

MORALS IN AN IMMORAL AGE

By Dub McClish

Introduction

It is no secret to those of us who have lived a few decades that our nation has suffered a catastrophic decline in moral principle and behavior over this span. Those who are 20 or fewer years old are incapable of fully recognizing this decay, because its onslaught was well underway when they discovered America—they have known little different. While not all of our fellow citizens of decades passed lived by an absolute moral code, the vast majority nonetheless recognized that such existed and should be honored.

The forces at work to produce this degradation have been many and they have been working patiently for a long time. However, all of these elements have one devastating philosophy in common. I will allow it to describe its warnings aims, stratagems, and consequences when it describes itself honestly:

I am a threat that is even more sinister and dangerous to mankind than global military terrorism. I do not grab dramatic headlines by attacking skyscrapers with hijacked airplanes or crowds with car bombs, causing immediate physical injury or death. The grave danger I represent lies partly in the fact that most people do not recognize me for the threat that I pose. I employ cultural and ethical terrorism. I subtly attack the spirits and minds of men, undermining and eroding the very cultural and moral foundations upon which sane and civilized lives are built. My weapons of war are demonic ideas that urge the unfettered pursuit and fulfillment of every fleshly desire. I elevate mankind and his human nature to absolute supremacy and encourage each person to formulate his own moral standards. I corrupt, rot, and damn the souls of men. I foment anarchy and destroy civilization. I am **Humanism**.ⁱ

A Primer on Humanism

It is impossible to discuss the nature of man and his morals without discussing aberrant concepts of both. All abnormal and erroneous views of these subjects of which I am aware, at least in the Western World, reside under this one philosophical umbrella—**Humanism**. Some have confused Humanism with “humanitarianism”—the charitable desire and inclination to be helpful to other human beings. Others have even wrongly identified Humanism with the “humane” organizations that seek to protect animals from unnecessarily cruel treatment. Humanists typically portray Humanism as a superior and innocent philosophy that pursues “truth, justice, and the well-being of the human spirit,” as one Humanist indicated to me several years ago, but do not be deceived by such palaver.

Humanists claim two major branches of their philosophy: *Secular* and *Religious*. However, this distinction is completely artificial. The only difference between the two is that **Religious** Humanists—such as the Unitarian-Universalist Association (better known as the Unitarian Church)—dabble in some free-wheeling, secular-oriented “religious” ritual and ceremony, usually on Sundays. These “religious” meetings may feature a poet doing a “reading” laced with four-letter profanities, a Hindu lauding his panoply of gods, or a Wiccan explaining the advantages of witchcraft. **Secular** Humanists, on the other hand, make no such pretense regarding religion. One does not misspeak, however, when he says that a Humanist is a Humanist is a Humanist. When most of us think of Humanism, we likely think of the term, *Secular Humanism*, which correctly describes all dedicated Humanists, whether they style themselves “Religious” or “Secular.”

Contrary to the denials of some Humanists, they are well organized and wield a powerful influence. Our federal government is riddled with Humanists in every branch and agency and at the highest levels of power. The Department of Education is especially shot through with Humanists whose policies and pronouncements eventually make their way into the public school classroom by means of humanistic teachers in colleges of education and textbooks written and approved by Humanists. The major news media are largely owned, operated, and staffed by Humanists.

The entertainment industry is a ready vehicle of Humanism because its owners, producers, and the majority of its players have sold their souls to Humanism. Some are “deliberate” Humanists out of devotion to the philosophy; they are “card-carrying” Humanists—it is their religion. Multitudes are merely “practical” Humanists, having embraced humanistic thinking without joining any Humanist organization; they are not even conscious of the source of their thinking and behavior. Among these are those who have mindless ambition for wealth and/or power. Still others have fallen prey to the principles of Humanism because they pursue the guiltless fulfillment of fleshly lusts, particularly of the sexual variety. Humanism affects not only the USA, but other nations as well. Most of those who are in key positions in the United Nations are dedicated Humanists, which explains many of that organization’s irrational and liberal social, economic, and ecological policies.

