

Plausible and attractive alternatives

that are also more humane and coherent (i.e. also more scientifically correct) than many of the established habits of the past.

TOPIC 1: HIGH SEXUAL MORALS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: **Those who forbid everything will only achieve that 'everything' is done in the end!**

THEREFORE: A plea for a middle way in sexual morality for young people! And we can certainly refer to the commitment of the real Jesus here! For he was in any case completely different from the one in the Bible and the one proclaimed by the churches. Just to mention one thing: the story of the Fall, i.e. the story of Adam and Eve, is about punishment with the curse of shame. And if it is true that Jesus saw himself as the second Adam, then that would also mean that he was concerned with overcoming this curse – naturally with people behaving appropriately in terms of sexual morality, according to the motto: 'Not everything and not nothing!' And this motto gives rise to many interesting and – I believe – very attractive and yet very 'childlike, innocent possibilities'!

TOPIC 2: RELIGION AND THE CHURCH: **Jesus for everyone: For Christians, for Muslims, for Jews, and also for people who reject all religions and churches.**

Virtually all theologians today, at least those in German-speaking countries, agree that the authors of the Gospels were not disciples of Jesus, that the authors' names were therefore invented by the real authors, who are unknown (i.e., anonymous). And so on...

But what was really going on 2000 years ago? The truth is probably that such stories regarding sexual abuse don't just exist today, but that they have always existed, and how! And through his friendship with prostitutes, Jesus himself had witnessed this in his time – and publicly campaigned against it. Naturally, the criminals didn't like that at all and made sure he was eliminated.

HORUS	5,000 YEARS AGO	BORN OF A VIRGIN STAR IN THE EAST WALKED ON WATER HEALED THE SICK RESTORED SIGHT CRUCIFIED DEAD FOR 3 DAYS RESURRECTED		
MITHRA	3,200 YEARS AGO	BORN OF A VIRGIN BORN ON DECEMBER 25 STAR IN THE EAST HAD 12 DISCIPLES PERFORMED MIRACLES DEAD FOR 3 DAYS RESURRECTED		
KRISHNA	2,900 YEARS AGO	BORN OF A VIRGIN STAR IN THE EAST PERFORMED MIRACLES CALLED "SON OF GOD" SON OF A CARPENTER RESURRECTED		
DIONYSUS	2,500 YEARS AGO	BORN OF A VIRGIN BORN ON DECEMBER 25 TRAVELING TEACHER TURNED WATER INTO WINE CALLED "HOLY CHILD"		
JESUS CHRIST	2,000 YEARS AGO			
			ALL OF THE ABOVE	

Unfortunately, the text is somewhat illegible, probably from being copied so many times, so here it is a little clearer: So

HORUS 5000 years ago:

- # born of a virgin
- # star of the east
- # walked on water
- # healed the sick
- # made the blind see
- # was crucified
- # was dead for three days
- # rose from the dead

and similarly with MITHRAS 3200 years ago

KRISHNA 2900 years ago

DIONYSUS 2500 years ago, from Iran, from India, from Greece

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

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

This list, which I received from an American friend, does not even mention that Jesus' Last Supper with bread and wine with his disciples did not take

place at all, but is a borrowing from the cult of Mithras. There, too, there was a farewell meal with bread and wine. Isn't all this clear confirmation that the biography of Jesus, as we know it from the Bible, is a deliberate and very artificial fabrication? And why and by whom?

And no true follower of a great revered master would invent such stories about him – not today, and not in the past either! There is certainly no difference in mentality on this point! True followers, and there must have been many of them, especially in Jesus' case, given his public speeches, who also began to continue in his spirit after his death, would try much harder to highlight the special qualities of their master and to pass them on to posterity as well and as plausibly as possible, and above all without such stories, which sound very much like fairy tales.

So who else could be responsible for such 'fabrications'?

The only ones who could have made such falsifications are surely his opponents – and Jesus had had enough of them! So in Jesus' case, it was probably the same people who had put him on the cross. After his death, they realised that the commitment of the man who had been murdered in a miscarriage of justice was far from over. And since there were too many of these followers, whom the opponents did not even know and therefore could not locate and eliminate, it was both the most sophisticated and the most perfidious thing for them to do to falsify the real biography of Jesus by circulating a supposedly 'true story' about this Jesus – namely, the one with the stories of the gods. And that they finally wrote texts about it. So the Gospels etc. are the work of Jesus' opponents?!

The main matador here was probably Paul, the <former> opponent of Jesus' followers, to whom, of course, the risen Jesus had never appeared on the road to Damascus to give him any private revelations. Thus, Paul had never been converted. All of this is pure fiction. Paul had always remained an opponent of Jesus and his followers and had only changed his tactics in order to effectively combat Jesus's commitment. He had now turned the political revolutionary Jesus into the unrecognised Messiah (= 'Christ') of the Jews, etc., and invented a new religion that the real Jesus certainly did not want. Somehow he also managed to 'suck up' to Jesus' followers and make himself an apostle of Jesus. And when we consider that Jesus was crucified around 30 or 31 AD and that Paul's alleged Damascus event took place in 31 or 32 AD (according to Wikipedia), this means that the false stories about Jesus began to circulate almost immediately after his death, so that they are (at least so far) inseparably linked to the stories about Jesus. The followers of the real Jesus were initially extremely sceptical, but at some point they gave in, possibly because they

were blackmailed. In any case, Paul and other opponents of Jesus had completely distorted Jesus' commitment and thus completely defused it.

So Jesus was not the Son of God? Definitely not! For what is meant by 'Son of God'? 'Son of God' is clearly an invention of ancient mythologies, among other things. The Egyptian pharaoh, for example, was considered the 'Son of God.' And these mythologies were transferred to Jesus. That was the most skilful move by his opponents, to turn him into an unreal cult object and devalue his revolutionary commitment here and now.

TOPIC 3: The most plausible and conclusive reason for the brutal judicial murder of Jesus and for the falsification of his biography is that he apparently had a run-in with the protection racket mafia of the time.

Theologians, both Protestant and Catholic, are fairly unanimous in their opinion: he was friends with prostitutes – and also with tax collectors (the appropriate translation is probably 'tax farmers'), but no further research is being done here. So let's do that here: in his conversations with the women (what were they about, I wonder?), he must have learned how they were subjected to the 'two witnesses procedure' ("either you have sex with us – which very often also meant recruitment into prostitution – or we report you to the court that we caught you having sex with a man other than your own, then you will be executed") and then exploited 'for protection money'. And he probably learned from the tax collectors that she not only had to pay the lease amount to the relevant authorities, but also had to pay a hefty protection fee to 'her protectors' (or 'backers'), who were, in a sense, also necessary – certainly in the case of the prostitutes. However, the problem with them was that they had been largely blackmailed into their 'profession of needing protection'.

Jesus denounced these mafia-like practices in public speeches – and people even followed him into the desert to hear him! Presumably, some women also realised what the background was to their own experiences as 'professional prostitutes' – and that they were not to blame at all, but had simply been blackmailed. And Jesus may also have developed ideas on how these abuses could be changed. However, what the authors of the New Testament would have us believe, that people at that time wanted to hear sayings such as 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven' – how naive and undeveloped do we consider the people of that time to be today, that they followed Jesus into the desert to hear such things?

Note: Of course there were laws against the abuse of such laws! Those who falsely accused another person and were found out received the same punishment that the accused would have received – if the accusation had been proven false.



When I interpret the painting 'Jesus and the Sinner' (Rosenberg Fortress, Kronach), the painter Lucas Cranach the Elder (1472-1553) had the same view of the story in the Gospel of John as I do, namely that it is a genuine

crime story. I don't think you could paint it any more clearly if you consider the would-be stoners to be criminals; at any rate, they don't look like narrow-minded moralists. And the two 'wise older gentlemen' in the back right are the typical highly intellectual theologians and philosophers who only ever see the surface 'in such matters' and do not (want to) know what is really going on. In this way, the criminals can continue to do whatever they want, however they want. A fascinating picture, at least in my opinion! I know why I had it painted for myself in Vietnam in what is probably the original version (after coming into contact with the Bavarian painting collections)! Incidentally, in a lecture, 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 considering the three books mentioned in the text, I consider it even truer than (almost) the rest of the Gospel as a whole.

