

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Transgenderizations of the Collective Psyche of Humanity

[Christoph-Maria Liegener](#) *

Posted Date: 21 February 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202402.1227.v1

Keywords: Collective psyche; transgenderization; evolution of humanity; gender studies



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Transgenderizations of the Collective Psyche of Humanity

Christoph-Maria Liegener

Independent Researcher; christoph.liegener@freenet.de

Abstract: The evolving collective psyche of humanity reveals a shift from predominantly masculine to increasingly feminine characteristics since around 1500 A.D. This transformation, termed 'transgenderization,' is attributed to identified psychological factors. Remarkably, the collective psyche has undergone similar transitions in the past since the emergence of humanity.

Keywords: Collective psyche; transgenderization; evolution of humanity; gender studies

The Collective Psyche of Humanity Becoming Feminine

C. G. Jung pioneered the concept of the collective unconscious and collective psyche in psychology (Jung, 1992). The collective psyche of a group mirrors behavior patterns akin to and influenced by the individuals within that group. Consequently, it may exhibit human characteristics, notably gender-related traits, as the group's behavior can reflect both typically feminine and typically masculine qualities.

As an example of a behavior of the whole collective of mankind we can identify the tendency to wage wars. This tendency, which presently cannot be denied, is typically masculine because aggression has developed in male individuals under the influence of an excess of testosterone (van Vugt, 2006, Eisenegger, Kumsta, Naef, Gromoll, & Heinrichs, 2017, Hashikawa, Hashikawa, Lishinsky, & Lin, 2018), and aggression is ultimately responsible for wars. Violent combative confrontation is a male trait (Wilson & Daly, 1985). Wars, unfortunately, occur everywhere. This would indicate that the collective psyche of mankind is masculine, at least so far.

The suffix "so far" is there because recently there has been an increasing move to avoid war through de-escalation and to use sanctions instead of troops. Confrontations are avoided while dialogue is sought. Conventional wars are made superfluous and are being replaced by hybrid warfare, i.e., covert operations, terrorist attacks, and partisan attacks.

That shift in behavior is true for nations as well as for smaller groups. People are joining forces in alliances instead of fighting each other. Everybody tries to shift altercations from the physical to the communicative level.

The avoidance of open fighting in favor of secret taunts can be characterized as typical female behavior. Women avoid open fighting as much as possible. But for men it is often the option of choice. In dangerous situations, men fight while women flee. That is why men have a stronger physique and women have longer legs.

The roots of such behavior can be traced back to early childhood, notably among young girls. The phenomenon of 'bitching' has become emblematic of female interactions among both children and adults. Interestingly, this behavior, while perhaps not ideal, is seen as a preferable alternative to more violent acts like murder or assault. A comparison can be drawn on the schoolyard, where, in extreme cases, girls may engage in hair-pulling, while boys resort to more physically harmful actions such as causing bloody noses or using knives. Consequently, the shift in the collective psyche towards femininity is viewed as a positive development, eliminating brute force from interpersonal dynamics.

Another example of a group's collective behavior: The rise of democracies. During the last 400 years democracy has been rediscovered and has become more and more widespread. It has been present before in ancient Greece, but has been lost later, a story that will be elaborated on below.

Research indicates the existence of a gender stereotype: Men are perceived as hierarchical, while women are seen as egalitarian (Schmid Mast, 2004). The collective unconscious tends to align with prevailing stereotypes within a group, reflecting the influence of these stereotypes. Consequently, in a masculine society, the collective unconscious may manifest in hierarchical forms such as dictatorship or monarchy, whereas in a feminine society, it may lean towards democracy or anarchy.

In our present world, democracy is on the road to prevail in the world, a clear sign that the world is becoming feminine.

Does this mean that the collective psyche of mankind used to be masculine and is slowly becoming feminine, and, if so, why is this so and what follows from it?

The first question can be answered with a "Yes": Humanity is slowly becoming feminine. Women and men who think like women will rule the future (Gerzema & D'Antonio, 2013). Many aspects support this thesis (Liegner C.-M., 2017).

