

Secular Humanism: Birth of The Golden Age or Death of the West?

The Establishment of the New Religion

What we see at work in our society and culture today is the outworking of the American Religion. It may be termed “civic religion,” an Atheistic Faith, Naturalism, or whatever one wishes. But modern, Far Left Liberals are the religious zealots of the *Established Religion of America*. That religion is Secular Humanism, and it seeks to marginalize or eliminate Christianity and fashion society in its own image.

Empiricism and the New Religious Principles

An overweening reliance on and trust in empiricism lies at the very root of American thought, in that stream of philosophy known as British Empiricism. The English speaking world is almost universally empirical in outlook. Part of the issue between the traditional Christians and secular humanists can be reduced to the dilemma regarding the ultimate question of empiricism. Either there are areas of reality that are not subject to strictly empirical means, or whatever cannot be empirically perceived is not truly real. This problem itself is beyond empiricism to solve, leaving only a blind religious faith where old fashioned rationalism might have helped. The modern pillars of this faith, and after them the Secular Humanists, chose to limit reality to that which is empirically perceived, and simply speak the non physical universe out of existence. From this come two religious convictions exhibited in secular humanists, but particularly prominent, as we shall see, in its four “pillars of the faith.”

The first religious conviction of Secular Humanism is this: *Nothing meaningful “exists” beyond what we can perceive*. Such things as God, purpose, meaning, morality, and virtue are the inventions of humanity and do not exist in any meaningful way hence nothing of practical importance can be predicated of them. This conviction produces, in those who hold it, an intense this-worldly, here-and-now mentality, for to these people, there is nothing else. This explains the political fervor of many political activists. They are either atheists, agnostics, or think that whatever one chooses to believe is fine, because all religions are equal. This brings us immediately to the next point.

Secular Humanism's second religious conviction is that *any genuine explanation of things must be a naturalistic explanation*. This is apparent in any discussion of “science” dealing with ultimate origins and the nature of things. There can be no meaningful explanation of things that does not itself participate in its immediacy, hence, transcendence is proscribed *a priori*. This helps us understand the apathy of some humanists concerning religion, because it has been reduced to the status of a comfort blanket; no *real* explanation of *anything* is needed from religion.

These two religious convictions underlie the works of the four modern figures who became the “pillars” of Secular Humanism. It is true that empiricism had been around for centuries, but these four represent its radicalization, the use of empiricism to explain things not before explained

in such a way. All four, whether tacitly or explicitly, refused to entertain the notion of a transcendental entity. Each of these men drew tight new boundaries to the discipline in which he was interested, and so, redefined the discipline itself.¹ So, in addition to validating the two religious convictions, each of these four “pillars” provided at least one specific principle that can be held quite apart from a demonstration of the veracity of his work.

The Pillars of the New Faith

There have always been atheists, and there have always been cultures built on different religious bases than ours. But we are seeing, in our time, a culture built on Christianity being destroyed by the very advantages created by Christianity. Those who would destroy it have even taken some of their ethical concerns right out of Christianity, even as they ridicule and abandon it. It is this concerted effort on the part of a vociferous, and seemingly invincible, minority that interests us here. How did we, as a country, arrive here? What are the immediate antecedents of those who would change our culture?

There are two major ways of analyzing and critiquing the development of today's cultural climate. The first is by noting and categorizing its main tenets and teachings, its “sacred cows,” as it were. The second is by exposing the *qualities* and *tendencies* of these tenets and their implications. Many dozens of books have been written on various harmful causes, tenets and teachings. Prominent figures such as Ann Coulter, Rush Limbaugh and Bill O'Reilley, flail away at ideas and concepts seemingly unrelated yet, on their telling of it, of the same fabric and of the utmost importance. But what is that fabric? How are these “Far Left” ideas related?

Happily, there is a quick and easy way to answer these questions. If we begin with the “Pillars of the Faith,” Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud, extract their common features and collate their common contributions to modern thought, while watching for interesting developments along the way, we may very well come to an adequate picture not only of what our society intends itself to be, but how it came by those intentions as well.

The contributions of Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud

1 Nietzsche

Nietzsche may have been the world's most honest atheist. He saw the implications of his beliefs, recognized them as a radical departure from Western thought, understood the horrible conclusions to which they led, yet accepted them anyway. His prototypical existentialism and doctrine of the “will to power,” combined to delineate a forceful and complete denial of rationalism and Christianity. The terrible philosophical consequences have rarely been treated with as much honesty as that which he himself showed.

As the father of existentialism, and the preacher of self realization, his was a godless humanism in which there was nothing beyond the self and its *Will to Power*. Although Nietzsche

¹ That is, each of them redefined his discipline as a “closed system.”

was a devotee of the will rather than a pure empiricist, he attacked rationalism and tradition and left only experience to inform the human psyche. His contributions bear the same relationship to Secular Humanism as the New Testament books of Romans and Hebrews bear to Christianity. His works state quite clearly that *God is not necessary to man*. This provides the third religious conviction, namely that *men must seek their own well-being through the “will to power,” and freedom from intellectual and emotional slavery to objective systems of morality*. The will is the all-powerful mechanism in those human beings who are free from “slave mentality,” and is more important than reason for a free man.²

2 Darwin

Charles Darwin's work had a similar effect on the scientific community to that which Nietzsche's had on the philosophical world. Darwin's hypotheses, that all life came from a single cell, and that God was unnecessary to explain the variety of life forms seen on planet Earth, lead directly to conclusions about the nonexistence of God and the place of man in a meaningless cosmos. Few people, even those who espouse the theory of evolution, have come to grips either with its amoral ethos or its existential implication of absolute meaninglessness.

Darwin was the father of modern evolutionary theory and an exemplar of the extreme empirical method, he was a careful observer and collector of data. His interpretation of his data was an oblique attack on Christianity and theism by way of attempting a satisfactory empirical alternative to the creation story. He proposed existence without God, or at least a realm of life without the Judeo-Christian creator. His was a godless biosphere, a world created by time and chance and without meaning, purpose or a basis for ethics beyond oneself.³ Darwin's *Origin of Species* runs somewhat parallel to the Book of Genesis. It is wholly unimportant that physics, semantics, philosophy and statistics disprove Darwinism, or what we call *macro evolution*.⁴ Darwin's importance for our age lies in the fact that he attempted a godless explanation of the beginning of species, and by extension, to the rest of the universe. The principle here, then, is that man was not created, but evolved. So religious conviction number four is *God is not necessary to life*, or by extension, *to the universe*.

3 Marx

² Again, note the irrational elements. For Nietzsche, it is not *reason*, but *will* that characterizes the free man.

³ Here, Nietzsche's “will to power” would naturally fill the ethical void.

⁴ It is still taught as fact in our schools and universities, and is supported through grants of tax payer money. How is it that evolution has never *won a debate* with creationism, nor *lost a court case* in recent years?

The impact of Karl Marx was felt keenly both in history and economics. Through the years this impact has reverberated through politics, religion and speculation about the future. Precious few wars or revolutions have centered around the teachings of Nietzsche or Darwin. Marx, on the other hand, is the seminal figure and “patron Saint” of all modern “revolutions.” Of these four men, Marx surely has had the greatest practical influence on Western culture. He has proven to be prophetic in many respects, accurately extrapolating the general trend of economics into the future. His teachings, in the hands of his followers, became an attempt to engraft a feeble *ethics* into economy, *via* warfare if necessary!

As the historian and prophet of *dialectical materialism*, the impersonal sweep of history to its ultimate end in socialism and communism, Marx gathered and interpreted empirical data to demonstrate his positions.⁵ Even his predictions of a coming socialist society were based on human experience and were therefore largely satisfying to the academic community. His was a godless process of economic development dependent upon nothing beyond man meeting his material needs.