But how can anyone prove that the charges were false? And even if such proof were to be found, which was hardly possible in itself because the masterminds/mafiosi and the judges were basically 'in cahoots', the acquitted person would certainly not enjoy their freedom for long – the mafia comrades would soon take revenge for their exposed and executed buddy. And if anyone were to publicly denounce these practices, they would make sure that the person concerned would pay dearly for their

courage – and we know from the story of Jesus how that worked. A charge of blasphemy always works, and in Jesus' case, there was also a charge brought before the Romans that he was planning a rebellion. And if the charge was successful, the punishment was crucifixion. So no one dared to do it – and Jesus was the great and magnificent exception here.

In any case, the continued success of Jesus' commitment had to be prevented at all costs. For it would have been a disaster for both the mafiosi and the 'religious leaders'. And every memory of the real Jesus, who had dared to publicly expose their criminal practices, had to be erased.

Yes, even the "religious people" are usually deeply involved in such criminal practices – simply because they look the other way, because they're not interested. They don't want to know what's going on; after all, their job is to forgive sins and lead people to God. While it all looks very solemn and pious, it's completely useless for the lives of believers. They don't care about that, and so they have no interest in people living a high moral standard in a sensible way, but rather in preventing them from doing so, so that they develop feelings of guilt or a bad conscience. Because they are also businesspeople, and their business model is, after all, the proclamation of God's mercy and the forgiveness of sins. And for this purpose, they stage various rituals that are merely a sham, but for which the religious people charge exorbitant fees – and which, in reality, help absolutely nothing.

TOPIC 4: The Jewish, or Real, Jesus

The Jesus we know from the Bible, the New Testament, is certainly a completely artificial construct. This construct, with the virgin birth of a son of God, miracle stories, resurrection, and ascension, simply never happened. Of course, the creators of this Jesus weren't stupid—and so they incorporated episodes from the real Jesus that actually occurred and were still remembered by many contemporaries, to at least create the impression that everything they had constructed was true. If some things are true that people know from their own experience, then they generally conclude that what they don't know is also true. But overall, a completely different Jesus emerged from the one he really was. And so, even those who still knew the real Jesus were cleverly presented with a completely different Jesus, one with a completely different commitment.

Here, first of all, is what I consider a very plausible reconstruction of the real Jesus: It seems quite certain that: 1. He lived. 2. He was friends with prostitutes. 3. He spoke publicly. 4. He was crucified. From this, we can conclude that he also discussed with the prostitutes how they had been coerced into their work, that he therefore publicly denounced the coercers,

and that they didn't take kindly to this at all and ultimately ensured his removal – through a judicial murder in the most gruesome way and, of course, under false accusations. And everything that didn't fit into this narrative is an addition or even a falsification by Paul's writing workshop.

What's particularly ingenious, of course, is that this falsified Jesus is, outwardly, a completely Jewish Jesus: He was a true Jew, he adhered to Jewish law, he practiced Jewish customs, and he moved about in Jewish lands.

But all of that is just superficial. The problem is, what did this Jesus think, what did he want, what was his inner self like? What we know of him today is primarily what is written in our creeds and hymns, and what we were taught from childhood in sacramental instruction and religious education—that the goal of our lives is the eternal salvation with God that he has prepared for us. And that, for us, is usually the real Jesus. But all of that has very little to do with the reason he was executed; no one is killed for such goals!

But what was it that this Jesus truly stood for?

We must assume that it is something that actually belongs to the Jewish faith and that was quite obviously wrong at the time, and that Jesus recognized as perverted and wanted to overcome and restore what is right – and where, however, there were such malicious interests to prevent exactly that from happening, that a truly Jewish model of faith and morality was not allowed to be restored by certain circles.

And that was the prevailing moral code back then!

So I'm not referring here to the Jewish religion still practiced today, with all its rituals that have accumulated over many centuries, such as male circumcision, the often very peculiar dietary rules (milk and meat must not be cooked in the same pot and eaten from the same plate), and the often ridiculous-seeming Sabbath rules (for example, that no lights may be turned on, no telephone calls may be answered, and one may not walk long distances). These rules have no practical purpose; Immanuel Kant would call them "post-service" (see p. 29+). So I'm not talking about rules that are purely religious and have no practical meaning whatsoever, but rather about a version of Judaism that is concerned with a high moral code, one that is probably unique in the history of religions. And that could look something like this, based on the biblical story of Paradise, regarding the handling of sexuality:

1. The strictest monogamy (i.e., monogamy, where sexual intercourse only belongs within a lifelong marriage, except in cases of widowhood), and I think that with appropriate pedagogy this should

certainly be possible – because young people basically want it too, if only they knew how. This would then include:

2. The Jewish paradise story is certainly not only an idealized vision of a perfect state in the past, but also a vision of a future in which there is a perfect world where uncomplicated, healthy nudity is also possible.

And – something I learned in a lecture during my theological studies:

3. the right of women to orgasm (the Jewish religion is the only religion that includes this right).

And it's not just about one or the other, but the combination is the real kicker! Therefore, the original Jewish religion is not actually a typical religion, but a way of life!



The baptism of Jesus in the Arian baptistery in Ravenna (end of the 5th century): Jesus completely naked – among the Arians and also in the Orthodox baptistery. In any case, the Arians believed that Jesus was only human – essentially the same as in this text here. I think we should forget all possible theological disputes about the

nature of Jesus here; we should let practice decide: With which version of our faith can people live a beautiful, genuine monogamy with joy—and this starts with young people, inspiring them to embrace it! And wasn't the success of monogamy more important to the real Jesus than belief in any dogmas about him? The aforementioned Professor Rupert Lay S.J. once said that Jesus didn't want a single one of these dogmas that are so important today!

I think I've managed to combine the two quite well in my concept, and in my experience, it's also highly attractive to young people. I also consider it highly likely that this concept, or at least something very similar in its essence, corresponds to the commitment of the real Jesus—and I say this as a Catholic theologian!

And now to us today:

High morality, meaning strict monogamy, and nudity (of course, only where it makes sense) – that is presumably exactly what the authors (or rather, female authors) of the primeval history of the Bible envisioned as the paradisiacal state of humanity – and not only in the past, but also in the future! And why shouldn't realization be perfectly possible today? Today we have all the necessary resources: freedom, because we can think and discuss anything – and therefore don't immediately end up at the stake; scientific methods and knowledge, allowing us to research objectively and without fixed guidelines; well-educated people; the openness of many to try something unfamiliar – there will always be a few exceptions – and above all, the obvious fact that the old religious and moral models are largely obsolete!

And whoever says it can't be done is simply saying that it didn't work for them. The generalization that it's impossible due to our human nature is merely a distraction from their own stupidity or ignorance, which led them to live differently. What do you think, dear reader?

Please also bear in mind, dear reader: With his commitment to high moral standards, the real Jesus, whom we are discussing here, certainly fits into the line of Jewish prophets in the Old Testament – for him it was about a way of life! Therefore, Jewish individuals and institutions (such as Jewish media outlets) could very well be interested in and even engage with this real Jewish Jesus, so that Christians finally learn to follow the real Jesus and not a phantom who never existed!

And please don't see the practical application of the moral model, for example on page 26, as a requirement for young people to follow it, but rather as an alternative to avoid premarital sex with who knows how many partners! I can certainly imagine this practical implementation being both beautiful and very practical!

But what about the belief in an afterlife following earthly death? Suffice it to say: In Jesus' time, one could be a good Jew with or without such a belief. It is therefore quite possible that Jesus did not hold any belief in an afterlife at all, but that he was only concerned with the full success of life here and now!

TOPIC 5: The falsification of the real Jesus has been very successful (at least so far): How girls today are manipulated into a (pseudo-)self-determination.

Religious people are not interested in how people can live a moral life – and neither are today's church leaders. They too thrive on proclaiming God's mercy and forgiveness of sins. Only today, this is not done through

blackmail as it was 2000 years ago, but through manipulation – in which our religion is also deeply involved. For even today, churches are essentially commercial enterprises, and their business model is not one of ‘high morals’ but of forgiveness, consolation and the proclamation of God's mercy.

Although the concern of the ‘real Jesus’ was most likely high morality, and humans also have a high potential for such genuine morality, ultimately none of this matters to our Christian churches – it is much more about something that happens when ‘everything’ has happened ...

The method used to dissuade girls from high morality today is actually quite simple: Sexual self-determination is emphasised, which is actually a good thing. (Or is it just a lazy excuse for letting everything slide because there is a lack of sensible educational concepts that are really attractive to young people?) In any case, self-determination includes freedom of choice, and this freedom of choice in turn includes at least two options between which girls can choose. Firstly, there are those educators who are not concerned with ‘high morals’ offer young people the moral model (or rather ‘immoral model’) of trying out ‘sex before marriage with different partners’ until they find the right one. And secondly, there are the oh-so-good and highly moral ‘do-gooders’, especially those in our churches, who offer as an alternative the moral model of a body-hostile, uptight asceticism à la monks and nuns, meaning that young people should be completely abstinent from anything to do with sex until marriage – if they even talk about the subject at all.

