

ANOTHER RESPONSE ON HUMANISM

By Dub McClish

How strange it is that those who pride themselves in being most liberal toward and tolerant of every philosophy, lifestyle, and religion can be exceedingly intolerant toward those whom they judge to be intolerant! Two recent articles in the *Denton Record-Chronicle* (one by Mr. Fielding (local Unitarian Church “minister”) and one by Mr. Vela (professor at University of North Texas), both appearing June 3, 1994) offered excellent examples of this strange phenomenon. While professing broad-minded, non-prejudicial, we-don’t-condemn-those-who-differ-with-us virtues for Humanists (and doubtless for themselves), their words were among the most narrow-minded, prejudicial, and hypercritical words we have read lately. They wrote as if they were the absolute authorities on what Humanism really is and how it most often manifests itself in modern times. Both articles were exceedingly condescending toward Christianity. Please understand that we make no defense of any atrocity, crime, or any other error that some ill-begotten religious organization or religious nut has mistakenly sought to justify by the Bible. We do wish to question several of the assertions of the articles.

Mr. Fielding quoted the following definition from his dictionary: “a doctrine, attitude or way of life centered on human interests and values; especially a philosophy that asserts the dignity and worth of man and his capacity for self-realization through reason” (he changed “man” to “human beings” and “his” to “their” to be politically correct, we suppose). This is correct as far as it goes, but I have the same dictionary and he only quoted part of the definition. Significantly, Mr. Fielding omitted (with no elipsis dots to so indicate) the last phrase of *Webster’s* definition. The quotation does not end with the word “reason,” but with the following : “... through reason **and that often rejects supernaturalism** [emph. DM].” I wonder why this phrase was dropped. Could it have been because it practically denies the entire thrust of the article, which was apparently intended to lead us to believe that Humanists are actually believers in the Bible and the God of the Bible?

Mr. Vela’s Guest Column was entitled, “Personal View on Humanism,” and it is just that—his personal opinion about what Humanism is or perhaps what he would like us to believe it is. Unfortunately, it does not agree with the facts, as we intend to show. He alleged that “much is written about humanism by those who seem to know very little about it.” This is likely true, including his thoughts on the subject. He sought to project Humanism as a mere innocent philosophy that pursues “truth, justice and the well-being of the human spirit.” He denied that it is a religion, but it describes itself as such (*Humanist Manifestos I & II*, p. 9, hereafter abbrev. as *HM I & II*). It has also been declared such by more than one court decision. He avers that some must have gotten their definition from the family cat. *Webster’s Dictionary* was not written by the

respective family cats of Noah Webster and his successors, and it states that the Humanist "often rejects supernaturalism." In his book, *Religions in America* (1975), Edward L. Erickson defined Humanism as a philosophy suggesting "...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* [emph., DM]" (p. 257). I doubt that Erickson depended on his cat for the information in his book.

However, the best source of information on what Humanists affirm and deny is their own official document, *Human Manifestos I and II*, published by Prometheus Books, Buffalo, NY (1973). The following excerpts give us insight to the Humanist creed:

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, 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).

(Was it a Humanist cat that provided the information written in the *Humanist Manifestos*, or was it Humanists who simply revealed their actual convictions and agenda?) To the Humanist man is a wholly material creature: Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful.... There is no credible evidence that life survives the death of the body" (*HMI & II*, PP. 16–17). No wonder James Curry, past president of the American Humanist Association once said, "Humanism is a polite term for atheism."

Obviously, these tenets of Humanism destroy man's sense of accountability and responsibility for his own actions. If man is merely a material, physical animal, why should he think about duty, good, right, conscience, or consequence of behavior any more than a worm or a housefly? At least two generations have been fed a steady diet of such poisons and we should not be amazed that the value placed on human life and private property are at an all-time low and are steadily declining in our nation.

Mr. Vela used half of his article on historical notes related to Humanism. He cited the Classical Greeks and Romans as the earliest Humanists because they sought to "bring human beings to the highest station possible." (Yes, and that without knowledge of or belief in God in their unmitigated Paganism.) Protagoras, the fifth century B.C. Greek philosopher, well states the foundation of the Humanist creed: "Man is the measure of all things." By this dogma, man, not God, has the right to determine the limits or bounds of his own behavior—what is good, what is evil. What man says about himself and his world is final! Actually, the history of Humanism may be traced to the first man who denied God and determined to manage his own life and destiny completely independent of Him. The apostle Paul accurately described the

Humanists in ancient or modern times: 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).