The works of Karl Marx roughly parallel the New Testament books of Acts and Revelations. He traces an economic motive through many cultures and historical eras in Western history and prophesies what the future will look like on that basis. Yet even these “contributions” pale in comparison to that made by his empiricism and practical atheism. For he demonstrated that economics can be treated apart from ethics, theology, or any other sort of reference to God. The process he claims is responsible for shaping the Western world needs make no reference whatsoever to any god at all. Consequently we have the belief that God is not necessary to historical processes or economic systems. This is the essence of religious conviction number five, that *history is powered and guided only by man's economic needs, not by God*.

Nietzsche, Darwin and Marx were thoroughly empirical in outlook. They were anti-rationalist and studiously anti-Christian, Nietzsche rabidly so. But their empiricism was a perversion of the philosophy championed by scientists since Newton and Galileo.

4 Freud

Freud provided a self-conscious look at the individual psyche. It is true that much of his psychoanalysis has been rejected and superseded. Although his system of psychoanalysis was somewhat rationalistic in its method, the subject material for it was the result of methodical empiricism. Freud was decidedly anti-Christian. His Ego, Id, and Super Ego find exact counterparts in the New Testament book of Romans. But it would not do for an agnostic Jew to give credit to St. Paul for anything, so the ideas were reworked, and purveyed as part of psychoanalysis. Yet his value to secular humanism is greatest in another respect. Freud propounded something of a godless “spirituality” of the self. And despite the fact that much of his work has been discredited, its overall impact remains. For he is the apostle of unapologetic self-centeredness, believing that a true picture of man, corporately and individually, can be had without any reference whatsoever to God, or to objective morality. God is not necessary to the Human soul and is inimical to its proper functioning. Thus we have religious conviction number six: *self-awareness and self acceptance is vital to mental and emotional health, but belief in God may pose a danger to the psyche*.

⁵ His “turning Hegel on his head” may be understood as *extreme empiricism*.

The contributions of these four men were incorporated in the Humanist Manifestos, in which Secular Humanism is rightly acknowledged to be a religion. As such, the canonical authors of the Humanist “Bible,” include these four men. They represent the Atheistic equivalent to Christian exposition. As such, their teachings have become the basis for a systematic, non theistic, or *naturalistic* interpretation of a truncated “reality.” All four of these men share a common feature that makes them seminal figures in Secular Humanist thought. This feature underlies, and indeed transcends, their works. This characteristic, and its “contribution” to the new religion is a *radical empiricism* that implies atheism. Mankind is nothing more than an animal⁶ living in a meaningless universe without hope of aid from any god whatsoever. As such, all that happens to him and to the planet is up to him. All hope is for this world, and only what happens here and now matters.

Indeed, the “gospels” of Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud were shamelessly atheistic, and anti-Christian, their interpretations of their data wholly “naturalistic.” The extreme agnosticism or atheism of these four men not only prepared their respective disciplines to forgo reliance on Christian thought, but fostered the systematic incorporation of naturalism into other disciplines and developed an academically respectable atheism, thereby gaining an audience with the “educated” population. These ideas interacted with other disciplines, creating a cross-discipline consensus of doubt about traditional religion and positing a “respectable” alternative to it.

There are at least two major reasons for the humanists' rejection of Christianity. First, miracles and an “absentee” God are hard to accept in light of the suffering and ill in the world. This is even more true for a mindset that has been conditioned by a scientific outlook and a presumed human autonomy. Supernaturalism ill accords with an outlook trained to deny what is not immediately apprehensible in experience. This might be termed the *epistemological reason*.

Second, sin, as a concept, is difficult enough to apply to oneself in the abstract. When a particular, deeply ingrained behavior is deemed sinful, one may not see it in himself, or he may try to mitigate its importance or nature. But it is easier simply to presume human autonomy and define one's behavior and preferences as merely “different.” Who, in the absence of God, has the right to decide what is “sinful” and what merely “natural?” This might be termed the *ethical reason*.

The appeal of such a godless system as Secular Humanism lies in its pretension to just such a presumed human autonomy. The sinful human heart will grasp whatever caters to its own will in order to serve itself. There need be no evidence, demonstration or proof of its assertions, only a slight patina of pseudo-respectability. Although disbelief and self-centeredness have always existed, there was always a disreputable stigma attached to them. The empiricism of science, once perverted, provided just such an appearance of respectability to the philosophers and scientists of the mid-and late 19th century, and atheism became fashionable. So while atheism and self-centeredness are not new, their organization in a systematic religious guise is.⁷ Secular Humanism seemed the perfect demonstration that “Man is the measure of all things; of things which are, that they are and of things

⁶ Is it a surprise that, today, our behavior, music, morality and daily seeking of “creature comforts” is so animalistic?

0. We are speaking of modern times, and so pass over such ancient philosophies as Stoicism, Cynicism and Hedonism.

that are not, that they are not.” Protagoras of Abdera

II Validation and Consolidation of the New Religion

The various aspects of the self-centered and godless redefinition of reality effected by extreme empiricism permeated virtually all fields of academic endeavor. From about 1850 until the first world war, whole disciplines were invented or rewritten. While it would be wholly improper to call this or any part of this, a conspiracy, it cannot be denied that the systemic self-centeredness and anti-Christianity fostered by extreme empiricism was becoming a culture wide academic syndrome.

By the early years of the 20th century, educated Americans could find a permissive, but facile, alternative to the Christian “slave” morality, the Christian creation narrative, the older economic views which included recognition of the social classes, and to the psychology of belief in God. The contributors to the humanist manifesto recognized the religious nature of the tenets they had adopted from the four “pillars of the faith,” and openly propagated their beliefs as religion.

The Humanist Manifestos

Categories Impacted by Secular Humanism

In 1933 a few Humanists, as those who imbibed deeply of these ideas liked to call themselves, issued a brief tract entitled *The Humanist Manifesto*. It had 34 signers. It attempted to ease the despair of Existentialism by providing a viable alternative to Christianity. It borrowed Christian “values,” and whistled in the (self imposed) dark.

Existentialism is the sense of despair left when the “comfortable” world of Christianity is rejected and a fragmented, meaningless chaos is left in its place. It was this voice of social despair and individual actualization that provided the dark reality against which many of the creative spirits of the age rebelled, and against which a positive, though godless message of secular humanism had to be spoken. *The Humanist Manifesto* of 1933 tried to systematize thought and direction for a world which had awakened to find itself alone in the universe. It focused its attention on making the here-and-now a better place and time by posing solutions to the very real issues facing mankind. It put together a program for providing man with a better culture by actively engaging the social issues of the day. So the first Humanist Manifesto was not unlike a religious pamphlets revealing what the faithful believed. These beliefs were not new, but the attempt to use them to create a comprehensive and systematic alternative to Christianity was. The tract addressed itself primarily to those once religious but now disillusioned. Its tenets were categorized as *Religious*, *Ethical*, and *Social*, and promoted greater freedom and individuality, and a just, classless, egalitarian society.

If we pay close attention to *The Humanist Manifesto*, we see throughout that it is a secular religion that bills itself as a replacement for Christianity, which it labels “superstition.” The first sentence of the preface to the *Humanist Manifestos I and II*⁸ says “humanism is a philosophical,

⁸

Paul Kurtz (ed.) *Humanist Manifestos I and II*, Prometheus Books, 1973., p. 3.

religious, and moral point of view as old as human civilization.” The manifestos themselves do nothing to mitigate its religious character. This is of great importance because in its zeal not to establish “a religion” or favor one denomination over the others, *secular humanism* in its various guises and programs *has become the established religion of the United States of America*. It has shaped our culture in the three major areas, religion, ethics, and culture, including politics.

