

HUMANISM – ENEMY NUMBER ONE

Dub McClish

Introduction

I am a threat that is even more sinister and dangerous to mankind than political terrorism. The grave danger I pose lies partly in the fact that most people do not recognize me. I do not grab dramatic attention by attacking innocent people with hijacked airplanes or car bombs, causing immediate physical injury or death. Rather, I subtly attack the spirits and minds of men, undermining and eroding the very foundations upon which sane lives are built. I wage war by means of demonic ideas that urge the unfettered pursuit and fulfillment of every fleshly desire. I elevate human nature and pleasure to absolute supremacy. I corrupt and rot the soul. I foment anarchy and destroy civilization. I am **Humanism**.

Definitions and Identifications

Some have confused Humanism with “humanitarianism,” and some even with the “humane” organizations that seek to protect animals from cruel treatment. Humanists portray Humanism as an innocent philosophy that pursues truth, justice, and the well-being of humanity.

Beware: It is none of these.

Humanism claims two branches: Secular and Religious. However, the only distinction is that Religious Humanists dabble a bit in certain free-wheeling religious ritual and ceremony, while Secular Humanists make no such pretense. Theism and Humanism stand juxtaposed to one another. Theism is God-centered. Humanism is mankind-centered and God-denying.

Humanists generally deny that Humanism is a religion. However, their own “bible” (*Humanist Manifestos I & II*, Prometheus Books, p. 9, hereafter *HM*) so describes it, and more than one court decision has thus identified it. In his book, *Religions in America*, Edward L. Erickson defined Humanism as the philosophy “...that man must look to human experience for moral and spiritual guidance, **without believing that there is a supernatural God, or divine power to support him**” (p. 257, emph. DM). The best definition of this religion comes from their *Human Manifestos*:

Traditional theism, especially faith in the prayer-hearing God, assumed to love and care for persons, to hear and understand their prayers, and to be able to do something about them, is an unproved and outmoded faith.... We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of a supernatural; ...As non-theists [a euphemism for *atheists*, DM], we begin with humans not God, nature not deity.... But we can discover no divine purpose or providence for the human species.... No deity will save us; we must save ourselves... (pp. 13, 16).

James Curry, former president of the American Humanist Association, candidly wrote: "Humanism is a polite term for atheism."

Background and History

Many Humanists claim the words of Protagoras, fifth century B.C. Greek philosopher, as the foundation of their creed: "Man is the measure of all things." The first Humanist was actually the first man who denied God and determined to manage his own life and destiny independent of Him.

When Darwin published his theory of evolution, Humanists were given a "scientific excuse" for abandoning the idea of the personal Creator-God to Whom men are accountable. Utter secularism, **independent of God**, is Humanism's sum and substance. Atheism, with its awful implications and consequences, is its cornerstone.

If Humanists are right in asserting that man is merely a highly developed paramecium, he is under no "moral" obligation to behave a certain way. He is accountable to no one but himself, and he need not think about duty, good, right, conscience, or consequence of behavior any more than a worm or a housefly does. Dostoyevsky was right: "If God did not exist, everything would be permitted." If there is no God, there is no basis for moral laws or ethical absolutes. Unbridled carnal instinct becomes the sole basis of "right" and "wrong."

In 1937, Aldous Huxley candidly admitted his moral relativist motivation for being a Humanist:

I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning, consequently assumed that it had none.... For myself,...the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was...from a certain system of morality...because it interfered with our sexual freedom (*Ends and Means: An Inquiry into the Nature of Ideas and into the Methods Employed for Their Realization*, pp. 312, 316).

Effects and Consequences

If Darwin was right, there is no God. If there is no God, Huxley should not be censured. At least three generations have been fed such poisonous Humanistic philosophy to one degree or another in our public schools. The home environment that for many generations taught children moral principles (and insisted on adherence to them) has utterly failed millions of children as normal family life has degenerated. It is no mere coincidence that values placed on human life and private property in our nation are at an all-time low and continue to decline.