Independent American Humanists published the first *Humanist Manifesto* in 1933, signed by thirty-four of our fellow-citizens (including John Dewey, the “father of public

education”). To give some structure to the advancement of their cause, the American Humanist Association (AHA) was formed in 1941. The Humanists have an official journal, *The Humanist Magazine*, and their own publishing house (Prometheus Books). True to their relativistic credo, they amplified and updated their “bible” by publishing the *Humanist Manifestos I and II* in 1973, this time claiming signatures from several nations. In 2003 they published *Humanist Manifesto III*, which has several hundred signatories and for which they are still soliciting signatures through the AHA Website.ⁱⁱ

Secular Humanists come in a variety of sub-philosophies. In 1983, Norman L. Geisler wrote an interesting and helpful book titled *Is Man the Measure?* subtitled, *An Evaluation of Contemporary Humanism*.ⁱⁱⁱ Geisler categorized and evaluated the following varieties of Secular Humanism (the names in parentheses are their principal originators/advocates):

- Evolutionary Humanism (Julian Huxley)
- Behavioral Humanism (B.F. Skinner)
- Existential Humanism (Jean-Paul Sartre)
- Pragmatic Humanism (John Dewey)
- Marxist Humanism (Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels)
- Egocentric Humanism (Ayn Rand)
- Cultural Humanism (Corliss Lamont)^{iv}

All of the foregoing subdivisions of Humanism share at least the following credo:

- Denial of the existence of God and all things supernatural (i.e., atheism)
- Belief in absolute naturalism and evolution
- Belief that man is wholly physical, with no immortal soul/spirit
- Belief that man is the supreme being and is totally self-sufficient
- Belief in moral/ethical relativism and denial of moral absolutism

Humanism, as its name implies, is rabidly anthropocentric—man-centered. This fact is bad enough, but Humanists also cannot abide the very **idea** of God, as *Humanist Manifestos I and II* testifies:

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....^v

They thus replace God the Creator with lifeless, imaginary forces and processes to explain man's origin, nature, and purpose. Humanism views man as wholly physical—an accidental combination of spiritless material molecules. Therefore, man has evolved to become the ultimate life-form, and Humanists exalt and fix all their attention upon his desires, ambitions, achievements, and interests for his physical lifespan. To them, that is all he has. Accordingly, Humanists believe that all standards of moral behavior have arisen from within men, either individuals or communities. Their "bible" (*Humanist Manifestos I and II*) states:

We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous [i.e., governed solely by the individual, DM] and situational, 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."^{vi}

Humanists vigorously oppose the very suggestion of moral absolutes. Paul Kurtz, editor of the *Manifestos*, and former editor of *The Humanist Magazine*, wrote:

As secular humanists we believe in the central importance of the value of human happiness here and now. **We are opposed to Absolutist morality**, yet we maintain that objective standards emerge, and ethical values and principles may be discovered in the course of ethical deliberation (emph. DM).^{vii}

This assertion is evolutionary theory applied to morals, and such quotations could be multiplied, indicating that Humanists absolutely despise what they derisively label, *absolutism*. There is no static, absolute moral standard; "morality" is relative and is whatever men determine it to be. We are therefore answerable only to ourselves.

The late Joseph Francis Fletcher wrote his infamous book, *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*, in 1966, while an Anglican theologian who still claimed to believe in God. He deceptively misnamed his book; it actually trumpeted the **old immorality**. However, it gave great impetus to the "sexual revolution" that was beginning to flex its muscles at the time. As Darwin's theory had done a century before (and as I will discuss later), Fletcher's ideas gave an "excuse" for indulgence to those who wanted to engage in "guiltless" recreational sexual activity, while still feigning belief in God. After all, Fletcher was a "believer," was he not? Before he ceased this pretense and openly joined the Secular Humanists (as a signatory of *Humanist Manifestos I and II*), he almost single-handedly assailed the absolutism of Biblical morality. Because of his book, the term *situation ethics* became sort of a code-term to indicate all anti-Christian and relativistic ethical philosophy. The following statement from Fletcher summarizes his Humanist moral relativism:

It all depends on the situation.... 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. It depends on whether it hurts or helps people, whether or not it serves love's purpose—understanding love to be personal concern—in the situation.^{viii}

Contrariwise, Christianity is Theocentric—centered on God. It recognizes the existence of God, credits Him as Creator, and duly acknowledges Him as the Center of the universe. Christians hold that man has worth and that his life has meaning only because God created him in His image and gave him purpose. We further hold that man is not merely a superior animal or physical specimen, but an immortal spirit in a physical body who is answerable to the Creator Who has revealed His Will in the Bible. Christians contend that God's revealed Law is the **absolute standard** of behavior for mankind.