A cursory reading of *The Humanist Manifesto* reveals a religion based upon extreme empiricism. The Secular Humanists would like to rid the world of all transcendent religious beliefs; any religion that believes in an unseen reality such as heaven, or eternity, especially Christianity must be eliminated or at least dumbed down. God, sin and redemption, the sanctity (holiness) of life, and humanity as a higher life form created “in God's image, are gone. In their place we find a “feel good” religion in which one can “worship” as he chooses and in which the only “abiding” feature is the here-and-now.

The Humanist Manifesto also makes short work of traditional Christian ethics and morality. Objective ethics and morality such as religious behavioral expectations and codes, particularly the Ten Commandments (or the “Decalogue”) are gone. In the place of normative ethics are “values.” Values are “situational ethics” at best, and at worst personal preferences or poll results. The goal of such values is the betterment of society, but on the basis of subjectivism, who knows what that is? The very highest such a values “system” can reach is, in practice, fluid and unknowable.

Politically, *The Humanist Manifesto* must prove something of an embarrassment to those still infatuated with President Kennedy. Perhaps his most famous statement was in his inaugural address when he said “ask not what your country can do for you, rather ask what you can do for your country.” Only in the hands of the serious “spin doctor” can this statement be interpreted to mean “support socialism, and line up to give the government your wealth.” For this is precisely what the humanist manifesto seeks: a socialist “nanny” state.

Tendencies of Secular Humanism

Tendencies:

The tendency of a belief, doctrine or idea is the trajectory, or the implied trajectory, of its development, including both the spawning of new methods or applications and the reworking of old ones. It is the path taken toward its objective. A notable example is how empiricism reworked physics, biology and history and “created” criminal forensics.

Extreme empiricism, when made the sole custodian of human knowledge or the only legitimate purveyor of “reality,” results in atheism and reworks the academic disciplines so as to produce secular humanism and its offshoots. Having absorbed the teachings and ultra-empiricism of Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx, Freud and a multitude of their disciples, *The Humanist Manifesto* recast it all as a religion and philosophy. Having absorbed the religion and philosophy of the Humanist Manifesto, and against the turbulent backdrop of the late 60s and early 70s, *The Humanist Manifest II* in turn created what might be termed the second generation of Humanists. This generation espouses the “social causes” we hear so much about. A few of these causes are new, but interestingly, most of them are merely the result of reworking old Christian values. Hence, traditional

personal freedom, or Christian liberty, without a God to set moral constraints on it, tends toward unrestricted freedom, or license. Traditional wildlife and environmental conservation, and Biblical “dominion over the earth, becomes “animal rights” and PETA protests. The Christian notion of personal equality before God, and the Constitutional fiction of equality before the law, become minority issues and quotas.

One of the new creations of secular humanism is legalized abortion on demand. Where once such practice was simply unthinkable because people thought in terms of the “sanctity of life,” they now consider the barbaric practice “a woman's right” because we now think only in terms of the “quality of life.” Quality of life almost universally refers only to those *capable of making the decisions*; because the rest don't count, perhaps it would be more honest to call it “quality of life for the healthy, viable and sound” because abortion will surely pave the way for euthanasia.

Another good example is “gay” marriage. Marriage, for over 6000 years of recorded human history, has been a social and legal arrangement whereby the sexual and financial relationships between a man and a woman provided for their mutual care and the nurture of children produced by that union. By definition alone, to say nothing of history, there can be no such thing as homosexual marriage. If we insist on allowing homosexuals to “marry,” we do not *include them* in marriage, *we completely destroy the universal notion of marriage altogether*. But on the basis of legal fiat and a misguided sense of “equality,” secular humanism has given rise to just such a situation. The next such issue may well be polygamy, incest or child marriage.

Personal Equality

By “human equality,” is meant the unchecked metamorphosis of “equality of opportunity” into “equality of results,” and from equality before God and the law, into the equality of personal opinions, purposes and desires. It has gotten so ridiculous that a white firefighter who scores well on his chest cannot be promoted if a black firefighter cannot also be promoted. Worse yet, there is no indication that this little embarrassment works the other way.

Individual Freedom

By greater individual liberty is really meant creeping license, with ever fewer annoying constraints and responsibilities in the realm of personal behavior. This is not entirely offset by the burgeoning corporate Responsibility forced upon government, even in the quest for the Utopian, One World Government.

III Demographic Niche, Spread and Outreach of the New Religion

First Humanist Manifesto, 1933

By 1933, the beliefs engendered by Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud had cross pollinated a number of disciplines and sciences which exemplified the core beliefs that came to be known as

Secular Humanism. These beliefs were unabashedly and systematically Atheistic. The Humanist Manifesto, published that year, revealed three broad areas of the cultural climate reworked by Atheism. They were Religion, Ethics, and Politics. The tenets brought to bear on these disciplines were the direct development of the empiricism and naturalism found in the works of the “Pillars of the Faith.” Indeed, although the wording is slightly different, very little, by way of intermediary, stood between Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud on the one hand and the Humanist Manifesto on the other.

Baby Boomers, and the Spock Generation

The Baby Boomers were raised, if not all of them strictly “according to Spock,” with at least a passing knowledge and understanding of (and sympathy with) his permissive ideas. Members of the Spock Generation had fewer and less stringent restraints at home as children, often balked at restraint in school, particularly at the college level, rebelled against the restraints of society and denied those of religion, and now with their children (the “I-Want-It-Now Generation), advocate stripping away all governmental restraints on individual freedom. Thus was a generation prepared for the coming battle for the new religion.

Beatniks and Hippies

In the 50s, Beatnik's (the Beat Generation) were characterized by the dark side of existential thought. In the 60s, the Hippies, The New Left and other groups tried to overcome existential despair with the use of dope⁹ and the “positive” aspects contained in the Humanist Manifesto. Probably only a very few of these “activists” had actually read the Humanist Manifesto, but its basic positions were part of the air they breathed. They actually thought themselves furthering the cause of the American enterprise.

Saul Alinsky on Methodology

It is interesting that the 60s and 70s saw the division of the humanist movement into highly focused “causes,” some with both peaceful and violent factions. For example, there were the Hippies and the Weathermen, Martin Luther King Jr. and the Black Panthers. The methods of the violent strains included protests, sit-ins, draft evasion, murder, extortion, terrorism and an endless stream of disinformation purveyed to the gullible masses by conspiracy theorists. Much of this methodology was summed up in 1971 by Saul Alinsky, in his book *Rules for Radicals: a Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*. Alinsky provided, in large measure, the methods for implementing the goals of Secular Humanism via “revolution,” (i.e., Marxism), using the Viet Nam war as its point of entrance.

⁹ Much of the widespread use of all sorts of dope was nothing less than self medication for despair.

Humanist Manifesto II

Two years later, in 1973, *The Humanist Manifesto II* was published. It was slightly longer than the first manifesto and was divided neatly into categories of *Religion, Ethics, The Individual, Democratic Society, World Community* and *Humanity As A Whole*. Whereas the first Humanist Manifesto was a direct development on the thought of Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud, Humanist Manifesto II shows a straight line of influence from the first. The Humanist Manifesto II was a paraphrase, or commentary on the first Humanist Manifesto. It provided an expansive treatment of the tenets set forth in the original by illustrating its implications as they were brought out by the events of the late 1960s and early 1970s. As such, the contributions of the fathers of the faith are not so easily discerned in the text. The tendencies of the humanist tenets, however, became unmistakably clear.

The tendency was toward a wholesale advocacy of the (peaceful) achievement of personal equality, unrepressed individual freedom, socialism and a responsible, responsive, One World Government. The thought was clear and focused, and placed its faith in both science and humanity. It was a statement that pulled together all the humanist ideals (now “causes”) and sought humane, government redress for its complaints.