Apart from the examples already given one might consider that there is a substantial improvement of women's rights since the Middle Ages up to today which speaks for a strengthening of the feminine side of the collective psyche in that period of time. A more detailed look is possible for the second half of the 20th century.

In the 1960s and 1970s, a notable shift in societal values occurred, marked by a transition from materialistic to post-materialistic values (Inglehart, 1977). Materialistic values, centered around physical well-being, security, and integrity, were traditionally associated with men, reflecting their historical roles in securing tribes and ensuring survival through battles. In contrast, post-materialist values transcend basic needs, focusing on the quality of life—happiness, health, sociability, and culture. These values are primarily associated with women, who historically contributed to creating a livable environment in caves, caring for the wounded, raising children, and nurturing their husbands. The shift in values during this period can be interpreted as a symptom of an accelerated transformation in humanity's values from masculine to feminine perspectives.

The change of humanity shows up already early in the life of each human being. Consider the school environment—there's a noticeable trend where the emphasis on teaching factual knowledge is diminishing, giving way to a greater focus on developing soft skills, particularly communicative abilities. These soft skills are skills that women are better at than men. Men are strong on facts, women on emotions (Christov-Moore, et al., 2014, McDuff, Kodra, Kaliouby, & LaFrance, 2017). Today's students are expected to do better in a female-centric world. Our ancestors would not have understood that you can graduate from high school without Latin and Greek. Today you can. In turn, today's students have more social competence than those of the past.

The emotional strength of women also has a flip side: their emotional vulnerability. Emotional strength and emotional vulnerability can both be found in our world as it is becoming female. The emotional strength of humanity is shown in the care for the weak, the emotional vulnerability in the increase of psychological problems in modern society.

Where else can we see the influence of the feminization of the world? What about the overpopulation of the earth? In the male phase of humanity, people multiplied explosively until the whole earth was populated. Only in more recent times (from 1970 onward) has the birth rate started to somewhat decline again. That is hardly to be led back on conscious decisions. China had tried something like this with its former one-child policy. As is well known, this led to problems and had to be abandoned. However, from a global point of view, forces of the collective psyche are unconsciously at work in the containment of overpopulation.

In exploring the underlying reasons, we observe a desire in men to disseminate their genetic material widely, leading to a preference for having many children, potentially contributing to overpopulation. However, when considering the slowdown in population growth, it becomes apparent that women play a crucial role in child rearing. Moreover, women share a closer bond with their children compared to men. This also means that she only wants to bring as many children into the world as she can provide for. Birth control is a woman's domain.

Feminized humanity that reaches the limits of overpopulation will curb its reproduction. Thus, the influence of humanity becoming female can also be felt here. In her desire to do what is best for her children, humanity is slowing down population growth.

Of course, there is also a much simpler explanation; starting in the late 1960s, there was the birth control pill. This can explain a decline in the birth rate, but it does not refute the psychological argument. It can be argued that the development of this pill may have arisen precisely from the desire for birth control in a society that was becoming more feminine; this closes the circle.

The feminine world seems to be more friendly than the masculine. The friendly side of femininity can already be seen in the comparison of the physique of women and men: The female breast serves the selfless nourishment of the infant, the connective tissue of the body for tenderness in interaction. In contrast, the man's muscles and physique serve the fight.

If the feminine world is the more pleasant one, why then was the world masculine before? Because humanity used to have to fight for its place in the world. For this, a male psyche is better suited.

The choice between male and female behavior depending on the presence or absence of danger has been demonstrated by nature in the fate of the bonobos.

When comparing chimpanzees and bonobos, our closest relatives in the animal kingdom, it becomes quite clear what choices are. These two species have descended from common ancestors and separated two million years ago when the Congo River was formed. They were separated because they could not swim. Apparently, living conditions were more difficult in the north of the Congo. The chimpanzees that evolved there had to compete for scarce resources with gorillas, found only there but not in the south of the Congo. The bonobos that evolved south of the Congo had an abundant food supply that they didn't even have to fight for.