Even in the broadest popular use of the term, *Christian* (far removed from its Biblical usage in most cases), it is evident that *Christian* and *Humanist* are utterly antagonistic. In this fact lies the accelerating aggressiveness of the movement to eradicate God, Christ, and the Bible from any place in the public life of our nation. Humanists and/or Humanist philosophy are behind it all. Their assault against anything pertaining to the Bible is grounded in their determination to rid the world of all moral absolutes.

The Darwinian “Excuse”

From the Humanist credo listed earlier, the last listed item is the subject of this study: Humanism's belief in moral relativism and its denial of moral absolutes. While they did not start organizing and coordinating their efforts until 1933, Humanists go back a long way. Many Humanists credit the words of Protagoras, fifth century B.C. Greek philosopher, *Man is the measure of all things*, as the foundation of their creed. However, he was certainly not the first to adopt what is now known as Humanist philosophy.

God's people are not surprised that He foresaw this damnable philosophy, as demonstrated by the numerous Biblical passages in which it is addressed, exposed, and condemned. Five centuries before Protagoras, David described the consummate Humanist: “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. They are corrupt, they have done abominable works; There is none that doeth good” (Psa. 14:1).^{ix} Still a century before Protagoras, Jeremiah categorically condemned Protagorean philosophy in his classic inspired observation: “O Jehovah, I know that the way of man **is not in himself; it is not in man** that walketh to direct

his steps” (Jer. 10:23, emph. DM). Noah’s era was full of Humanists. In his day “God saw the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth” (Gen. 6:12). Thirteen centuries before Christ, the long period of the judges was characterized by its rejection of God’s objective standard in the Law of Moses. The people were all Humanists at heart, for “every man did that which was right in his own eyes” (Jud. 17:6b; 21:25b)). The first Humanist was simply the first man who denied God, decided that as a man he was the apex of existence, and determined to manage and live his life on his own terms.

The existence of God and the doctrine of creation imply, among other things, man’s immortality and his accountability to his Creator by means of His revealed Will. Dostoyevsky, in his monumental novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*, has Ivan Fyodorovitch correctly observe: “There is no virtue if there is no immortality.”^x Ivan implies that if God does not exist, everything is permitted. He got it exactly right: If God does not exist, man does not have a creator; he is a mere accident of “nature.” If he is merely an animal, he is completely earth- and time-bound—wholly mortal. If he is wholly mortal, there are no such things as virtue and vice for his kind, any more so than for dogkind or monkeykind. That is, without God, there is no **basis** for moral laws or ethical absolutes. Unbridled, selfish, carnal instinct becomes the sole basis of “right” and “wrong.”

Thomas J.J. Altizer was a professor of religion at Emory University, a Methodist school in Atlanta, when he published his book, *The Gospel of Christian Atheism* (quite an oxymoron!). This book, coincidentally (?) published the same year Fletcher published *Situation Ethics* (1966), made him the principal modern spokesman for the blasphemous “God is dead” movement of the last half of the 1960s (note that both of these men began as liberal theologians and that both of their books and the “sexual revolution” appeared on the scene simultaneously). Altizer was at least rational enough to admit that moral absolutes are rooted in God, and that if we “remove” God, we remove the standard of moral restraints:

Once God has ceased to exist in human experience as the omnipotent and numinous Lord, there perishes with Him every moral imperative addressed to man from beyond, and humanity ceases to be imprisoned by an obedience to an external will or authority.^{xi}

So while one theologian (Fletcher) was attacking moral absolutes by urging relativism, depending on the “situation,” another (Altizer) simultaneously sought to obliterate them by proclaiming their Source to be dead. Should we wonder that these men greatly helped unleash the cruel beast of family- and home-destroying sexual promiscuity?

Atheism, with its unspeakably horrible implications and consequences, is Humanism's foundation. Evolutionary theory, materialism, and moral relativism compose most of its superstructure. If evolution explains origins, then man is nothing more than a highly developed paramecium. Grant them the dogma of evolution and Humanists are correct in arguing that men are under no moral obligation to behave a certain way. We are thus accountable to no one but ourselves, and we need not think about duty, good, evil, right, wrong, truth, error, conscience, or consequence of behavior any more than an earthworm or a housefly does—unless it pleases us to do so. In fact, by Humanist dictum there is no way for one to determine one act to be “good” and another “evil,” and *duty* and *obligation* are rendered nonsensical terms. Make no mistake about it: The foregoing description is precisely the mold into which the Humanistic secularists are seeking to stuff our great nation as rapidly as possible (be they in the entertainment business, politics, broadcasting, the National Education Association, the American Civil Liberties Association, or even much of so-called “Christianity”). Their alarming success is evident on every hand.