Co-opting power

Slowly, and with little or no resistance, the heirs to the Beatniks, Hippies and New Left took over the University, The Media and the Democratic Party. The changes were small and slow and for the most part were unrecognized by those who went about their daily business. The schools began to teach the new agenda uncritically. The media began their roles as cultural policemen by pointing out those who stepped out of line and slanting their news reports, The Democratic Party, in Congress and in the White House, began its quest for the legal sanction and establishment of its views. And the increasingly liberal Supreme Court became part of an activist outreach and lately has been accused of usurping the power of congress. The ACLU began arguing the secular agenda as normative against a Christianity portrayed as repressive. This was like a fox arguing before a panel of wolves that Chickens are dangerous to all predatory forms of life.

Political Correctness

Political Correctness, which became recognized by that name in the 90s, was the “citizen’s” arm of the “thought police.” Some things were forbidden to be spoken, while the ultra liberals, following the teachings of Saul Alinsky, were free to spread disinformation and conspiracy theories, and spew the vilest lies, slanders and sputum imaginable in the name of, and under the protection of, “Freedom of Speech.” Gullible Americans were told that “words have power,” and meekly acquiesced to the politically correct.

Offshoots and Causes

Conclusions

The religion of Secular humanism, although it likes to masquerade as a set of respectable disciplines and sciences, is nothing more than a self serving atheism in academically respectable dress. It is the natural result of perverting and exploiting to the fullest the empiricism made so attractive to the West by the advances it achieved in science. By turning empiricism upon the question of the nature of reality, and thus truncating reality, it has become the exact counterpart to the superstitions produced when rationalism was turned loose on speculation, wherein vast systems of “thought” were deduced and “proven” from little more than wishful thinking. If superstition is rationalism *creating a false universe*, Secular Humanism is empiricism *destroying the real universe*.

The progression has been one of gathering a theistic viewpoints into a cohesive religion. The religion then itself began transforming large segments of culture and social thought. The various social causes we see today are the application of this philosophy to many areas of life. Frequently these causes are couched in terms calculated to gain sympathy from Christians. Such sympathy is often more easily gained because many of the causes themselves bear a striking resemblance to Christian teachings. The differences often are quite subtle and arise from two facts; that these liberal causes do not grow out of biblical teaching but out of modern atheism, and thus do not have moral restraints, and that liberalism makes little or no use of evidence, being primarily an exercise of the will. This is the nature of the practical difference between the two religions. Both camps, for example, want personal freedom, but the Christian and traditional American want restraints put on freedom in order to avoid the very extremes the Humanists espouse. The theoretical difference between the two lies in their use of empiricism.

In the nature of the case, the secular humanists have a religious faith exactly like the one they wrongly accuse Christians of having, i.e., one in which belief is all that is important and facts mean nothing.¹⁰ But this is why a correct understanding of Christian thought escapes them.

Material

While things look bleak for traditionalists, perhaps all is not lost. For as Robert Bork has pointed out, ultra liberalism, the spawn of the 60s generation, has no argument. It is not really a reasoned position using evidence to reach conclusions, but a *mood* that spreads like the flu. Francis A. Schaeffer, in the 60s and 70s pointed out how words were being used as banners, not as conveyances for information. What has resulted from this *mood* is a religion of the poorest sort, one that cannot defend itself but by smear tactics, has no evidence to support its views, and is so dogmatic as to brook no rival. Russian Communism was one “denomination” of such a humanist religion. Darwinian Evolution, holds a similar place in the Humanist Religion as the Book of Genesis holds in the Bible. Furthermore, the protection of abortion on demand, born of the meaninglessness inherent in a universe produced by time and chance, and touted as one of those “new rights,” is also supported by law.

¹⁰

Bork, Liberalism as a “mood.”

Quality of Life and the Sanctity of Life

People yap a lot about “quality of life.” Pro-choice folks, Madison Avenue marketeers, Senators and people of every stripe. You never hear anyone talk about the “sanctity” of life, because it is not politically correct to acknowledge God, and that’s where *sanctity* leads us.

What people don’t understand is that without the “sanctity of life” there can be no genuine quality of life. Without sanctity we are just poorly dressed animals, and all the money and “creature” comforts modern materialism can provide do not change the fact. The presupposition of the sanctity of life is what enables man properly to view life. Without it, he is condemned to live like an animal.

The nature of these works and the propositions contained therein were clearly demonstrable as religion by the time the first humanist manifesto was written.

Science as we know it could not have been conceived apart from the Biblical mindset. No world view has ever provided a basis for a uniformity of nature sufficient for empiricism to grasp and explain except the Judeo-Christian worldview. It is ironic, then, that extreme empiricism now seeks to discredit the very world view that gave it birth.

The Dilemma of Empiricism

Either Empiricism confines itself to its own realm (e.g. history and science) or it defines all but that which can be perceived (particularly transcendent religion) from existence. It must do one or the other, so it must be either the foundation of science or the foundation of a religion. It cannot decide the issue itself.

Critique of secular humanism

Secular humanists follow the teachings of Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx, and Freud. In following these men they pick up uncritically the extreme empiricism which leads directly to agnosticism or outright atheism. Having given up on Christianity they substitute for it a system without ethics but with “values.” The social programs, which have devolved into “causes,” are reactionary, and when they are proactive, are socialistic. Most people recognize such a religion as empty and bankrupt, but the few who don’t view themselves as “revolutionaries” and fight their battles using the conspiracy theories, disinformation, and smear tactics common in Soviet Russia under Lenin and Stalin, and advocated in America during the sixties and seventies by Saul Alinsky.

Appendix: The Humanist Manifestos

With what has been said here, anyone should be able to read each one of the 32 points of the Humanist Manifestos and see immediately A) where it came from, i.e., which of the pillars' teaching justify it, B) its basic subject matter and C) What its tendency is. The body of the Manifestos are included here for the purpose of analysis. The narrative will not be dissected, but portions will be italicized in order to call attention to them. The numbered points will be analyzed little beyond noting the predecessor, the discipline redefined, and the tendencies in terms of modern *causes*.

Humanist Manifesto I (text and commentary)

The Manifesto is a product of many minds. It was designed to represent a developing point of view, not a new creed. The individuals whose signatures appear would, had they been writing individual statements, have stated the propositions in differing terms. The importance of the document is that more than thirty men have come to general agreement on matters of final concern and that these men are undoubtedly representative of a large number who are forging a new philosophy out of the materials of the modern world. -- Raymond B. Bragg (1933)

The time has come for widespread recognition of the radical changes in religious beliefs throughout the modern world. The time is past for mere revision of traditional attitudes. *Science and economic change have disrupted the old beliefs*. Religions the world over are under the necessity of coming to terms with new conditions created by a *vastly increased knowledge and experience*.¹¹ In every field of human activity, the vital movement is now in the direction of a candid and explicit humanism. In order that *religious humanism* may be better understood we, the undersigned, desire to make certain affirmations which we believe the facts of our contemporary life demonstrate.

There is great danger of a final, and we believe fatal, identification of the word religion with doctrines and methods which have lost their significance and which are powerless to solve the problem of human living in the Twentieth Century. Religions have always been means for realizing the highest values of life. Their end has been accomplished through the interpretation of the total environing situation (theology or world view), the sense of values resulting therefrom (goal or ideal), and the technique (cult), established for realizing the satisfactory life. A change in any of these factors results in alteration of the outward forms of religion. This fact explains the changefulness of religions through the centuries. But through all changes religion itself remains constant in its quest

¹¹ This is the admission that whereas once, rational thought and knowledge judged experience, experience now judges rational thought and knowledge. Whereas there once was a symbiotic relationship between rationalism and empiricism, now there is only empiricism.

for abiding values, an inseparable feature of human life.

