MANUSCRIPT

www.michael-preuschoff.de

Jesus as a Forerunner of Immanuel Kant

An attempt to apply the ideas of Immanuel Kant in his book "Religion within the Bounds of Bare Reason" in connection with today's insights from both devout theologians and critics and opponents of religion and churches into the practical life of today, especially for young people.

Part 1 (about Religion):

ONE AGAINST THE UNDERWORLD AND THE PRIEST MAFIA

Part 2 (about Morality):

NOT EVERYTHING – BUT NOT NOTHING!

From my experiences and impressions with young people and their parents, as well as many other contemporaries, a religion and a (sexual) morality based on reason is highly relevant.

Here, I present what I have arrived at over more than fifty years, thirty of which I spent actively teaching vocational students. I would gladly be a teacher again with this concept.

Just a little on the same concern shared by Immanuel Kant and Jesus: both completely rejected any religious cult because they saw no rational sense in it. They were much more concerned with living according to true moral principles. Kant was rather cautious, academic, and theoretical, while Jesus was more direct, relatable to the people, and practical, and probably didn't shy away from personal insults either (I'm thinking here of the scathing speeches in the Gospel of Matthew, which probably "have some truth" to them).

And since we're already on the topic of morals and reason: When it comes to sexual morality, we should question everything that supposedly belongs to morality 'with reason,' to see if it really has any 'moral value' or might even end up having a counterproductive effect. I'm thinking here, for example, about the usual upbringing of young people to feel shame.

Part 1: ONE AGAINST THE UNDERWORLD AND THE PRIEST MAFIA

by a retired vocational school religious studies teacher



A completely new perspective without the usual distortions by Jesus' opponents – therefore everything is completely realistic

And from page 22:

Part 2: NOT EVERYTHING – NOT NOTHING!

A realistic exploration of the story of the Fall: Enjoyment of sexuality for young people – without the risk of girls sliding into prostitution (and not even into the gray area leading to it)

Introduction: Isn't the New Testament a syncretism ("belief mash-up") from the stories of various ancient god religions? Judge for yourself!



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

If you are now motivated to want to know how this mix of beliefs probably came about, I happily invite you to keep reading.

Point 1: WHO wrote the Gospels in which Jesus is ascribed such god stories?

The fact that all these god myths, from the virgin birth to the 'resurrection from the dead of a god's son,' also fit Jesus cannot be a coincidence; so many coincidences are impossible. In this overview (which I received from an American friend and whose origin I could not figure out), it doesn't even mention that the Last Supper with bread and wine with Jesus' disciples didn't happen at all, but was a borrowing from the Mithras cult. There too, there was such a farewell meal with bread and wine.

More details about these "inventions" have been described by Karlheinz Deschner in his book "The Forged Faith" – you can also find more information about it on the Internet.

But it's not just Karlheinz Deschner! The Danish Sanskrit researcher Christian Lindtner, thanks to his professional knowledge of Sanskrit and Greek, also discovered that the Gospels are in large parts clear plagiarism of texts from Buddhism, that is, from Buddha stories. Hence, in his book "Secrets About Jesus Christ," he puts forward the thesis that Buddhist monks wanted to create a form of Buddhism for the West, that they wanted to, so to speak, missionize the West with Buddhism and for that wrote a Buddhist "New Testament" for the West. (I had corresponded with the Sanskrit researcher several times before his early death and wrote him my version – and he confirmed to me that I could be right too, but he would rather stick to his explanation.)

Isn't this all the clear confirmation that the biography of Jesus, as we know it from the Bible, is a deliberately very artificial construction?

And regarding the details: Jesus certainly lived, and he was also crucified. But who invents such stories about him? Who does something like that?

The usual "church people" explain the depiction of Jesus with these "divine stories" by saying that back then there was a different mentality, so people thought they had to make an important person seem even more significant with special extraordinary stories than he already was. But isn't this attempt already an admission on the part of the "church people" that these stories are just made up and therefore not really true?

Anyway, it is completely unlikely that real followers of an important person would do something like that; they would much more likely try to write exactly what really happened, and support it as best as possible with examples that actually existed and are very plausible. A few stories about Jesus reported in the New Testament could certainly fit here as well. But they might have ended up in the Gospels mainly because they were still generally known about the real Jesus and therefore could not be easily left out. And not least, they also

served to cleverly mix lies and truth, giving everything the appearance of the truth of the entire text.

It is much more likely, therefore, that Jesus' opponents made up these stories about him. And the only circles that could have done this were certainly the same ones who brought him to the cross. Of course, all of this happened very cleverly.

Point 2: Jesus' fight against the Jewish mafia, which terrorized its fellow humans, in ancient times.

I once came across a theologian who had the thesis that Jesus clearly engaged against a (worldly) power. And the only power that, according to this theologian, could have been considered was the Romans. Because what other power could there have been?

And I think I've found exactly this other power that existed back then – and that is the one Jesus had engaged against! Against the Romans, only an uprising would have been possible, but there's no indication that Jesus planned such an uprising, at least nothing concrete and "worldly." He was concerned with a completely different power!

But which ones otherwise? As a kind of experiment, I once typed into Google: "Mafia in ancient Israel": but the answer was a clear no – there was no Mafia in Israel back then. Then I tried typing just "Mafia" without any additional words, so Mafia in general – and among other things, all kinds of "business fields" of the Mafia were listed, and right at the top were "prostitution" and "protection racketeering." If that wasn't something! According to a fairly unanimous opinion by most theologians here, Jesus was likely friends with prostitutes, and tax collectors also seemed to be somehow close to him – since he always protected both. And if we look closer, these are also professions typically associated with protection racketeering and that like to, or rather don't like to, have anything to do with the Mafia.

Prostitutes are typically associated with extortion anyway, we know that from today, and the tax collectors back then too, if we just take a closer look at how taxes worked at that time.

Here's a bit more on that: The father of Jesus, Joseph, was involved with his sons in the construction and building of houses, as indicated by the Greek word "tekton" in the Gospel of Matthew, because this word essentially means that (the word is also still part of our word "architect"). Luther had correctly translated the word, which today means "construction worker," in his time as "carpenter" or "builder," because back then – in the era of timber-frame buildings – all houses were essentially made of wood. Over time, however, in our imagination this has turned into a different wood-related profession, namely that of the joiner, who in his workshop "in the back" makes tables and

chairs and cabinets, which Mary then sells "in the front of the shop" – and this image is in any case completely wrong and completely distorts what kind of profession Jesus had and what kind of person he probably was.

For Joseph and his sons were, so to speak, house builders "on assembly" throughout the country and got to know all kinds of people in the process – Jesus in particular must have been very sociable here. And these other people were certainly first and foremost the clients and then also the prostitutes, who wanted to earn something from the workers "from outside" after work.

There has already been enough talk about the prostitutes here. But as for the clients: Most people in the area at that time probably built their simple houses from a few wooden poles and otherwise with clay alone or at best in neighborly help. But there were simply also people who were so unpopular that there was no neighborly help for them, and who also had the money to afford professional builders for more impressive houses. And those were precisely the typical clients – and specifically, these were also the customs officers or, today, perhaps more accurately, the 'tax collectors.'

A bit about the tax collection system back then: It worked on a lease basis. So, a tax collector had basically leased all the inhabitants of a certain area, paid a fee for it, and then had to figure out how to get his money from the people in his area. He would set the respective tax according to his knowledge and estimates, and he could definitely collect this tax with force – he might even have had soldiers at his disposal if he needed them.

We can imagine how popular these tax collectors were—basically not at all! And they didn’t just collect the money they had to pass on, but also an extra charge that they could live on. And that wasn’t just money for themselves, but also for the appropriate “protectors.” Because we have to imagine that back then, all taxes were paid in cash, and sizable amounts could definitely add up. That means tax collectors were an attractive target for thieves and robbers. So they needed “protectors”—who, of course, they also had to pay. And that was exactly where the protection racket came in, which is usually invisible but has its methods and connections to provide protection. Often, though, the protection is just an excuse to extort money, because there may not actually be any robbers—or another branch of the mafia is the robber itself. Whatever it was, maybe a certain amount was acceptable depending on the situation, but the protection racket probably always wanted more – and that was often no longer justified at all and also a kind of exploitation, or better yet: extortion.

And these tax collectors would sometimes have their houses built by the construction business 'Joseph and Sons' from Nazareth. At that point, one of the sons, Jesus, probably showed interest in the problems of these tax-collector clients, talked with them quite a bit, and possibly even befriended them and learned about their issues – including, and especially, protection racket extortion.

And since prostitutes were also involved in this kind of extortion for protection money, that's already a hint that back then – contrary to what Google thinks – there actually was a mafia – and what a one!

Of course, there's naturally no evidence for this, which is quite normal for a parasitic organization like the Mafia. What would such evidence even look like that critics would accept? Membership lists certified by Pontius Pilate? I think anyone demanding evidence here is just out of touch – there's no such evidence today, and there certainly wasn't any back then either. And while the mafias were generally pretty invisible, nobody supposedly knew anyone who belonged to them, and nobody was a member themselves, the mobsters still held power in society, even if they were invisible. But anyone who broke the general rules of these organizations could sometimes face very drastic punishment!

But there are clues! Of course, a single clue on its own doesn't really mean anything, but what if several clues come together that are still typical for mafias today or at least fit into the mafia's line of business? And I think there were plenty of such clues back then!

We've already mentioned the first ones here: That Jesus had friends who, by profession, were typical for "business relationships" with the mafia.

And more clues?

Well, for starters, there's the law in Moses' books, according to which women caught in the act of having sex with a man who wasn't theirs had to be executed. Technically, this law applied to men too according to the Ten Commandments, but in this patriarchal society, based on my information, it was always only about women—unless someone like Jesus stepped in for the women.

But how could this law and these so-called "Books of Moses" have come about at all, which seem quite over the top? According to our current knowledge, the laws of Moses were actually not written by Moses himself, but were composed between 750 and 400 BC by various known and unknown authors. It even says in there that women caught in the act of having sex with a man who isn't theirs must be punished by death. I still remember how, during my studies, a professor wondered how such a law could have come about, when its proportionality really didn't make any sense at all.

