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This paper proposes a hypothesis on a falsely perceived superiority of men versus women along with the history of humanity: in short, men were falsely perceived as “superior to women” along the human history NOT ONLY BECAUSE of their generally stronger bodies (and false-hypothetically superior intelligence and/or creativity), but ALSO POSSIBLY BECAUSE the semen (/semen fluid) of men (and all known males from various animal species) is visible to the human eye and that may have created the FALSE impression that ONLY men possess “creative seed” and women are just “soil”-like passive containers (“fertile soils”) which only assure the favorable conditions for that creative seed to generate a fetus/child; this hypothesis may also explain why various Gods (from various religions) who possess the power of creation are represented as males, not females.

This paper continues the work of other past articles/preprints of the same author in philosophy [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6].

I. The main section of this paper

Observation (Obs). The semen (/semen fluid) of men (and all known males from various animal species) is visible to the human eye (macroscopic, although the actual sperm cells (SCs) of males are microscopic and only visible under microscope) AND THAT may have sparked along with the history, the false conscious and/or unconscious impression that only men/males posses “creative seed”, “Ironically” (in a way), the female ovum (/egg cell) (FO) is much more complex than a SC and much larger than the average size of SCs: FO is even visible to the naked eye (URL) although it is unobserved in daily experience because it is already dead and decomposed when physiologically eliminated by menstrual secretions in the menstrual period of females.

Hypothesis (Hyp). Based on Obs, we launch the main hypothesis of this paper stating that: men/males were falsely perceived as “superior to women/females” along with the human history NOT ONLY BECAUSE of their generally stronger bodies (and false-hypothetically superior intelligence and/or creativity), but ALSO POSSIBLY BECAUSE the semen (/semen fluid) of men (and of many known males from various animal species) is visible to the human eye and that may have created the FALSE impression that ONLY men posses “creative seed” and women are just “soil”-like passive containers (“fertile soils”) which only assure the favorable conditions for that creative seed to generate a fetus/child. Indeed, the macroscopic appearances/ facts (related to sexual act and procreation/ reproduction) may easily induce the false impression (especially to low-educated/ ignorant human persons) that human/ animal males procreate actively and females are only passive procreators in general.

** Possible implications and explanations based on the potential/possible validity of Hyp. See next.

Explanation (1). In many science/medicine-ignorant religions, women are wrongly considered “teluric”/passive entities AND/OR inferior persons which “should be obedient to men because they are inferior to men”: the extensive scientific analysis of sex differences in humans [URL2, URL3] has shattered many myths regarding this generally false/apparent-only male superiority. Hyp may thus bring an additional possible explanation on why some religions fell in this false “male superiority trap”.

Explanation (2). Hyp may also contribute in explaining why various demiurge-like Gods (from various religions) who possess power of creation are represented as males, not females.
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