Today man's *larger understanding of the universe*, his *scientific achievements*, and *deeper appreciation of brotherhood*, have created a situation which requires a new statement of the means and purposes of religion. Such a vital, fearless, and frank religion capable of furnishing adequate social goals and personal satisfactions may appear to many people as a complete break with the past. While *this age does owe a vast debt to the traditional religions*, it is none the less obvious that any religion that can hope to be a synthesizing and dynamic force for today must be shaped for the needs of this age. To establish such a religion is a major necessity of the present. It is a responsibility which rests upon this generation. We therefore affirm the following:

FIRST: Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.

[This is an extension of Darwinism. There were other voices as well, but Darwinism encouraged such a belief. The discipline overtly challenged and redefined here is clearly religion, specifically Judaism and Christianity. The tendency of this point is toward existentialism and despair and toward an explicit naturalism.]

SECOND: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as a result of a continuous process.

[The Pillar of the Faith responsible for this particular is also Darwin. Social Darwinism, the belief that society is the result of social evolution, is an analogue of this point. Again, the challenged discipline is the Judeo-Christian tradition. Together with first point, a nascent meaninglessness creeps into the thought. No creator, and no guidance implies that man is a lone in the universe, and all his historical beliefs in God were so much wasted time. Who is there to care about man in such a universe? If we are the produce of time and chance, we are all nothing more than ‘blobs of protoplasm,’ and expendable. Is it any wonder that Abortion on demand and Euthanasia are so widely accepted today?]

THIRD: Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.

[The Pillar of the Faith is Freud (and his followers). Again, the redefined discipline is religion. The mind-body problem can be restated the material-immortal aspect of the human being. If there is no immortal being, no mind, there can be no soul, or spirit – nothing that can be in relationship with God. The tendency is toward a cheapened existence, and the further definition of man as nothing more than an animal afloat in the cosmos on a lonely rock. The other tendency, quite frankly, is toward jargon, mumbo-jumbo, and psychobabble.]

FOURTH: Humanism recognizes that man's religious culture and civilization, as clearly depicted by anthropology and history, are the product of a gradual development due to his interaction with his natural environment and with his social heritage. The individual born into a particular culture is largely molded by that culture.

[The roots of this teaching are to be found in Darwin and Marx. Christianity does not deny this point so much as it also claims that every soul, no matter what his culture, has the ability to recognize the truth if he hears it. So once more, religion, in the form of a tenet of Christianity, is denied. The tendency of this point is toward sympathy to all cultures, and eventually, to a one world government sympathetic to all cultures.]

FIFTH: Humanism asserts that the nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values. Obviously humanism does not deny the possibility of realities as yet undiscovered, but it does insist that the way to determine the existence and value of any and all realities is by means of intelligent inquiry and by the assessment of their relations to human needs. Religion must formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method.

[The primary contributors to this point are Nietzsche and Marx. This point is more an implication than a straightforward statement by these men. The disciplines redefined here include religion, ethics and sociology and politics. The reference to "supernatural" clearly points to Christianity. Mention of "values" clearly relates to ethics (the term values is the Humanist substitute for ethics; values are subjective in nature and change with the times, ethics and morals claim to be changeless and objective). The reference to "human needs" clearly points back to Marx and forward to some form of socialism. And "formulating hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method" is a reiteration of reliance on extreme empiricism. The tendency of these ideas toward one world government, socialism and reliance on science as the light of mankind.]

SIXTH: We are convinced that the time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of "new thought".

[The contributing "pillars" here are Nietzsche and Freud. Religion and ethics take the hit, and the tendency is to ever greater secularism.

SEVENTH: Religion consists of those actions, purposes, and experiences which are humanly significant. Nothing human is alien to the religious. It includes labor, art, science, philosophy, love, friendship, recreation -- all that is in its degree expressive of intelligently satisfying human living. The distinction between the sacred and the secular can no longer be maintained.

[There may be no particular "Pillar of the Faith" who supplied this point. It seems to be an

extrapolation from general principles for the purpose of redefining religion in secular terms. This is for those who think they can worship God by going fishing on Sunday morning. But this point is hugely interesting for two reasons. First it deliberately obliterates the line between sacred and secular, and second, it is a pointed example of word magic. All this statement really means is that whatever I think of as worship, *is* worship. The list of words that have been stretched to all-inclusion in this manner now include *art, music, science, Christianity, worship, education* and many others. Is it any wonder that we now need “spin doctors” to decipher the double talk of politicians? The tendency of this point is simply toward the use of buzz-words to rationalize whatever one wants rationalized.]

EIGHTH: Religious Humanism considers the complete realization of human personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfillment in the here and now. This is the explanation of the humanist's social passion.

[This is a generalized statement based on the views of Nietzsche, Marx and Freud. It is not pertinent to any one discipline, but outlines a view of the purpose of life, hence a philosophical statement. The tendency is man centeredness and self centeredness, and can justify just about anything as “the pursuit of happiness,” personal freedom, or greater equality.]

NINTH: In the place of the old attitudes involved in worship and prayer the humanist finds his religious emotions expressed in a heightened sense of personal life and in a cooperative effort to promote social well-being.

[This is a rehash of numbers seven and eight stretched to cover society and social issues.]

TENTH: It follows that there will be no uniquely religious emotions and attitudes of the kind hitherto associated with belief in the supernatural.

]Pillars: Nietzsche and Freud. Discipline: Religion. Tendency: Anti Christianity.]

ELEVENTH: Man will learn to face the crises of life in terms of his knowledge of their naturalness and probability. Reasonable and manly attitudes will be fostered by education and supported by custom. We assume that humanism will take the path of social and mental hygiene and discourage sentimental and unreal hopes and wishful thinking.

[Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud. Discipline: Religion and politics. Tendency: to redefine education, promote “mental health” (a need produced by the very philosophy purporting to supply it!), anti Christianity and empiricism. Note the note off hope concerning the support of *custom*. They are obviously out to rework and redefine life itself.]

TWELFTH: Believing that religion must work increasingly for joy in living, religious humanists aim to foster the creative in man and to encourage achievements that add to the satisfactions of life.

[This point appears to be nothing more than little bit of romantic palaver. It is an attempt to counter the despair of existentialism, and very little, if anything, in the “Pillars of the Faith” lends itself to “joy in living.” The affected field is religion, and the tendencies toward self-satisfaction.]

THIRTEENTH: Religious humanism maintains that all associations and institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of humanism. Certainly religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods, and communal activities must be reconstituted as rapidly as experience allows, in order to function effectively in the modern world.

[Nietzsche and Freud were the contributors at this point, although some interpreting spin may also be present. Again, religion takes a hit and the tendency is toward the takeover of institutions and the reconstituting of religion.]

FOURTEENTH: The humanists are firmly convinced that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society 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. The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good. Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.

[The Pillar of the Faith for this point in his Marx. Politics, in the service of economics is redefined in this. The tendency is toward socialism and the redistribution of wealth. Clearly, the “nanny” state is in view here.]

FIFTEENTH AND LAST: We assert that humanism will: (a) affirm life rather than deny it; (b) seek to elicit the possibilities of life, not flee from them; and © endeavor to establish the conditions of a satisfactory life for all, not merely for the few. By this positive morale and intention humanism will be guided, and from this perspective and alignment the techniques and efforts of humanism will flow.

[Interpretive strains of Nietzsche, Marx and Freud echo through this passage. It is a summation of its advocacy for maximizing personal life for all through the establishment of the external conditions.]

