

Chapter 3

WHAT IS HUMANISM? A Pagan Religion

Humanism is first and foremost a religion. It is a religion because it attempts to answer the religious questions all humans ask: Is there a God? What is our origin? What is right, and what is wrong? What is our purpose in life? Is there life after death? How can I be saved? That humanism is a religion is easily seen by inspecting the definitions and proclamations of humanism written by Humanist leaders. This chapter will examine these definitions and proclamations in relation to the fundamental religious questions they attempt to answer. Also, since the significance of error is easier to see if contrasted with truth, Humanism will be contrasted with Christianity in each case, giving the Christian position first.

Religious Questions Humanism Tries To Answer

The most fundamental religious question of all, of course, is:

Is There a True and Living Creator God?

God is an undeniably religious topic. A doctrine concerning God is the most fundamental element of any religion.

True Christians Believe In the True and Living God

God is declared to exist in the very first verse of the Bible: “In the beginning God...” (Gen. 1:1), and the Bible reveals to us God's attributes and will, using the word “God” 4,110 times.

The reality of God is clearly seen—even by atheists—in the incredibly intricate design of all God's creation.

For the invisible things of [God] from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. (Rom. 1:20)

It does not take much intelligence to realize that random chance could not produce such a creation no matter how many billions of years one allows for it to do so. How many billions of years would you have to wait for random chance to produce a personal computer? *It would never happen*, you rightly answer. Yet the simplest one-celled animal is far more complicated than the most advanced super-computer—and is alive! Where there is such amazing design there is an amazing Designer.

However, though nature clearly reveals that God exists and is super-naturally intelligent, nature is unable to reveal to us the spiritual attributes of God. Science is also unable to reveal to us the spiritual attributes of God. “God is a Spirit” (John 4:24), but science can only deal with matter. God cannot be made the object of scientific experiments. Because of this, science cannot reveal the complete truth about God—that is why God revealed Himself to us in the Bible.

The Bible declares that faith in God is essential to finding and pleasing God:

By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God. But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and

that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. (Heb. 11:5-6)
 True Christians have believed God's Word, and have been rewarded with becoming personally acquainted with him. They no longer just believe God exists, they *know* He exists.

Humanists Do Not Believe In the True and Living God

Humanists claim to base everything on science. Since there is no scientific evidence to disprove the existence of God, one would think that Humanists would therefore not have a position concerning God. Wrong! Very wrong! Humanists have strong, continually preached doctrinal beliefs concerning God—beliefs they cannot prove, but accept on blind religious FAITH. Statements such as the following are found often in Humanist writings:

Sigmund Freud said the widespread belief in a father-god arises from psychology. Tiny children are awed by their fathers as seemingly all-powerful protectors and punishers. As maturity comes, fathers grow less awesome. But the infantile image remains buried in the subconscious, and attaches to an omnipotent, supernatural father in an invisible heaven.

That makes sense to me. It says the father-god is just a figment of the imagination. **But you can't prove it's true....** Is there a personal God waiting to reward me in a heaven or punish me in a hell? **I don't know**—but I doubt it.³⁶ (Emphasis added)
 So, Humanists do not know that God does not exist, and certainly cannot prove it. Obviously their belief that God does not exist rests on pure FAITH alone.

Still, Humanists are far from neutral concerning God. Indeed God occupies a major portion of their thoughts. They hate the true and living God with a burning passion. Though they claim to be atheists or “non-theists,” they cannot get God out of their minds. *Humanist Manifesto II*, Section 1, states:

... 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 the survival and fulfillment of the human race. As nontheists, we begin with humans not God, nature not deity.³⁷

Of course, such talk is pure deception. Placing God first does not place Him above human needs. Indeed, the first and most basic needs of man are to be rescued from the wages of sin, to be given eternal life, to have a relationship and be in fellowship with God, and to have an eternal purpose for living. God alone can supply those needs.

Also, as will be shown in this book, there *is* scientific evidence that God exists. On the other hand, there is zero scientific evidence that God does not exist. Of course, humanists do have a multitude of atheist doctrines—mere myths—cloaked as scientific evidence.