The result of evolution in this case is impressive: chimpanzees are patriarchally organized, aggressive, and the individual ape groups wage endless wars with other ape groups. On the other hand, Bonobos are matriarchally organized and solve their problems with sex. The collective psyche of the chimpanzees is male, that of the bonobos female.

Therefore, it is understandable that humans tended towards a basic feminine attitude when their living conditions had improved to the point where they no longer had to struggle for their daily sustenance.

So, it is quite reasonable for humanity to become feminine. However, reason does not play a role here. It is not possible for a group like humanity to chose its gender consciously by itself. How then does the transgenderization come about?

A closer look shows that humanity's psyche before the transgenderization resembled the psyche of a mother's son (Liegner C.-M., 2017). The problem with this is that humanity as any mother's son was prone to self-destruction (Pilgrim, 1993). This can be understood as follows: Nature is the mother of humanity, and the notion of God serves as the father. While nature is omnipresent, God is perceived as distant. The son of the mother is nurtured by her, yet she struggles to fulfill her dreams independently. So she instills them in her son. Thus, he is raised to believe that he is destined for something very special; it makes him a narcissist. His feminine imprinting by his mother collides with the social necessity that he behaves in a masculine manner. This inner conflict destroys him. As a narcissist, he cannot accept his failure, which, however, is inevitable. He takes refuge in suicide. This fits with the facts: in its masculine past, humanity was constantly working on its own self-destruction; in 1983, it was only a push of a button away from nuclear war (Hoffman, 2009).

Salvation comes by transgenderization as follows: The mother's son becomes the mother's daughter and she is psychologically stable. This is already shown by the fact that the existential consciousness of guilt, which plagued humanity for so long and found its expression in the doctrine of original sin, is in the process of disappearing, a fact that can be explained psychologically: According to Freud, the existential consciousness of guilt is due to the Oedipus complex (Freud, 1930). Humanity as a mother's son suffered from this complex, culminating in the son's desire to kill his father and marry his mother. This complex can only occur in a son, not in a daughter, at least as

far as stereotypes are concerned. So the newly formed mother's daughter is safe from it. From a psychological point of view, humanity can be free of guilt and be happy.

Is the future really happy?

Happiness is a subjectively felt state of mind. However, there is some evidence that feminine humanity currently feels this state of mind more often than masculine humanity did in the past.

The decisive factor here is the circumstance that in a stereotype view women approach a problem in a process-oriented manner, whereas men approach it in a solution-oriented manner (Pease & Pease, 2002). Women first discuss the problem together, then proceed in small steps (think of the stiletto heels), and keep improving the preliminary result, a process they never finish. It is noticeable that this is precisely the procedure of modern science.

On the other hand, men try to solve the problem quickly and then retire. In turn, women never come to a rest. Unfortunately, men's quick solution is never perfect by its very nature, which is why women like to criticize it - and they do so during the men's rest period! In the past, in the masculine world, such criticism interrupting men's well-deserved break was considered annoying by the men and was called "nagging". Consequently, the women in the masculine world often omitted the criticism and the faults accumulated.

In the feminine realm, positive outcomes emerge incrementally through continuous refinement. Similar to evolution, certain steps are deemed successful in hindsight. Subjectively, it may feel like luck or, put differently, as if fate has been benevolent. Objectively, success is rooted in the ability to recognize early achievements by taking small steps, paving the way for further progress in the same direction.

This effect brings the feminine world to developments being perceived as happy. In the masculine world of the Middle Ages, on the other hand, people often ran in the wrong direction for too long. The subsequent failure was difficult for men to come to terms with. There was a general mood of doom at that time. In the arts, memento mori and vanitas motifs were propagated accordingly. The collective of humanity appeared to have been rather unhappy.

Viewed through this lens, the feminine world appears to be the happier one. In this light, we can consider ourselves fortunate to live in a world that is transitioning towards femininity.