When Darwin published *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, setting forth his theory of natural selection and survival of the fittest—evolution, now all but universally accepted in the Western World—he handed Humanists a “scientific excuse” for abandoning belief in the personal Creator-God to Whom men are accountable. Some philosophers immediately rejoiced at its implications and jumped at the “opportunities” it presented. If men arose through the evolutionary process merely by natural means, they were not created. If they were not created, there is no Creator/God. If there is no God, the Bible is just another book written by men, itself a product of literary evolution. If the Bible is not from God, we can forget all of its confining laws and prohibitions. Darwin's theories doubtless gave great impetus to the philosophy of Nihilism—the denial of meaning and purpose in such things as established morals, religion, and political institutions—that had begun to rise among German philosophers about the same time. Some—perhaps many—were just looking for this very excuse. In 1937, the late British-born Aldous Huxley, more candid than some, 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.^{xii}

I suspect that many have latched onto and cling tenaciously to the religion of evolution from the same motivation.

Let us not forget that Paul declared that all who deny the manifold evidence of God's creative power in the natural world and give themselves over to every vile lust are "**without excuse**" (Rom. 1:18–32, emph. DM).

Effects and Consequences

If Darwin was right, there is no God. If there is no God, Humanistic relativism is valid, and we should not censure Huxley and his ilk. At least two generations have been fed such poisonous Humanistic philosophy to one degree or another in our public schools, forced from the top down. The home environment that for many generations taught Bible-based moral principles (and insisted on adherence to them) will never be known by millions of children as the poison of situation ethics has caused normal family life to implode. It is no mystery (and 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. Why should they not do so, if men believe they are mere animals and are bound by no moral absolutes?

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 push for homosexual "marriages," and other aberrant sexual behavior
- The power of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), called by some of us, the "Anti-Christian Litigation Union," which serves as Humanism's legal arm
- The effort to remove every vestige of God and the Bible from public schools and from every other area of public life (led by the ACLU)
- The feverish attempts to ignore, or worse, revise history, particularly the fact that our Founding Fathers believed in the God of the Bible and in the Bible as His Word, as reflected in our nation's founding documents, especially the Declaration of Independence
- The creation and trumpeting of the *separation of church and state* myth
- 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 as seen in the zealous championing of abortion and the growing push to make euthanasia acceptable
- The potential for unimaginable harmful policies in the field of “medical ethics” (e.g., genetic engineering, cloning, in vitro fertilization, fetal stem cell research, eugenics, psycho-surgery, et al.)
- The attack on personal responsibility and accountability for one’s behavior, treating even violent lawbreakers as “victims,” rather than perpetrators, if they are of certain classes or races

Humanistic Relativism is to blame for the moral collapse since the middle of the twentieth century 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, Existentialism, and more recently, Postmodernism, have been (and are) their willing accomplices. In fact, many of these religionists are proud signatories of the Humanist Manifestos. Through their seminaries, they have spawned several generations of denominational pulpiteers who treat the Bible as a fairy-tale product of literary evolution. Many of them question or deny every fundamental tenet of the Gospel. These skeptic sermonizers have robbed the masses of their faith in God, in the Bible, and in its absolute moral principles, leaving them sitting ducks for Humanistic propaganda. As long as the Bible was a dominating influence in our nation’s culture, Humanism’s moral relativism could not thrive. It has flowed freely, however, into the vacuum left by the faith-demolishing work of the infidel theologians.

Humanism feels no threat from any religion except Christianity, because the Bible declares that its God, its religion (the church), and its ethical doctrine are exclusive, objective, and absolute. This fact explains the constant denigration of those whom the left calls “right wing religious fundamentalist hayseeds” in the “Jesus states.” To oppose an Humanistic-inspired behavior or policy makes one a “bigot.” Accordingly, Humanists do not oppose, but actually encourage, promotion of pagan religions in the public schools and elsewhere (i.e., Wicca, “Native American” religions, Islam, New Age-ism, Eastern religions, et al.).

Inconsistencies, Self-Contradictions, and Absurdities

As with all flawed belief systems, Humanism is rife with inconsistencies, self-contradictions, and absurdities.

First, Humanists themselves, try as they might, cannot avoid making moral claims and judgments in absolute terms, all the while decrying “absolutism.” The moment one of them pronounces the Nazi Holocaust “evil” and the outcome of the Nuremberg Trials “good,” he has made an absolute moral claim that contradicts 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**, which Humanists consider to be the ultimate evil.

