants her daughter (13) not to end up just as messed up by religion as she was – and for us to do something together with her daughter so that she can see how wonderful a moral code based on reason is.

And wouldn't it be the job of a Minister for Education, who belongs to a party that calls itself Christian, and which does, after all, have influence over school curricula, to change them – since the Christian churches cannot do so, because they are stuck in their dogmas of divine myths and in their business model of preaching God's forgiveness and mercy?

Could you perhaps organise a forum where I can answer questions? (I would, however, like the participants to be familiar with this text – and for there to be a genuine 'question and answer' session.)

In any case, I believe we must do something – and urgently! Naturally, I'm also trying elsewhere, including with other parties, and even with the AfD <no one has got in touch so far> – but I don't want to overlook the CDU. After all, the CDU should really be the social force driving this forward!

I would appreciate a reply.

Best regards MP

Please also read 'Element 2', at least the beginning, to see what our Christian faith has to do with this

Regarding the 'open letter': To ensure that the letter to you does not end up in the bin straight away, even though it concerns a very important issue, I will be sending copies to various media outlets, as well as to churches (just a thought that occurred to me!).