The Reasons for the Feminization of Humanity

If feminization makes humanity happy, then arises the question why has it started so late. Probably humanity would have chosen it earlier if humanity could have chosen. But humanity cannot control itself. There must have been a psychological mechanism, massive reasons for humanity becoming feminine. Since it is a process in the collective psyche of humanity, the reasons must also be psychological.

In fact, at the beginning of the change, the psyche of humanity entered a crisis.

In broad terms, the crisis initiated around the 1500s, gaining virulence gradually. The Copernican shift and the Reformation served as initial triggers, but the intellectual ramifications only became evident after a delay.

That time was preceded by the Age of Discoveries. In the upheaval that followed, humanity had made the shift from conquering distant countries to cultivating its nearest environment, that is, its homeland. Men have always been responsible for conquests, while women were responsible for the nearer environment, formerly the cave. This is the first building block towards an explanation.

What happened to the psyche of the humanity during that time? Humanity had gained new knowledge with which it could not easily cope. The human being had to recognize by the Copernican turn that he was no longer the center of the world, as the Bible had portrayed him as God's creation. His being at the mercy of the immeasurable universe hit him as an unexpected insight. At the same time, the omnipotence of religion, hitherto the anchor of salvation, was questioned. The mother's son was shaken in his narcissistic overconfidence. The psyche of the collective humanity got into an existential crisis. This is, in principle, the situation of the failure of the narcissistic psyche of the mother's son, which leads to his self-abandonment.

Arising from spiritual development, the crisis was internal. As a result, there was an internal reaction, a kind of self-abandonment, albeit a partial one. The mother's son gave up his masculine identity, and humanity's feminine side began to take over.

Models for such a happening exist in nature. Spontaneous sex changes for the preservation of the species are known from the animal kingdom.

The question that arises here is whether the shift in gender dynamics was practical from a survival standpoint. Are women or men better equipped to navigate crises? In essence, the inquiry revolves around determining whether passive (female) or active (male) behavior tends to be more successful in survival situations. This question has been posed numerous times.

First: Men fight in case of danger while women run away. This had already been stated above.

More precisely: The man fights his battle in such situations, regardless of whether it is senseless or not. It has become "the fight he cannot win" for him, proverbially. The man fights it with particular pride, corresponding to his gender role. He feels like John Wayne in the Western: "A man has to do what a man has to do."

Women are more flexible, and they tend to flee or resign. Resigning doesn't sound like an option for men, but it is a perfectly permissible strategy that can enable survival in nature. It does, however, require acquiescent qualities, and endurance is a female strength.

Which promises more success?

In his fable of the frog in the milk jug, Aesop advocated for the perseverance in seemingly hopeless situations: the frog, faced with the threat of drowning in the milk, continues to kick, eventually causing the milk to clump together, allowing the frog to escape.

Evolution, the incorruptible evaluator of statistical chances, has decided otherwise: Animals of the real-world play dead in hopeless situations. In near-death experiences, humans secrete endorphins that make them feel good and lethargic. One could speak of a grace of God that makes death easier for man. God would have chosen, if it were so, a way that can be explained scientifically. The simple explanation is that resignation has prevailed in evolution as the more promising strategy.

To behave in a feminine way, therefore, promises the best chances in humanity's struggle for survival. Evolution has formed the collective unconscious in such a way that it chooses the change from male to female behavior in threatening situations. The collective transforms itself unconsciously.

Here, existential fear is only the trigger of the change. Psychologically the danger lies deeper, namely in the threatening self-destruction of the mother's son, a danger which the collective unconsciousness feels very well. It acts accordingly without involving the conscious mind.

So much for the principle. But it can also be observed practically in human beings. Women have the greater power of resistance in crises than men. Evolution has given it to them to survive the ordeal of childbirth. This female resilience was now needed and mobilized. The corresponding spontaneous transformation of humanity to a feminine identity actually enables humanity to survive. The emerging mother's daughter is psychologically more stable than the mother's son. That saves humanity.

Other reasons could be given for the feminization of humanity. A second reason could be found in the already mentioned original sin, rooted in the Oedipus complex. Becoming feminine would make this psychic conflict non-existing.