To be consistent they must therefore avoid—at all cost—the use of such words as *all, none, never, always, should, should not, duty, obligation, must, completely, universally*, and (above all), *absolutely*. After observing that such terms are taboo for moral situationists/relativists,^{xiii} Fletcher, in his book on situation ethics then miserably fails at avoiding them. For example, he preaches: “**No** unwanted and unintended baby should **ever** be born (emph. DM).”^{xiv} “Love is the **only norm**.... The **ruling norm** of Christian decision is love: **nothing else** (emph. DM).”^{xv} Such statements are clearly absolute declarations, which they profess to despise.

Geisler correctly emphasized the absurdity of relativism in pointing out that what Fletcher is really saying is: “(1) ‘one should never use the word *never*’; (2) ‘one should always avoid using the word *always*’; (3) ‘one would absolutely deny all ‘absolutes’.’”^{xvi}

Second, Humanistic ethical claims are blatantly self-contradictory. Their entire relativistic scheme is built upon such absolute assertions as “All moral values are relative” and “There are no moral absolutes.” Consider again Fletcher’s comment quoted near the beginning of this study, and let its blatant self-contradiction sink in: “**No** action is **good** or **right** in itself”—an absolute denial of all absolutes! The moment the Humanist makes any such claim he forfeits his case. Nonetheless, the pronouncements of these elitist sophists on morality are generously sprinkled with such terms. Even the *Humanist Manifestos I and II* find unavoidable the “trap” of making absolute statements about ethics:

This world community **must** renounce the resort to violence and force as a method of solving international disputes.... War is obsolete. **So is the use** of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. It is a **planetary imperative** to reduce the level of military expenditures and turn

these savings to peaceful and people-oriented uses.... World poverty **must** cease (emph. DM).^{xvii}

Any system that is self-contradictory is false on its very surface.

Third, one of the many fallacies of relativism is the assertion that time, place, and context (i.e., situations) determine the morality of an act. Therefore, by Humanistic dictum one could be “immoral” at one point and “moral” **in doing the same act** a moment later (e.g., a doctor performing an abortion immediately before and then performing another one immediately after the 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling). In truth, **only the act itself** determines if it is moral or immoral. The **act** of abortion is right or wrong, moral or immoral. Such elements as time or judicial rulings are non-factors. The relativist who pronounces, based on the court ruling, that abortion is “moral,” implies that it was previously “immoral.” In both cases, he has again stepped into the trap of absolutism by making an absolute claim. Like it or not, he unavoidably ends up being that which he so much detests—an absolutist.

Fourth, at the personal level, moral 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, we note again, is itself an absolute claim). But what does this relativist 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 by declaring such acts to be “wrong”!

The True and Only Alternative

If for no other reasons, moral relativism is proved false by its self-contradictions and inconsistencies. If moral relativism is false, moral absolutism, the only alternative, must be true. Moral values must be either **objective** (from an unvarying source exterior to us) or **subjective** (arising from within us)—there are no other choices. We correctly identify moral absolutes only by means of an objective ethical standard.

If an absolute standard of morals 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 **generally** in His creation (Psa 19:1–4; Rom. 1:19–20), is further revealed **specialy** in the Bible as perfect in every moral attribute (i.e., love, kindness, justice, purity, longsuffering, holiness, righteousness, et al.). From His nature flows His standard and pattern of moral absolutes for mankind, His ultimate creation: “Be ye holy, for I

am holy” (1 Pet. 1:16). Moral absolutes are rooted solely in God and His special revelation (the Bible). **Herein lies the explanation for Humanism’s bold, relentless assault against everything pertaining to the Bible. It must destroy the Bible or be destroyed!**

Biblical morals are based on two great fundamental principles of conduct, stated by 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 established man-to-God obligations for Israel, while the remaining six set forth man-to-man moral behavior. Though no man has been accountable to the Decalogue for two thousand years, the order of our loyalties it prescribes are constantly reflected in the New Testament. In direct contradiction to Humanism, the Bible exalts God and binds all human behaviors to this ultimate loyalty to Him. This loyalty drives us to His revealed, absolute standard of conduct—His law, as revealed in the Bible—particularly, the New Testament for post-pentecostians. Love for God cannot be defined apart from respecting and obeying His law: “If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments” (John 14:15). “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: “Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and light unto my path” (Psa. 119:105). One of its major themes is this distinction between the “oughts” and the “ought nots.” Scripture enables men to “...have their senses exercised to discern good and evil” (Heb. 5:14). The Bible repeatedly contrasts the objective distinction between light and darkness and good and evil (2 Cor. 6:14–16; Gal. 5:19–23; Tit. 2:12; 1 John 2:15–17; et al.). To suggest or employ some other standard invites the eternal condemnation of a loving Creator: “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness...” (Isa. 5:20a).