Humanist editor Morris B. Storer writes:

What is humanism, and who is humanist? For our purposes I will identify as “humanist” all who, in the basic deliberations and action decisions of their lives, have set aside faith in revelation [the Bible] and dogmatic authority [God] (if they ever had it), and have settled for human experience and reason as grounds for belief and action, putting human good—the good of self and others in their life on earth—as ultimate criterion of right and wrong, with due concern for other living creatures. It has been estimated that as many as thirty million Americans—around one out of every seven—are of this mind, but the number is probably much larger. And the world population of humanists defined in such limited terms, may be numbered at close to a billion, remembering that 95% of China's 700 million were reared to a mix of humanist Confucianism, naturalist Taoism, and atheistic Buddhism, and that the Soviet Union's 250 million population have been officially committed to a somewhat corrupted mode of Marxist humanism by fiat of a dictator State.³⁸

Notice in the above quote that Storer includes Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism—the religions espoused by the so-called “New-Age Movement”—right along with Communists as fellow humanists. All of

³⁶ James A. Haught, “Commentary: Is There a God?” in *Secular Humanism Online Library* (Amherst, New York: Council For Secular Humanism, 1996), http://www.SecularHumanism.org/library/haught_08_96.html.

³⁷ Paul Kurtz, ed., *Humanist Manifestos I & II* (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1981), <http://www.humanism.net/documents/manifesto1.html> and <http://www.humanism.net/documents/manifesto2.http>.

³⁸ Storer, *Humanist Ethics: Dialogue on Basics*, 2.

these philosophical religious systems deny the existence of a true and living creator God, who is separate from the universe He created. Instead they teach that the universe itself is God—that God is not a living person, but is just the dead natural forces. This idea is called pantheism. Humanists call these dead natural forces “Evolution.”

Harvey Lebrun, founder of the Chapter Assembly of the American Humanist Association, refers people seeking a definition of Humanism to the

Statement of Purpose preamble to the Bylaws of the American Humanist Association, which declares the philosophy of Humanism to be—*a nontheistic world view that rejects all forms of supernaturalism and is in accord with the spirit and discoveries of science.*³⁹ (Emphasis original). That statement is half true, half lie. The lie is that Humanism is in accord with the spirit and discoveries of science. The so-called “science” Humanism preaches is the “theory” of macro-evolution, which is mere faith, not science. No scientist has ever seen dead matter birth life. Nor has any scientist ever witnessed an animal of one kind give birth to an animal of a different kind. Evolution is not science, nor is it reason; it is superstition. This will be discussed in more detail in a later chapter. Nevertheless, it obviously is true that Humanism preaches atheism, which also is not science, but is a religious doctrine based on faith.

Lebrun goes on to say that one of the “four basic principles, the *raison d’etre* of the American Humanist Association” is

No belief in, reliance upon, or subservience to supposedly supernatural powers or their effluvia, such as a god or gods, a soul separate from the body, immortality, sin, answered prayer, or divine revelation.⁴⁰ That is a very strongly stated religious belief. It is interesting to note that no attempt whatsoever is made to give proof for such a belief. Definitely this is not a statement of science, but of religion. Lebrun and his humanist friends are not scientists but mere ***Human-Theory Thumpers***. Evolution is their ***dogma***.

Another document from the American Humanist Association web site is titled “What Is Humanism?” and is written by Fredrick Edwords. According to a biography on the Infidels.Org web site—the name of this web site shows just how arrogant Humanists are—, Fredrick Edwords is the current executive director of the American Humanist Association, editor of the *Humanist* magazine, and is also a Humanist minister.⁴¹ He describes Humanism as defiance of God.

The Secular Humanist tradition is a tradition of defiance, a tradition that dates back to ancient Greece... Prometheus stands out because he was idolized by ancient Greeks as the one who defied Zeus. He stole the fire of the gods and brought it down to earth. For this he was punished. And yet he continued his defiance amid his tortures. This is the root of the Humanist challenge to authority.

The next time we see a truly heroic Promethean character in mythology it is Lucifer in John Milton's *Paradise Lost*. But now he is the Devil. He is evil. Whoever would defy God must be wickedness personified. That seems to be a given of traditional religion. But the ancient Greeks didn't agree. To them, Zeus, for all his power, could still be mistaken.

Imagine how shocked a friend of mine was when I told her my view of “God's moral standards.” I said, “If there were such a god, and these were indeed his ideal moral principles, I would be tolerant. After all, God is entitled to his own opinions!”⁴² Lucifer—the Devil himself—is a “truly heroic Promethean character” for Humanists to model themselves after because he defies God?! If, as Humanists insist, God does not exist, then why bother defying Him? What a waste of time and life.

