

Jens Fankhänel

The socialism of the 22nd century

Preliminary version, status: February 3, 2020

Jens Fankhänel

The socialism of the 22nd century

Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Religion and Spirituality	6
2.1	The Old Testament	6
2.2	The New Testament	8
2.3	Hinduism	9
2.4	Islam	11
2.5	The end of religious conflicts	12
2.6	Which teachings a social religion must not contain	13
3	The economy	14
3.1	The wrong concept of ownership	15
3.2	The agriculture	15
3.3	Putting an end to urbanisation	16
3.4	Only small businesses	16
3.5	No interest	17
4	The Sciences	19
4.1	Only small colleges	19
4.2	Test of general knowledge	20
5	The roles of the sexes	22
5.1	The traditional gender roles	22
5.2	Gender Mainstream	22
5.3	The new theory	22
5.4	Priestesses and theological researchers	23

Copyright notice

This book as a whole may be distributed free of charge. The sale is not permitted.

It is not permitted to take individual statements of this book out of context. Only the author has the right to revise this book. No other person is allowed to add words, phrases or sentences to this book or remove words, phrases or sentences from this book. No person other than the author is allowed to add words, phrases or sentences to sections of this book or remove words, phrases or sentences from sections of this book. No person other than the author is permitted to add words or phrases to sentences in this book or remove them from sentences in this book.

Chemnitz, February 3, 2020
Jens Fankhänel.

1 Introduction

Traditional socialism is mostly based on the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This traditional socialism fell into disrepute in the course of the 20th century due to numerous crimes of its followers.

After the counterrevolutions in several socialist countries towards the end of the 20th century, the capitalists believed they could finally breathe a sigh of relief because the “red danger” was apparently averted. However, it became clear that capitalism is far from being able to satisfy all people in the long run. Subsequently, Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and Evo Morales in Bolivia invented the “socialism of the 21st century”.

Since this term is already documented, I named my book “The Socialism of the 22nd Century”. With my ideas I do not want to compete or even be hostile to the good approaches in Bolivia and Venezuela. I merely intend to give new food for thought.

On the other hand, the title of my book should not induce any socialist to postpone the implementation of my ideas until the year 2100. You can certainly start as early as 2020 if you want to. Moreover, parts of my book can serve as a theoretical basis for the “socialism of the 21st century”.

This PDF file is only a preliminary version of my book. There is still a lot of evidence missing for my claims. Nevertheless I have thought it would be appropriate to make my ideas available to the general public as soon as possible.

If something should happen to me, all my knowledge would be lost to posterity. In this case, the reader should please find the evidence for my claims himself. I am a deeply sympathetic person and I am not afraid of a possible attack by a capitalist secret service.

2 Religion and Spirituality

Marx, Engels and Lenin generally had a very critical attitude towards religion. In the schools of the GDR (German Democratic Republic) a radical atheism was spread. As a result, the majority of Central Germans today are without religion.

However, it should be borne in mind that Marx, Engels and Lenin as well as the SED (Socialist Unity Party of Germany) mainly knew Christianity and Judaism as religions. From their perspective, it may have looked as if “religion” was generally incompatible with socialism. Yet there are hundreds of religions around the world. I don’t think that at that time all of these religions were tested for compatibility with socialism.

On the other hand, there are now German leftists who take a very positive attitude towards Christianity and Judaism. For example, the left-wing Thuringian Prime Minister Bodo Ramelow is at the same time a professed Christian.

This contradictory treatment of religions by the left requires a thorough analysis of the content of the individual faiths. Every socialist should know which religious doctrines she/he can reconcile with her/his ideology and which doctrines she/he must reject.

An analysis of all the religions of the world would certainly require more than one human life. However, it seems that I am the first person to examine several religions for their compatibility with socialism. That is why I will limit myself here largely to the bible and Hinduism.

2.1 The Old Testament

The Old Testament commands war against the pagans. The subjugated pagans are then to be either economically exploited or mercilessly slaughtered, so that the existing assets of the pagans can be acquired. [*King*

James Bible online, n.d.]