Of course, you can find a theological or moral justification for anything if you really want to, including that adulteresses should be punished with death. But in my opinion, it's highly unlikely that well-meaning lawmakers, whose goal should be securing the common good in a society, would actually come up with such a punishment. They might invent something like a pillory, as we had in the Middle Ages, which is already bad enough, but certainly not the death penalty. A much more likely reason, according to what a friend of mine who's an American lawyer once told me, is this: There are laws that at first glance

might make sense, but on closer inspection don't make any sense at all. Yes, these laws are just so grotesquely terrible compared to any common sense that they could probably only have gotten into the legal code through criminally convoluted means. The reason can actually only be that the criminals could carry out their criminal deeds even more effectively with these laws. And here we have a law that dictated a woman who was caught in the act of having sex with a man other than her own by two witnesses had to be executed. I mean, when do you ever catch a woman "doing something like that" in the act, and then also with two (male) witnesses (as the law required), who are nasty enough to run straight to the court to get her executed? That hardly ever happens! So this law is completely useless for the purpose it was supposedly made for – it could only have been made for abuse from the start, namely to extort women! And such extortion always has a mafia-like background – it almost proves the existence of a mafia! And a mafia so powerful that it can even manage to... And a mafia so powerful that it even manages to pass laws or at least be involved in them!

So the law that says adulterous women must be punished by death is clearly a law that was introduced into the legal code by mafia people, and it's not about any kind of morality at all, but about the fact that women can be easily and straightforwardly led into immorality. And that then works with the "two-witness procedure" ("either you have sex with us or we claim we caught you having sex with another man than your husband, and then you'll be executed"), which made it easier and more perfect to blackmail women into sex!

Such an extortion story is, in all likelihood, the story of the harassment of the beautiful Susanna by two 'elders,' as we know it from the appendix of the Book of Daniel – here, however, with a happy ending for the woman troubled by the blackmail. So here we learn what the concrete application of this law looked like – according to the findings of our modern theologians around 130 B.C.!

Certainly, this story was by no means just about the sexual satisfaction of these two 'elders' (if at all), but above all about recruiting a woman for prostitution, in this case the beautiful Susanna: It is completely unlikely that the two elders just happened to meet and realized they had the same goal, namely to have sex with Susanna. But much more likely is that they had already coordinated with each other beforehand and had come up with this strategy of the 'two-witness procedure' to get to the woman – probably in coordination with their clients. It probably wasn't even about protection money at that point, but rather about recruiting a woman for prostitution in general – the protection money would have come later. And the two witnesses were surely promised by the clients that if anything went wrong, they would be protected thanks to their connections with the official legal circles. Only things went wrong for the wrong witnesses here 'due to unlucky circumstances,'

because a brave 'Daniel' happened to get involved, so the 'witnesses' ended up getting the same punishment that, according to the law at the time, the defendant would have received if the case had gone differently.

But in most similar cases, the women probably had to give in to the blackmail; life was more important to them than sex with some blackmailers, and in the end, even prostitution – maybe it wouldn't be all that bad after all. But then they also felt like sinners, because the blackmailing men had found some reason to think the women were to blame for why the men had become so driven as they were toward them.

The question naturally also arises here: where, then, is the man being punished, the one who was also caught and to whom the law actually should have applied? But either the man was ultimately just the victim of a “lascivious woman” who, through her “provocative behavior,” had made him “hot” (you can always find something if you want to!) and so ultimately bore no guilt. Or the man in question was part of the mafia from the start and was therefore informed and could disappear quickly and unnoticed in the commotion of being “caught.”

And today we can draw a line from the creation of the law to the story of the beautiful Susanna – so for at least three hundred years there was the influence of the mafia! And to rule like the mafia, you don't even need such concrete extortion stories, the fear of the women that something like that could happen to them is enough to suppress them!

And this influence even reached the time of Jesus!

The story of the averted stoning of the 'sinner' in John 8, based on what we've seen so far, can only be such a 'mafia story' – and precisely in the time of Jesus!

The case here is a bit different, though. It's not about blackmailing a woman into prostitution, but about punishing a prostitute who didn't behave the way her pimps wanted (maybe she even wanted to leave the profession?), and who now was supposed to be 'sacrificed,' mainly to warn the other women so they wouldn't pull similar stunts.

(Note: Of course, I have no evidence for this interpretation of the story of the sinner according to John 8, where would I even get it from? And again: What would it even look like for critics to accept it? Still, I did get a tip from the underworld – albeit “indirectly”, that is, through a neighbor who had a business relationship with “such a man” and had quite an open conversation with him. So he said: “This is definitely a punishment story from the underworld!” Naturally, I also can’t prove anything here – either you see it or you don’t. But if you see a connection with the other examples I’ve mentioned so far, then it can only also be some kind of mafia story!

And now a bit about me: So this tip was the beginning of my entry into alternative theology – you can see what has come out of it since!)



When I interpret the painting "Jesus and the Sinner" (Rosenberg Fortress, Kronach / Germany), the painter Lucas Cranach the Elder (1472-1553) had the same view of the story in the Gospel of John as I do—that it's really a true crime story. I think you can't paint it more clearly if you see the would-be stoners as criminals; anyway, they don't look like stuffy moral preachers. And even the two "wise old gentlemen" in the back right are the typical highly intellectual theologians and philosophers who, in "such matters," only ever see the surface and don't even want to know what's really going on. In this way, the criminals can keep doing whatever and however they want. At least I find it a fascinating painting! I know why I had it painted for myself in Vietnam in what is presumably the original version (after contact with the Bavarian painting collections). By the way: The Jesuit Rupert Lay (1929 – 2023) considers - as he said in a lecture - the story of the salvation of the sinner to be truer than the rest of the Gospel of John – and after taking into account the three books mentioned in the text and appendix, I also consider it truer than (almost) the rest of the Gospel in general.

Jesus had now exposed the true perpetrators and probably also the backgrounds of such laws and the criminal way they were enforced in public speeches, making it clear that all the accusations were completely far-fetched – and that men were the wrongdoers with the highest criminal energy.

And of course, the criminals didn't just put up with that—they made sure that Jesus was taken out of the world through crucifixion on false charges. Couldn't that also be a sign of the power of the mafia, that this crucifixion happened? Because, basically, what Jesus had done was absolutely nothing bad, or at most trivial things that normally would never have led to a crucifixion—if there hadn't been a malicious power behind it, like a mafia? So the very fact of the crucifixion could also be seen as evidence for the existence and effectiveness of a mafia—and this mafia definitely knew the right tough "methods" to punish some opponents and to warn others not to

dare the same move.

So the Mafia existed even at the time of Jesus with various business fields and wasn't just barely active; it was actually absolutely powerful in his time. That means we can add about 150 more years from that period to the time of the Mafia's activity, up until the story of Susanna!

Of course, the people behind it weren't visible from the outside (as is usually the case with mafias—no one really steps in front of people and announces, 'I'm Mafia!'), but the Mafia was somehow everywhere, and it was very powerful, basically terrorizing the entire Jewish people together with the priestly caste (see point 4). However, of course (hopefully!), the priests weren't aware of this at all.

Whether this mafia still exists today, and if so, whether it's the same one as back then? After all, if we google, we also find an Israeli mafia. So we read (Oct. 2026):
"There are said to be 16 criminal organizations in the country (in Israel), five of which are reportedly active nationwide (as of 2024). Many of these groups also have close connections abroad. The main areas of activity for mafia groups are drug trafficking, illegal gambling, prostitution and human trafficking, car theft, loan businesses, as well as extortion and contract killings."

If there actually is a connection, the Israeli mafia would be celebrating its 2,500-year anniversary sometime in our time. Could it even be the oldest mafia in the world?

And anyone still asking for evidence of the existence of a mafia in the time of Jesus should maybe try providing evidence that there wasn't a mafia in Jesus' time first!

Point 3: But we shouldn't celebrate too soon! For us today, in principle, everything is still exactly the same, only today the Mafia's strategy doesn't run on extortion, but on manipulation!

The question arises here whether the typical anti-Semites – like, incidentally, Adolf Hitler – are right in claiming that Jews are predisposed to having a 'certain relationship' not only with 'normal business fields' but also with those 'less moral business fields.'

How it came about that Jews have a 'certain relationship' with 'normal business fields' has already been discussed enough, so I don't need to rehash all that here. But on the topic of 'less moral business fields,' I don't want to shy away, although here I can only say: No, and again no! Just Google 'Mafia' and you'll see that it's exactly the same with many other peoples; especially in

highly developed societies, in which no one knows each other, very often these parasitic organizations, if you just take a closer look.

And no one would think of equating Italians with the Mafia just because modern Mafia has its origins in Italy. When we think of Italy, we think much more of a particularly cultivated way of life and then of the great cultural achievements in architecture, painting, sculpture, music, and many other areas.

And if there are such mafias among the Jews, then it certainly isn't due to the 'special relationship' of Jewish people to 'such professions,' but it probably has more to do with some external conditions. For antiquity, I can't say anything specific here, but possibly one reason could be that, of course, laws alone are not enough to make young people choose a certain moral way of life; a reasonably well-designed educational concept is also needed. And that was probably missing (as it is with us today!), so there was basically a free path for the customs from neighboring countries to seep into the Jewish cultural sphere. And at the time of Hitler and before, this was likely also due to a certain outsider situation of many Jews, caused both by circumcision and by coming from other regions with different languages or the like. Somehow, people shared the same fate, the same unchangeable traits, they had the same background; it was like being part of a family, they knew each other, they trusted each other. On one hand, all of this was and still is the basis for mutual trust, and on the other hand, it’s also the best protection against undercover agents being infiltrated by the respective official authorities. And both of these are, after all, the foundation for the thriving of a mafia.

By the way, according to Maccoby, Jesus was popular with the people of his time, and these people were also Jews. Maccoby doesn’t say why. But maybe the ordinary people around Jesus already noticed that he wanted to free them from a scourge of psychological oppression, against which they had always been powerless?

So this means that it's not 'the Jews' who have a special affinity for the Mafia, but rather that there are 'Jewish people' who do, in fact, also terrorize other Jewish people – and that these 'other Jewish people' are happy when someone is there to free them from this scourge of terrorizing!

But now to us today: of course, it would be nonsensical if we only looked at the 'disagreements' in the way they existed at the time of Jesus and tried to overcome them; instead, we have to see how these disagreements happen today and start there. And today, this usually doesn't happen through extortion, but through manipulation!