Nevertheless, this rationale does not account for the delayed timing of the transformation, considering that the original sin had already been present for an extended period (dating back to the Neolithic revolution, as will be clarified below).

The third possibility of reasoning is almost trivial. It also explains the late timing. With the beginning of modern times around the 1500s, humanity had cultivated nature to such an extent that the whole world had become a man's home. In the stone age, the men went hunting in the wilderness, while the women made the cave homely. Now that the whole world has become a cave, so to speak, the female side of humanity becomes predominant. This consideration explains the process of transformation, including the timing, but not its compelling psychological necessity. However, all three explanations together give a coherent picture of the events.

More Transgenderizations

The feminization of humanity can be called a transgenderization of humanity because the collective psyche of humanity changes its gender.

Here a clarification of terms is needed. The term "transgenderization" does not exist in today's linguistic usage for individuals because transgender persons really carry their new sexual identity already from birth in themselves. The step to living this out is called "transition". In the description of the collective psyche of humanity, however, it is a different situation. The psyche of humanity is at the one time masculine and at another time feminine. Here, in contrast to the individual, a real change of gender does occur. To use the designation "transgenderization" to describe this process seems, therefore, logical. It should not to be confused with similar terms from the psychology of individuals.

The so far described transgenderization from masculine to feminine is not the only one that ever existed. In the Neolithic Revolution, at the beginning of the Neolithic period, an earlier transgenderization already took place, in that case from feminine to masculine. This change began between 9500 BC and 5500 BC, depending on the region.

The people, who had lived as hunters and gatherers until then, became sedentary and practiced agriculture and animal husbandry, cultivating the land. Whereas until then, they had gratefully accepted what nature freely gave them, they now became aggressive towards nature, tried to subjugate and exploit it, took by force what they needed. Feminine humanity had revered nature and received what it gave; the now emerging masculine humanity manipulated nature to get what it wanted.

Significant changes occurred since then: the advent of metalworking and house building necessitated specialization. Men were already familiar with specialization from hunting, while women, who had to alternate during pregnancy, became generalists. The work of specialists was acknowledged, while women's contributions were often taken for granted.

Thus hierarchies developed in which men dominated. The very development of hierarchies is a male trait.

The character of the collective psyche changed. The obedient daughter of Mother Nature became the rebellious son. A transgenderization. The genesis of the predominance of men at that time was already identified by Theweleit (Theweleit, 2019).

There was a new thing that emerged in the masculinization of the world at that time: the first wars. Wars are typically masculine, representing the clash of two competing hierarchies. With the settling down of humanity, the necessity arose to mark out and defend territories. To achieve this, hierarchical fighting communities had to be established. The archaeological remains of the first battles of humanity date from this time and tell of a cruelty that was unknown until then (Meyer, Lohr, Gronenborn, & Alt, 2015).

Also the general consciousness of guilt arose at that time in humanity.

The overcoming of the feminine at that time finds its expression in the myth of the deluge. Like many great myths, this myth is based on a dream of the collective unconscious of humanity. This can be interpreted as follows: According to Jung, water is a symbol of the feminine, which threatened to destroy humanity in the myth. Through the construction of the ark - a symbol of the masculine art of engineering - the danger was overcome. In brief: The threatening female Flood is defeated by the inventive male spirit. The myth arose independently almost simultaneously in the most diverse places of the world - from the Near East to China, at the time of the Neolithic Revolution, i.e., at the time of this transgenderization. The myth describes the change of the collective psyche of humanity from feminine to masculine.

There is a possibility to look for further transgenderizations of humanity, but the interpretations become more speculative when going further back in time. Four million years ago, the very short legs and long canines in male specimens of Australopithecines indicate that they had to fight extensively for their position in the group (Carrier D. , 2007, 2011). The short legs lowered the center of gravity, which was advantageous in combat. These rank fights suggest hierarchies and a male collective psyche. Furthermore, certain strontium isotopes in the canines of Australopithecines showed that the

males stayed in their places whereas females wandered about (Copeland, et al., 2011) which means that the males held the power, also an indication of a male collective psyche.