“But of the cities of these people, which the LORD thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee:” (Deutoronomy 20, 16-17)

“For the indignation of the LORD is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood.” (Isaiah 34,2-3)

It need not be mentioned that such a teaching is extremely antisocial. Nevertheless, I would like to warn here against one-sided recriminations. The expansion of the Jewish empire ended at the latest in 37 B.C., when the Romans made their vassal Herod the Jewish king.

The Romans, who later had a much larger empire than the Jews had ever been able to have, tried time and again to impose parts of Roman culture on the Jews, which led to conflicts. In 66 AD, the Romans placed a statue of Jupiter in the Jewish temple and sacrificed pigs there. This provocation triggered a Jewish uprising that was bloodily suppressed.

In my opinion, however, this conflict was not caused by Jewish intolerance, but by the disrespect of some Romans.

The claim of the Old Testament that Yehowah is the only god is to be seen fundamentally critical. However, even the pagans had certain sanctuaries that were dedicated to only one deity. The other goddesses and gods were respected by the pagans. But no man had the right to confiscate the temple of a certain deity for the worship of an other god.

According to ancient pagan custom, then, Jewish monotheism should certainly have been challenged, but the Jewish temple should not have been misused for the worship of Jupiter.

Also the rejection of the pig victims by the Jews cannot be objected to from a socialist point of view. On the contrary, a socialist should not sacrifice animals at all, because social compassion applies to animals to a

certain extent.

Although the Jews had been tamed from 37 B.C. onwards, the parasitic teachings of the Old Testament were later realized on a much larger scale. As a result of Christianization, the Old Testament also came among many peoples. Many of the so-called “Christians” have obviously always been more fascinated by the eradication of paganism than by the love of Christ. Thus, Charlemagne murdered 4000 Saxons, because these Germanic tribes held on to their old pagan beliefs.

The teachings of the Old Testament, however, only developed their worst effect during the period of colonialism. Red and black people were massacred in far greater numbers than white heathens. Prof. Jack D. Forbes estimates that 30 million Native Americans died in the 16th century alone as a result of colonialism [Forbes, 1992].

The parasitic teaching of the Old Testament was supplemented in Christian times by forced conversion, which hardly plays a role in the Old Testament. However, the parasitic practice does not improve by a single degree. On the contrary: if more and more people are made Christians, then the virus of the Old Testament teaching will get into more and more people’s heads and thus multiply.

2.2 The New Testament

As I explained in the previous section, many Christians have always lived more according to the Old Testament. These “Christians” are quasi-religious Jews, though they are generally neither circumcised nor do they celebrate the Jewish Sabbath.

A person who is descended from the old Jews, however, has the opportunity to distance himself from the parasitic teachings of the Old Testament. Any blaming on the basis of personal descent is inappropriate.

The actual teaching of the New Testament is obviously much softer than the teaching of the Old Testament. In this section, however, I will show that this teaching also has its antisocial aspects.

The New Testament teaches that the lord god punishes man for the smallest missteps with eternal hellish torment. But whoever accepts Jesus Christ as his personal Savior receives complete forgiveness of all his sins. Already these two extremes about punishment and forgiveness are capable of depriving Christians of any healthy moral standard. A Christian will now believe on the one hand that a liar who does not believe in Jesus

Christ is lost. On the other hand, she/he will believe that a believing murderer will go to heaven.

Now how is this promised remission of sins to be understood? Can a person simply say: “I believe in Jesus Christ inwardly, therefore I am forgiven”? Can a converted person say “I baptize myself so that I am free from all church ties”?

In general, it is expected that one will be bound to any church in order to receive forgiveness of sins. In that church, there is a privileged class of priests. Through threats of hell the class rule of the priest over the lay member is thus established.

Moreover, priests often have very close relations with feudal lords or capitalists. The class rule of the feudal lords and the capitalists is further supported by the priests “in the name of god”.