The Vela article asserts that modern Humanism arose as a reaction to "organized, church Christianity" which taught "the one true God" and demanded despotic control over man's destiny, both here and hereafter. (We suppose by "organized, church Christianity" he refers to Roman Catholicism.) There is an element of truth in this assertion, although it is a gargantuan historical error to equate Christianity with Roman Catholicism. The former had its beginning in Jesus Christ and His teachings and revelation—the New Testament. The latter evolved between the third and seventh centuries A.D. as a monstrous aberration of Christianity, based upon human dogma and tradition. The "Golden Age" of Catholicism corresponded with the Dark Ages that plagued the world (cir. A.D. 600–1600). The Roman Church held absolute power, both civil and religious, during much of that millennium and abused it horribly in innumerable documentable cases.

When men in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries began to rediscover the Classical works of the old Roman and Greek civilizations they were like a breath of fresh air when compared to the intellectual bondage of Catholic dogma. The result was the Renaissance that roughly corresponded in time with the beginning of the Protestant Reformation (early sixteenth century). The intellectual world (philosophers, scientists, artists, teachers, et al.) of the Renaissance became more and more enamored with itself and less and less God-centered. Theism and revealed religion were equated with the oppressive evils of Catholicism.

To summarize, those who rejected Roman Catholicism, but who retained their faith in God and His revelation, became the Reformation movement. Those who rejected Roman Catholicism, but who lost their faith in God, became Humanists. Atheistic, secular Humanism was on its way. When Darwin came along in the nineteenth century with his theory of evolution through natural selection, it gave Humanists a "scientific excuse" for dismissing the idea of the personal Creator God altogether. While there have doubtless been some Humanists who have claimed to hold on to a belief in God, utter secularism and total faith in man *independent of God* have increasingly dominated the movement over the past two centuries. Since the publication of *Humanist Manifesto I* (1933), atheism (and its awful attendant consequences) has undeniably been the cornerstone of Humanism. It would be amusing to read that "Modern Bibles owe their historical and moral authority to the work of ... humanists," were it not so palpably false. The New Testament canon was for all practical purposes already set by the second century, as evidenced by both the Muratorian Canon and the Peshito. The Vela claim that Humanists gave the world the Bible is as fantastic as the Roman Catholic claim that it did so!

Contrary to Mr. Vela's denial that Humanists act in concert, have any network, a communication system, a plot, or a plan, all of these do, in fact, exist. Only by acting in concert were they able to write, sign, and publish *The Humanist Manifestos I and II*. They must have some sort of "communication system" that enabled them to contact each other to gather signatures for the *Manifestos*. The *Manifestos* are the declarations of their "plots" and "plans" for our world. They have their own official periodical, *The Humanist Magazine*, and their own publishing house, Prometheus Books.

Now, what are some of their "plots" and "plans"? They have plots and plans for ethics, holding none to be absolute or immutable:

We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous [governed solely by the individual, DM] and situational {depending on the situation, DM}, needing no theological or ideological sanction. Ethics stems from human need and interest.... In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures unduly repress sexual conduct.... The many varieties of sexual exploration should not in themselves be considered "evil" (*HM I & II*, pp 17–18).

Sol Gordon, author of sex education books used in public schools, is a signer of the *Humanist Manifesto II*. Dr. Mary Calderone, a prime mover in the campaign to force sex education into the public schools over the past twenty-five years, was named "Humanist of the Year" in 1974 by her fellows. We unhesitatingly charge that Humanists, with their godless doctrine of amorality, have been *directly responsible* to a great degree for the sexual revolution that has precipitated the tragic breakdown in morals in America. The resultant spiraling illegitimate birthrate and the dissolution of marriage, family, and home—the very foundations of a healthy and strong society—are destroying the very fabric of American life. They scream (sometimes even through lawsuits) if a Bible-believer seeks to "impose his values" on others (especially in public schools), but they don't mind brazenly imposing their non-values on everyone through every institution (public or private) they can infiltrate!

Their amoral ethical platform has further dire implications. Humanists have been in the forefront of abortion advocacy that now slaughters an average of 1,500,000 unborn babies annually. Francis Crick, a British biologist and a signer of *Humanist Manifesto II*, has advocated legislation that prohibits a newborn from being declared legally alive till the third day after delivery and before certification as healthy (thus worthy to live) by medical examiners. He also campaigns for compulsory death for all at the age of eighty years. Prometheus Books, the Humanist publishing house, lists numerous books that advocate the killing of infants, the elderly, and others whose "quality of life" is judged unsatisfactory. Isn't this a wonderful new world the Humanists set forth? Remember, they have no plots and plans!