So on that note:

The professor of canon law, Horst Herrmann (*1940, +2017) in Münster, once jokingly told in a lecture how the church can manipulate a rather church-hostile state, or at least could. So: there are probably already agreements

between such a state and the church that before a bishop's appointment, the church has to present the state with a few candidates; somewhere I once heard of three, from which the state can then choose the one it prefers. And here the church could quite easily manipulate the state by presenting it with two 'Chinese' (that is, two candidates who the state would likely not consider at all) and the church's preferred candidate. And then the state would end up choosing the candidate the church wants. And if that works, it would be a clever manipulation: It may seem like the state has a choice, but the alternatives are so unacceptable to it from the start that they aren't really an option, and in essence, there is no real choice.

But as I said, the professor was obviously only joking about such a manipulation possibility, because the church really isn't that unfair to need such trickery. And besides, it could backfire if the state sees through the trick and decides on a 'Chinese' instead.

But unfortunately, this kind of trickery, although surely completely unconscious and guaranteed without any ill will, works when it comes to offering an alternative in an election situation that is not even really an option to begin with, especially with the way we teach girls morality! For example, girls are advised in sex education class or wherever, to "try out" several partners before marriage to figure out which one is the right one, even including sexual intercourse. And from the church's side, the commandments of God are pointed out, stating that all practices related to sexuality before marriage are sins and therefore must not happen at all; the young people are basically taught a moral model like that of nuns and monks as the only Christian one, which they must follow if they want to be true Christians. So the young people outwardly appear to have a choice regarding "sexual self-determination" – but only superficially. Because how do they decide? Generally, in favor of the moral model 'trying multiple partners – including having sex,' that is, against the church's teachings. And that was predictable! After all, they don't actually want to become nuns or monks; they just want to find the right partner for themselves. And the moral model of 'nuns and monks' is simply no good for that. So they end up back with the moral model 'sex with multiple partners' from sex education to find the right one.

That's how 'sexual self-determination' actually works, which in reality is the result of massive manipulation. We can't really talk about true sexual self-determination at all, because the offered alternative isn't a real alternative and therefore isn't even an option from the start – just like 'Chinese candidates' aren't considered for the state. And so, it is precisely those who claim to be proclaiming God's commandments who are actually failing to ensure that God's commandments are truly lived!

The devout moral educators (and also all the others who basically support the 'nuns and monks' model of morality, who may have good intentions) should

have realized at some point in their pedagogical considerations that they are doing something wrong if young people largely make different choices than what they have been taught? (More on this in the next point 4.) So they are raising something that they should by now know has no moral value at all, and that is actually counterproductive for true morality, as it aligns with our faith. Does this mean that even devout educators, by raising young people in this pseudo-morality, as shame more or less inevitably is, are steering them away from God's commandments? It at least looks that way. What do you think?

At the time of Jesus, turning away from God's commandments was enforced through extortion by a mafia; today, the departure happens through manipulation, especially by devout people, but the result is somehow the same!

So how should it be done correctly now?

I described this in Part 2, Point 4, that sexual self-determination necessarily requires an attractive offer, meaning that something has to be there for young people to make a reasonable decision at all! According to my experience, that would be: 'Not everything, not nothing!' And that actually goes over well, or even very well, with young people!

But isn't this idea of an alternative ultimately just theoretical, i.e., that with such closeness it will eventually lead to sex anyway?

There's this cute story about a young Chinese couple in China, both chemists, during the Mao era, which was reported in our newspapers back then. So, they had been married for a while and were wondering why SHE wasn't getting pregnant. Off to the doctor they went! After a brief questioning, the doctor found out that they had never had sex because they didn't know anything about it—back in those days, anything related to sexuality was taboo, and you simply weren't allowed to talk about "things like that." So they had never learned about it and thought that children were created by the mixing of molecules on the skin.

That means there's no automatic progression to sexual intercourse, even if both are really close – so that "the molecules on the skin mix." So I can, in good conscience, recommend the method "Part 2, Point 4" (I also call it the "moon bathing method") as an alternative way to get to know each other sexually before marriage – especially to see if it works with the partner's orgasm. That would, in any case, be an indication of soulmates, that the two somehow fit well together.

Of course, a well-maintained approach to intelligent nudity should have been part of things long before—to prevent manipulation! And I think that kind of prevention should even be the foundation of proper moral education, leading to real emancipation and genuine sexual self-determination, so that in the end you can also find the right partner for a fulfilling life! Nudity probably belongs

to healthy human development anyway—and our fears of nudity are simply a sign that we're sick from civilization.

Yes, the churches could really get involved here! And especially the Catholic Church would actually have the best opportunities – particularly through confession. Priests could get firsthand information on how and why young women, for example, started having 'sex outside of marriage.' I know from conversations that such things were actually confessed. But that never interested the confessor. And so the Church misses the chance to learn more in order to reasonably inform young people, who still have their whole lives ahead of them, how they can do better themselves. And that would certainly be a sensible use of this sacrament, so that the mistakes of individuals could contribute to the 'people of God' as a whole coming closer here and now to the utopia of a successful high morality. This way, they could help young people pray to God to help them, for example, to get rid of false ideas about morality and to become natural, wise, and sensible! Note: Such a prayer could actually come true because there's a strong desire behind it to become smarter and more fulfilled, so people would seriously work on making it happen.

But from my experience with theologians: they have no interest. And why not? Unlike in Jesus' time, there's no mafia behind it. Or is it that there's a business model here, because people to whom you can promise God's mercy and forgiveness are more profitable than those who do everything right from the start?

Note: With the idea that sexual intercourse belongs in marriage, that was at least the case in the past. Today, the church has largely given in and adapted to the trends of the times; it basically lets anything go. There are supposedly great scientific reasons for this too. But in my opinion, those are more or less pseudoscientific, not really Christian at all, and many parents don't like it either. However, they feel overwhelmed and helpless when their kids live like this, and it's not exactly a solid moral model! Still, I think the conditions today are very good for the Christian moral model to have the best chance! The embers just need to be freed from the slag and ash that have accumulated over time (since the real Jesus from the very beginning!) and have mostly smothered the fire, and given fresh fuel! And the fuel can definitely be thick logs, so that the result becomes a really nice, long-lasting fire!

Point 4: Did Paul also belong to this mafia, and is the religion he at least laid the foundation for therefore a mafia product?

If we want to overcome the mafias now, we first have to think about how the interaction between the specific mafiosi and the rest of society works.

So:

For the mafia business to flourish, and especially the one with prostitution, it's not enough if the Al Capones, Lucky Lucianos, and Vincenzo Colosimos—just to name a few bosses from our time—and their henchmen are active. What's especially needed is also the surrounding network of helpers, look-the-other-way types, explainers, appeasers, glossers, and even healers, when people can't cope with this lifestyle and therefore such help might be necessary.

Yes. Above all, we need first of all workers who make sure that the young people, and especially the girls, are and remain beautifully uninformed and therefore stupid, so that they can stumble into the system of "sex without marriage" on their own, which is also the same system as that of prostitution. Of course, this works best if young people are not taught any real morality in the first place, because then they have no real ideas of morality from the outset. It is best for them to know only an illusory morality (I mean that of shame), which results in fears in them, but which is rather useless for a real morality and which, on the contrary, literally drives them into the system of "sex without marriage". And the uselessness of shame for a real morality is really like that. I know it from my time as a teacher: Especially girls would never go to a nudist beach, because in their opinion it is immoral and disgusting and somehow also sinful (as distant from religion as they may otherwise be, this attitude is obviously still ingrained in them from their religious education), the upbringing to feel shame kicks in fully, yet starting sex with any man, according to the girls' opinion again, has nothing to do with morality and is much more a sign of adulthood and emancipation and simply has to happen in order to find the right partner. So they do it because you just have to 'get it over with.' So no trace of real morality – because real morality is exactly the opposite! But of course, no one tells them that….

If this lack of information and blindness isn't practically an invitation for the enemies of morality to act – and they are, of course, the mafia!

And we still have a religion today that works perfectly in favor of these enemies of morality!

But how did it come about?

It definitely isn't because of the original, the real Jesus! Jesus was possibly so convinced by the goodwill of his fellow humans, at least when it comes to high morals, that he saw the cause of the "sexual mess," which certainly existed in his time too (after all, there were prostitutes, and as far as we know, not too few), solely in the activities of the mafiosi – and then he probably thought further: if they didn't exist anymore, or if young people saw through it and stopped participating, the mafias would dry up pretty quickly, and the mafia system would sort of solve itself. Yeah, it could actually be that morality works like that. But maybe, though, this Jesus also had too much idealism? At least I

think such an attitude isn't entirely wrong …

But unfortunately, Jesus was forced to abandon his project. What a shame …

And what happened after Jesus' death?

If it had just been these communal meals with bread breaking, and that Jesus' followers had pooled their assets for communal use and maybe even given some of it to the poor (as the Gospel writers want us to believe), etc., that certainly wouldn't have been a reason for Jesus' opponents to persecute them.

No, Jesus' followers must have really caught fire from what the real Jesus wanted and started to continue in his spirit. And of course, Jesus' opponents had a problem with that, because if they succeeded in what this Jesus himself was prevented from doing by his death, then all the effort with his death would have been completely wasted.

But what could they do? The mafia types couldn't just kill all the followers of this 'devilish-reform-crazed Jesus' — and how could they even figure out who was a follower of him?

So what to do to make sure that the fantastic ideas of this Jesus didn't actually come true?

We don't know for sure who came up with the idea in this situation to turn Jesus' biography upside down and make him a Son of God with a sacrificial death and a resurrection from the dead – in other words, to shift the goal of Jesus' mission to an afterlife and create a typical religion, like there were others. But it could have been that henchman of the high priests, Saul, when on his ride to Damascus he was thinking about how to carry out the arrest of Jesus' followers as ordered, even though he had no right to do so because Damascus was technically foreign territory from Jerusalem. Maybe it wasn't even about an arrest at all, but just about 'doing something against it' so that the mission of this Jesus wouldn't actually become reality.

And then the idea came to him "like a flash of light," to sneak in with Jesus' followers and claim that this Jesus had risen from the dead after being buried, appeared to him, and made him an apostle with the mission to tell everyone that his death was a voluntary sacrifice for the sins of humanity and to proclaim him as the risen one, and that all people who believed in him would also rise from the dead on the last day. And thus he would have converted to the Jesus who had risen from the dead. And, in feigned modesty toward his new master, he now also changed his name to 'Paul' (Latin "the little one").