If you don’t believe that the clergy have such a relationship, just listen to how today’s clergy talk about socialism or capitalists! Besides, in my experience, it is almost impossible for a real socialist to get into the parish office, no matter how well she/he knows the bible.

Since church ties supposedly lead to the forgiveness of sins, that is why there is so much controversy about the question which Christian church is the right one. Many Christian churches and free churches have meanwhile allied themselves in the so-called “ecumenism”, so that they no longer fight against each other. But they still insult the so-called “sects” because these special groups are generally not part of ecumenism.

Some Christian special groups do not teach the eternal torment of hell, but the final annihilation of the sinner. But one can imagine that this does not change anything essential. Whether man acts out of fear of the eternal torment of hell or out of fear of the final annihilation is ultimately irrelevant.

2.3 Hinduism

Since the end of the 19th century, many Europeans have turned to Hindus’ writings because they are disappointed in Christianity. In fact, these writings are not as cruel as the Old Testament. However, even the ancient Indians had some anti-social teachings, which I will examine in this section.

In the Indian Vedas the so-called “Aryans” are represented as the “better” people [Griffith, n.d.]. These “Aryans” are obviously largely identical with

the white people.

“Discern thou well Aryas and Dasyus; punishing the lawless give them up to him whose grass is strewn. Be thou the sacrificer’s strong encourager all these thy deeds are my delight at festivals.” (Rig-Veda 1-L-8)

“... Thou hast disclosed the light to light the Arya: on thy left hand, O Indra, sank the Dasyu.” (Rig-Veda 2-XI-18).

“Thou, thou alone, hast tamed the Dasyus; singly thou hast subdued the people for the Arya. ...” (Rig-Veda 6-XVIII-3).

The racism of the old Indians also gave rise to the caste system: the lighter-skinned an Indian was, the higher was the caste to which she or he belonged. The whitest of the whites belonged to the Brahmans, the highest caste.

The Indian Vedas are said to be much older than the bible. Already in this early time there was white racism. A brutal genocide as in the Old Testament is already hinted at in the Indian Sanskrit writings by the prophecy of Kalki [Risi, 2001].

According to the prophecy Kalki is supposed to be a future avatar of the god Vishnu. He is supposed to purify the world by simply killing the “evil”. These “evil” are then in turn associated with the colored, casteless peoples in the ancient Indian scriptures.

According to his official confession, Moses was a monotheist who served the Jewish god Yehowah alone. Monotheism was perfectly suited for him to govern the Jews. But it is quite possible that Moses secretly thought he was this Kalki, the Hindu judge of the end times. Moses was the first man to order genocides in the name of a god [*King James Bible online*, n.d.]. In the end, his lifetime was not enough to “purify” the entire world, as he probably understood his work.

So is there a secret connection between Hinduism and the Old Testament? According to Armin Risi a speculation says that the Jewish name of god is a reference to Shiva, the deputy of Vishnu [Risi, 2001]. Since only the consonants are written in Hebrew, the Jewish name of god is YHWH, which is

usually pronounced as Yehowah. If you add a sibilant sound to the Hebrew name of God, you get the name shYHWaH.

Obviously, the National Socialists were also inspired by the ancient Indian doctrine of the allegedly “legal” dominance of the “Aryans”. Simultaneously, the National Socialists still possessed the bible, which made their ideology even worse.

Hinduism also contains the teaching of karma. This doctrine states that good is adequately rewarded and evil is adequately punished, which can also happen in a future life after a rebirth.

First of all, we can judge that the teaching of karma is very moderate. It does not condemn to eternal hellish torment nor does it promise forgiveness of all sins. At first glance, this could be the longed-for enlightenment for disappointed Christians.

The problem is that you generally cannot remember your good or bad deeds that you committed in a previous life. Therefore, the soul cannot learn anything from the supposed reward or punishment. Other people certainly can much less know what the soul has done in a previous life.

The teaching of karma, however, serves one purpose: it claims that the poor and the handicapped are to blame for their own suffering. The teaching of karma thus relieves the healthy and the rich of their responsibility for the common good.