Edwords continues:

Only a Humanist is inclined to speak this way. Only a Humanist can suggest that, even if there be a god, it is OK to disagree with him, her, or it. In Plato's *Euthyphro*, Socrates shows that God is not necessarily the source of good, or even good himself. Socrates asks if something is good

³⁹ Harvey Lebrun, “Humanism with a Capital H,” reprint, 1973 (Amherst, New York: American Humanist Association, 1994), <http://www.americanhumanist.org/humanism/lebrun.html>.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ “Brief Biography of Fred Edwords,” in *Library: Modern* (Amherst, New York: American Humanist Association, 0198), http://www.infidels.org/library/modern/fred_edwords/edwords-bio.html.

⁴² Frederick Edwords, “What is Humanism?” *American Humanist Association Home Page* (1989) (Amherst, New York: American Humanist Association, 1989), <http://www.humanism.net/definations/humanism.html>.

because God ordains it, or if God ordains it because it is already good. Yet, since the time of the ancient Greeks, no mainstream religion has permitted such questioning of God's will or made a hero out of a disobedient character. It is Humanists who claim this tradition.

After all, much of Human progress has been in defiance of religion or of the apparent natural order.... [Humanists] recognize the Promethean defiance of their response and take pride in it. For this is part of the [Humanist] tradition.⁴³ “Such questioning of God's will” is not new. It began in the Garden of Eden. The book of Genesis records the origin of humanism as follows:

Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. (Gen. 3:1-5)

Satan's appeal to mental pride has not changed. And to believe him is to worship him—and to suffer horrible loss.

At its November 6, 1996 meeting in Mexico City, “the Board of the International Humanist and Ethical Union approved the following ‘minimum statement’ of Humanism:”

Humanism is a democratic and ethical life stance which affirms that human beings have the right and responsibility to give meaning and shape to their own lives. It stands for the building of a more humane society through an ethics based on human and other natural values in a spirit of reason and free inquiry through human capabilities. It is not theistic, and it does not accept supernatural views of reality.⁴⁴

Notice once again that this is merely a statement of *faith* concerning basic religious issues. There is nothing scientific about this statement at all.

What Is Our Origin?

People of all ages want to know how humans and this universe came into being. Where did we come from? This is—and will forever be—a religious subject, for it is impossible to reproduce the creation of the universe in a laboratory. Either we accept God's explanation of how the universe began, or else we must accept the speculations (human-theory thumping) of some men who were not there when it happened, and do not know. Everyone at some point in life decides who they will believe. What a person decides to believe concerning the origin of the universe determines that person's worldview. A “worldview” is the foundational belief which one uses as a basis for determining all other beliefs. A person's worldview drastically influences every area of his life.

The Christian Worldview

The Christian worldview is found in Genesis 1:1, the very first verse in the Bible: “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” Christians believe the revelation of God's Word in this matter of origins, and base every aspect of their lives upon it. Looking at the world from this view, it is logical to believe that since God created the heaven and the earth, then God must exist. And since God exists and the Bible is “given by inspiration of God” (2 Tim. 3:16), then the teachings of the Bible concerning sin, immortality, Heaven, Hell, redemption, salvation, and everlasting life are also true.

The Humanist Worldview

The Humanist worldview is just the opposite of the Christian one. Humanists choose NOT to believe the revelation of God's word concerning creation, and instead base every aspect of their lives upon the “theory”

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Board of the International Humanist and Ethical Union, “IHEU Definition of Humanism” (Amherst, New York: American Humanist Association, 1996), [Http://www.humanism.net/definitions/iheu-def.html](http://www.humanism.net/definitions/iheu-def.html).

of macro-evolution (either Charles Darwin's version or else someone else's modification of Darwin's theory). Of course, Darwin did not originate the theory of evolution, but only made an old pagan myth look “scientific.”

According to a document on the American Humanist Association web site, early in 1977 the AHA established itself as a major force in the creation-evolution controversy by issuing "A Statement Affirming Evolution As a Principle of Science" and sending copies of it to every major school district in the country.⁴⁵

Thus Humanists clearly not only believe in evolution, but also intend that every child in America be taught evolution.