Young people do indeed have a choice, and today they usually have a very free choice. But which one? Since the moral model of the do-gooders, ‘asceticism à la monks and nuns,’ is completely unattractive and unworldly to young people from the outset and therefore out of the question—after all, they do not want to become nuns and monks— they just want to find the right partner, they reject this ascetic moral model of the do-gooders from the outset and orient themselves much more towards the first moral model, i.e. the ‘immoral model of partner search’. This then leads all too often to a certain promiscuity among young people, with which many young people are ultimately not really happy and which is certainly not in the spirit of our religion.

This is how manipulation works to thwart high moral standards – and religions, whose moral model is primarily that of do-gooders, are particularly involved in this manipulation. In practice, this means it is best to do nothing at all on the subject and certainly no scientific research into how to talk to young people in a meaningful way. In other words, let everything run its course. Where, for example, is there serious research on the moral

value of teaching shame? In this way, the 'pious people' kill two birds with one stone, so to speak: they avoid all sensitive topics and let everything run its course, and so at some point the need for forgiveness and consolation arises all by itself, which they can serve and which is precisely their business model. But what kind of business model is it that requires people to make mistakes in the first place, because you can earn more from helping them deal with the consequences than from teaching them how to do everything right from the outset? It's the same as when doctors deliberately or negligently allow their patients to become ill (even though they could do something about it) because they earn much more from curing them. For me, such a business model is highly criminal!

Conclusion: 2000 years ago, Jesus encountered criminal structures with regard to the treatment of women, in more or less tacit cooperation between genuine criminals and well-behaved religious figures, the latter looking the other way and not wanting to know what was going on. And such criminal structures still exist today – just in a different form! But how can things be different?

6. In Praise of Nudity: Nudity and True Morality

First, I'd like to point out that I arrived at some of these approaches rather by chance or through a certain casualness on my part, because you can't really plan anything here.

It started with a brief conversation with a student after a lesson. She wistfully confirmed that I was right, that sex belongs in marriage—and that she had unfortunately done things differently and that she soon regretted it very much. But everyone always says that it's normal and a sign of emancipation because it helps you overcome your shyness, and that you simply have to do it at some point. I interlocked my hands with my first two fingers and asked if that hadn't worked for her too. And she replied: "Of course, but nobody says that..." So, that gave me a rough idea of the direction for my lesson...

And then I had further experiences. Several women told me how, in most cases, it was they who wanted to "do it," simply because it was supposedly part of being an emancipated girl when they were young. I particularly remember one student who was rather inconspicuous and well-behaved, and who was clearly planning such an introduction. She apparently wanted to ask me for advice again because, deep down, she didn't really want "this introduction" at all and was in distress. Unfortunately, I hadn't really grasped her situation, and so I probably didn't help her much. However, it became clear to me then that all my previous teaching had been rubbish—but what would be the right way to teach it? Have I figured that out now?

And another experience, namely a conversation I had with the mother of a student relatively soon after the start of my "career" as a teacher at a voca-

tional school, during a parent-teacher conference: Many years ago, she had asked me at a parent-teacher conference about the purpose of my religious education. To which I replied, rather casually: "Aren't all girls kind of schizophrenic?" She: "???" I: "Well, they're terrified of the harmless and idyllic stuff, where they might also gain some useful people skills and inspire men who want to be decent with a beautiful morality—namely, 'naked on the beach,' where absolutely nothing happens. But they want the problematic stuff, namely sex with all too often questionable partners, which sometimes even leaves them with lifelong trauma—and they do it." "And," the mother said, "what do you intend to do about it?" Me: "That the girls do the opposite." The mother: "If you can manage that, you're good!"

So, quite early in my career, I had received a kind of assignment—and a very interesting one for a single man. But how to put it into practice: combining nudity and genuine morality? Is that even possible? Isn't it a contradiction in terms?

After all, there are, or were, indigenous peoples in the tropics where people of all genders walk around naked, and they aren't constantly aroused and having sex with each other. There must be a certain order there, too; not everyone sleeps with everyone else... And then we have nudist beaches (FKK) here, and there's no wild sexual mayhem there either. We also have gynecologists who are "very close" to the female anatomy—and "nothing happens."

So, nudity must be possible without sex, and even without an appetite for sex—and perhaps this is where the key to a higher morality lies?

And then there's the old saying: What's hidden often becomes all the more interesting—and so it can happen that relationships develop primarily because of these "special body parts"—sure, they're a nice bonus, but isn't it possible that by hiding them, these "special body parts" acquire a significance they perhaps shouldn't have? And then there's also the common experience that body parts perceived as unaesthetic and even disgusting by children become particularly interesting during puberty, and especially in the case of falling in love.

So it's worth questioning the moral meaning of shame!

Furthermore, girls today are often led to believe that premarital sex is the gateway to successful emancipation. But in reality, it's mostly pure stupidity, something even the dumbest girl (I usually express myself a bit more bluntly here) could manage – and the consequences are often lifelong trauma. In contrast, the practice of being naked with a man without "anything" happening requires understanding of human nature and intelligence – and these are surely the very indicators of true wisdom and genuine emancipation! What doesn't a young person have to consider in such a situation – whether they can talk openly with the other person about everything, whether the other person feels safe, whether it's happening in the right environment, whether

the other person is looking for an opportunity where others can come to their aid if necessary, whether they want to talk to their parents and have them assess them – although sometimes parents can lack the necessary insight...

But isn't shame, the desire to conceal one's genitals, simply part of human nature? I dare to doubt it. I think that humans, and especially women, are by nature highly moral beings, meaning that this highly moral being wants sexual intercourse to belong only within marriage. However, since they don't receive the right information from childhood and therefore eventually make mistakes and violate this "natural morality," and since they do need a morality, a substitute morality arises—namely, shame—which very often becomes a pseudo-morality: Shame is used to pretend to be moral. And even children are affected by this, children who actually have nothing to hide: They want to show that they are moral—and so they go along with what everyone else is doing.

It must be stated very clearly here: A natural attitude towards nudity certainly has more to do with emancipation and high moral standards than a body-hostile rejection!

Of course, at least initially, it would be sensible for girls to participate in self-defense training!

Note: Anyone who has a problem with the "praise of nudity" should bear in mind that this is simply a consequence of the religious-historical interpretation of the Fall of Man story – see point 12!

7. Sexual intercourse simply belongs in marriage!

But what if he and she are truly, truly in love with each other – isn't intimacy, i.e., penetration, absolutely part of it?

It must be stated very clearly here: "No!" Penetration is related to fertility, i.e., having children – and that, by nature, belongs in marriage!

But penetration isn't even necessary to get to know each other really well!

Far more important than the experience of penetration is the experience of orgasm, which many women never experience in their lives. Getting everything right from the start is the key! The problem is that an "inexperienced" girl can never truly let go, especially during her first penetration, because there are always some anxieties involved – and freedom from anxiety is the fundamental prerequisite for experiencing orgasm!

So what exactly is orgasm? First of all: It has nothing to do with the wild writhing, moaning, and sometimes even screaming that we sometimes see in porn films. A true orgasm is more of a jolt to the entire body, almost like an earthquake, more comparable to a sneeze, which a woman can't fake.

And orgasm simply doesn't work for everyone, so you should experiment a bit – but not everything. It's quite obvious that nature has even provided for this, ensuring that young women, in a harmonious relationship, can experience

orgasm—especially when they begin engaging in the kind of sexual activity typically found only in a happy marriage—completely and without penetration, meaning they can try it with multiple partners without any "major damage." After all, all the nerve cells responsible for orgasm are located on the surface of the female genitals, so simply being together with legs intertwined is sufficient; there's no need for penetration or even mutual genital contact. And what she doesn't experience in terms of orgasm without penetration, she won't experience with penetration either. A student even spontaneously confirmed this to me once in class—though she immediately added, "Oh dear, what did I just blurt out!" (She had said it in different words, but I can't remember them—hence my words, which accurately reflect what she meant.) At least nature has ensured that these touches remain just that, and that sexual intercourse doesn't occur against the woman's will, by placing the vagina between her strongest muscles. Nor is there an automatic equation "naked man plus naked woman or naked girl equals sex," as girls are often led to believe, so that they become afraid of nudity. Of course, a man can still achieve sexual intercourse, but that's primarily because there haven't been proper conversations beforehand, and because the woman or girl lacks a well-thought-out plan and any decisive will. The foundation of sound morality is, after all, sound communication!