They have plots and plans for Globalism, Socialism, and Communism:

The humanists are firmly convinced that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society [i. e., Capitalism] has shown itself to be inadequate and that a radical change in methods, controls, and motives must be instituted. A socialized and cooperative economic order must be established to the end that the equitable distribution of the means of life be possible.... Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.... Only a shared world and global measures will suffice.... We affirm a set of common principles that can serve as a basis for united action—positive principles relevant to the present human condition. They are a design [is this anything like a “plot” or “plan”?]for a secular society on a planetary scale.... We deplore the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds. We have reached a turning point in human history where the best option is to *transcend the limits of national sovereignty* [emph. in orig.] and to move toward the building of a world community...: Thus we look to the development of a system of world law and a world order based on transnational federal government (*HM I & II*, pp. 10, 14–15, 21).

Could Karl Marx have said it any better? This is anti-nationalistic, one-world Socialism and Communism, pure and simple. But remember, Humanists have no plots or plans!

The greatest channel of influence for Humanism in America has been through public education. “Innovative and experimental forms of education are to be welcomed” (*HM I & II*, p. 20). Their bold innovations and experiments have made guinea pig farms out of our public schools and have left us with millions of high school and college graduates who cannot read, comprehend, write, or work math sufficiently to fill out a job application form. In short, we should give Humanism an A+ for the disaster it has wrought in our public schools. Besides abandoning long-standing, proved, and indubitable teaching and learning methods, these wonderful innovations have driven even the mention of God, the Bible, prayer, and Biblical morals from the schools. The Ten Commandments cannot even be placed on a public school bulletin board, but how to “safely” commit fornication (with the same or the opposite sex), evolution, moral relativism, values clarification, and the whole package of Godless Humanism are given free reign, in some cases, even mandated. Humanism has taken the paddle and switch from the hands of classroom teachers and principals and placed threats of bodily harm, physical attacks, and lawsuits in the hands of students.

The late John Dewey, hailed as the father of modern American education, was among the signers of the *Humanist Manifesto I*. Principally through his influence Humanistic philosophy became synonymous with education philosophy several decades ago. It was first introduced at the college and university level, which explains why so many professors have evangelistically promoted atheism, evolution, Marxism, Socialism, amorality, and every other anti-Christian philosophy on our university campuses over the past two or three generations.

Public school teachers trained by Humanist professors now flood our public schools, even at the kindergarten level. The majority of school textbooks are saturated with Humanistic

concepts, including leftist politics. While some public school teachers are willing and conscious purveyors of Humanist propaganda, doubtless many of them are unconscious and unwitting pawns of Humanistic strategy. Is “Humanistic plotting” too strong a term when it comes to education? Read the following from the official mouthpiece of the American Humanist Association and decide for yourself:

I am convinced that the battle for humankind’s future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being. These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the educational level—preschool, day care or large university. The classroom must and will become an area of conflict between the old and the new—the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of humanism, resplendent in its promise of a world in which the never-realized Christian ideal of “love thy neighbor” will finally be achieved (John Dunphy, *The Humanist Magazine*, Jan.-Feb. 1983, pp. 25–26).

Mr. Fielding, as did Mr. Vela, would have us believe that Humanism is merely an innocent philosophy of good will toward humankind that seeks dignity, justice, and wellness for all men, based upon reason. Oh that only this were so! He avers that most Humanists are not “secular” Humanists, or at least would not call themselves such. (If I believed what the *Humanist Manifestos I and II* promulgate, I would try to deny my identity as a secular Humanist, also.) Whether through ignorance or intent, he is mistaken. I suggest that Humanism is dominated by atheists, agnostics, naturalists, materialists, and secularists. This includes those who claim to be “ethical” and/or “religious” Humanists. Paul Kurtz, former editor of *The Humanist Magazine* and editor of *Humanist Manifestos I and II*, wrote precisely on this very point: “Humanism cannot in any sense of the word apply to one who still believes in God as the source and creator of the universe. Christian Humanism...surely does not apply to God intoxicated believers.” A “Christian Humanist,” as suggested by Mr. Fielding, is an oxymoron. (One may as well speak of a “Nazi Communist”!)