It is important to note that Bible-believing Christians do believe in *micro*-evolution (change within a kind of animal or plant). It is *macro*-evolution (change from one kind into another kind) that Christians deny. Mate two mongrel dogs and you never know what the babies will look like, except for one certainty—the babies will all be dogs. Humanists want us to believe that a new *kind*—a non-dog—might be born. Furthermore, Humanists believe and teach our children that change within a kind proves that change from one kind into another kind also happens. Their belief is simply not in line with what is observed day by day in the laboratory of life. Since it is macro-evolution that Humanists generally mean when they refer to evolution, macro-evolution is what will be meant in this book also, unless stated otherwise.

Looking at the world from the false macro-evolution worldview, it appears logical to believe that there is no such thing as a real, living, prayer-hearing-and-answering God, no sin, no immortality, no Heaven, no Hell, no redemption, no salvation, and no everlasting life.

Humanists are atheists in the sense that they reject the true and living creator God. ***This does not mean that Humanists do not believe in a god—for they do believe in a god, though they deny it.*** The “natural force” that they claim created life and all the life forms is their god. They call him (or her or it) **EVOLUTION**. Though no one has ever seen him (or her or it) in action, Humanists insist he (or she or it) exists. Evolution is their “spook in the machinery,” their idol, and they worship him (or her or it) with a fervent blind faith. Humanists are, in fact, polytheists, for they also worship themselves.

What Is Right, and What Is Wrong?

Like it or not, we have to make decisions concerning right and wrong virtually every day of our lives. Should I lie about my age? Should I sleep with this person? Should I cheat my neighbor? Should I murder my unborn baby? These are religious decisions for which scientific experiments cannot provide direction.

Christians Believe There Is Righteousness and Sin

Christians believe that since God created all things, He certainly knows what is good for humans, and what will cause them harm. His laws are therefore authoritative, and, though in our youth or inexperience we may not understand them, we are wise to obey them for our own good. Most people go through a time during their teenage years when they question God's moral laws, but the pain this causes eventually convinces wise people that God must be right after all. This accepting the truth of God's law is called maturing. True Christians believe that God is right when He says that murder, rape, sodomy, adultery, fornication, stealing, and lying are sins.

⁴⁵ Lloyd Morain, “Chapter 9: The American Humanist Association,” in *Humanism as the Next Step*, reprint, 1954 (Amherst, New York: Humanist Press, 1998), <http://www.americanhumanist.org/publications/morain/chapter-9.html>.

Humanists Deny There Is Righteousness and Sin

Humanists reject the Ten Commandments and the very concept of sin because they reject God Himself. Boasts Fredrick Edwords,

Religious Humanism is usually without a god, without a belief in the supernatural, without a belief in an afterlife, and without a belief in a “higher” source of moral values.

Humanism's rejection of the notions of sin and guilt, especially in relation to sexual ethics, puts it in harmony with contemporary sexology and sex education as well as aspects of humanistic psychology.⁴⁶

Harvey Lebrun declares that two of the basic principles held by Humanists are:

1. No belief in ... sin.
2. Commitment to individual and social ethics that are based on changing human experience, compassion for other human beings, and concern for the related world of humankind and Earth—rather than on supposedly divine injunctions, church pronouncements, divine rewards and punishments in this or a future life, and so forth.⁴⁷

Now it is these ideas—that there is no sin, that nothing is absolutely wrong, and that God is not the final authority concerning right and wrong—that make humanism so purely wicked and evil. To the Humanist, morality is whatever he wants it to be. What the Humanists call “new morality” is what the Bible calls “sin.” The following quotes from Humanist writings demonstrate this fact clearly.

Humanist Morality Rejects/Belittles Marriage

Humanist (im)morality means a total breakdown of the home. Humanist writer Tom Flynn states the Humanist stand concerning marriage very bluntly:

For my money, matrimony remains a corrupt, misogynistic, and outmoded institution. The need to do away with it is as real today as it was in the 60s... Today, it seems foolish to expect that many persons will find the same partner physically, emotionally, and intellectually fulfilling throughout a long life of profound and often unpredictable personal development. Divorce and remarriage are easier than they were, say, half a century ago, a reform for which freethinkers and humanists deserve much credit... Perhaps our battle cry should be “Legitimize bastardy!”⁴⁸

Misogynistic means hateful of women. According to those who have swallowed humanist dogma, to marry a woman means you hate her, but to rob her of her virginity, give her a bastard baby, and then desert both her and the baby is to love her and liberate her. Humanists have confused love with lust and have confused liberty with licentiousness. Obviously, it is actually the Humanists that are hateful of women.