So stand the theses of religious humanism. Though we consider the religious forms and ideas of our fathers no longer adequate, the quest for the good life is still the central task for mankind. Man is at last becoming aware that he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams, that he has within himself the power for its achievement. He must set intelligence and will to the task.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: There were 34 signers of this document, including Anton J. Carlson, John Dewey, John H. Dietrich, R. Lester Mondale, Charles Francis Potter, Curtis W. Reese, and Edwin H. Wilson.]

Humanist Manifesto I (text and commentary)

[Because the Humanist Manifesto II is more discursive, the positions of Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud are not so clearly seen and therefore will not be pointed out as was done with the first Humanist Manifesto. Another difference is that the original Humanist Manifesto was negatively stated; its burden was to show what humanists *don't want*. Humanist Manifest II was more positively stated because it was shaped by contemporary events that necessitated stating what humanists *did want*. Hence, *revealing* points in the text of Humanist Manifesto II will be placed in italics to draw the reader's attention to them. This will also prepare the reader to see the relationship of secular humanism to the modern "causes" we hear about so frequently.]

-- Preface --

It is forty years since Humanist Manifesto I (1933) appeared. Events since then make that earlier statement seem far too optimistic. Nazism has shown the depths of brutality of which humanity is capable. Other totalitarian regimes have suppressed *human rights* without ending *poverty*. *Science has sometimes brought evil* as well as good. Recent decades have shown that inhuman wars can be made in the name of peace. The beginnings of police states, even in democratic societies, widespread government espionage, and other *abuses of power* by military, political, and industrial elites, and the continuance of unyielding *racism*, all present a different and difficult social outlook. In various societies, the demands of women and minority groups for *equal rights* effectively challenge our generation.

As we approach the twenty-first century, however, an *affirmative and hopeful vision* is needed.¹² Faith, commensurate with advancing knowledge, is also necessary. In the *choice between*

¹² Ironically, it is undirected Romanticism and, thereafter, the tenets of the Pillars of the Faith that resulted in that black despair known as Existentialism. Romanticism is still alive, as it posits its "hopeful vision" where its own beliefs destroyed hope in the first place. Secular Humanism has no basis for promoting hope if the world is as they describe it. It is certainly not to be found in the writings of Nietzsche or Darwin, and in Marx only after the socialistic Utopia has been established.

despair and hope, humanists respond in this Humanist Manifesto II with a positive declaration for times of uncertainty.

As in 1933, humanists still believe that traditional theism, especially faith in the prayer-hearing God, assumed to live 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. Salvationism, based on mere affirmation, still appears as harmful, diverting people with false hopes of heaven hereafter. Reasonable minds look to other means for survival.

Those who sign Humanist Manifesto II disclaim that they are setting forth a binding credo; their individual views would be stated in widely varying ways. This statement is, however, reaching for vision in a time that needs direction. It is social analysis in an effort at consensus. New statements should be developed to supersede this, but for today it is our conviction that humanism offers an alternative that can serve present-day needs and guide humankind toward the future.

-- Paul Kurtz and Edwin H. Wilson (1973)

The next century can be and should be the humanistic century. Dramatic scientific, technological, and ever-accelerating social and political changes crowd our awareness. We have virtually conquered the planet, explored the moon, overcome the natural limits of travel and communication; we stand at the dawn of a new age, ready to move farther into space and perhaps inhabit other planets. Using technology wisely, we can control our environment, conquer poverty, markedly reduce disease, extend our life-span, significantly modify our behavior, alter the course of human evolution and cultural development, unlock vast new powers, and provide humankind with unparalleled opportunity for *achieving an abundant and meaningful life.*¹³

The future is, however, filled with dangers. *In learning to apply the scientific method to nature and human life, we have opened the door to ecological damage, over-population, dehumanizing institutions, totalitarian repression, and nuclear and bio-chemical disaster.* Faced with apocalyptic prophesies and doomsday scenarios, many flee in despair from reason and embrace irrational cults and theologies of withdrawal and retreat.

Traditional moral codes and newer irrational cults both fail to meet the pressing needs of today and tomorrow. False "theologies of hope" and messianic ideologies, substituting new dogmas for old, cannot cope with existing world realities. They separate rather than unite peoples.

Humanity, to survive, requires bold and daring measures. We need to extend the uses of scientific method, not renounce them, to fuse reason with compassion in order to build constructive social and moral values. Confronted by many possible futures, we must decide which to pursue. *The ultimate goal should be the fulfillment of the potential for growth in each human personality – not for the favored few, but for all of humankind.* Only a shared world and global measures will suffice.

A humanist outlook will tap the creativity of each human being and provide the vision and courage for us to work together. This outlook emphasizes the role human beings can play in their own spheres of action. The decades ahead call for dedicated, clear minded men and women able to marshal the will, intelligence, and cooperative skills for shaping a desirable future. *Humanism can provide the purpose and inspiration that so many seek; it can give personal meaning and*

¹³ Is it not strange that Jesus first promised "abundant life," but meant precisely what the Humanists *do not mean*?

significance to human life.

Many kinds of humanism exist in the contemporary world. The varieties and emphases of naturalistic humanism include "scientific," "ethical," "democratic," "religious," and "Marxist" humanism. Free thought, atheism, agnosticism, skepticism, deism, rationalism, ethical culture, and liberal religion all claim to be heir to the humanist tradition. Humanism traces its roots from ancient China, classical Greece and Rome, through the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, to the scientific revolution of the modern world. *But views that merely reject theism are not equivalent to humanism. They lack commitment to the positive belief in the possibilities of human progress and to the values central to it.* Many within religious groups, believing in the future of humanism, now claim humanist credentials. Humanism is an ethical process through which we all can move, above and beyond the divisive particulars, heroic personalities, dogmatic creeds, and ritual customs of past religions or their mere negation.

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 for a secular society on a planetary scale.*

For these reasons, we submit this new Humanist Manifesto for the future of humankind; for us, it is a vision of hope, a direction for satisfying survival.

– Religion –

FIRST: In the best sense, religion may inspire dedication to the highest ethical ideals. The cultivation of moral devotion and creative imagination is an expression of genuine "spiritual" experience and aspiration.

We believe, however, that *traditional dogmatic or authoritarian religions that place revelation, God, ritual, or creed above human needs and experience do a disservice to the human species.* Any account of nature should pass the tests of scientific evidence; in our judgment, the dogmas and myths of traditional religions do not do so. Even at this late date in human history, certain elementary facts based upon the critical use of scientific reason have to be restated. *We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of a supernatural; it is either meaningless or irrelevant to the question of survival and fulfillment of the human race.* As non theists, we begin with humans not God, nature not deity. Nature may indeed be broader and deeper than we now know; any new discoveries, however, will but enlarge our knowledge of the natural.

*Some humanists believe we should reinterpret traditional religions and reinvest them with meanings appropriate to the current situation.*¹⁴ Such redefinition, however, often perpetuates old dependencies and escapism; they easily become obscurantist, impeding the free use of the intellect. We need, instead, radically new human purposes and goals.

We appreciate the need to preserve the best ethical teachings in the religious traditions of

¹⁴ To get a sense for the inroads made in American churches, listen to the "music" being played there on Sunday morning, notice the lack of messages that even mention *sin*, watch what passes for worship, and think about Rick Warren and his Madison Avenue approach to "Churchianity."

humankind, many of which we share in common. But we reject those features of traditional religious morality that deny humans a full appreciation of their own potentialities and responsibilities. Traditional religions often offer solace to humans, but, as often, they inhibit humans from helping themselves or experiencing their full potentialities. Such institutions, creeds, and rituals often impede the will to serve others. Too often traditional faiths encourage dependence rather than independence, obedience rather than affirmation, fear rather than courage. More recently they have generated concerned social action, with many signs of relevance appearing in the wake of the "God Is Dead" theologies. But we can discover no divine purpose or providence for the human species. While there is much that we do not know, humans are responsible for what we are or will become. *No deity will save us; we must save ourselves.*

[The redefined discipline here is religion. The tendency is toward a religion that includes some of Christianity's ethics, but not the Christian traditions. This is certainly included in what Paul meant when he prophesied that in the end times there would be those "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." – 2 Tim 3:5]

SECOND: *Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful. They distract humans from present concerns, from self-actualization, and from rectifying social injustices.* Modern science discredits such historic concepts as the "ghost in the machine" and the "separable soul." Rather, science affirms that the human species is an emergence from natural evolutionary forces. As far as we know, the total personality is a function of the biological organism transacting in a social and cultural context. There is no credible evidence that life survives the death of the body. We continue to exist in our progeny and in the way that our lives have influenced others in our culture.