Sometime roughly two million years ago, the genus "human" evolved from the Australopithecines. In the course of that evolution, a simultaneous change in the collective psyche from masculine to feminine took place. There were visible signs: Approximately 500,000 years ago, the first artifacts emerged, crafted by *Homo erectus* and serving as precursors to jewelry. By around 300,000 BC, with the advent of *Homo sapiens*, the use of jewelry became widespread. It can be assumed that the wearing of jewelry was accompanied by an appreciation of beauty and that this awareness of beauty was related to a feminization of humanity, which was then in the process of emerging. The process of the development of humanity from the Australopithecines might have extended over almost two million years. During this process, an early transgenderization from masculine to feminine took place in the collective psyche of these beings. Another indication: About 30,000 years ago, Upper Paleolithic Venus figurines indicated a matriarchal form of society. These figurines disappeared again with the Neolithic Revolution, when the next transgenderization started.

The reasons for the masculine condition of humanity more than two million years ago and the subsequent change to a feminine condition can be understood. The history of pre-humans was likely intricate. They faced challenges such as enduring periods of drought in southeast Africa during which they had to assert themselves against competing species. For the fight, the man was better suited. Therefore the collective psyche had to be masculine at that time.

With the development of the first humanoids, many things changed. *Homo erectus* appeared at nutritionally better times in much smaller numbers. He had gained an inevitable dominance over the animal kingdom by using weapons. Now he needed less male aggressiveness and on the other hand a concerted approach to hunting and defense against predators. Competition within groups also became undesirable, as there were not enough individuals to spare. Fights over women were reduced as monogamy emerged. Members of the group had to get along well with each other - a strength of women. The collective psyche became feminine.

The history of humanity with regard to the gender of its collective psyche can therefore be summarized as follows:

The pre-humans exhibited a masculine collective psyche. Approximately two million years ago, the development of the "Homo" species introduced a shift towards a feminine collective psyche. Humans transitioned to a sedentary lifestyle around 10,000 years ago, marking a return to a masculine collective psyche. From around 1500 AD to the present, there has been a gradual shift towards a feminine collective psyche once again.

The discussed transgenderizations concerned the past of humanity. Will there be more transgenderizations in the future?

Humanity could one day set off into space. Whatever this may look like, one thing is certain: If humanity leaves the borders of this planet behind, the danger of its self-destruction is reduced. Existence as a mother's son would then be an option again. The man's greater fighting power could be an advantage in conquering hostile habitats. Therefore, a new transgenderization from feminine to masculine in the very distant future cannot be excluded.

Another thought: Is it too narrow-minded to speak only of transgenderization between being masculine and feminine? After all, transgenderization to a queer identity would also be possible. Indeed, there was a transgenderization to a homosexual male identity for some time. This took place in the Late Bronze Age (Liegener C.-M., 2018), around 1200 - 750 BC in the Greek cultural sphere and did not affect all of humanity but the center of Western culture at that time and led to the emergence of democracy long before it was rediscovered in the current transgenderization.

At that time, the Mycenaean culture declined. This culture was organized in a feudal hierarchy, i.e., male-dominated. The subsequent Greek culture brought forth democracy, actually a sign of a feminine collective psyche. The upheaval could be mistaken for a transgenderization from masculine to feminine, but it was not. The female psyche resembles the homosexual male psyche in some traits. In fact, this particular transgenderization resulted in a homosexual masculine collective psyche.

The reasons for this change could have been social unrest at that time, caused by an earthquake, climate catastrophes, or permanent immigration, which questioned the existing power relations (Cline E. H., 2014). Apparently, self-destruction, an implosion of the society threatened. To avoid this, the Oedipus conflict had to be eliminated, as in other cases. For this, the heterosexual mother's son had to transform himself. The transformation to a female identity could have been apparent, but it was out of the question. Since life circumstances were difficult, the male identity had to be maintained with its fighting power. On the other hand, the Oedipus complex could also be defused by homosexuality. That the collective at that time preferred not the female, but the homosexual male identity is shown by the myths of that time.