Conclusion

It is surpassingly ironic that Humanists claim to have the very highest view of and greatest reverence for man, while denying the very things that give him worth—the fact that God created him in His Own likeness and vested him with immortality.

Humanism is but one more attempt of rebellious men to eschew the restraints of their Creator. Paul described Humanists in every 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 own operator’s manuals; their makers do. So it is with God and puny men. Yet Humanists deny this most obvious dictum. God’s “operator’s manual” for mankind is the Bible. We must resist the deadly religion/philosophy of Humanism with all of our might.

Endnotes

-
- ⁱ The author originally wrote some of the following material in a slightly different form under the title: “Enemy Number One—Humanism,” *The Gospel Journal* 5 (July 2004): 2–7.
- ⁱⁱ www.americanhumanist.org
- ⁱⁱⁱ Norman Geisler, *Is Man the Measure?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983).
- ^{iv} *Ibid.*, “Contents” (unnumbered p.); Geisler also discusses “Christian Humanism” (pp. 95–107), and cites such men as C. S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and J.R.R. Tolkien as examples of same. As theists, the only basis upon which such men can be called “Humanists” is their accent on the worth and the rational powers of humankind. Otherwise, they are some of the loudest and most effective enemies of Secular Humanism. Given the unsavory connotation of *Humanist* because of its atheism, naturalism, materialism, and moral relativism, I consider *Christian Humanist* to be an evident oxymoron.
- ^v Paul Kurtz, ed., *Humanist Manifestos I and II* (New York, NY: Prometheus Books, 1973), pp. 13, 16.
- ^{vi} *Ibid.*, pp. 17–18.
- ^{vii} Paul Kurtz, “A Secular Humanist Declaration,” *Free Inquiry* 1:1 (Winter 1980/81): 5, as quoted by Dick Sztanyo, “The Impact of Secular Humanism Upon Morality,” *Biblical Ethics*, ed. Terry Hightower (San Antonio, TX: Shenandoah Church of Christ, 1991), p. 387.
- ^{viii} Joseph Fletcher, *Moral Responsibility—Situation Ethics at Work* (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1967), p. 34, as quoted by Dick Sztanyo, “The Impact of Secular Humanism Upon Morality,” *Biblical Ethics*, ed. Terry Hightower (San Antonio, TX: Shenandoah Church of Christ, 1991), p. 389.
- ^{ix} All Scripture quotations are from the American Standard Version unless otherwise indicated.
- ^x Fyodor Dostoyevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, trans. Constance Garnett, *Great Books of the Western World*, 54 vols., ed. Robert Maynard Hutchins (Chicago, IL: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1952), 52:34.
- ^{xi} Thomas J.J. Altizer, *The Gospel of Christian Atheism* (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 127, as quoted by Dick Sztanyo, “The Impact of Secular Humanism Upon Morality,” *Biblical Ethics*, ed. Terry Hightower (San Antonio, TX: Shenandoah Church of Christ, 1991), p. 394.
- ^{xii} Aldous Huxley, *Ends and Means: An Inquiry into the Nature of Ideas and into the Methods Employed for Their Realization* (New York, NY: Harper, 1937), pp. 312, 16, as quoted by Dick Sztanyo, “The Impact of Secular Humanism Upon Morality,” *Biblical Ethics*, ed. Terry Hightower (San Antonio, TX: Shenandoah Church of Christ, 1991), pp. 406–07.

^{xiii} Joseph Fletcher, *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* (Philadelphia, PS: The Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 43–44, as quoted by Geisler, *Is Man the Measure?* p. 180.

^{xiv} *Ibid.*, p. 39 (emph. DM).

^{xv} *Ibid.*, p. 69 (emph. DM).

^{xvi} Geisler, p. 180.

^{xvii} Kurtz, *Humanist Manifestos*, pp. 21–22, as quoted by Geisler, p. 180 (emph. DM).

[Note: I wrote this MS for and I presented a digest of it orally at the Memphis School of Preaching Lectureship, Memphis, TN, March 27–31, 2005. It was published in the book of the lectures, *What Is Man?* ed. Bobby Liddell (Memphis School of Preaching, Memphis, TN)].