Both the Old and the New Testament build empires and class societies. The Old Testament does it through physical violence, the New Testament through threats of hell.

The doctrine of the alleged superiority of the “Aryans” enables at least white supremacy. The doctrine of karma cements injustice including the antisocial conditions created by the bible.

2.4 Islam

Some people believe that Allah is identical with the biblical lord god Yehowah.

However, one should bear in mind that the Roman Catholic Church was already relatively strong at the time of the Prophet Mohammed. It was clear that Catholic imperialism could not be overcome by charity alone. It is therefore conceivable that Islam was destined from the outset to form an antithesis to the dominant religion.

This means that the Prophet Mohammed could have been a forerunner

for left-wing resistance in Europe. Till Eulenspiegel and Klaus Störtebeker were certainly part of the left-wing resistance during the Middle Ages. The medieval resistance was in turn a forerunner for the socialist and communist movements of modern times.

The roots of imperialism obviously lie in Hinduism and in the Bible.

Since Islam came into being real late, it is very difficult to assess its true meaning. The question whether Islam is to be judged rather positively or negatively, I will therefore leave open in this book.

The socialists of the future should at least try to cooperate with Islamic associations and states to fight imperialism together. If the cooperation succeeds, then it is good. Otherwise, they should distance themselves from Islam.

2.5 The end of religious conflicts

People have been thinking for a long time about how to end the religious conflicts and wars in the world.

Many Christians believe that the religious conflicts would end when all people were moved by the love of Christ. Others believe that religion must be as liberal as possible (in terms of the practical scope of action of its followers) so that frustration is kept to a minimum.

There seems to be some truth in these two ideas. However, some problems are being ignored.

Not all people can be enthusiastic about the usual doctrines and ideas of the well-known churches and religious communities. In addition, many churches and religious communities have a priesthood, which has the privilege to teach and preach and usually receives a salary from the institution. This two-tier structure can of course cause envy among the ordinary members.

Even the “most liberal” Christian community can still generate frustration, which is then let off steam on those of other faiths!

True religious freedom means that every person can believe what he wants. If intellectual freedom is also given due consideration, there will be even less frustration and therefore more social peace in the future. Moreover, it will become more and more difficult to establish a priesthood as religious views become more individualized.

2.6 Which teachings a social religion must not contain

I will now summarize what religious teachings a socialist must reject:

- the teaching that violence against people of other faiths is legitimate or necessary,
- the doctrine of eternal torment,
- the doctrine of the forgiveness of all sins,
- the teaching that some people are better than another people,
- the teaching that any race is better than another race,
- the teaching that the deeds a person has committed in one life will be rewarded or punished in a future life,
- the teaching that God, the goddesses or the gods want bloody sacrifices from humans or animals.

Apart from these seven antisocial teachings, a socialist can be a believer. She/he may well believe in God, goddesses, gods or spirits. She/he may well believe in an afterlife and/or reincarnation.

Nowadays, it is relatively easy to find out about the various alternative religions around the world on the Internet.

3 The economy

The capitalist economic system allows few people to constantly increase their capital. Many other people are forced in this system to work for pure self-preservation.

The traditional socialist ideology according to Marx, Engels and Lenin recommended nationalization of large parts of the economy. However, experience has shown that nationalization is not the solution. Instead of the capitalists, a political elite can become the new exploiters.

General theories on democracy and the separation of powers show how the problem of capitalism can be solved.

We have learned that political power must be shared in democracy. That is why there are the three powers of state: legislative, executive and judicial. In addition, political power is shared between the federal government, the states and the municipalities. A concentration of political power in a few hands should be prevented.

We should also apply the principle of separation of powers to the economy. For in principle it does not matter whether a person rules by virtue of a political office or by virtue of his capital. It must be prevented that a few people get too much economic power.