It begins with the Genealogy of the Gods, where it is told that Uranos, who brought the male into the world, was emasculated by his son Kronos. The story testifies to a disempowerment of the masculine principle; not only because the originator of masculinity was emasculated but also because Kronos committed such an act in the first place. Heterosexual men shy away from castration. The reason may be that it requires physical contact with another man's genitals, which is taboo for heterosexual men. However, women and homosexual men could commit this act. So should Kronos be depicted as homosexual? There is no other evidence for that. In any case, if it had been meant in this particular context, a homosexual titan would have ended the masculine principle.

Was the new gender not the female, but the homosexual? There is another hint for this: The statues of the "Kouroi" in ancient Greek art with their strange smile do not look like heterosexual men.

One more hint in the myths: The homosexual man Achill defeats the female Amazon queen Penthesilea in the Trojan war. Both are outstanding representatives of their gender. This means: In the myth, the homosexual principle asserted itself against the female one.

One final point: Homosexuality was actually widespread and generally accepted in ancient Greece, even to the extent that it was considered essential in the education of young men.

The homosexual epoch, which manifested itself in classical Greece, is often seen as the cradle of European culture.

The end of the final Hellenistic epoch came in 27 B.C. with the incorporation of Greece into the Roman Empire, whereby Greek culture was integrated into Roman intellectual life, and probably the cultivation of homosexuality partly outlived the political changes.

Consequences

What follows from the theory? The future world will probably be democratic because this is a female form of state.

It could also be communist. This is so because in the caves women shared their tools whereas men in a fight to death did not rely on other weapons than their own. Communism reflects the feminine traits of sharing with and caring for the weak. The stereotype says: Women are egalitarian (Schmid Mast, 2004). Communism is, therefore, a female form of state and it will possibly return. It was already there in the first female phase of humanity. Friedrich Engels called it "Urkommunismus" (Engels, 1884). Of course, it cannot return in the masculine form of dictatorship as in the 20th century. Perhaps a democratic socialism will be what is going to come (Liegener C.-M., 2023).

Crucially, the eventual disappearance of wars is paramount. While wars still persist today, the process of transgenderization is not yet complete. How can we contribute to its culmination?

The changes in the societies are difficult to influence and there are many societies. Visible changes are not what is needed, but the small changes in all the individuals which sum up to a change in the collective psyche of mankind.

Is there anything that every individual can contribute?

Avoiding hierarchies is one way of becoming a feminine society. It begins with avoiding hierarchical thinking. Lateral thinking (de Bono, 1992) is a main concept here. It will lead to more creativity in all areas of life.

Furthermore, aggression should be avoided. This was already recognized by Stephen Hawking (Hawking, 2015).

Global peace is still far away. There are still so many autocratic regimes. The dilemma is that autocratic regimes display male behavior and male behavior makes aggressive and is favorable for fighting. Therefore, autocratic regimes will attack and conquer democracies if possible. There is no other way than to strengthen the defense powers of democracies. Although it is not feminine democracies can defend themselves in the long run.

One further thing is clear: feminine behavior should be appreciated. It is the future. This still succeeds only hesitantly. However, a look back a few hundred years shows that a lot has already happened. It will continue. What's more: women will play the leading role at some point. Equality will also be ingrained in the female world, ensuring continued opportunities for men. The feminization of the world does not entail a shift from male to female domination. In the future feminine world, dominance over others will not prevail. Everyone will have equal rights. It could only be that women will get along better in this new world than men. It could also be that some men mourn their lost supremacy. But they will come to terms with that, too. It will become a world of women, which will be less bloody than the masculine world.

If the theory of the world becoming feminine teaches us anything, it is probably this: that our world is in for a happy time. There is a reason for optimism.