Today I would also like to talk a bit about the romance of moonbathing, as this "procedure" can also be called; see point 12, page 23 about moonbathing. American sexual health consultant Betony Vernon, who has written a book on the subject, believes that such a procedure can actually increase a woman's pleasure (see ICON, 12/2021)! More on this in "Element 2" (point 12)!

And deflowering can wait until marriage; any potential pain will either be overshadowed by the experience of orgasm or it might even provide the ultimate thrill. Yes, until marriage, because that's when children can be conceived! But that doesn't mean a woman has to be prudish or hostile to her body; there's still plenty of other stuff – as I said!

During my time as a teacher, however, I was hesitant to get too specific about this; I simply didn't dare, and I also didn't have any truly positive experiences with the topic. But then, on a trip, the opportunity arose. I'm thinking of a conversation with a high school graduate from northern Germany who was traveling the world and whom I met at the end of 2019 while visiting the catacombs containing the bones of Franciscan monks who died long ago, beneath the Franciscan church in Lima, Peru.

When I realized she was interested in talking to me, I introduced myself as a retired Catholic vocational school religion teacher – albeit with somewhat alternative ideas. Could I tell her? Of course she wanted to know – so:

The main idea, I explained, was that the faith Jesus supposedly wanted and that the churches proclaim, as it's told in the Bible, probably isn't true at all. It's

all just old stories about gods and commonplace wisdom. Furthermore, according to what he supposedly preached, Jesus would never have been executed so brutally.

And then he told her about the prostitutes who were Jesus' friends and their experiences in a criminal, male-dominated society, and so on. And while women aren't treated as brutally today as they were back then with the two-witness trial, we're still far from being truly fair to women, and especially to girls. In concrete terms, this means that girls are taught a sham morality of shame and aren't properly informed about how to recognize the right partner for them without first having to gain sexual experience with several partners like (free) prostitutes.

I then suggested to her how a girl could find out if she could have an orgasm with a partner by interlacing my fingers – as I had already done in my conversation with the student – see point 6, p.11.

When I realized that "this method" probably didn't quite align with her sense of morality, at least not the kind she wanted to show a man, I added: **"If you forbid everything, you just end up with everything being done!"** And in a split second, her face lit up and she was electrified; that was obviously the explanation that resonated with her. And I had obviously "won her over"; that was clearly what she also desired deep down, even if she hadn't been fully aware of it – and that's exactly what I had now – as a man, no less – said out loud! She also immediately came along on a city tour, which I invited her on because we could talk just as well and see some of Lima at the same time.

During the drive, I also told her that religions had absolutely no interest in such information, because they are, after all, businesses, and their business model is the proclamation of forgiveness and the consolation of an afterlife and trust in God's mercy—all essentially "opium for the people," as Karl Marx put it. The fact that girls and women, in particular, do everything right from the start is something they don't consider.

And then, regarding the practical side of things, I told her a bit about the beginning of this point, and I could do so without hesitation since it was obvious to me that she had no sexual experience. So I wasn't hurting her by, in effect, accusing her of doing something wrong.

And obviously she went along with everything – and I ended up having to tell her twice that we were passing her guesthouse, which is quite far from the center of Lima, and that it would be difficult for her, especially because of the constant traffic jams, if she stayed on the bus on the way back to Lima and then had to travel back to her guesthouse late at night – and that I wouldn't mind if she cut the city tour short and got off near her guesthouse. And I didn't tell her this because I didn't like her; in fact, I liked her very much – but given our ages, there was "no chance" anyway – and so I enjoyed simply being a good teacher, nothing more, and I certainly hope I really was one...

I should also mention that I had previously had similar experiences with a Muslim student who was sitting with a fellow student on a park bench near her university in Meknes, Morocco, and then also with a young waitress in a small guesthouse in Bali. I had always introduced myself in the same way as that high school graduate from northern Germany, but then I added that my most interested students were Muslim and other non-Christian girls, and asked if I could tell them what had interested them so much. And of course, I was always welcome to do so here too – and here too, both were clearly electrified; it was obviously exactly what they had always longed for deep down.

However, I didn't say as much to them as I had to that high school graduate from northern Germany. There simply wasn't enough time, and I didn't want to overwhelm them – especially since it wasn't as easy to explain everything in English as it was in German. Also, my arguments weren't as developed as they had been with my young conversation partner in Lima.

So I'm convinced that I've struck gold, so to speak, which could be the foundation of a pedagogy of "high" morality – anywhere in the world!

However, I am convinced that I have struck gold, so to speak, which could be the very foundation of a pedagogy of "high" morality – everywhere in the world! Therefore, here is my approach to how the commitment of the real Jesus can be proclaimed to young people today – and how it can be attractive to them and be very well received!

8. And the concept is actually practicable!

You, dear reader, may now think that the 'not everything – not nothing!' approach simply wouldn't work, that it's all illusory, because the temptation would be far too great and ultimately 'everything' would happen anyway. I would like to mention a newspaper article about a young Chinese couple, both chemists, so obviously not stupid people, during the Mao era, when everything to do with sex was taboo and could not even be talked about: a young married couple consulted a doctor because they were surprised that the woman was not getting pregnant. When the doctor asked them questions, it turned out that the couple had not yet had sex because neither of them knew that 'such a thing' existed. They thought that pregnancy resulted from the mixing of molecules on the skin – and both of them were chemists! I once asked a Chinese professor if the story was a newspaper hoax, but he just grinned... In any case, I think it's entirely possible that the story is true, not least because I knew a lady from Catholic Ermland whose mother had told her on her wedding morning that she didn't need to be afraid, that whatever her husband wanted to do with her during the night would be fine and all right. And back to the Chinese couple: the two of them obviously hadn't missed anything and were happy with their 'partial asceticism'. So why shouldn't it work if young people here know about "it" but only want 'full communion' in

marriage? I think both would find it so good that it could become 'fashionable' – educators just need to advertise it properly!

I know that boys also think this is a good idea from my basic training in the British Army, when I was in a barracks with young men from all walks of life, so to speak, and overheard their conversations. Girls were generally referred to as 'LFG's', i.e. 'easy fuckable objects'. Terrible – but it is precisely this kind of participation that girls are often persuaded is a special sign of emancipation. But I listened carefully, and when a girl behaved as I advocate here, it was considered great: 'She's okay, she knows what she wants!' And that fits in perfectly with the concept I recommend to the girls here: don't overdo it with morality, because exaggeration often achieves the opposite of what you actually wanted, but rather deal with sexuality before marriage according to the motto 'Not everything, not nothing!' After all, both sexes actually want exactly the same thing for their 'premarital relationships' – they just need to know it! Of course, and again and again: it takes intelligence for a girl to know who she is getting involved with in 'such games'! After all, there are also studies on which women are most likely to be raped. And it has been found that it is not the cheeky and lively ones, but rather the well-behaved and reserved ones. So it's better to be cheeky and lively than well-behaved and reserved!

9. Even if something corresponds to the natural disposition of a living being, including a human being, that living being must still learn how to put it into practice.

It's best to google how bird parents teach their 'children' to fly, i.e. how something that is part of the natural disposition of birds must also be explicitly learned – and birds learn this more or less willingly. There are wonderful videos on the internet showing how storks learn to fly from their parents, or how a 'human mother' who cannot show her parrot how to fly and therefore has to teach it in other ways tries to put herself in her bird's shoes and how it slowly understands everything related to flying.

And how do you find out what a person's true natural disposition is, which may have been buried, especially in our civilisations, and which we therefore cannot easily recognise, but which we must recognise if we really want to educate a young person properly?

A student once told me very vividly what she had learned in psychology class at her former school: We have to imagine the 'new human being' as a cupboard with empty drawers. And if what this person experiences later fits perfectly into these drawers without any problems, then that is a pretty sure indication that this is exactly what corresponds to their natural disposition.

And I am of the opinion, which is basically also held by our Christian religion, that this is true monogamy, i.e. having only one sexual partner in life. So young people would be only too happy to learn everything there is to know about this and how they can achieve beautiful, true monogamy.

However, religions deal with this natural predisposition in a very amateurish way, because their business model is simply different. And anyway, if it is to work, then educators with an appropriate concept must start very early in childhood. But how do you do that properly?