In the beginning, the whole thing with the sacrificial death and the resurrection might have been a crazy trial balloon. But it was at least somewhat well received by some people at the time, when people were a bit more superstitious than we are today. And even if some sons of gods had risen from the dead,

why shouldn't this Jesus also be a son of God and have risen from the dead?

Of course, there were also persistent opponents of this resurrection thesis, and a genuine pro and con battle developed, with the opponents of the resurrection ideology—who were concerned with the real Jesus' mission—at a disadvantage. After all, it was still life-threatening to continue with Jesus' mission, while the 'resurrection believers' didn't have any problems with that.

And so it finally came about that experts from Judaism and other religions like Buddhism ended up in a writing workshop – probably for good pay from some shady clients – where they cobbled together a new biography of Jesus. Paul was possibly the main player in this writing workshop. Hence the god stories and the Buddhist stories in the New Testament. And we don't know the authors' names either, because who would give their real name for a shabby fake product that they know is a fraud?

My opinion on this: I could imagine that the followers of the real Jesus in this situation might have even covertly gone along with the mobsters, using even more bizarre god stories, whose nonsense was so obvious that people later on could actually easily recognize it and thus find the real Jesus. And at some point, the followers of the real Jesus even managed to work the story of the prevented stoning of the sinner into the "fake stories," from which people who aren't completely out of touch could easily see how the real Jesus stood up against the underworld mafia and could conclude what his real concern was.

And the question now is: Was Paul a mobster?

My opinion: He was one! But not one like an Al Capone or a Lucky Luciano, and also not a henchman like the two elders in the Susanna story, but he was a man of honor who didn't get his hands dirty! He was "merely" a middleman, a distraction, a falsifier, and also someone who promised forgiveness and the mercy of a god to those who couldn't handle the harsh methods in the mafia system. So he belonged to those who weren't direct members of the mafia, but without whom the mafia system wouldn't work.

Did he do all this voluntarily, or was he blackmailed into it by the real mafia people? We don't know.

In any case, he seems to have found joy in his work and maybe even believed in what he was doing.

And what are we supposed to do today?

I hope I have clearly and convincingly laid out how I see the Mafia problem and what that has to do with Jesus and Paul.

And now I want to leave it to the readers to decide who they side with. The Paul people can let things continue as they are, and the Jesus people would have to raise their kids differently if they're parents, and go to schools and churches and demand different lessons, or teach different lessons themselves

if they're teachers or pastors. In any case, there would be a lot to do, even for media folks!

Point 5: So who was the real Jesus? And how did the Gospels come about? So here's a combined biography.

We know the problem from computers: when we delete something, it's still there – a hard drive is only truly deleted once it has been overwritten with something else. And that was certainly the case with Jesus too: a new story had to be made up about him, in order to at least erase what was still alive about him among the people, so that none of the original meaning remained. And this also fits with what theologians say when they talk about the pre-Easter Jesus and the post-Easter Jesus, and that the pre-Easter Jesus, meaning the one before the supposed resurrection, was completely different from the one after the resurrection. And here it really needs to be said clearly: the post-Easter Jesus is a deliberate invention by Jesus' opponents, meant to completely wipe out the pre-Easter Jesus, the real one, as perfectly as possible.

And why should the real Jesus be wiped out?

After all, we can say quite a bit with fairly good certainty that the opponents couldn't hide about Jesus, because it was something so special and even unusual that it remained known about him long after his death and was probably passed on orally for a long time:

1. Jesus was friends with prostitutes and tax collectors (and back then, when there were no great written calculations, tax collectors were people who set and collected taxes at their own discretion).
2. Jesus saved a prostitute from being stoned; although the episode from John 8 isn't mentioned in the earlier Gospels (perhaps because it clearly points to the engagement of the real Jesus?), it is said to have actually happened.
3. Jesus considered the religious cult as secondary or even unimportant.
4. Jesus spoke publicly – and especially in the desert, because probably only the 'normal people' followed him there, those who had a genuine interest in Jesus' revolutionary ideas.
5. Jesus was crucified – obviously a miscarriage of justice.

And from these points, we can quite well piece together a biography of Jesus. It might not please everyone, especially not the typical theologians – but that could very well be a hint that it might actually have been like that. After all, back then, it was precisely the theologians who were against him.

And now the 'combined biography':

Through his friendship with tax collectors, Jesus had learned how they naturally needed 'protectors' because of their large amounts of cash. But they ended up being extorted far beyond an acceptable level by these 'protectors' through excessive protection money.

And from the prostitutes, with whom he was also friends, he knew how they had been blackmailed into sex and often into prostitution through the "two-witness trial". And how they were then still blackmailed by demands for protection money.

And he had then publicly trampled on all this and denounced the perpetrators – and also the people behind it, such as the temple people, who knew about it for sure, but pretended not to know anything. And especially as far as sexuality was concerned, they did a very vague moral education of the young people, where it was only a matter of a pseudo-morality (of shame), but everything was excluded as to how it really went and would have helped the young people to become fit as far as high morals were concerned. And so the girls, for example, remained uninformed and downright stupid – and stumbled into this dirty system more or less unsuspectingly, so to speak. Let's not believe that sexual abuse is something that only started today; it has always existed and probably was much more brazen and common than it is now!

And let's also not believe that people followed Jesus into the desert to hear pious sayings like in a Sermon on the Mount: 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven!' Surely people wouldn't have followed a popular speaker into the desert two thousand years ago just for something like that – and without bringing any food along either! It was definitely more about exposing the dirty system back then, which mostly affected the more ordinary people, who at that time were usually the poorer ones!

So these were certainly very explosive topics of Jesus' public speeches. And many women remembered during these speeches that something very similar had once happened to them, which Jesus was condemning, but that until now they had always only felt guilty themselves. That it was criminal extortion with some flimsy excuses by their respective 'flirt attackers' (you can always find something, like their veil wasn't sitting properly or they laughed provocatively or whatever), they had never thought about that. And Jesus now explained to them that all that guilt feeling was nonsense – and that the real guilty ones were the men involved, who were really criminal – just like the oh-so pious men behind the scenes in the temples, who knew about it and, through their silence and through a completely impractical, out-of-touch pedagogy for young people, had participated in a kind of pretend morality in the process of keeping people dumbed down.

We have to imagine that among the people behind the scenes, there were probably well-known and highly respected men who outwardly acted very proper – and Jesus now publicly exposed them as downright criminal hypocrites and put them in the spotlight – and he had, so to speak, driven them crazy. So, understandably, they looked for a way to take revenge on Jesus. And at the next opportunity, they accused him with more or less far-fetched charges, like blaspheming God (you can always find something), after all, he had actually questioned laws that were still considered the laws of Moses at the time and even portrayed them as criminal. Or that he had planned an uprising against the Romans – and so they made sure he was eliminated through crucifixion.

And when all of that wasn't enough, because what Jesus stood for was still alive among the people through his public speeches, they also tried to wipe out his spirit. They managed that by turning him into a divine miracle worker and spreading all these god-stories about him among the people – and finally even commissioning the fake biographies that we know today as the Gospels. And as for Jesus' mission, they turned it into the idea that we're all sinners anyway, need God's mercy, and are justified through Jesus' crucifixion. In a way, that sounded a bit like what the real Jesus had actually said. But only a bit, in reality it was something completely different.

The main ringleader behind this was probably this Saul, who most likely, on higher orders (from the underworld and priestly mafia!), had infiltrated the followers of Jesus, for example with the story of an alleged conversion on the way to Damascus (kind of like a precursor to the DDR informant!) where the resurrected Jesus supposedly appeared to him and tasked him with spreading his message about the resurrection and salvation through faith in this salvation among the people. In feigned modesty, he even called himself 'Paul,' from the Latin 'the little one,' and made himself an apostle, but in reality, he was just a 'pseudo-apostle' – the English Talmudic scholar Hyam Maccoby described all of this very well in his book 'The Mythmaker,' in my opinion.

With the real Jesus, all of this basically had nothing to do.

The next followers of Jesus, of course, knew that everything this pseudo-apostle was saying was wrong, but he managed to push these true followers back more and more and portray them as the false prophets.

And that's where we stand today. Not least, Paul probably also received financial support from his patrons to assemble a writing workshop made up of educated opponents of Jesus. And they then wrote the fake version of Jesus' biography that we know today. Hence the anonymity of the authors, hence the forced naming of Jesus' disciples as authors, hence the plagiarisms from other religions! And what came out of that then also fit perfectly into the

cunning power and business model of the churches, which soon emerged.

It's time for us to reflect on the real Jesus, because what he was really concerned with was something completely different from God and faith, but rather with a more intense and fulfilling life for all people here and now, and to continue from where he had to stop!

I hope I've at least explained somewhat plausibly how everything really corresponds to the facts.

In the following second part, you will now learn how Jesus' commitment can be applied to our time, because not much has changed in terms of the attitude toward women – it's just different!

Notes:

The image of Jesus presented here is certainly also based

(a) on the results of German Protestant research on Jesus over the past approximately 250 years, and

(b) on the results of research by critics of the church and opponents of religion, which have generally been very high-quality and scientific. I am thinking here, for example, of:

1. **Karlheinz Deschner: "The Forged Faith"** (about the stories of the gods), 1988/91
2. **Christian Lindtner: "Secrets About Jesus Christ"** ("The New Testament is largely a plagiarism from Buddhism"), 2003/2005
3. **Hyam Maccoby: "The Mythmaker"** (Paul, among other things, invented the resurrection and sacrificial death of Jesus; Maccoby believes that even the synoptic gospels, i.e., those according to Mark, Matthew, and Luke, come from Paul's 'school' or 'writing workshop'), 1986/2007
4. And something about the book **"Mafia" by Petra Reski** (2014): Mafias thus seem to be something like a cancerous tumor in civilized anonymous societies – and in my opinion, they must have existed in earlier societies in the same way. The reason there are no reports about this lies in the nature of the matter. Because that's exactly what's special about such "factions": they simply always "go along" unnoticed in societies.

The author is a graduate theologian (Catholic) and former vocational school religion teacher.

www.michael-preuschoff.de,
Email: hpreuschoff@gmx.de

Part 2: NOT EVERYTHING – NOT NOTHING!

Realistic review of the Fall of Sin story: Enjoyment of sexuality for young people – without the risk of girls sliding into prostitution (and not even into the gray area of prostitution)

by a former vocational school religion teacher.



High (sexual) morality based on the understanding of religion of the Königsberg philosopher Immanuel Kant in his book 'Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone'.