References

- Carrier, D. (2007). The short legs of great apes: Evidence for aggressive behavior in Australopiths. *Evolution* 61, S. 596.
- Carrier, D. (2011). The Advantage of Standing Up to Fight and the Evolution of Habitual Bipedalism in Hominins. *PLoS ONE* 6(5): e19630.
- Christov-Moore, L., Simpson, E. A., Coudé, G., Grigaityte, K., Iacoboni, M., & Ferrari, P. F. (2014). Empathy: Gender effects in brain and behaviour. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioural Reviews* 46, S. 604-627.
- Cline, E. H. (2014). *1177 - The Year Civilization Collapsed*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Copeland, S., Sponheimer, M., de Ruiter, D., Lee-Thorp, J., Codron, D., le Roux, P., . . . Richards, M. (2011). Strontium isotope evidence for landscape use by early hominins. *Nature* 474, S. 76-78.
- de Bono, E. (1992). *Serious creativity: using the power of lateral thinking to create new ideas*. New York: Harper Business.
- Eisenegger, C., Kumsta, R., Naef, M., Gromoll, J., & Heinrichs, M. (2017). Testosterone and androgen receptor gene polymorphism are associated with competitiveness and confidence in men. *Journal for Hormones and Behaviour* 92, S. 93-102.
- Engels, F. (1884). *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats*. Im Anschluss an L.H. Morgans Forschungen. Hottingen-Zürich: Schweizerische Genossenschaftsbuchdruckerei.
- Freud, S. (1930). *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*. Wien: Internationaler Psycho-analytischer Verlag.
- Gerzema, J., & D'Antonio, M. (2013). *The Athena Doctrine. How Women (and the Men who Think Like them) Will Rule the Future*. Hoboken: Jossey-Bass.
- Hashikawa, K., Hashikawa, Y., Lishinsky, J., & Lin, D. (2018). The Neural Mechanisms of Sexually Dimorphic Aggressive Behaviors. *Trends in Genetics* 34, S. 755-776.
- Hawking, S. (2015). Aggression could destroy us. Interview by N. Clark. *The Independent, Ausg. vom 19. Feb.*
- Hoffman, D. E. (2009). *The Dead Hand: The Untold Story of the Cold War Arms Race and its Dangerous Legacy*. New York: Doubleday.
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1992). The persona as a segment of the collective psyche. In V. S. Laszlo, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung, revised edition* (S. 140-146). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Liegner, C.-M. (2017). *Warum die Welt weiblich wird. Ein Psychogramm der Menschheit*. Leipzig: Einbuch-Verlag.
- Liegner, C.-M. (2018). *Der Untergang der mykenischen Kultur*. München: Grin-Verlag.
- Liegner, C.-M. (2023). *Die weiblich werdende Welt, 8. Auflage*. Norderstedt: BoD - Books on Demand.
- McDuff, D., Kodra, E., Kaliouby, R., & LaFrance, M. (2017). A large-scale analysis of sex differences in facial expressions. *PLOS ONE* 12(4), S. e0173942.
- Meyer, C., Lohr, C., Gronenborn, D., & Alt, K. (2015). The massacre mass-grave of Schöneck-Kilianstädten reveals new insights into collective violence in Early Neolithic Central Europe. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 112., S. 11217-11222.
- Pease, A., & Pease, B. (2002). *Why Men Lie and Women Cry*. London: Orion.
- Pilgrim, V. (1993). *Muttersöhne*. Düsseldorf: Claassen.

23. Schmid Mast, M. (2004). Men are hierarchical, women are egalitarian: An implicit gender stereotype. *Swiss Journal of Psychology* 63, S. 107-111.
24. Theweleit, K. (2019). Männer tragen eine 12000 Jahre alte Gewaltgeschichte im Körper. Äußerung in einem Interview, geführt von J.S Basad. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung vom 30.11.2019*, S. 40.
25. van Vugt, M. (2006). Gender Differences in Cooperation and Competition: The Male-Warrior Hypothesis. *Psychological Science* 18, S. 19-23.
26. Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1985). Competitiveness, Risk Taking, and Violence: The Young Male Syndrom. *Ethology and Sociobiology* 6, S. 59-73.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.