Traditional religions are surely not the only obstacles to human progress. Other ideologies also impede *human* advance. Some forms of political doctrine, for instance, function religiously, reflecting the worst features of orthodoxy and authoritarianism, especially when they sacrifice individuals on the altar of Utopian promises. Purely economic and political viewpoints, whether capitalist or communist, often function as religious and ideological dogma. Although humans undoubtedly need economic and political goals, *they also need creative values by which to live.*

[Echos of Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud can all be heard here. Not only does Christianity take a hit here, but mention of "creative values," tips us off as to what is coming.]

– Ethics –

THIRD: We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational needing no theological or ideological sanction. Ethics stems from human need and interest. To deny this distorts the whole basis of life. *Human life has meaning because we create and develop our futures.* Happiness and the creative realization of human needs and desires, individually and in shared enjoyment, are continuous themes of humanism. We strive

for the good life, here and now. The goal is to pursue life's enrichment despite debasing forces of vulgarization, commercialization, and dehumanization.

[Nietzsche provides the bulk of the sentiments in this interpretive point. Ethics and Christianity are affected most by this, and the tendency is clearly life here-and-now. It should be noted that the notion of the “good life” is even more nebulous and ambiguous than the “pursuit of happiness.”]

FOURTH: Reason and intelligence are the most effective instruments that humankind possesses. There is no substitute: neither faith nor passion suffices in itself. The controlled use of scientific methods, which have transformed the natural and social sciences since the Renaissance, must be extended further in the solution of human problems. But reason must be tempered by humility, since *no group has a monopoly of wisdom or virtue*.¹⁵ Nor is there any guarantee that all problems can be solved or all questions answered. Yet critical intelligence, infused by a sense of human caring, is the best method that humanity has for resolving problems. Reason should be balanced with compassion and empathy and the whole person fulfilled. Thus, we are not advocating the use of scientific intelligence independent of or in opposition to emotion, for we believe in the cultivation of feeling and love. As science pushes back the boundary of the known, humankind's sense of wonder is continually renewed, and art, poetry, and music find their places, along with religion and ethics.

[Religion and ethics take the hit on this one. The overweening reliance on reason and the denial of revelation necessitate a replacement of Christian ethics altogether. The tendency is toward reasoned “values” and “diversity.”]

– The Individual –

FIFTH: The preciousness and dignity of the individual person is a central humanist value. Individuals should be encouraged to realize their own creative talents and desires. We reject all religious, ideological, or moral codes that denigrate the individual, suppress freedom, dull intellect, dehumanize personality. We believe in *maximum individual autonomy* consonant with social responsibility. Although science can account for the causes of behavior, the possibilities of *individual freedom of choice* exist in human life and *should be increased*.

[The political and social sphere are to be adjusted to allow for a tendency toward increased human autonomy and maximal personal freedom.]

SIXTH: In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by

¹⁵ Here is the basis for “Tolerance” and “Diversity.”

orthodox religions and puritanical cultures, unduly repress sexual conduct. The right to birth control, abortion, and divorce should be recognized. While we do not approve of exploitative, denigrating forms of sexual expression, neither do we wish to prohibit, by law or social sanction, sexual behavior between consenting adults. The many varieties of sexual exploration should not in themselves be considered "evil." Without countenancing mindless permissiveness or unbridled promiscuity, a civilized society should be a tolerant one. *Short of harming others or compelling them to do likewise, individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities and pursue their lifestyles as they desire.*¹⁶ We wish to cultivate the development of a responsible attitude toward sexuality, in which humans are not exploited as sexual objects, and in which intimacy, sensitivity, respect, and honesty in interpersonal relations are encouraged. *Moral education for children and adults* is an important way of developing awareness and sexual maturity.

[Written during the "sexual revolution," this adaptation of psychology of Freud and the ethics of Nietzsche, coupled with the quest for ever more "personal autonomy," is not surprising. The surprise is in the notion that we need to (re)educate children and adults. That is, we need to see to it that everybody is trained to at least turn a blind eye toward, if not participate in free wheeling sexual behavior. After all, this is one of the chief ways humanity expresses itself and pursues the "good life." This is the genesis of sex education classes, and provides the underlying rationale for the way it is taught. Is it any wonder that abstinence is considered by school officials and "local authorities" to be a dirty word?]

– Democratic Society –

SEVENTH: To enhance freedom and dignity the individual must experience a full range of *civil liberties* in all societies. This includes freedom of speech and the press, political democracy, the legal right of opposition to governmental policies, fair judicial process, religious liberty, freedom of association, and artistic, scientific, and cultural freedom. It also includes a recognition of an individual's right to die with dignity, euthanasia, and the right to suicide. We oppose the increasing invasion of privacy, by whatever means, in both totalitarian and democratic societies. We would safeguard, extend, and implement the principles of human freedom evolved from the Magna Carta to the Bill of Rights, the Rights of Man, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

[Here we have the basis for euthanasia and suicide as well as that new "right," the right to privacy.]

EIGHTH: We are committed to an open and democratic society. We must *extend participatory democracy* in its true sense to *the economy, the school, the family, the workplace, and*

¹⁶ You can almost hear the hippy saying "Yeah, man, do your own thing, just don't hurt anyone" just after debauching a girl and hurting her, her parents, and others closely connected with her. Even if the girl was complicit to the fullest degree, that only means that they *both* hurt someone.

voluntary associations. Decision-making must be decentralized to include widespread involvement of people at all levels -- social, political, and economic. All persons should have a voice in developing the values and goals that determine their lives. *Institutions should be responsive to expressed desires and needs.* The conditions of work, education, devotion, and play should be humanized. Alienating forces should be modified or eradicated and bureaucratic structures should be held to a minimum. *People are more important than decalogues, rules, proscriptions, or regulations.*

[A dangerous notion is set forth here in the notion that democratic processes should be extended to the family. Permissiveness will hit a new high when children vote on what is acceptable behavior and what constitutes suitable punishment! Not only should “all persons” have a say in the development of their “values,” but “institutions should be responsive” to them.]

NINTH: The separation of church and state and the separation of ideology and state are imperatives. The state should encourage maximum freedom for different moral, political, religious, and social values in society. It should not favor any particular religious bodies through the use of public monies, nor espouse a single ideology and function thereby as an instrument of propaganda or oppression, particularly against dissenters.

[There is no problem with this notion other than the original misunderstanding of the constitutional separation of church and state. But after having made this statement, it is hypocritical to define ones position as a religion and then expect public “monies” to teach it to school children. This is the very nature of the establishment of Secular Humanism as the official religion of America!]

TENTH: Humane societies should evaluate economic systems not by rhetoric or ideology, but by whether or not they increase economic well-being for all individuals and groups, minimize poverty and hardship, increase the sum of human satisfaction, and enhance the quality of life. Hence the door is open to alternative economic systems. We need to democratize the economy and judge it by its responsiveness to human needs, testing results in terms of the common good.