And in the appendix, an open letter to the Minister of Education of the state of NRW, Ms. Ina Brandes, regarding the extreme misogyny in school sex education. Instead, a concept for a 'philogynous sexual self-determination'!

'First, I take the following sentence as a principle that requires no proof: Everything that a person thinks they can do, beyond leading a good life, to be pleasing to God, is mere religious delusion and after-service to God.' (From the mentioned book, part 'The Philosophical Doctrine of Religion', Second Part, § 2).

For Kant, a rational sense of religion is therefore not some kind of 'religious delusion' or an 'after-service to God' (by which he means the typical religious fuss), but a 'good way of life.' For him, that is morality. So, what can we recommend to young people here? Kant doesn't get very specific. And during my active time as a religion teacher, and even afterward, I looked for what 'morality' might mean for young people, especially when it comes to dating. It has to be something really concrete and not just some hypocrisy that only looks moral — as is often the case with the pseudo-morality of shame. True morality can only come from the mind, that is, from attitude or reason. And I was really convinced by how girls were practically electrified by my idea of 'moon bathing' with 'Not everything – not nothing!' With this method, both genders can very well test, on the basis of high moral standards and without any problematic 'accomplished facts,' whether true love connects them and whether they really fit together.

So it's about an attractive and classy pre-marital concept, where any form of penetration is definitely out of the question. The trick is instead 'paradisiacal': for example, a girl can ask a boy, 'I imagine moonbathing with you would be wonderful, wouldn't you like that too?' Here, moonbathing means the liberating openness with each other, with a high use of reason and the freedom from fears, as described in this concept: maybe lying on a meadow on a warm night with nothing on but the moonlight, bathing in it—or something else along those lines. And both don't necessarily have to do everything possible together! It's also nice for a girl to have a protector during, say, a trip to the beach or an interesting journey, or maybe at some point to practice a paradisiacal sports massage, where the "special body parts" naturally remain taboo. Above all, such a desire also shows a willingness to overcome fears and an openness to really get to know oneself. And those are really the prerequisites for a happy lifelong partnership!

***

About the cover image: The Market Fountain in Varberg / Southern Sweden: "Bathing Youth" (Bror Marklund 1907 - 1977). I interpret the sculpture in the spirit of the great Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset: Young people who can interact with each other in such a paradisiacal and open way are not just casually playing with a ball—they even have the globe in their hands!"

Foreword: Why I am so engaged with "this topic"?

First, a little about me: I was a vocational school religion teacher west of Cologne – retired for over 20 years – and my concern has always been, and still is, genuine monogamy (so only one sexual partner in a lifetime), which is actually the basis of our Christian faith. And I think this teaching is by no means outdated or old-fashioned, because from what I've seen, young people basically want the same thing, if only they knew how to live it properly and, above all, how to get it started. And I think that especially now in my retirement, I've come across a concept that, based on my impressions so far, would likely appeal to most young people, maybe even very strongly: It's something that girls, who really want to be moral, seem to literally dream about. And the boys like it too!

But one step at a time!

Point 1. First: Why the pedagogy regarding sexual morality that I advocate looks so different from what is usually taught might be explained by what I recently read about the NATO exercise "Hedgehog 2025" in Estonia in the newspaper DIE WELT. In that exercise, a team of ten frontline-experienced drone pilots from the Ukrainian army managed to hold up an entire NATO brigade (so 2,000 - 8,000 soldiers). And just as the obviously quite good solution concept of the Ukrainian team grew "under combat conditions," my solution concept can be seen in the same way—it also grew "under combat conditions," only this time in the classroom with young people. And it should be understandable that I therefore came to a different concept than the usual theorists at the green table "far from the front," who have never stood as "frontline fighters," for example in a "real battle with a class." And after all, I also tried to always orient myself to the high ideals of the Christian-Jewish understanding of religion when it comes to morality, as we have known it for a few thousand years. Because this ancient morality is not wrong – the problem is just the pedagogy of this morality, and that is largely downright catastrophic and completely unprofessional!

Point 2. So what I came to through the "frontline experience," meaning also through closer conversations, indeed also in and after lessons (then at the desk) or on trips, where sometimes students came along as well:

In conversations, I was also interested in why the girls "started with it" or had started. For a long time, I believed that there were so-called Don Juan types, who, with a certain charm, manage to wrap girls around their fingers one by

one, and so on. And that this is the deepest reason for the "sexual confusion" that we find today. But this image began to falter more and more – not least some girls confessed to me that no one had seduced them, but that it was they themselves who wanted "it" and had expressly sought one for it. So are the girls instinct-driven with a tendency to immorality, to put it drastically? Or has the almost ubiquitous pornography seduced them into it, so is it to blame for the "moral decay"? However, I couldn't see anything here, because what girls in particular notice here is largely perceived by them as disgusting and has a rather deterrent effect on them.

In my experience, the girls are rather very aware of what they are doing and they are by no means primitive and instinct-driven or even unpredictable, as it sometimes seems to others. And it is also not a blind fate how they decide.

They actually see themselves in a big dilemma, namely in a really hard-to-solve bind – and they're not entirely wrong about that. They just want to find the right life partner for them. And everyone says that the first sexual partner is never really the right one anyway, and that the first time having sex is never really good – or only very rarely. So the problem for them is this: if they don't have any 'real experiences' with men, there's a big risk that they might blindly commit to a man and end up with someone who's basically a dud for them, or someone who just doesn't fit them at all – not just sexually, but overall. But if they try out several partners now, then there's the risk that they'll be seen as a slut – or even as a prostitute if there are too many. And true monogamy would be out the window, though they don't care about that anyway.

So that's the problem of the girls, because of course they don't want to be sluts or even prostitutes under any circumstances! But what else are they supposed to do in this predicament to find the right one? The only solution they see is: Because a woman can't do anything sensible here anyway, so: "Close your eyes and get through it!" And you have to start with it anyway, so why not when the opportunity presents itself? And depending on their predisposition or previous upbringing, they are sassier or more reserved, even when choosing the respective partner – very often it is only an occasional partner. And if it's one of them, then that's also well thought out: Because that's what everyone says, you don't have to look so closely anyway, because for the first time everything doesn't matter anyway. And above all, the other girls practice it that way too, so it's obviously normal and part of growing up and getting emancipated. You just have to get through it. And nowadays, it's even practically recommended in sex education classes. So it can't be that bad. You just have to be careful and use condoms. And eventually, a girl has to start anyway, so it basically doesn't matter with whom. Sooner or later, an opportunity will come up and someone will be found – and you just have to be emancipated enough to recognize and seize it.

But of course, none of this is really felt as ideal! And especially, the beginning

is often really not nice – when the girl lies there like a "piece of wood with a hole," and just lets everything happen to her, while he struggles with himself "doing it"… A lot of girls then really get fed up with 'that' at first. Often, what's left is also a traumatic experience – very often lasting a lifetime. But how to do it differently?

Point 3. I stumbled upon the solution of true monogamy more by chance during my travels, or sometimes on a whim.

Long after my active time as a teacher, I tried to catch a glimpse of the royal palace during a trip to Meknes in Morocco, so I wandered around the area along a huge clay wall. But I couldn't get a view of the palace. At least I passed by the university and saw two female students sitting on a bench. And, so to speak, the devil got me and I thought about 'hitting on them' – as an idea for my concept. And somewhat cheekily following the motto that they don't know me anyway and what could possibly happen to me, I went up to the two of them and introduced myself, saying that before my retirement I had been a Catholic or Christian religion teacher in Germany and that my most interested students had been Moroccan girls. And whether I could tell them what particularly interested those girls. Of course, I could, especially the one who was obviously wearing a hijab, that Moroccan hood-like "head covering." So I started by saying that my teaching goal was high morals, that sex should only be within marriage. And for that, I had once roughly calculated in my head what I had learned about why the girls start having sex. And I had noticed that everyone was incredibly afraid of nudity, even though there are "such beaches" with us where it's completely uncomplicated. And where no one would do anything to them. But they would never do that, because they would find it disgusting and immoral. However, they would definitely start sex of their own accord, sometimes even with boys they would never marry and who really didn't suit them - and where the relationship would soon end.

Obviously, the fear of nudity has no moral effect at all. For me, this means that the girls don't do exactly what could even be innocent paradisiacal fun, but what very often brings problems, which often never disappear from their lives, that's what they do. And there is no trace of a beautiful romance anyway. My goal now was that they really use their reason and behave the other way around and thus don't do the problematic – and do the unproblematic paradisiacal – that is, that they even have fun with nudity – of course, only where it's possible and where the other people also have a corresponding rational and moral attitude.

And the reaction, especially from the student with the hijab, was completely different than I had expected: I had expected that she would scold me for my "immorality" and that she would now know how her "Moroccan sisters" in

Germany even got corrupted in Christian religious education. But absolutely none of that! On the contrary, she seemed electrified; obviously, that was exactly what she had secretly wished for all along – and I had, so to speak, hit the black core of her soul. I had similar experiences later with a young waitress in a small guesthouse in Bali and especially with a high school graduate from northern Germany, whom I met on her world trip during a visit to the Franciscan Church in the capital of Peru, that is, in Lima, and with whom I had a longer conversation during a city tour that I had invited her to. And with this high school graduate, I got even closer to understanding what a woman should rather “do” instead of having sex before marriage.

And here I also talked for the first time about the idea of moon bathing, about how much more beautiful and classy a concept is if a girl asks a guy (instead of hitting on him for sex): “I imagine moon bathing with you would be wonderful, wouldn’t you like to do it too?” By moon bathing, I mean the freeing openness to each other with freedom from fears, as described in this concept: maybe lying in a warm night on a meadow with nothing on but the moonlight, just bathing in it together—or something else along those lines. But of course, both don’t have to do everything that’s possible with each other! It's also nice for a girl, for example, to have a protector on a beach visit or an interesting trip, or at some point to practice or experience a paradisiacal sports massage, where the 'special body parts' of course remain off-limits for touching – and definitely with mutual consent. Above all, such a wish shows a willingness to overcome fears and an openness to really get to know each other. Just think of all the things the two of them could do together!

Point 4: The motto of good advertising is: 'Never against something – always for something!' And this motto applies here too, if high morals really are supposed to work!