10. Teaching high sexual morality to primary school children

But how can such teaching be done with children in a way that is really interesting for them and ultimately effective? And you have to start with children! After all, when caring for plants, you have to start with the buds if you want to get beautiful flowers and good fruit!

In my experience, I came up with a very inspiring introduction out of an unpredictable situation – so there was no long deliberation involved. And obviously, this introduction worked very well! I didn't just start with any story, but with the oldest crime story, at least one that is widely known and even appears in the Bible. And crime stories are always well received, even by children.

It is the story of the beautiful Susanna from the appendix to the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament. Yes, this story (please read it, at least if you don't know it – either in the Bible or on the internet!) is certainly more suitable for children than the story of the sinner in the Gospel of John. Because this story hits much more on the situation of young people who still have everything ahead of them – and who are supposed to get an overview of how the entry 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:

A mother from my wider circle of acquaintances once again brought up the fact that children are supposedly not interested in 'these topics' because they are not part of their world. Since her 10-year-old daughter was there and was obviously following our conversation with interest, I took the opportunity to prove how well this can work; it just depends on finding the right way in: And since the mother agreed, I told the girl the crime story about the beautiful Susanna (and because I had often read it aloud in class, I knew it almost by heart). Of course, I also got specific, for example, what is meant by 'be willing,' so that the girl would understand what it

was all about. And thanks to sex education at school, the girl understood everything.

In my concept, the 'point' was not the steadfastness and trust in God of the beautiful Susanna, as pious theologians usually like to do in such lessons. That was not an issue for me at all, but rather the criminality of the men and the gullibility and blindness of the bystanders, who took the false testimony of the two elders at face value – and did not believe Susanna's protests of innocence.

And the girl's comment when I was finished: "I'm lucky I didn't live back then." And I said to the mother: "You see, your daughter has understood perfectly what this is about and she has reacted in a completely normal and ethically well-meaning way – unlike many religiously oriented adults, who pretend they don't know what this is about. In any case, they don't consider such a story suitable for children, at least in my experience – and yet it's a fantastic introduction to the 'topic'. The reason for this refusal may be that they don't really want young girls to become truly worldly-wise in dealing with their sexuality and to change something in this world for the better. And then they come up with some rationalisation that children should have no idea about such brutal events because it would destroy their innocent childhood, etc. All I can say to that is what a stupid romanticism it is to think that children should grow up with all kinds of untruths and not be allowed to know how to live their lives sensibly and wisely.

Yes, this story can be read aloud in an exciting way, preferably in a group lesson, of course. This can also lead to lively and enjoyable discussions. Even "religious people can now view sex education positively, because young people know what it's all about! And if children have not really understood this, then you can help them to understand everything. You can also conclude that the two men were ultimately interested in 'recruiting' a woman for prostitution, i.e. 'renting' her out like an object to many men for sex and thus earning money. And if the beautiful Susanna had gone along with it, she would have been finished with her family, because no one at that time and in that area would have wanted to believe how she was blackmailed into it.

This story is also a meaningful introduction to the situation today, where not much has changed. It's just a little different. Back then, girls were taught to fear everything related to sexuality, that they had to cover their bodies with veils out of shame and not be provocative in the presence of men, etc. But in the end, these fears didn't help at all, because everything turned out completely differently! And actually, Susanna had not violated this morality of shame at all, even though she was naked, because how

could she have expected that two men had invaded her private garden and hidden behind bushes? The fears that girls and women were taught back then were therefore completely pointless in her case. And so it is today with the fears that are taught to girls in particular, that they must 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. They are not allowed to enjoy the harmless fun of being naked, of course in places where nudity would not be a problem at all. And when they do start having sex, the typical moralists shrug their shoulders and say that it is part of a girl's self-determination, which cannot be prevented today. Of course, the typical body- (and mind-) hostile educators don't realise that sensible self-determination also includes the choice of an attractive alternative, which young people have been stubbornly denied.

Today, this is no longer achieved through blackmail as it was in the past, but rather through manipulation into a false morality and the idea that girls want 'it' of their own accord, based on supposed self-determination.

To set the record straight, school lessons or religious education would be the place to do this, and the family – especially fathers! – would be the place to put it into practice. This means that there would have to be a kind of triangular relationship: young people – family – church/school. If that isn't a model for the future – including for the church!

And there is another reason why the teaching of a sensible moral concept must begin with very young people. Because if you only start with older young people, you have to expect that at least some of them have already started 'doing it' – and then, when you rave to them about how wonderful it is to be 'without', you only make their hearts unnecessarily heavy.

In any case, the focus of education should not be on fear of God, that young people might do something wrong ('sin'), but rather on a genuine joy in high moral standards – as this is surely also in God's interest. (The question of whether God actually exists is no longer relevant here.) And then the problem of 'sinning' will probably resolve itself!

11. Why the topic of 'the first sexual relationship' is also so politically significant.

I would like to refer here to the Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset, who argued that the motivation behind girls' choice of their first sexual partner, whether for marriage or whatever, has had a greater influence on the history of humanity than any military power. Yes, it is probably true that in most cases, and I think in nine out of ten cases, it is not the men or boys who seduce the girls into having sex for the first time, but rather the girls

who want to have sex – and ‘certain men’ simply seize the opportunity and ‘don’t let anything slip by’ and therefore do not see themselves as responsible and do not feel obliged to do anything. After all, they have only done the girls in question a favour at their own request. (See point 4 on who the instigators of the girls are here!) And let us imagine the power that our Christian churches could have if they succeeded in motivating young people here to choose partners based on high ideals from the outset – and if this could be done better without the Bible, why not? After all, it is not reliable anyway as to what the real Jesus really wanted.

And the power that our religion could develop in this way would be perceived by people today as a pleasant, if not a joyful, burden!

The advantage Catholics have over Protestants here is that Protestants adhere to the principle of ‘sola scriptura’, meaning ‘scripture alone’ – or, in other words, the Bible. But what if this ‘scriptura’ turns out to be the work of Jesus’ opponents (Protestant theologians were also involved in the research, which is also the great achievement of German Protestantism, according to Albert Schweitzer, who was also an important theologian)? Then the Protestants have a problem. In contrast, we Catholics Basically, we don’t need the Holy Scriptures at all; we just need to know what the real Jesus was committed to so that we can continue where he had to stop. And then we can creatively translate his commitment into our present day – with today’s means of pedagogy and psychology, and even advertising psychology. That’s enough work!

We must also remember that Jesus died at the age of 33. And his concept was certainly not yet fully developed, because it would not have been all right if his speeches had actually overcome the mafia-like structures. Young people would still not have known how to live sensibly. It is not enough to overcome something negative; it must also be clear what the positive should look like, for example, how ‘different sexualities can be cultivated’.

For practical examples of this, see point 13, p. 27.

12. Without taking religious history into account, the interpretation of some biblical stories is nothing but nonsense.

What does that mean – religious history?

When I wanted to explain the story of Adam and Eve in class, I first asked the young people to come up with a joke, it could even be a dirty one, because it's not about telling it to others. And when I had the impression that the young people all had a joke in mind, I asked them what the pun-

chline of the joke was, so that others would laugh when it was told. Well, I then put forward my opinion that the joke addresses things that everyone has in mind but which are not actually said in the joke itself.

And the problem is: if we don't know the background, we don't know what to laugh about. This is often the case with children when they happen to overhear a dirty joke that they don't understand because they lack the necessary background knowledge to understand it.. But they look for a reason to laugh and then make up something that sounds halfway funny, but has absolutely nothing to do with the joke. When they then tell the joke in their version to adults, the adults can guess what was perhaps meant and what the children have made of it – and smile.

And – as I then explain in my lessons – this is also the case with some stories, especially in the Old Testament. Some things are addressed that were on everyone's mind at the time, but which are not mentioned. But we need to know these things if we want to interpret a story correctly. If we don't know this background and just start interpreting, the result is nonsense, as with jokes where children don't know the background – and sometimes very profound and, unfortunately, often disastrous nonsense.

A sad example of this is the story of Adam and Eve's fall from grace. Even great theologians such as Paul and Augustine came up with the theology of original sin, or rather, today, primordial sin, which consists of wanting to be God oneself, and then built a huge theological house of cards on top of this theology. And God knows what else they spin – and this spinning continues throughout the history of the churches! Yet the theology of original sin is utter nonsense and was, of course, never the concern of the real Jesus, for which he was ultimately killed!

What it's really about: Of course, we are not born with original sin or any other kind of sin, and therefore we do not need salvation!

But I believe that the conclusion I have reached on the basis of religious history and the history of religion is truly impressive! In any case, it fits in perfectly with the Jesus presented here so far!