The foregoing definitions and descriptions, and the fact that Humanists occupy numerous places of great influence and authority, explain the major source of the burgeoning

and destructive secularism in our nation. Following are some of the effects that are directly related to Humanistic ideology:

- The ascendancy of moral relativism, based on totally selfish and individual “felt needs” and situations
- The “sexual revolution” of the 1960s that produced the “Era of No-shame,” which has led to the recreational sex culture and the push for “normalization” of homosexuality
- The power of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), which serves as the legal arm of Humanism
- The removal of every vestige of God and the Bible from public schools, and the agenda to do the same from all public life (led by the ACLU)
- The feverish attempts to rewrite and/or revise history, particularly the fact that our Founding Fathers believed in the God of the Bible and the Bible as His Word to the extent that they based our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and most of our civil laws on Biblical principles
- The creation of the myth of “separation of church and state”
- The general ruination of public education
- The menace of “political correctness” (i.e., censorship by intimidation) and its related offshoots (hyper-tolerance, non-judgmentalism, multiculturalism, sensitivity training, overemphasis on diversity, et al.)
- The devaluation of human life seen in zealous championing of abortion and a growing cry for euthanasia
- The potential for unimaginable harmful policies in the field of “medical ethics” (e.g., genetic engineering, cloning, in vitro fertilization, stem cell research, eugenics, psycho-surgery, et al.)
- The attack on personal responsibility and accountability for one’s behavior, treating even the vilest criminals as “victims” rather than perpetrators

Humanistic Relativism is to blame for the moral collapse of the past several decades in the USA, the influence of which is far out of proportion to the actual number of card-carrying Humanists. Infidel theologians, who, for almost two centuries, have spewed forth the poisons of German Rationalism, Modernism, and Existentialism, have been (and are) their willing accomplices. Through their seminaries they have spawned several generations of denominational pulpiteers who treat the Bible as a fairy-tale product of literary evolution, and who question/deny every fundamental tenet of Christianity. These skeptics have robbed the masses of their faith in God, in the Bible, and in its absolute ethical principles, leaving them sitting ducks for Humanistic propaganda. As long as the Bible was a dominating influence in our nation, Humanism’s moral relativism could not thrive.

Humanism feels no threat from any religion except genuine Christianity, because the Bible declares its God, its religion (the church), and its ethical doctrine to be **exclusive**,

objective, and absolute. Accordingly, Humanists do not oppose, but actually encourage, promotion of pagan religions in the public schools and elsewhere (i.e., Wicca, “Native American” religion, Islam, New Age-ism, Eastern religions, et al.).

They State Their Own Case

Humanists best state their attitudes toward moral absolutes, concerning which the following quotes are but a tiny sampling: Paul Kurtz, a past editor of *Humanist Magazine* and editor of *HM*, stated: “As secular humanists we believe in the central importance of the value of human happiness here and now. We are opposed to Absolutist morality...” (“A Secular Humanist Declaration,” *Free Inquiry* 1:1 [Winter 1980–81]:5).

Frederick Edwards, a leading activist in efforts to remove any trace of “creation” thesis from public education, and at one time the administrator of the American Humanist Association, wrote:

We base our ethical decisions and ideals upon human needs and concerns as opposed to the alleged needs and concerns of supposed deities or other transcendent entities of powers.... We oppose absolutistic moral systems that attempt to rigidly apply ideal moral values... (“The Humanist Philosophy in Perspective,” *The Humanist* 44:1 [January–February 1984]: 18–19).

In 1966 Joseph Fletcher wrote his infamous book, *Situation Ethics*. In a 1967 sequel (*Moral Responsibility—Situation Ethics at Work*), Fletcher explained his version of moral relativism:

In some situations unmarried love could be infinitely more moral than married unlove. Lying could be more Christian than telling the truth. Stealing could be better than respecting private property. No action is good or right in itself ([Westminster Press], p. 34, emph. DM).

He was at least consistent, if not “honest” (by his credo there is no such thing as “honesty”). He eventually gave up any pretense of belief in God and became a full-fledged Secular Humanist.

Inconsistencies and Absurdities

In the world of humanists, one could be “immoral” at one point and “moral” in the same act a moment later (e.g., a doctor performing an abortion immediately before and then immediately after the *Roe v. Wade* ruling). However, one of many fallacies of relativism is the assertion that time and place (i.e., situation) determine the morality of an act. In truth, **only the act itself does**. The **act** of abortion is right or wrong, moral or immoral. The relativist who pronounces, based on the court ruling, that abortion is “moral,” implies that it was previously “immoral.” In both cases, he makes an absolute claim. Like it or not, the relativist unavoidably ends up as an absolutist.