My Münster professor Wilhelm Heinen (1909 – 1986) put forward the interesting idea that a person needs some basic family figures for healthy development in youth, and these are the father and mother, grandparents, and siblings, that is, a brother and sister. And when it comes to a later partnership, it can only be successful if they have successfully experienced a sibling relationship. Only then are they free for the next relationship, that is, for a partnership with a partner of the opposite sex. And the problem today is that young people don’t have siblings, so at first they end up looking for a sister in a man of the opposite sex – and a brother in a girl. But because young people aren’t aware of this – of what they actually first needed – they end up, by accident, marrying their sister or brother, or rather the person who should have been their sister or brother. And that is then the problem: that so many relationships end in divorce – people just married the wrong basic type.

And how do you notice that someone is the wrong basic type?

My thesis here is: if in a romantic relationship the female partner just can't reach orgasm, could it be connected to being with the wrong basic type? Because in a sibling-like relationship, orgasm normally doesn't happen – that only happens in a real love relationship with a more unfamiliar partner. And so that would be the deepest reason why two-thirds of all women never reach orgasm. Of course, this love relationship also has to be set up properly…

And here, there's no point in always just condemning and demonizing all blackmail, seductions, and manipulations regarding how young people start their sexual relationships, because if we only focus on preventing the negative, in real life one negative just gets replaced by another negative we weren't prepared for, and in the end nothing really changes over time, so everything basically stays the same!

So young people definitely need to learn what they should be doing to have a positive impact! And it seems as though nature has equipped us precisely for such a test! For all the nerve cells responsible for orgasm in women are located on the surface of their genitals; in other words, if an orgasm does not occur without penetration, it will not occur with penetration either. To test for orgasm – and that is what really matters – it is therefore sheer stupidity on the part of a girl (or simply the result of utterly despicable manipulation) to allow penetration or even to want it….

Yes, penetration is even likely to be extremely unfavorable for the experience of orgasm, especially when it comes to the "first time"!

Let's imagine how this first time is going in general so far, even if she had taken the initiative for it. So she lies down (like a piece of wood with a hole) and lets everything go over her more or less passively, what else is she supposed to do? And he then rides around on her and struggles for "one". Her attitude is a mixture of fear and apathy - and in any case not of freedom from fear and letting herself fall, which is actually the basic condition for her orgasm par excellence - and in the process she is supposed to get an orgasm? Never, never. Everything is going wrong here, so to speak! And once it has started really wrong, then this is by no means a good introduction to the beautiful experience of orgasm in later life ...

And here is a quick note: What is orgasm anyway?

First of all, it has nothing to do with the twitching and moaning that we sometimes know from films, the real orgasm, on the other hand, is something so personal and private that it is probably hardly possible or even impossible to film someone doing it. To make a long story short: It is comparable to sneezing, so it is something like a shock of the whole person and thus something completely different and then also something like a liberation. You can also compare it to an earthquake. And so you can explain the orgasm to children –

in a suitable morality lesson.

And it doesn't happen to everyone, it requires something like a kindred spirit.

And how is it supposed to do it better – in concrete terms?

Yes, if it gets really "hot" for both of them and they can no longer "hold" each other, then according to the motto "not everything - not nothing": So he at the bottom and she at the top with her legs crossed, so that she keeps the reins in her hand and so she also practices emancipation here, but a real one, i.e. one that also has to do with wisdom of life! And if she feels comfortable and itches "downstairs" and she also moves to intensify the contact, then he will also find it great! Because it is a wonderful togetherness when both are intertwined with full skin contact and their increased feeling of pleasure is also transferred to him. And if his "masculine" is gently "squeezed" between her body and his body and is "stimulated" by her movements, this is certainly much nicer with him than when he rides wildly on her, so to speak, without any beautiful harmonious skin contact! This is how the irritation happens for him, which is not possible at all during intercourse, at least with a normal woman, because she has no muscles in her vagina with whose play she can bring him to orgasm!

And that should be so fulfilling for both of them that they can easily do without penetration for the time being. The famous Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset is of the opinion in his book "On Love" that a truly fulfilling sexual intercourse also includes that it can also materialize, that is, that a child can be conceived or at least could be conceived with him. And such sexual intercourse still has time! But be careful: Both should only practice this togetherness if they are ready for a really beautiful relationship, if it comes to a real orgasm for them as well.

A great advantage of this "procedure" is also that it is not unsophisticated and dishonorable, if "she" also expresses the desire to do so, because from the real morality only the intimate intercourse is problematic, only for that there are these ugly and contemptuous words ....

And if he does not want such a thing and thus insists on penetration, hands off him! Because he is not interested in love, but he wants to get his partner down and rule!

And it even seems as if nature explicitly intended such a sort of “preliminary procedure” so that young people can figure out who really fits with whom. For that reason, it has placed a woman’s vagina between her strongest muscles, so that nothing can penetrate against her express will. Of course, the will can be broken, either through force or manipulation. Against force, the main help is long beforehand training in self-defense, and if there was none, then in the situation itself there is still the possibility to hit him on his “male” part with your hand or even a fist, or grab it to bend it, because then he hears angels singing and immediately loses interest. But please only do such a thing with the utmost caution and only in extreme emergency, because otherwise he could take “her” to court

for bodily harm. (And please have a word with him beforehand – ideally, let him read this text so he knows what's in store for him if he doesn't behave himself!) And education in life wisdom helps against manipulation. But for that, of course, the right educators need to be found, who also have genuine interest in young people!

But is it not easily possible, whether in the end 'everything' might not happen anyway? I think that reasonable male partners have just as much interest in keeping things that way, because they want to love a partner, not use her – and not do something to her that could harm her. Only, the two of them need to talk to each other. See also the beautiful story of the Chinese couple in Part 1, Point 3!

And what about the fear of possible pain during defloration? No problem! Firstly, such pain is actually quite rare anyway – and secondly: If the orgasm works, then such pain is the ultimate kick anyway!

(Note: In the book "The Patriarchy", the anthropologist and sex researcher Ernest Borneman <1915 – 1995> sees a connection between sexual behavior and social conditions in general. If he is correct, this could mean that a real emancipation of women in sexual behavior also changes social conditions in general – in the direction of real full emancipation of women. This would also mean that linguistic genderism in particular is largely superfluous. And I think Borneman is right! In any case, a real emancipation of a girl in sexual behavior should not harm anyone! And if I am so concretely clear here how both can be together without "penetration", this is also due to my experience as a teacher: If I'm not being clear enough, then young people won't even get their mouths watering to want to experience something like this. Yes, especially the girls really have to develop a fear of missing out, namely the orgasm – for life. Such a fear should actually be the strongest driving force for a behavior change! Because you can definitely do something about this fear!)

And if all that doesn't help and you realize that you just don't fit together, then both can always start over with a new partner.

And especially with this Northern German high school graduate, whom I could tell more about because we were together longer, it was always the same – it felt to me as if I had taken a heavy burden off her soul, yes, as if I had practically freed her from a great distress.

The young ladies all obviously found that very good, as I imagined the practice of high morality, which, by the way, also corresponds to our Christian religion – if you don't get carried away and exaggerate the moral rules.

Of course, I wondered what I had done differently here than in my religious studies classes back when I was an active teacher? Because there, my ideas certainly didn't meet with much approval – unlike here with my brief travel acquaintances. It must have been that I was speaking here with girls who wan-ted to live according to the high morality they had somewhere in their heads, but who also

saw the problems of how they could find the right partner. In principle, these were the same problems as those of my former students with the dilemma – only I must have been more concrete here, I offered something like a concrete concept that they could act on, what I had imagined to them. And at that time in school, I wasn't really there yet, I was still stuck in my thoughts – I simply hadn't had any positive experiences with a corresponding pedagogy and was therefore probably too reserved and didn't express myself clearly. So the young people often didn't really know what I actually wanted. And I also hadn't quite figured out yet how they should do it positively.

But it was already right that I had seen the opportunity that exists in a lesson as it's given in school. Because what would a young person gain if they only learn all this from their parents and therefore want to live by a high moral standard while others don't? Incidentally, Immanuel Kant sees it that way too – in his book that's always mentioned here!

And if all young people experience that, so that it becomes a general mindset, then the positive concept would also have the potential for great "events"!

Point 5: On the other hand, the previous concepts of sexual morality only create meaningless fears – and in the end, everything still happens anyway!

But first: at least the older among us still remember what sexual education looked like in earlier times: Back then, it was considered a sin to violate modesty, children weren't allowed to know more. And anyone who broke the moral rules about what children were allowed to know committed a serious sin and faced eternal damnation in hell after death, or at least a more or less long purgatory, unless they managed to repent and confess their sins in time. So nudity got an unfairly immoral reputation it didn't deserve at all. And when young people eventually learned about sex, they might have realized what sin was really about, but nudity kept its immoral reputation..Yes, there was a real fear of her, because the implicit assumption was that there is an automatic connection that nudity plus man and woman automatically means sex – and if you don't want that, you must avoid nudity. And this also applied to those who wanted to be moral. Yet every sauna or nudist beach visitor knows that such an automatic connection doesn't exist at all – but you first have to have that kind of experience.

Truly a great pedagogy! And the tense, fear-laden abstinence taught here even caused real harm – with the "purity culture" – see online – it's still similar today!

And our theologians have since recognized that such pedagogy is probably not right, especially because it induces fear of a punishing God – and this fear would contradict a loving God and could even lead people to turn away from God. And the church folks definitely didn't want that – for whatever reasons, not least because God is also their business model.

So away with anything that could cause fear! And since one could only imagine effective sexual morality education through fear-mongering, they consequently threw the baby out with the bathwater and tossed out all sexual morality education altogether. That means they don't do any sexual morality education at all and just let everything happen – and this total surrender is then euphemistically justified by saying that young people also have a right to 'sexual self-determination,' and therefore, from a scientific perspective, there's no need to teach anything about sexual morality. And for those who can't deal with it, there's the loving and merciful God. And the task of parents and also of church people is now to behave toward the young ones who have difficulties with this like this merciful and loving God.

And so that would be the implementation of our Christian faith in practice today.