The problem with Paul's letters, whether genuine or spurious (they exist too!), and indeed with the entire New Testament, is that according to the work of Christian Lindtner, Hyam Maccoby and Karl Heinz Deschner, the New Testament is largely a forgery, i.e. a fraud. At best, we can ask ourselves what in the New Testament could actually originate from the real Jesus and whether and how it was reinterpreted by Paul's writing workshop. This applies in particular to the relationship between 'Adam in the story of Genesis' and the 'second Adam' Jesus in Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

I can only speculate here, but I believe I can say with good reason that this idea of the second Adam actually originates from the real Jesus, but that it was reinterpreted or, rather, 'completely distorted' by Paul, consciously or unconsciously. According to my interpretation of the story of the sinner in John 8, Jesus had learned through his friendship 'with such women' how they had come to their profession through blackmail. And he now saw it as his life's work to change this, so that women could determine their own lives in future – and that prostitution and the exploitation of women would disappear as a result. And that a society in which everything would then be different and true love between men and women would be the norm would be, so to speak, the Kingdom of God.

And perhaps Jesus interpreted the story of Adam and Eve in terms of religious history in the same way that I know from the work 'The Name of Eve' by the Czech Protestant theologian Jan Heller (1925-2008), namely as a story against cultic prostitution, which was common at the time this story originated.

And this is also connected to the belief in one God!

Yes, how did the belief in God come about in the prehistory of the Bible? It must be said quite clearly here: at least in this prehistory, God is a pure construct! To understand this, we must first consider the superstitious society of that time, in which people firmly believed that the gods would send them misfortune if they did not make sacrifices such as sexual intercourse with 'sacred prostitutes' and, depending on the circumstances, even human sacrifices, apart from the material gifts that were due anyway.

The question now is how to dissuade people from these sacrifices, which were sometimes very inhumane and, not least, completely contradicted the self-determination of the people concerned. And it was not that easy, because there were always fears, which were naturally fuelled by the priests, that the gods would take revenge if they did not receive these sacrifices (which were, after all, the priests' business model).

And here, clever and highly moral people came up with the idea of introducing or even constructing a new super-god who had created everything, including the love between man and woman and between parents and children, as well as caring for one another, and for whom these inhuman sacrifices were simply sins that had to be overcome.

Thus, the goddess Hebe or Hepatu or Hawwah, in whose honour this prostitution existed, was degraded by the authors of the biblical story of the Fall to the 'woman Eve' (linguistically, Hawwah and Eve are basically the same name), and what was worship for the goddess became sin par excellence for the 'new supergod' of the Bible. Thus, Eve was meant to be

a cult prostitute who seduced Adam, who was initially a pure natural man, into sexual intercourse, and thus the whole 'sexual confusion' began and paradise was lost.

I quote from the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh on the seduction of the primitive man Enkidu, which also caused him to lose paradise:

Then he turned his gaze to his animal / But now, when the gazelles saw Enkidu, / they fled from him. The game of the steppe shrank from him, and Enkidu was frightened, his body became stiff, his knees wavered, and it was not as before, but now he had knowledge; he understood. Turning around, he sank to the prostitute's feet, raised his eyes to her face, and listened to the words she spoke. The prostitute said to Enkidu: You are now wise, Enkidu, like a god!

(quoted from Oswald Loretz, Creation and Myth, Man and the World according to the Opening Chapters of Genesis, Stuttgart Bible Studies, 32, 1968, p. 114)

So that is the religious-historical and thus the real background to the story of Adam and Eve's fall from grace!



There is also an illustration accompanying Jan Heller's work 'Der Name Eva' (The Name Eve) and the passage in the Epic of Gilgamesh – namely at the Sun Temple of Konarak (India) – featuring a god or goddess in serpent form, whose cult includes ritual prostitution.

The fact that this is not a married couple is evident from the other 'unambiguous' sculptures at the temple. (Photo: M.P.)

And why is sinning against the 'order of sexuality' so problematic that it is seen as the 'original sin' in the early history of the Bible, which could perhaps also be called the 'fundamental sin' or 'mother of all sins'? It is not so far removed from us today. I refer here to how young men refer to girls as objects, i.e. as things, see p. 17: It is about people being turned into objects – and that they even turn themselves into objects, or at least participate in doing so. Above all, this is something that affects or could affect all

human beings in some way! And here we can do something to put an end to it!

This also means that this new God is not the most important thing in the story of the Fall, or anywhere else for that matter, but was, so to speak, only a contemporary vehicle for achieving something, namely overcoming the inhumanities that came with belief in the gods.

And that also means that if a belief in God does not achieve this goal, then it is superfluous and another way must be found.

This brings us back to Jesus: he saw how this 'sexual confusion' still existed in his time, but this time with a criminal background. And he wanted to overcome this – as the second Adam, so to speak, but for real this time! Jesus as the second Adam would thus achieve what the first Adam had 'messed up', and he may have seen this as his life's work.

But Paul could not accept this interpretation of Jesus and its corresponding implementation in practice – especially since the eradication of Jesus' commitment was precisely his concern – and so he constructed his theses of the old Adam and the new Adam in the Epistle to the Romans, which then became the basis of the Christian churches' ideology of original sin. Of course, Paul's theses can somehow be linked to the concerns of the real Jesus – with a little intellectual dexterity, anything is possible.

And the aim of this concept is to restore the importance of this 'second Adam', Jesus, in the completely 'non-mythological sense' that Jesus presumably meant.

This also means that we must solve the problem of sexual morality with today's means – and in doing so, we must also question the old 'recipes' to see whether they still make sense and are effective today.

So: do belief in God and prayers and sacrifices and all the religious rites make sense, does teaching modesty make sense, do they actually help us to achieve better morality?

Of course, everything can be justified, but whether the solution of people not doing something evil, or at least not so good, out of fear of punishment by a deity is a good solution is highly doubtful, because experience shows that this fear is of little help – not least because, especially in our Christian religion, there is always trust in God's mercy. So there is probably a pretty clear 'no': these fears of a deity do not really help!

In practice, this means that we are not so wrong in not believing that there is a God – but there is no reason why we should not behave as if there were a God who is pleased when we behave morally in accordance with his will. However, one should not exaggerate one's belief in a God and,

above all, the corresponding cult for him. What is important is a reasonable morality that actually works!

And that should also solve the problem of shame, which, in the psychologically very plausible story of the Fall, is the result of an 'intrusion' that does not take place within the order of a community based on love and 'eternal partnership between man and woman'. However, the moral model based on shame is linked to the ideology of original sin developed by St. Paul and, above all, St. Augustine, which is hostile to the body and therefore also to nudity, and which is still ingrained in us. But what if we have overcome this ideology of original sin? And this concept assumes that this is indeed possible – if only we tackle it with a genuine will to succeed!

13. The romantic middle way – intoxicating moon bathing!

At present, at least here in Germany, it is very common – and far too common – for a girl to ask a boy, 'Will you be my boyfriend?', which in plain language means, 'I'm tired of being a virgin, won't you take my virginity?' This is actually a terrible, undignified, dishonourable and primitive procedure. There is no trace of beautiful romance. (For more on the instigators of the girls, see point 5!)

How much more beautiful and sophisticated, by contrast, is a concept where a girl were to ask a boy: "I imagine moonbathing with you would be wonderful, wouldn't you like to try it?" Moonbathing here refers to the liberating openness towards one another, the freedom from fears, as described in this concept: perhaps lying in a meadow on a warm night, clothed only in the moonlight, bathing in it – or something similar. But they don't have to do everything that's possible! It's also nice for a girl to have a protector during a visit to the beach or on an exciting trip, or perhaps to experience a heavenly sports massage where, of course, "special body parts" remain off-limits. Above all, such a desire demonstrates a willingness to overcome fears and an openness to truly getting to know one another. Just imagine all the things they could do together!

And if things get really "hot" for both of them and they can't "hold back" any longer, then it's a case of "not all, not nothing": He's on the bottom and she's on top with their legs intertwined, so that she remains in control, thus practicing emancipation here too – and if she feels comfortable and moves to intensify the contact, then he'll also find it great and won't want penetration at all – see point 6... But be careful, both should only practice this kind of arrangement if, should orgasm occur, they could and would want to stay together forever! (Note: In his book "The Patriarchy," the anthropologist and

sex researcher Ernest Borneman (1915–1995) sees a connection between sexual behavior and societal conditions in general. If he is right, this could mean that genuine emancipation of women in sexual behavior would also change societal conditions overall—in the direction of true and full emancipation of women. This would also mean that all the gender politics is completely superfluous. And I think Borneman is right! In any case, the emancipation of women in sexual behavior shouldn't harm anyone!