[This point seems to be nothing more than a welter of wishful talking points and conflicting terms. That “societies should evaluate economic systems . . . by whether or not they increase . . . well-being . . . , minimize poverty . . . and enhance the quality of life” is just such an ideology as the statement prohibits. Furthermore, thinking that “the door is open to alternative economic systems” is not only limited by the foregoing considerations, but by the notion that the system should be “democratized.” A “democratized” economy that “increases economic well-being and “minimizes poverty” is, by definition, socialism, for it amounts to nothing more than the masses voting themselves pay raises out of the bank accounts of the wealthy. This is democratized theft!]

ELEVENTH: The principle of moral equality must be furthered through elimination of all discrimination based upon race, religion, sex, age, or national origin. This means equality of opportunity and recognition of talent and merit. Individuals should be encouraged to contribute to their own betterment. If unable, then society should provide means to satisfy their basic economic, health, and cultural needs, including, wherever resources make possible, a minimum guaranteed annual income. We are concerned for the welfare of the aged, the infirm, the disadvantaged, and also for the outcasts -- the mentally retarded, abandoned, or abused children, the handicapped, prisoners, and addicts -- for all who are neglected or ignored by society. Practicing humanists should make it their vocation to humanize personal relations.

We believe in the right to universal education. Everyone has a right to the cultural opportunity to fulfill his or her unique capacities and talents. The schools should foster satisfying and productive living. They should be open at all levels to any and all; the achievement of excellence should be encouraged. Innovative and experimental forms of education are to be welcomed. The energy and idealism of the young deserve to be appreciated and channeled to constructive purposes.

We deplore racial, religious, ethnic, or class antagonisms. Although we believe in cultural diversity and encourage racial and ethnic pride, we reject separations which promote alienation and set people and groups against each other; we envision an integrated community where people have a maximum opportunity for free and voluntary association.

We are critical of sexism or sexual chauvinism -- male or female. We believe in equal rights for both women and men to fulfill their unique careers and potentialities as they see fit, free of invidious discrimination.

[Reiteration of the humanist adherence to diversity, equality, and socialism.]

– World Community –

TWELFTH: 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 and to move toward the building of a world community in which all sectors of the human family can participate. Thus we look to the development of a system of world law and a world order based upon transnational federal government. This would appreciate cultural pluralism and diversity. It would not exclude pride in national origins and accomplishments nor the handling of regional problems on a regional basis. Human progress, however, can no longer be achieved by focusing on one section of the world, Western or Eastern, developed or underdeveloped. For the first time in human history, no part of humankind can be isolated from any other. Each person's future is in some way linked to all. We thus reaffirm a commitment to the building of world community, at the same time recognizing that this commits us to some hard choices.

[This is not Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx or Freud. It is Romanticism on a grand scale. The ignorance displayed in this point is truly titanic. It apparently never occurred to those who drafted this manifesto that perhaps third world countries *don't want* to be part of our world community.

Maybe some countries are better run by dictators. Maybe some countries prefer to abuse women. How are we going to change that? The notion that a culture can be talked out of practices it has observed with religious fervor for centuries is too absurd to even entertain. We must either accept with sorrow their barbarity, or take up arms to change it. Even “economic sanctions” are of dubious value.¹⁷ There is a very simple concept to be grasped here. The downtrodden come to this country because they cherish the freedoms and opportunities we have here. They come here precisely because those advantages are unavailable in their homelands. Those homelands see our success but *don't want it*. They *could change*, but *they refuse*. Hence, those who want what we have must come here to get it. It will never be offered in their homelands. It is presumptuous beyond expression to think that everyone wants to be like us just because we like it.]

THIRTEENTH: This world community must renounce the resort to violence and force as a method of solving international disputes. We believe in the peaceful adjudication of differences by international courts and by the development of the arts of negotiation and compromise. 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.

[Again, this is mere fantasy. Demilitarizing only ensures that we will be unable to defend ourselves against those not so inclined to listen to talk.]

FOURTEENTH: The world community must engage in cooperative planning concerning the use of rapidly depleting resources. The planet earth must be considered a single ecosystem. Ecological damage, *resource depletion*, and excessive *population growth* must be checked by international concord. The cultivation and conservation of nature is a moral value; we should perceive ourselves as integral to the sources of our being in nature. We must free our world from needless pollution and waste, responsibly guarding and creating wealth, both natural and human. Exploitation of natural resources, uncurbed by social conscience, must end.

[This is the basis for environmentalism and population control.]

FIFTEENTH: The problems of economic growth and development can no longer be resolved by one nation alone; they are worldwide in scope. It is the moral obligation of the developed nations to provide -- through an international authority that safeguards human rights -- massive technical, agricultural, medical, and economic assistance, including birth control techniques, to the developing portions of the globe. World poverty must cease. Hence extreme disproportions in wealth, income,

¹⁷ Even granting the United Nations good marks for UNICEF, the rest of its endeavors have been nothing so much as failure on parade. Surely old fashioned diplomacy is far better than anything the UN has provided.

and economic growth should be reduced on a worldwide basis.

SIXTEENTH: Technology is a vital key to human progress and development. We deplore any neo-romantic efforts to condemn indiscriminately all technology and science or to counsel retreat from its further extension and use for the good of humankind. We would resist any moves to censor basic scientific research on moral, political, or social grounds. *Technology must, however, be carefully judged by the consequences of its use*; harmful and destructive changes should be avoided. We are particularly disturbed when technology and bureaucracy control, manipulate, or modify human beings without their consent. Technological feasibility does not imply social or cultural desirability.

SEVENTEENTH: We must expand communication and transportation across frontiers. Travel restrictions must cease. The world must be open to diverse political, ideological, and moral viewpoints and evolve a worldwide system of television and radio for information and education. We thus call for full international cooperation in culture, science, the arts, and technology across ideological borders. We must learn to live openly together or we shall perish together.

[Open borders and free travel.]

-- Humanity As a Whole --

IN CLOSING: The world cannot wait for a reconciliation of competing political or economic systems to solve its problems. These are the times for men and women of goodwill to further the building of a peaceful and prosperous world. We urge that parochial loyalties and inflexible moral and religious ideologies be transcended. We urge recognition of the common humanity of all people. We further urge the use of reason and compassion to produce the kind of world we want -- a world in which peace, prosperity, freedom, and happiness are widely shared. Let us not abandon that vision in despair or cowardice. We are responsible for what we are or will be. Let us work together for a humane world by means commensurate with humane ends. Destructive ideological differences among communism, capitalism, socialism, conservatism, liberalism, and radicalism should be overcome. Let us call for an end to terror and hatred. We will survive and prosper only in a world of shared humane values. We can initiate new directions for humankind; *ancient rivalries can be superseded by broad-based cooperative efforts*. The commitment to *tolerance*, understanding, and peaceful negotiation does not necessitate acquiescence to the status quo nor the damming up of dynamic and revolutionary forces. The true revolution is occurring and can continue in countless nonviolent adjustments. But this entails the willingness to step forward onto new and expanding plateaus. At the present juncture of history, commitment to all humankind is the highest commitment of which we are capable; it transcends the narrow allegiances of church, state, party, class, or race in moving toward a wider vision of human potentiality. What more daring a goal for humankind than for each person to become, in ideal as well as practice, a citizen of a world community. It is a classical vision. we can now give it new vitality. Humanism thus interpreted is

a moral force that has time on its side. We believe that humankind has the potential, intelligence, goodwill, and cooperative skill to implement this commitment in the decades ahead.

[Dedication to Cosmopolitanism.]

We, the undersigned, while not necessarily endorsing every detail of the above, pledge our general support to Humanist Manifesto II for the future of humankind. These affirmations are not a final credo or dogma but an expression of a living and growing faith. We invite others in all lands to join us in further developing and working for these goals.