Point 6: Advantages of the concept "Plausible and attractive alternatives" and the practice

After all, our traditional concept that one "is not allowed to have anything in the direction of sexuality" before marriage, that is, not even enjoy paradisiacal innocent nudity, was already criticized by Saint Thomas More in his little book "Utopia": Among the Utopians, there is no divorce, so marriages have to be arranged in such a way that they really last. Thus the Utopians wonder, for example, that among other peoples, people marry each other without having properly seen each other beforehand, when even for intellectual people it should not be ignored whether they also – purely outwardly – really. Therefore, among the Utopians they are presented naked to each other in the presence of a venerable person: *"If there <among the other peoples> so they said, someone buys a colt, which is only a few pieces of money, he is so cautious that, in spite of the almost complete nakedness of the animal, he does not decide to buy until the saddle and all the riding blankets have been removed; for under these covers there might be some defective spot hidden. But when it comes to choosing a wife, a matter that results in pleasure or disgust for life, one goes about it with such carelessness that one hardly judges the whole woman by a hand's breadth of her body. One looks at nothing more than the face – the rest of the body is covered by clothing – and so one binds oneself to the woman and thereby exposes oneself to the great danger that the marriage bond will not have a real hold if something causes offence later on."*

Well, kind of funny – but doesn't that really hit the problem with sexual morality as the Church still imagines and teaches it today, and as do the devoutly self-righteous educators? Isn't what they preach completely out of touch with reality and therefore can't really work well for everyone! Of course: with a lot of effort maybe anything can work, but that certainly doesn't make it an elegant solution. But all of this is so completely irrelevant to the church authorities and theologians whether it works or not! I've written to several of them, and at least they see

absolutely no need for action. So I'm trying to do it differently, because going completely naked isn't an option either; you need a whole alternative concept and I think the one I've come up with after a lot of trial and error would work very well. And well-meaning young people would get used to it very quickly too.

Point 7: Even during my active time as a teacher, I already had positive experiences with students (and of course also with female students).

And here's something else, why I keep going even in retirement:

So, the Bishop of Aachen revoked my teaching license because I no longer adhere to the church's dogmas. And since I was an employee of the state of NRW, I still had to be employed and was given all sorts of tasks at the school for which I seemed suitable. So I realized that students were puzzled about why I was no longer allowed to teach religion – and as an explanation, they came up with the idea that it might be some 'MeToo problem' I had. So I went to the boss: 'Look, this is what comes out of it now, what people are saying about me!' And the boss, back then Dr. Wolff, behaved very properly and went with me immediately to the relevant class and explained to the young people the reason why I would not believe in the church's dogmas and therefore would not teach them – and that belief was, after all, the requirement for a Catholic religion teacher. Well, a student said, what if 'we want him' then? To which the boss replied why that would not work either; I simply had to represent the Catholic teaching. Then another student stood up: 'If I see it this way, we actually have four groups here in the class: the Catholics, the Protestants, the Baptists, and the Muslims. Well, the Catholics can leave the room, but for the rest of us, he can continue teaching!' At that point, the boss was stunned, who had presumably always thought that my teaching wasn't reaching the young people, and I was also stunned because I had just had a lot of arguments with the young people in this class. But maybe these arguments weren't because I was wrong, just that I hadn't yet found the right way to teach?

At least now I clearly knew that my lessons were well received by the young people, that they actually wanted them, and so I kept tinkering with them, and now I try to make my texts approachable for others so that they can apply them in practice. Am I succeeding now?

Point 8: An article in the newspaper DIE WELT about the changing sexual lives of young Germans

Somehow this article also confirms my impression that young people are by no means unwilling to have a high sexual moral, but they just want reasonable arguments! You just have to read 'between the lines' in the article!

The Changing Sex Life of Young Germans (DIE WELT, Jan 23, 2026) A study

notes noticeable changes in the timing of first experiences with sex and kissing
by UMA SOSTMANN

“Young people today generally take more time and make conscious decisions when it comes to sexuality”: This is how Mechthild Paul, deputy head of the Federal Institute for Public Health, summarizes the main finding of the new youth sexuality study. **She says this is no coincidence but can be traced back to qualitative education**.

It is the tenth such representative survey conducted by the former Federal Center for Health Education. In the survey, 14- to 17-year-olds are defined as “adolescents” and 18- to 25-year-olds as “young adults.” Compared to the previous study from 2019, currently only 18 percent of 14- to 18-year-olds report that they have already had sex. This corresponds to a decrease of ten percentage points. A similar trend can also be observed in the other age groups surveyed.

The group of 17- to 20-year-olds is particularly affected: while in 2019, 61 percent of 17-year-olds were sexually active, today it is only 40 percent. About half of the teenagers (51 percent) and young adults (53 percent) cite the lack of a suitable partner as the reason. **In addition, 41 percent of teenagers say they consider themselves "too young" for sexual activity – and 37 percent describe themselves as "too shy."** Multiple answers were possible. Psychologist Sara Scharmanski, a speaker at the Federal Institute, explains possible reasons for increasingly later sexual experiences like this: 'One reason is definitely a changed leisure and communication behavior. Young people often lack opportunities to meet partners. Leisure time is very structured, very scheduled, and there’s also a changed need for health and safety—for example, risky behaviors like alcohol consumption have clearly decreased. I don’t think Corona is the sole cause; rather, it has functioned as a kind of catalyst for this development.'

A majority of teenagers and young adults report that their first sexual partner was someone they were in a steady relationship with. 65 percent of female and 53 percent of male respondents say so (2019: 64 and 50 percent, respectively). A quarter of the female respondents and 31 percent of the male respondents were, according to their own statements, 'well acquainted' with their first sexual partner (2019: 27 and 30 percent respectively) ... (The red highlighting and the 'greasing' are mine. Anyone who wants the full text, please get in touch!)

Notes: What does 'too young' and 'too shy' even mean here? **The statisticians and even the editors clearly can't imagine that young people might still have something like a healthy sense of morality.** Well-informed girls in particular do have a moral sense and, for instance, today don't want to be cheap and dumb 'fuck objects.' And from my experience, young people are by no means fundamentally prudish or body-shaming: they would be open to enjoying nudity, for example, if one just talked to them reasonably (in the sense of true emancipation)! Wouldn't that be a nice task for educators who really want to be moral?

APPENDIX: Pedagogy of High Sexual Morality for Children of Elementary School Age

But how can one actually conduct such lessons with children, and then in a way that's truly interesting for them and ultimately effective? And you just have to start with children! After all, when you're tending to plants, you start with the buds if you want to end up with beautiful flowers and good fruit!

And the problem isn't that the moral teachings of our religion are wrong or were wrong; it's the pedagogy that's just catastrophic! So how can we have sensible pedagogy?

In my experience, I stumbled upon a really exciting opening out of a situation that was, so to speak, completely unpredictable—so there was no long deliberation involved. And obviously, this opening worked perfectly! I didn't just start with any random story, but with the oldest crime story, at least one that is generally known and even appears in the Bible. And crime stories always go over well, even with kids.

It's the story of the beautiful Susanna from the appendix of the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament. Yes, this story (please take a moment to read it, at least if you don't already know it—either in the Bible or online!) is certainly better suited for children than the story of the sinner in the Gospel of John. Because this story much more accurately reflects the situation of young people who still have their whole lives ahead of them—and who are supposed to get an overview of how getting into "immorality" can go – even if that was more than two thousand years ago. And a sensible overview is, after all, the be-all and end-all of sensible life wisdom!

So: With a mother from my wider circle of acquaintances, it was once again about the idea that children supposedly aren't interested in "these topics" at all, because they're not their world. Since her 10-year-old daughter was just in the middle of it and was obviously following our conversation with interest, I took the opportunity to show how well it actually works, it's just about having the right introduction: And since the mother agreed, I told the girl the detective story of the beautiful Susanna (and because I had often read it aloud in class, I could almost recite it from memory). Of course, I also got specific, for example about what was meant by 'be willing to us,' so the girl also understood what it was about. And thanks to sex education at school, the girl understood everything.

The 'point' in my concept wasn't really about Susanna's steadfastness and trust in God, like religious theologians in such classes usually like to do—that wasn't a topic for me at all—but rather the men's criminality and the gullibility and blindness of those around them, who took the false testimonies of the two elders at face value and didn't believe Susanna's claims of innocence.

And the girl's comment when I was done: "But there I have Lucky that I didn't

live back then." And I to the mother: "Look, your daughter understood perfectly what it's all about and she reacted completely normally and ethically benevolently – unlike many religiously oriented adults in particular, who pretend not to know what it's about. In any case, they don't think such a story is suitable for children, at least in my experience – and yet it is a fantastic introduction to the "topic". The reason for this refusal is possibly that they don't really want young girls to become really wise in dealing with their sexuality and to change something in this world for the better. And then they come up with some rationalizations that the children should have no idea about such brutal events, because it would destroy their innocent childhood, etc. I can only say what a stupid romance it is, that children should grow up with all kinds of untruths and not know how to arrange their lives sensibly and wisely.

Yes, this story can be read aloud in an exciting way, preferably of course in a community lesson (as Immanuel Kant also found it useful). There can also be nice lively conversations. So "religious people can now also see sex education in a positive way, because the young people know what it's all about! And if children haven't really understood that, then you can just help them understand everything. One can also come to the conclusion that the two alleged witnesses were ultimately concerned with "recruiting" a woman for prostitution, i.e. "renting" her to many men for sex like one thing and thus earning money. And if beautiful Susanna had gone along with it, she would have been done for with her family, because no one back then in that area would have wanted to admit how she was being blackmailed.

Also, this story is really a meaningful way to get into the situation today, showing that so much hasn’t actually changed. It’s just a little different. Back then, girls were taught to be scared about everything related to sexuality, like that they should cover their bodies modestly with veils and not be provocative in front of men, and so on. But in the end, these fears didn’t help at all, because everything turned out completely differently anyway! And actually, Susanna hadn’t really violated that moral sense of shame, even though she was naked, because how could she have expected that two men had broken into her private garden and were hiding behind bushes? The fears that girls and women were taught back then were ultimately completely pointless for her.

And that's how it is today with the fears that girls in particular are taught that they have to cover their "special female parts". On the other hand, they are persuaded – by whoever – that sexual intercourse is part of maturing, i.e. growing up. So they are not allowed to have the harmless fun of being naked, of course where nudity would not be a problem at all. And when they start having sex, the typical moralizers shrug their shoulders and say that this is part of a girl's self-determination, against which nothing should be done today. Of course, the fact that reasonable self-determination also includes the choice of an attractive alternative, which had been stubbornly denied to the young people, does

not occur to the typical pedagogues who are hostile to the body (and spirit).

So today, it's not about blackmail like back then, but more about manipulating a fake sense of morality and making the girls supposedly want it themselves, supposedly out of their own self-determination.

To set things straight here, school lessons or religious education would take care of that, and for putting it into practice, the family—especially the fathers! That means there'd have to be a sort of triangle relationship: young people – family – church/school. If that's not a model for the future—even for the church!