In any case, both can always start all over again with someone else, including full romance, if the relationship doesn't go as expected and they realize they're simply not compatible.

Perhaps moral models can also be distinguished as unchristian or even pagan (multiple intimate partners) and genuinely Christian and also really beautifully romantic ('the one and only', which becomes realistic for everyone through the 'moon bathing process')? Yes, that's a moral model that is unrivalled in its appeal and easy to communicate because it simply corresponds to our human nature and young people want it too, once they know about it!

So, here's an alternative tip for young people: don't consume different types of sexuality, cultivate them!

And if you want to know more about this, please enter the keyword 'penetration-free sexuality': <https://basisreli.lima-city.de/pen-frei.htm>

And here, it would be the task of schools and churches to guide young people in this direction. However, since schools should basically be value-neutral and should not recommend any particular concrete attitude to life, churches would probably be more suitable for this task. They only need to orient themselves towards the real Jesus and could and should therefore be the ones who explicitly include a concrete attitude to life in their programme!

It is possible that the baptism of naked baptised persons, as was customary in the early Church, goes back to the real Jesus, meaning that we no longer need any 'rags' for our morality, but are clothed in the 'armour of the Holy Spirit'. In any case, the real Jesus today is likely to be of interest to those sections of the population that the Church has long since lost – I am thinking of the working class, for example! Yes, have we not long since become a church of the 'bourgeoisie'?

And the advantage over non-Christians, especially Muslims: We no longer have to be helpless when they judge our holy scriptures and say that everything is a lie anyway.

And since such a concept is quite important in a young person's life, and since both young people and their families need a ritual for such important things and want to celebrate them, perhaps a "baptism renewal" could be discussed, one that is certainly based on the practices of the early church. This "renewal" could then perhaps look like the young people taking a bath together in a public bath – as an experience of the "taste of paradise" "clothed only in the armor of the holy Spirit". It is important that the children genuinely want this bath and that it doesn't look like a typical "church service," but rather that it's genuine fun for them. And as for which adults are allowed or supposed to be there: a secret ballot by the children!

Afterwards, the children, dressed as they have chosen, enter the church, which has been cleared of benches, to the sound of bells ringing and organ music. A community leader may say a few nice words, and then there is a meal, but deliberately not a grand feast. Instead, the children's parents set up tables with snacks according to their culture – and the guests of the First Communion children then go from table to table – sampling the food on offer here and there and striking up conversations with each other.

And what does the future hold for a church based on the 'real Jesus'?

This Jesus did not actually establish the sacraments as they are practised in churches – they are all linked to Paul's ideology. So we can forget about them. What remains, perhaps, is baptism, even infant baptism (which is a beautiful custom), not as a liberation from original sin, but as a beautiful wish for the child from the parents and the child's family, the family's friends, and ultimately also the congregation and the whole church for a happy and God-pleasing life – regardless of whether God exists... And if he does exist, then he rejoices and sends his blessing!

And then there is the 'renewal of baptism' – when the children have understood what it is all about. I have described how this renewal works.

The other sacraments can therefore be omitted – except for the sacrament of marriage, because everything that has gone before leads up to this marriage, which is the beginning of a successful relationship.

And those who need more can go to church and organise private services, either alone or with others! Pilgrimages, such as those that already exist and are enjoying increasing popularity, such as the pilgrimage to Santiago in Spain, could perhaps serve as a model for this. The processions during Holy Week (i.e. Passion Week) in Spain, Sicily and elsewhere will also remain. Above all, these processions refer to the suffering and death of Jesus, something that really happened. In our country, this would correspond to a performance of Johann Sebastian Bach's St Matthew Passion.

But I think that the beautiful musical masses by Mozart and Haydn and many others will also remain and continue to be performed – albeit no longer as accompaniment to a ritual process, but as a poem to Jesus, who was concerned with a paradisiacal world, as God would also have liked it. But these are just thoughts; we should leave the implementation to those who want to live by high moral standards and ultimately do so.

14. Immanuel Kant's critique of religion leads precisely to the real Jesus.

Some consider the book 'Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone' to be the most significant work by the East Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant. It deals with the distinction between religion as 'after-service' and religion as a concept for morality. By 'after-service,' Kant rejects everything in religion that has to do with revelation, dogma, belief in miracles, and 'heavenly influences.' This includes prayers, church liturgies, pilgrimages, and confessions—in other words, all the 'religious trappings' that are of little value in everyday life. However, he does consider a rational religion to be meaningful, one that aims to lead people to genuine morality in such a way that they can also live it.

But first: Immanuel Kant (born on 22 April 1724 in Königsberg, Prussia, died on 12 April 1804 in the same place) revolutionised Western philosophy with his 'Critique of Pure Reason'. His maxim of "enlightenment", to use one's own understanding, and the 'categorical imperative' became popular. In his late work Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone, Kant undertakes nothing less than an attempt to prove that elements of a moral religion can be recognised in the Christian religion.

And I believe that this religion of reason is not only vague and only partially recognisable, it is actually the goal of a Christian religion based on the real Jesus! The difference between Kant and Jesus is probably that Jesus – motivated by his conversations with prostitutes and because he was a young man, and as such took a tough and aggressive stance against those he believed to be guilty of the immorality of his time – while Kant, as an intellectual, proceeded cautiously and cryptically. Both encountered resistance from those who were in power at the time, but Kant was somehow able to come to terms with his opponents, which Jesus was unable to do.

As far as I can see, this religion of reason was Kant's goal in life and thus also the goal of all his research and publications. Here, then, the concerns of the real Jesus and those of Immanuel Kant coincide! And all this is to be reduced to such a short common denominator?

I think we can compare him here to the West and East Prussian astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus, who also devoted his life to the fundamental question: that the sun doesn't revolve around the earth, but rather the other way around, that the earth revolves around the sun. And just as one can summarize his over 400-page book in a few words today, one can probably also summarize Kant's commitment in a few words. For just as Nicolaus Copernicus had to confront and refute the entrenched, dogmatic views of his time, which were considered absolutely certain in both the churches and society as a whole, so too did Immanuel Kant. But these entrenched views are no longer of interest today – we can, or at least could, therefore move beyond them even to the question of God!

Unfortunately, things aren't so simple with Immanuel Kant because – unlike with Copernicus – "common sense" doesn't interest the church officials, who still claim, and in a sense still possess, the authority to interpret everything related to Jesus and morality. And it's difficult to counter the church's claims, especially when so many believers go along with them. After all, belief in stories of the virgin birth and the resurrection of the Son of God clearly contradicts all common sense, and they are also quite obviously copied from ancient pagan religions. Yet for many people, and especially for many church officials – to use theologians and priests as a general term – they remain believable and are justified as true using all sorts of tricks. And the high moral standards that Kant was concerned with are, for many people, and especially for church officials, essentially secondary – so what? What matters is that wrongdoing here is forgiven through the mercy of God – if one believes correctly.

But for how much longer?

The question, however, is whether the morality at the heart of this concept – namely, the high sexual morality – is identical to the morality Immanuel Kant had in mind.

I think "yes" – and I refer to various texts on the internet to support this. At first glance, Kant's strict marital morality, that sexual intercourse belongs only within marriage, may sound out of touch with reality to many people today (as does this concept!). However, Kant scholars generally view it quite positively. Put simply, Kant sees the problem as follows: "In the act, a person becomes an object" because they "give themselves to the other." Kant thus sees the problem in the act, or rather in sexual intercourse, that the other person is essentially always objectified – something that ordinary young men also perceive as a problem – see p. 17 and p. 24. Through what I consider to be very elaborate marriage arrangements and structures, Kant aims to prevent this objectification of the other person in the spouse.

Comparison of Jesus – Paul/Christ – Immanuel Kant

Immanuel Kant's distinction between religion:	„Slave religion“ (Kant: „After service“)	„Religion of genuine morality“
Commitment of believers:	Cult, beautiful church services to ingratiate oneself with God, so that, due to his omnipotence, he will put right everything in the world that is not right.	We must tackle the problem of what genuine (sexual) morality is and take concrete steps to ensure that this morality becomes a reality.
External impact:	False morality, it should appear as if one is moral (sexual shame!).	People actually live out genuine morality from the spirit, and you can even rely on it!
History of religion:	Christ according to Paul	The real Jesus
Conclusion:	(True) morality is not important! Faith alone is what matters.	It is about (true) morality; faith is secondary – it even works without any faith at all.
Objective:	A fulfilled life after the resurrection of the dead in eternal life with God.	A fulfilled life here and now in the unity of body and soul – for all people.
Theology/philosophy:	We are justified by Christ's sacrificial death. Therefore, God is merciful to us.	The real Jesus never thought of sacrificial death; what was important to him was that we live the high morality that mattered to him.
My opinion:	This 'mythical religion*' has outlived its usefulness – and, based on my impressions and experiences, not only here.	This 'religion of reason' (very much in line with Kant) has a future – even if it is no longer a typical religion.