If Mr. Fielding has in mind the cozy relationship between Humanism and Unitarianism, the religious organization with which he is affiliated, we could not agree more. We say it without intent to denigrate (only to state and demonstrate the fact of this relationship, but without fear of successful contradiction), that the Unitarian Universalist Fellowship (the result of a merger between Unitarians and Universalists in 1961) occupies a position of **official denial** of all of the cardinal doctrines of and concerning Christ, including the following:

1. The Trinity
2. The virgin conception and birth and the Deity of Christ (they teach He was merely a human being);
3. The inspiration and authority of the Bible (they teach that it is only one of many equally-acceptable religious books, along with the writings of Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius, et al.)
4. The immortality of the soul and the doctrine of eternal bliss in Heaven with God or eternal torment in Hell with Satan and his minions
5. Absolute ethical and religious principles (they teach that man decides his own ethics and religious practices and doctrines)
6. Special creation (they teach that man is simply at the top of the evolutionary ladder)

Universalists are encouraged to be “free-thinkers,” to believe or disbelieve what they choose. Consequently, the membership of this organization has characteristically been composed of agnostics and/or atheists and those who possess the most liberal views of politics, morals, and theology imaginable. All of these matters are readily documentable.

It is sheer hypocrisy for Mr. Fielding to refer to “the Kingdom of God” of which Jesus spoke as if it were a Humanistic concept. Mr. Fielding has not the slightest concept of or belief in the kingdom of God as described in the Bible. It is strange that those who so despise what the Bible really teaches (when one correctly reasons concerning it) so often resort to mentioning it, quoting from it, and implying that they respect it **when it suits their purpose**.

Humanists do not have a monopoly on reason, as they like to imply. The fact is that they are among the most irrational people extant (e.g., it is irrational to believe that life came from non-life [evolution], that the marvelous design apparent in the universe and in our very bodies does not imply an Omnipotent Designer, that there are no moral absolutes, but certain things are somehow “immoral” nonetheless [e.g., exterminating 6,000,000 Jews]. Jesus Christ was the most rational, reasonable person who ever lived or ever shall. He never made an invalid argument, never stated a faulty premise, and was never asked a question He could not answer immediately and truthfully.

The Bible throughout is faultless in its logic and it urges men to approach it rationally: “Come now, and let us reason together, saith Jehovah” (Isa. 1:18). It urges its readers to “Prove all things: hold fast that which is good” (1 The. 5:21). We most certainly believe we must approach the Bible with reason, but if we understand Mr. Fielding, his idea of “reasonably” approaching the Bible is to deny its most fundamental teachings. Apparently, to him and all other Humanists, to employ reason means to totally reject any objective authority in favor of subjectively exalting one’s own thoughts, opinions, desires, and imaginations. This is actually a denial of true reason. He would do well to cease preaching so much on exalting rationality until he is willing to practice it, especially in relation to the Bible.

We are not surprised that Mr. Fielding, a Unitarian, came to the defense of Humanism, because the two are more than closely related. We have already documented several tenets of both philosophies pertaining to religion and morals which are in concord. It is significant that twenty-five percent of the signers of the *Humanist Manifesto II* were Unitarians. In 1976 Anthony Flew, a world-renowned atheist and Humanist philosopher from Reading, England and Thomas B. Warren, Christian, engaged in oral public debate on the question of the existence of God. The debate was conducted on the campus of the University of North Texas in the "Super Pit." Mr. Flew attended the Unitarian Church the Sunday before the debate began. Mr. Flew also signed the *Humanist Manifesto II*. Claire Chambers, in *The SIECUS Circle*, documents the control of the Unitarian Universalist Association by Humanists (Belmont, MA: Western Island Pub. Co.).

In light of these few facts about Humanism, it is nothing short of blasphemy to imply that Jesus was a Humanist or that he blended Humanism and religion. Humanism, with its moral and religious bankruptcy, stands in stark contrast with the beautiful and pristine purity of the religion and morals of the religion of Christ. We must not let erroneous definitions of Humanism and disclaimers by Humanists deceive us. It is a real and present danger to our entire way of life, including our basic freedoms, in America! Do what you will, but I plan to continue to both expose and oppose it.

[NOTE: A shorter version of this MS appeared in the August 12, 1994, edition of the *Denton Record-Chronicle*, the daily newspaper published in Denton, Texas. I wrote this in response to some articles favoring humanism that appeared in the newspaper.]