Humanist Morality Encourages Adultery and Sodomy

Humanists encourage teenagers to have sex before marriage, and encourage husbands and wives to be unfaithful to their mates, and encourage everyone to have sex with multiple partners of either sex. One of the most important Humanist documents is “The New Bill of Sexual Rights and Responsibilities” which states:

Repressive taboos should be replaced by a more balanced and objective view of sexuality based upon a sensitive awareness of human behavior and needs. Archaic taboos limit our thinking in many ways. The human person, especially the female, has been held in bondage by restrictions that prescribed when, where, with whom, and with what parts of the body the sexual impulse could be satisfied. As these taboos are dispelled and an objective reappraisal ensues, numerous sexual expressions will be seen in a different light. Many that now seem unacceptable will very likely become valid in certain circumstances. Extramarital sexual relationships with the consent of one's partner is being accepted by some. Premarital sexual relationships, already accepted in some parts of the world, will become even more widely so. This will very likely also be true of homosexual and bisexual relationships. The use of genital associations to express feelings of genuine intimacy, rather than as connections for

⁴⁶ Frederick Edwords, “What is Humanism?”

⁴⁷ Lebrun, “Humanism with a Capital H.”

⁴⁸ Tom Flynn, “Legitimize Bastardy!” *Secular Humanist Bulletin* 12, no. 2 (Spring 1996) (Amherst, New York: Council for Secular Humanism, 1996), http://www.SecularHumanism.org/library/shb/flynn_12_1.html.

physical pleasure or procreation alone, may then transcend barriers of age, race, or gender.⁴⁹ In other words, Humanists believe that for humans to live lower than dogs and pigs is the way it ought to be.

Humanist Morality Advocates Pornography

On every moral issue Humanism takes a stand against the morality of God's Word. If Humanism is moral, than the Bible is immoral (and, of course, Humanists say it is). Pornography is another example of Humanist (im)morality. Humanist Wendy McElroy has written several books on the subject of pornography, including, “*XXX: A Woman's Right to Pornography ... and Sexual Correctness: The Gender-Feminist Attack on Women.*”⁵⁰ Writing in the humanist magazine *Free Enquiry*, McElroy states her humanist moral position:

As a “pro-sex” feminist, I contend: Pornography benefits women, both personally and politically Pornography benefits women politically in many ways. Historically, pornography and feminism have been fellow travelers and natural allies. Although it is not possible to draw a cause-and-effect relationship between the rise of pornography and that of feminism, they both demand the same social conditions—namely, sexual freedom.

Pornography is free speech applied to the sexual realm. Freedom of speech is the ally of those who seek change: it is the enemy of those who seek to maintain control. Pornography, along with all other forms of sexual heresy, such as homosexuality, should have the same legal protection as political heresy. This protection is especially important to women, whose sexuality has been controlled by censorship through the centuries.⁵¹

There is a little bit of truth to what McElroy says: pornography and Humanist feminism *are* fellow travelers. That is another reason why no true Christian woman can be a part of the misnamed Woman's Liberation Movement (it should be called the Woman's Enslavement Movement).

The rest of what McElroy says is lies. Pornography does not benefit women, either personally or politically. To the contrary, pornography results in women being degraded, abused, raped, beaten and murdered. Pornography stirs up vile and selfish lusts in both men and women, thus causing them to break their marriage vows, to become prostitutes spreading destructive diseases, and to do many shameful, abominable acts.

Pornography is not free speech anymore than lying is free speech. Pornography is no more protected by the Bill of Rights than rape. True freedom provides opportunity to do right, not the opportunity to abuse and degrade fellow human beings.

Humanist Morality Advocates Murdering Children

Humanists love to put the word “children” in the names of their organizations so that people will think they love children. However, the fact is that Humanists hate children so much that they try to prevent them from even being born. Failing in that they try to kill them in any manner possible. Specifically, Humanists advocate murdering children by abortion, infanticide, and assisted suicide.