At the personal level ethical relativism always breaks down. The relativist loudly pontificates: “No one can say that adultery, theft, lying, or even rape, homosexual behavior, and murder are ‘wrong’”(which is itself a statement of absolutism). But what does he do when his wife commits adultery or someone rapes his daughter, murders his son, or steals his car? He suddenly morphs, if only momentarily, into a staunch absolutist!

Humanists cannot logically or practically escape **absolutes** or avoid making moral judgments and claims in **absolute terms**. The moment one of them pronounces the Nazi Holocaust “evil” and the Nuremberg Trials “good,” he has made an **absolute** ethical claim that denies his relativist premise. No Humanist can consistently say that one who attempts rape is “worse,” and one who prevents the attempted rape is “better.” To pronounce anything “good” or “evil,” “better” or “worse,” implies an **absolute standard**. The Humanist must therefore avoid—at all cost—the use of such words as *all, none, never, always, must, completely*, and (above all), *absolutely*.

The statements, “All moral values are relative” and “There are no moral absolutes” are both absolute statements. Reread Fletcher’s comment above, and let its blatant self-contradiction soak in: “No action is good or right in itself.” He uttered an **absolute** denial of all **absolutes**. The moment the Humanist makes any such claim he forfeits his case, exposing its inconsistency and absurdity.

The True and Only Alternative

Ethical values must be either **objective** (from an unvarying source exterior to us) or **subjective** (arising from within us)—there are no other choices. One correctly identifies moral absolutes with an **objective ethical standard**. If a standard of absolute ethics exists, this standard implies an absolute and objective Source. This Source must possess and exemplify all such absolutes to perfection. God, the omnipotent, omniscient Creator revealed in His creation (Psa 19:1–4; Rom. 1:19–20), is further revealed in the Bible as perfect in every moral attribute (i.e., love, kindness, justice, purity, longsuffering, righteousness, et al.). From His nature flows His standard and pattern of ethical absolutes for mankind, His ultimate creation: “Be ye holy, for I am holy” (1 Pet. 1:16). Ethical absolutes are rooted solely in God and His special revelation (the Bible). Herein lies the explanation for Humanism’s bold assault against everything pertaining to the Bible. **It must destroy the Bible or be destroyed by it!**

Biblical ethics are based on two great fundamental principles of conduct, stated by Jesus the Christ :

Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God, the Lord is one: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these (Mark 12:29–31).

Love of God with all of one's being is primary, followed by love for one's fellow man as one loves himself. The Ten Commandments reflect this very order. The first four commandments establish man-to-God obligations, while the remaining six set forth man-to-man ethics. In direct contradiction to Humanism, the Bible exalts God and ties all human behaviors to this ultimate loyalty. This loyalty drives us to His revealed, absolute standard of conduct—His law, as revealed in the Bible. Love for God cannot be defined apart from respecting and obeying His law: “For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments” (1 John 5:3a).

The Bible (God's law) is infallible: “The scripture cannot be broken” (John 10:35b). It is indestructible: “But the word of the Lord abideth for ever” (1 Pet. 1:25a). It therefore alone qualifies as the absolute standard that defines good and evil, right and wrong, truth and error. One of its major themes is this distinction. Scripture enables men to “...have their senses exercised to discern good and evil” (Heb. 5:14; cf. 2 Cor. 6:14–16; Gal. 5:19–23; Tit. 2:12; 1 John 2:15–17; et al.). To use some other standard invites God's eternal condemnation: “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness...” (Isa. 5:20a).

Conclusion

Humanism is but one more attempt of rebellious men to eschew the restraints of their Creator. Paul described Humanists in e very age:

[They] became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, ... they refused to have God in their knowledge... (Rom. 1:21, 28).

Automobiles do not write their operator's manuals; their makers do. And so it is with God and puny men. We must resist this deadly religion/philosophy with all of our might.

[Note: I wrote this MS, and it originally appeared as an “Editorial Perspective” in the July 2004 issue of *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*, a 36-page monthly of which I was editor at the time.]

Attribution: Printed from *TheScripturecache.com*, owned and administered by Dub McClish.