The thinking of Marx, Engels and Lenin was obviously still very strongly influenced by feudalism. For in feudalism there is a great intersection of the ruling class and the government. Feudal lords usually represent and govern their country quite officially. In capitalism, the ruling class is very rarely concerned with governance. Politics in the capitalist countries is often already very democratized. But in the background, unfortunately, there is capital, which, according to an “eternal dogma”, is supposedly untouchable.

In fact, it is difficult to impossible to abolish capitalism by a democratic path without formulating a clear redefinition of the concept of property. The socialists of the future should strive to preserve democratic institutions and the separation of powers as much as possible. But the democratisation of political institutions alone is not enough. Democratisation must also be

extended to the economy. In other words, true socialism is the completion of true democracy! In this chapter I will make some suggestions.

3.1 The wrong concept of ownership

Bad laws once enabled the feudal lords to expand their land holdings more and more, while many small farmers became impoverished and had to do compulsory labour. When there were no written laws, church dogmas and traditions served the same purpose. Bad laws allow the capitalists to let their wealth grow more and more, while most people are forced to sell the capitalists their labour power.

For centuries, unfortunately, anti-social laws, dogmas and traditions were in force without being challenged by the majority. Unfortunately, after some feudal lords and capitalists have amassed a huge estate at the expense of the majority, they insist on their “legal property”.

The socialists of the future were to debate several times a year in an unconventional way about which laws would have been appropriate in earlier times. They should discuss how the better laws would have affected the ownership structure. Of course, better laws for the future should also be considered.

3.2 The agriculture

Traditionally, agriculture is the most important part of human work.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, however, many small farmers lost their land and moved to the cities. This crisis forced rapid industrialisation with dramatic consequences.

The environment was destroyed. Diabolical weapons were developed which killed millions of people in the world wars, including women, children and the disabled.

The industry also produces a lot of worthless bric-a-brac. Billions are wasted on advertising so customers will buy all the frills.

The extreme industrialization of the last 200 years was not progress, as many people unfortunately still believe. The completely exaggerated focus on industry and cities was rather a decadent development, once forced by antisocial feudal lords.

I am convinced that extreme industrialization must be largely reversed. Agriculture should be put back at the centre of human labour.

The majority of the families were to work their own fields again, ideally directly in front of their own homes. The socialist state should enable each of its citizens to acquire a piece of land again.

Similarly, a large part of the work done by small farmers was to be used for their own food requirements. Part of the agricultural products must be sold so that the small farmer can buy other products.

In order to optimally achieve the goal of self-sufficiency in food, smallholders must grow a variety of different plants and keep different animals.

The care of many different plants and animals with their respective needs is a challenge for the mind, so that the smallholder cannot become stupid.

At the same time, emaciation of the soil is prevented if the one-sided cultivation of certain plants is avoided.

As long as all agriculture is carried out exclusively by smallholders without employed workers, exploitation in this sector is impossible. Simultaneously, trade by small farmers is kept to a minimum, which largely excludes social injustice for a large part of the families.

3.3 Putting an end to urbanisation

Life in a big city is far, far away from the natural way of life of humans. But many people are hardly able to break out of urban life because of their precarious economic situation.

Only a welfare state can reverse urbanisation and bring a large proportion of families back to the countryside.

Small towns are needed to a certain extent. Agriculture cannot satisfy all needs.

No city should have more than 20,000 inhabitants. The proportion of city dwellers should not exceed 30 per cent of a country's population.

3.4 Only small businesses

Large companies with thousands of employees are easily governed by capital. Direct participation of employees is almost impossible, because they can hardly express their wishes in a bundled form.

The participation of works councils in the management of a company by no means ensures the co-determination of all. First of all, works councils cannot address all the concerns of all employees in a large company, and secondly, like everyone else, works councils are also susceptible to the egoism of preferring their own welfare over the common good.

Democratisation and socialisation can only be achieved through a radical unbundling of industry.

As far as possible, each worker should be self-employed. The socialist state should ensure that the livelihoods of small entrepreneurs are largely secured.

However, if one of these small entrepreneurs should ruin herself or himself by stupidity or laziness, then at least it must be ensured that the dependency is not passed on to the next generation.