And there's also a reason why you need to start a reasonable moral concept in pedagogy with very young people. Because if you only start with older young people, you have to expect that at least some have already started "it"—and then, if you rave to them about how nice it is "without," you're just unnecessarily weighing down their hearts.

In any case, the focus of education should not be on the fear of God, that young people might do something wrong ('sin'), but rather on a genuine joy in high moral standards – as these could very well be in line with God's wishes. (At this point, the question of whether He actually exists doesn't really matter anymore.) And then the problem of 'sinning' will probably take care of itself!

And a bit about me:

My father was a journalist at the most important newspaper of Catholic Ermland in East Prussia, and after its 'dismantling' by the National Socialists, he worked for various press outlets in the Third Reich, and for a short time, he was also a soldier in the Wehrmacht. After the end of the war, he spent half a year briefly in Russian captivity. Later, he was a long-time director of studies in Cologne. My mother worked in wholesale trade in Breslau until her marriage.

I myself (born Dec 1941) extended my compulsory military service to two years after graduating from the Humboldtgymnasium in Cologne and then, after two military exercises, became a reserve first lieutenant.

After training and working as an industrial clerk, I studied Catholic theology at the Jesuit College of St. Georgen in Frankfurt/Main and at the theological faculties of the Universities of Innsbruck and Münster, graduating as a Diplomtheologe.

In the process, I already experienced that we actually know nothing about the real Jesus and that what we do know about him is merely the faith of the early Christian community.

For me, that was of course very unsatisfying: So we were proclaiming a Jesus who isn't even the real one, and we knew it. I can't say that I actively searched for the real Jesus; I rather stumbled upon the probably real story of this Jesus of Nazareth – mostly through conversations with friends, acquaintances, and even

complete strangers who gave me insightful tips from their own experiences, and of course also from various literature. That naturally also influenced my religious education teaching.

The result was that I unfortunately had to give up my job as a vocational school religion teacher in the Erft district and eventually at the vocational college - Commercial Schools in Düren in 2002, because the Bishop of Aachen, Heinrich Mussinghoff, revoked my teaching license – because I wouldn't believe in the church's dogmas and therefore wouldn't teach them either.

I think it's understandable that I did not accept this revocation of my teaching license and still do not accept it today, because I also felt and still feel theologically in the right. After all, even during my studies, I received support from some professors. And so I kept working on the idea of the Jewish Jesus, who really is more important than all these quite irrational dogmas that mostly appeared in the first centuries, and thanks to further literature that wasn't available during my active time as a teacher, I have, in my opinion, reached good and plausible results. Judge for yourself!

Pentecost 2026 M.P.

And here is an open letter to the Minister of Education of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany), Ms. Ina Brandes,

regarding the extreme misogyny and contempt for women in school sex education. Instead, a concept for a 'Philogynous sexual self-determination'!

Dear Minister Brandes!

Please take a look at page 10 in the attached article from WELT, a newspaper that isn't usually considered misogynistic or contemptuous towards women. And misogyny and contempt for women really shouldn't have any place in our society – unfortunately, however, that's exactly the case, and how! You just have to take a good look!

So what else does it mean when this WELT article states as a reason why girls aren't starting to have sex that they feel too young and too shy? That the real reason is probably that they have a natural moral sense and that having this sex would go against that moral sense (they don't want to be sluts or dumb, cheap sex objects) is something that the statisticians and editors obviously can't even imagine. That is, they have an attitude that girls are not capable of high morality at all – because they are too stupid and too instinct-driven, so they are denied any ability for such morality from the outset **– it doesn't get much more misogynistic than that!** And that seems to be not only the attitude of the WELT, but at the moment a general attitude in our culture towards girls. And with such an attitude, of course, it is not worth thinking about concepts and developing them on how things can be done differently – because you know from the outset that it doesn't help with the "stupid and instinct-driven girls" anyway. So today in sex

education classes they only learn how to use pills and condoms in order not to get pregnant and not to become infected with sexually transmitted diseases – and religion just lets everything happen anyway and merely proclaims God's forgiveness and mercy to those who can't cope with the consequences of their destiny-given impulses. Truly, a great pedagogy, how one can turn the lack of ability in what concerns reasonable pedagogy into a positive educational goal!

Can you imagine how I would love to be a teacher today with this concept – for 10–15 year olds? Kids who really shake things up, given the mindset of adults and especially today's sex educators (isn't today's sex education from the Reds and Greens?). Isn't the background pure institutionalized contempt for women (or better, 'girls') – and so no one tries to put the natural moral sense of girls on a reasonable basis with an appealing concept, so that they would also be happy to live by it and could even influence the male world – and ultimately be able to really turn our world for the better?

I'm including the text showing how it can be different! In this text, an alternative is also described for how young people can do it better. And such an alternative is absolutely necessary if the concept is to be attractive in practice and actually work!

By the way, I haven't been quite so unsuccessful so far: After her failed marriage, a former (Turkish) student remembered me how I wanted to build morality in interpersonal relationships on reason and not on some religion with the hostilities to the body typical of religions, and that she doesn't want her daughter (13) to be just as religiously screwed up as she was – and that we do something together with the daughter so that she can see how beautiful a morality is whose basis is reason.

And wouldn't it be the task of a minister of education who belongs to a party that calls itself Christian and who nevertheless has influence on the curricula in schools to change them – because the Christian churches can't do it because they are stuck in their god myth dogmas and in their business model of proclaiming God's forgiveness and mercy?

Could you perhaps organize a forum where I can answer questions? (I do want the participants to know this text – and for it to then turn into a 'question and answer' session.)

In any case, I think we need to do something – and urgently! Of course, I am also trying elsewhere, with other parties, yes even the AfD <so far no one has responded> – but I don't want to bypass the CDU. Because the CDU should really be the societal force dealing with this!

I would be very happy to receive a reply. Best regards, MP

www.michael-preuschoff.de / e-Mail: hpreuschoff@gmx.de

Table of Contents

Part 1: ONE AGAINST THE UNDERWORLD AND THE PRIEST MAFIA

Introduction: The New Testament is a syncretism ("mix of beliefs") from stories of various ancient god religions 2
Point 1: WHO wrote the Gospels that attribute such god stories to Jesus? 3
Point 2: Jesus' fight against the Jewish mafia that terrorized their fellow humans in antiquity. 4
Point 3: But we shouldn't celebrate too soon! Today, everything is basically the same, only the mafia's strategy now works not with extortion, but with manipulation! 10
Point 4: Was Paul also part of this mafia, and is the religion to which he at least laid the foundation a mafia product? 14
Point 5: Who was the real Jesus? And how did the Gospels come about? Here's a combined biography. 18

Part 2: NOT EVERYTHING – NOT NOTHING! 22

Foreword: Why I am so committed to "this topic" 24
Point 1. First: Why the pedagogy on sexual morality that I support looks so different from the one usually taught 24
Point 2. What I have come to through "frontline experience," that is, also through closer conversations, certainly also during and after lessons (then at the desk) or on trips, where sometimes students also came along 24
Point 3. I stumbled upon the solution to true monogamy more by chance during my travels, or sometimes just on a whim. 26
Point 4: The motto of good advertising is: "Never against something – always just for something!" And this motto applies here as well if high morality is really supposed to work! 27
Point 5: On the other hand, the previous concepts of sexual morality only bring pointless fears – and in the end, everything still happens! 31
Point 6: Advantages of the concept 'Plausible and Attractive Alternatives' and the practice 32
Point 7: Even during my active teaching career, I already had positive experiences with students (and of course also with female students) 33
Point 8: An article in the newspaper DIE WELT about the changing sexual life of young Germans 33
APPENDIX: Pedagogy of a high sexual morality for children of primary school age 35
And something about me 37
And here's also an Open Letter to the Minister of Education of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany), Ms. Ina Brandes 38

From what I came across, Jesus was not a founder of a religion and had nothing to do with belief in God. What he was concerned with is much more relevant today. He had stumbled upon criminal structures that involved government circles. In this regard, he was something like an investigative journalist, as we would say today. And he wanted to change something. Unfortunately, he had to share the fate of some of today's particularly brave investigative journalists: he was also killed.

Representing many today, here are two mentioned:

Ján Kuciak (* May 17, 1990 in Štiavnik; † February 21, 2018 in Veľká Mača) was a Slovak journalist who was murdered in February 2018 along with his fiancée Martina Kušnírová. His death led to the uncovering of a series of links between Slovak politicians and criminal businessmen as well as organized crime. The nationwide protests that followed resulted in a political and social crisis and led to the resignation of the Prime Minister, the Minister of the Interior, and the police chief.

and

Jamal Ahmad Khashoggi (English transcription; German transcription: Dschamal Ahmad Chaschuqdschi; Arabic جمال أحمد خاشقجي Dschamāl Ahmad Chāschuqdschī, DMG Ǧamāl Aḥmad Ḫāšuqǧī, * October 13, 1958 in Medina; † October 2, 2018 in Istanbul) was a Saudi Arabian journalist. He was the director of the Saudi daily newspaper Al-Watan and a media advisor to the Saudi prince Turki ibn Faisal. Khashoggi became a critic of the Saudi crown prince Mohammed bin Salman, who effectively rules the kingdom. From the summer of 2017, he lived in the U.S. and was, among other things, a columnist for the Washington Post. In his writings, he openly criticized the Saudi government.

The concept is based on a historical-religious interpretation of the Adam and Eve story in the Old Testament of the Bible: It’s not about the absurd speculation of original sin, but about the ideal of a paradisiacal approach to sexuality, as the authors of this story probably had in mind:

- strict monogamy, meaning only one sexual partner in life (except in the case of widowhood)

- the woman's right to orgasm

- intelligent handling of nudity

So this is the most likely origin of the Jewish religion – and behind it lies probably the most explosive dynamite.

Unfortunately, the Bible in the Adam and Eve story only reports how this ideal initially failed in everyday practice.

Presumably, the real Jesus wanted to realize this ideal in his time. But he was prevented from doing so.

Now, this is about a concept of how this ideal can definitely succeed today! The only problem is that theologians and educators also have to want it – young people would want it anyway, if only they knew about it!

And just so much in advance: It's no longer about the usual, often very body-hostile substitute morality and, after all, only the purely superficial seeming morality of shame, but about a genuine morality arising from reason (or from the spirit, that is).

www.michael-preuschoff.de