That's certainly extreme – but am I right that Jesus didn't want a religion, but a rational approach to life? And that's what it finally needs to be about! *) *Myths are all well and good, but would people really want to live their lives according to myths? A religion of reason would be preferable...*

However, Kant's ideas seem somewhat complicated to me and therefore fundamentally impractical – at least for most people. Here too, I advocate for the concept of the "middle way", i.e., "not everything, not nothing," which is much more practical: People of different sexes come together – for a longer or shorter time – and, depending on whether a partnership would be at least theoretically possible, practice physical contact as described – and definitely not sexual intercourse – until each realizes that something sparks, so that neither of them wants to live without the other – a feeling of reciprocity. An external indicator could be the woman's ecstasy during orgasm, which she has either never experienced with anyone else or cannot imagine with any other partner – and which then also affects the male partner, filling him with joy and self-confidence.

And that this feeling of togetherness is so strong that marriage – according to the rules of a religion or within the context of both families – is a natural consequence before the two begin full "physical intimacy."

And more generally:

The question naturally arises as to why Immanuel Kant didn't already come up with all of this that I describe in this concept. To that, one can say:

1. Jesus research was just beginning; the distinction between Jesus and Christ hadn't yet been recognized, and the New Testament was still largely considered the correct biography of Jesus.
2. And the power of the Mafia, against which Jesus had campaigned, was certainly not recognized or even suspected. Moreover, Kant most likely had no connections to Mafia circles that could have given him any hints - or that could have prompted him to think "in that direction."
3. Belief in God was hardly questioned in Kant's time, and certainly not in his circle. Therefore, it was impossible for Kant to be too explicit on this point.
4. Even today, it's not easy to talk about sexuality in a way that avoids misunderstanding. I think it was no different in Kant's time – which is why much seems cryptic to us today when the topic is "that." But how do we decipher such things today?
5. The power of conservative forces at that time was simply too strong for many critical ideas.
6. Many critical lines of thought were simply unimaginable.

In any case, what Copernicus and Kant accomplished back then – namely, breaking down entrenched structures because they are simply wrong – was truly ingenious, even though much of it is self-evident today and can

be expressed more easily. However, for Kant, this was initially just theory. I think it was entirely in keeping with his intentions to be creative in putting his ideas into practice so that they would actually "work"!

In any case, what Kant initiated was most likely exactly what the real Jesus wanted!

15. And finally, some general remarks on the concept!

The image of Jesus presented here is based

a) on the findings of German Protestant Jesus research over the past 250 years or so, and

b) on the findings of research by critics and opponents of the Church, which was and is generally of a very high scientific standard. I am thinking here of:

1. Karlheinz Deschner (German): Der gefälschte Glaube (The Fake Faith) (about the stories of the gods), 1988/91 in Germany

2. Christian Lindtner (Danish): Geheimnisse um Jesus Christus (Secrets about Jesus Christ) ('The New Testament is largely a plagiarism of Buddhism'), 2003 in Denmark/2005 in Germany

3. Hyam Maccoby (English/Jewish): Der Mythenschmied (The Myth Maker) (Paul invented, among other things, the resurrection and sacrificial death of Jesus; Maccoby believes that the synoptic Gospels also originate from Paul's 'school' or 'writing workshop'), 1986 at Barnes&Noble Books, New York/2007 at Ahriman Verlag Germany

I think that the special features of the most likely real Jesus (and also of Paul) are so well and scientifically researched in these books that I can adopt them myself – and simply needed to combine them accordingly.

And something about the Mafia: Petra Reski: Mafia (Mafias exist in pretty much all countries today), 2014, so they seem to be something like a cancerous tumour in civilised anonymous societies – and so, in my opinion, they must also have existed in earlier societies. The fact that there is no news about this is in the nature of things. After all, the special thing about such 'factions' is that they simply 'go with the flow' in societies without being recognised.

The thesis of this concept is that human beings have a high potential for genuine morality, but that this high potential has unfortunately not only been neglected and not really desired in theology and pedagogy since time immemorial, but has even been downright destroyed. However, this also means that a society with a high moral standard, especially in the

area of sexuality, is indeed possible. Could this be what the authors of the Bible's prehistory imagined paradise to be?

More on this can be found on the website www.michael-preuschoff.de.

What if young people or their parents printed out these 36 pages and gave them to the relevant teachers or priests so that they could teach religious education or confirmation classes (or even confirmation classes) 'according to the real Jesus'?

I would be very happy to receive feedback – whether positive or negative – at hpreuschoff@gmx.de!

16. And two important peculiarities in this concept

- A friend of mine, an American lawyer, suggested that, to help me understand the story of the woman who sinned in John 8, laws were sometimes enacted that allowed criminals to operate even more effectively than if they hadn't. This was likely also the case with the law against adultery, which carried the death penalty, though it was certainly very rarely applied in its true sense: When does one ever catch a couple committing adultery – and with two witnesses at that? That practically never happens – while abuse, on the other hand, certainly does happen – to blackmail women. Such a law is therefore a sure sign of an unscrupulous, criminal, patriarchal society (= macho society). Jesus probably recognized this criminal undercurrent and wanted to do something about it. But in doing so, he also made enemies of the "temple people," for whom all laws were divinely ordained.
- Theologians believe that Paul was unaware of the real Jesus's ministry and relied solely on revelations of the resurrected Jesus, which he claimed to have experienced. This view, however, assumes that Paul was indeed aware of the real Jesus's ministry and that the story of the revelations was a deliberate falsification to distort and thus defuse the real Jesus's ministry—a conspiracy, albeit a rather unconscious one, between the Mafia and the ruling class.

Table of contents

‘Plausible and attractive alternatives’

TOPIC 1: HIGH SEXUAL MORALS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: Those who forbid everything will only achieve that ‘everything’ is done in the end!	1
TOPIC 2: RELIGION AND THE CHURCH: Jesus for everyone: For Christians, for Muslims, for Jews, and also for people who reject all religions and churches.	1
TOPIC 3: The most plausible and conclusive reason for the brutal judicial murder of Jesus and for the falsification of his biography is that he had taken on the protection racket mafia of the time.	4
TOPIC 4: The Jewish, or Real, Jesus	4
TOPIC 5: The falsification of the real Jesus has been (at least so far) very successful: How girls today are manipulated into a (pseudo-)self-determination.	9
6. In Praise of Nudity: Nudity and True Morality	11
7. Sexual intercourse simply belongs in marriage!.	13
8. And the concept is actually practicable!	16
9. Even if something corresponds to the natural disposition of a living being, including a human being, this living being must still learn to put it into practice.	17
10. Teaching high sexual morality to primary school children	17
11. Why the topic of ‘the first sexual relationship’ is also politically significant.	20
12. The theological background of the approach represented here is based on religious history – using the example of the doctrine of original sin.	21
13. The romantic middle way – intoxicating moon bathing!	26
14. Immanuel Kant's critique of religion leads precisely to the real Jesus.	29
15. And finally, some general remarks on the concept	33
16. And two important peculiarities in this concept	34

Back cover text

I remember my First Communion instruction about 75 years ago: The priest taught it himself, at least in part, and he told us about the curse of original sin, which all people have been burdened with since the Fall of Adam and Eve. He also explained that one consequence of this curse is shame, that we have the urge to at least cover our genitals. And he also said that Jesus redeemed us from original sin through his death on the cross. Somewhat cheekily, I asked that we should then actually be freed from this curse, and that the problem of shame shouldn't exist either; if there was redemption, then surely this problem should also be solved. I don't remember what the priest answered, but as far as I recall, he just beat around the bush. And that's probably how all "church people" still talk around the topic today.

But somewhere in my mind, the problem still lingered. You can see in this booklet what I've come to in the meantime. This has nothing to do with faith anymore, and certainly nothing to do with magic; we simply have to act in accordance with our nature. In any case, I think that with my question and my assumption regarding salvation through Jesus, I was (already) on the right track back then.

Michael Preuschoff

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