For failed small entrepreneurs there can be companies with a maximum of ten employees.

To carry out difficult tasks, small entrepreneurs can join together to form cooperatives. But even here, moderation should be exercised. A cooperative should not comprise more than twenty self-employed and one hundred dependent workers.

3.5 No interest

The capitalists claim that you can make your money work for you. But that's a cold lie, which I will justify in the following paragraphs.

The investor either acquires shares in a company or brings his money to a bank or savings bank, which in turn can lend it to a company against interest. Part of this interest is then passed on to the savers. There are also alternative investments (such as investment funds), which I will not go into further here. In most cases, the investors' money is invested directly or indirectly in a company. The company uses the money to purchase capital goods such as a factory building.

The capitalists now claim that a company makes profits in an entirely "natural" way. These profits could then be used to pay out interest or other investment income, for example to shareholders and savers who have invested their money in a bank or savings bank.

But in reality, the so-called "profits" are created by the exploitation of the workers and employees employed by the company. Interest and other capital gains are thus a parasitic form of money acquisition. They have no

place in a socialist society.

In capitalist societies, consumer loans are also granted for the purchase of a consumer good against interest. The consumer is treated like an entrepreneur who can make a “profit” by purchasing a capital good and exploiting the employees. This claim is of course beyond the reach of most consumers. Many private households in capitalist societies are driven into economic ruin by consumer credit.

Even a consumer loan, which is granted against interest, is ultimately a parasitic form of money acquisition, at least for the bank and its owners. If the charging of interest is generally prohibited, then only few people will be willing to lend their money. But the socialist state should provide interest-free loans for the following necessary reforms:

- The acquisition of an own farm of appropriate size, if the own means are not sufficient for it,
- the acquisition of adequate housing for personal use,
- the unique possibility of independence for workers and employees,
- an appropriate vocational or higher education, if not already paid for by the state.

In contrast, the establishment of marriages and families should not be encouraged by the state. For marriages and families will be created as a natural consequence of social justice.

Some politicians in capitalist societies see a serious problem in the lack of young people. But any attempt to solve this problem directly will only exacerbate social injustice. If the capitalist state promotes marriages and families, it will only breed an army of underprivileged workers and employees instead of allowing as many citizens as possible to become self-employed.

The underprivileged in capitalist societies have good reasons for remaining alone. Firstly, they have more time for their own career and the possible step into self-employment. Secondly, in the long term, they thwart part of the capitalist plan to grow more and more dependent workers.

4 The Sciences

4.1 Only small colleges

In the previous chapter, I recommended unbundling the industry as much as possible. There should only be small businesses.

The same applies to the universities. Nowadays there are universities with thousands of students.

I say stop it! One professor is enough to found a college. The professor may have one or two staff members and some students.

Nowadays, for example, it is common practice for a mathematician to be trained by several experts responsible for the special subfields of mathematics. But in principle, one individual could also give all these lectures. If the sciences are more and more dissected, then ultimately no one has an overview.

Thus, a real project usually requires the cooperation of several sciences and even more so of different branches of these sciences. But if no one really knows what the other one is doing, it becomes more and more difficult to bring the different experts together.

A human being is not a machine to which you can simply assign a certain subtask. A human being is an autonomous co-designer of society. Therefore, a human being has to keep an overview as large as possible.

There are books and machines for small-scale specialisation. Computer programs and robots are usually designed to solve a special task. Likewise, there may be special databases that only contain work from one branch of science.

Unfortunately, nowadays one is rather efforted to create the universal database than to give the living person an overview.

Since most people have been taught tunnel vision, I think universal encyclopedias and Wikipedia are still necessary. But in the long run, universal knowledge should get back into people's heads, while books and machines are responsible for the details.

4.2 Test of general knowledge

Here, dear reader, your general education is to be tested from a completely new perspective. Man should keep the overview, but leave the details to books and machines.

You, dear reader, do not need to know what a prime number or a logarithm is. You should only know who could answer this question.

For the following test of general knowledge you only need a pen and about twelve A4 pages of paper. Answer the questions exclusively from your head! Do not check the correctness of your answers until you have completed the entire test!

1. **Write on paper what sciences you know!** (If you have a good general education, you should plan at least two A4 pages for the first question). Give you later one score for every listed science that really exists.
2. **Write down what religions you know!** For each religion listed that really exists, give you later two scores.
3. **Choose at least three sciences and enumerate their sub-disciplines!** (For three to five sciences, one page should be enough here.) For each branch that really exists and has been assigned to the right science, give you one score. If you are not able to enumerate at least two branches of three sciences, then deduct two scores!
4. **Choose at least two religions and list their denominations!** For every denomination that really exists and has been assigned to the right religion, give you later one score. If you are not able to enumerate at least two denominations from two religions, then deduct two points!
5. **Explain what the three sciences mathematics, computer science and physics are concerned with!** (For a rough description, one page should be enough.) For every correctly described science give you later two scores.
6. **Explain which problems mathematicians, computer scientists and physicists could solve according to your opinion!** (Here the space required depends very much on your imagination.)

For every science that you have correctly assessed after reading a reference book, give you two scores.

7. **Choose at least one more science! Explain what this science deals with and which problems you think it could solve!**
Give you later four scores for each correct description (see tasks 5 and 6) of a science. If you cannot solve this task, deduct two scores!

When you are finished, look it up in books or on the Internet and check the correctness of your information! Add up your scores!

An evaluation of this test will follow in a later version of this book.

5 The roles of the sexes

After my many years of studies on philosophy and spirituality, I have gained a conviction about the roles that the sexes should take on. On the one hand, my current conviction contradicts tradition, which is strongly influenced by the bible. On the other hand, my current conviction also contradicts modern gender theories.

5.1 The traditional gender roles

The bible gives all dominion to men. Gender roles were defined accordingly in Europe for a long time. Even today, unfortunately, there are still only a few women in leadership positions.

5.2 Gender Mainstream

This theory says that there are no actual genders. Which gender a person has is supposedly only dependent on education or on the free choice of the individual.

Gender mainstream obviously emerged as a protest against traditional gender roles.

5.3 The new theory

After my many years of study, I came to the conclusion that the sexes should be assigned completely different roles to those traditionally assigned.

I am convinced that women have the better empathy and ability to hold a community together. Men are better suited for tasks that involve danger, require great physical strength or a mind of research.

Typical female professions are therefore social worker, kindergarten teacher, teacher or mayor.

Typical male professions are hunter, policeman, bricklayer or scientist.

The traditional gender roles are therefore wrong. Because women have the better ability to unify a society. Women are more likely to rule.

On the other hand, gender mainstream is wrong. For example, a woman should not become a policewoman. A man should not become a kindergarten teacher.

5.4 Priestesses and theological researchers

The demand of some churches or religious communities to reserve the priesthood to men is, in my opinion, largely wrong.

For the priestly ministry today is largely about social issues. Women are much better suited for this task.

Only if theological research is still to be done, then this task should be assigned to a man.

The bad habit of entrusting social tasks to males unfortunately attracts parasites everywhere. These are men who do not want to prove themselves by courage, physical strength or inquiring intelligence. They rather strive to rule over even weaker men, women and children. The prestige as priest, deacon or mayor gives them the strength to do so, because then they have subordinates on their side.

Every male who wants to prove himself exclusively as a researcher has a really hard time these days to defend himself against such parasites. Unfortunately, nowadays almost every true male has to be a strong hero, whether he wants to or not.

Bibliography

Forbes, J. D.: 1992, *Columbus & andere Kannibalen*, 2nd edn, Peter Hammer Verlag.

Griffith, R. T. H. T.: n.d., The rig veda, <http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/rigveda/index.htm>.

King James Bible online: n.d., <http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/>.

Risi, A.: 2001, *Unsichtbare Welten*, 3rd edn, Govinda-Verlag.