Murder by Abortion. Says the American Humanist Association about its own self:

The AHA was the first national membership organization to endorse elective abortion. Further, leading abortion-law reform groups of the time were top-heavy with humanists, most notably the Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights (now the Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice) and the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws (now the National Abortion Rights Action League).⁵²

⁴⁹ Lester Kirkendall, “New Bill of Sexual Rights and Responsibilities,” *The Humanist*, January/February 1976 (Buffalo, New York), [Http://www.humanism.net/~documents/sexual-rights.html](http://www.humanism.net/~documents/sexual-rights.html).

⁵⁰ Wendy McElroy, “A Feminist Defense of Pornography,” *Free Inquiry* 17, no. 4 (Fall 1997) (Amherst, New York: Council for Secular Humanism, 1997), [Http://www.SecularHumanism.org/library/fi/mcelroy_17_4.html](http://www.SecularHumanism.org/library/fi/mcelroy_17_4.html).

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² “Frequently Asked Questions (FAQS) About the American Humanist Association” (Amherst, New York: American Humanist Association, Yr. on web 1997), [Http://www.humanism.net/information/faqs.html](http://www.humanism.net/information/faqs.html).

McElroy, the same Humanist that advocated pornography in the quote above, reveals the humanist principle underlying abortion as follows:

The liberal principle “a woman's body, a woman's right” underlay arguments ranging from abortion rights to lifestyle freedoms like lesbianism.⁵³ This idea, that a woman's body is her own to do with as she pleases, is very popular today, but is simply a falsehood. The Bible tells us the truth in 1 Cor. 6:18-20:

Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, **and ye are not your own?** For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your **body**, and in your spirit, which are **God's**. God owns us in two ways. First, He created us, and therefore we are His—spirit, soul, and body. Second, He became a human by being born of a virgin so that He could die for our sins. He gave himself to be crucified in order to purchase us with his own blood (Acts 20:28). By sinning we sold ourselves into the bondage of sin, but Jesus paid the ultimate price to buy us back.

Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. (1 Pet. 1:18-19).

Murder by Infanticide. Many people have already been so influenced by Humanist doctrines taught to them in public school “life skills” (sin skills) sex classes that they do not believe that abortion is murder. Humanism does not murder only the unborn, but the partial born are also murdered. The Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, the group the American Humanist Association said is “top-heavy with humanists” (see quote above), is pro-partial-birth abortion. This is the procedure in which a baby is delivered feet first, so that when all of the baby has exited but its head, a medical instrument is pierced into the baby's skull at the base of the neck, and its brains sucked out. If they did this an instant after the head emerged, they would be arrested for murder. It is, in fact, murder even if it is declared legal by corrupt judges. The Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice ended an article which they fittingly titled “Partial Compassion” (it certainly isn't full compassion, and in fact isn't true compassion) by exhorting readers to write then President Clinton to ask him to veto the partial-birth abortion ban bill sponsored by the Republican majority congress:

President Clinton has vowed once again to veto any ban on late-term abortions that does not include both a life and health exception for the woman. Please call or write the White House, citing bill S6/HR1122, to let him know you support that position.⁵⁴ The “life and health exception for the woman” is pure hypocrisy—the baby is already born except for its head; its legs, body and arms are already out. The head would easily follow in a few seconds. The real danger to the mother is not the birth of the baby's head, but the partial-birth abortion procedure itself, which requires the doctor to insert his hand or an instrument inside the mother to force an always risky breech birth. This procedure is nothing less than pure, premeditated, cold-blooded murder of a full-term baby. In July of 1998 the Republican-majority House voted 296-132 to overturn President Clinton's veto of a bill banning partial birth abortion, but on Friday, September 18, 1998, the Republican led Senate failed by three votes to reach the two thirds majority needed to do the same. Fifty-one Republicans and 13 Democrats voted to overturn the president's veto, while 32 Democrats and 4 liberal (humanist) Republicans voted to sustain it. So the murder continues.

But Humanists are not content to murder only the pre-born and partially born: they also want to murder the completely born. The murder of an already born child is called “infanticide,” and has always been murder in the USA. But Humanists intend to change that law. Infanticide is a logical position for a humanist

⁵³ McElroy, “A Feminist Defense of Pornography.”

⁵⁴ Jay Heavner, “Partial Compassion,” *Web Site of Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice* (1996) (Washington, D.C.: RCRC Publications, 1996), <http://www.rcrc.org/pubs/speakout/lateterm.html>.

to take. Humanist leader Joseph Fletcher (the author of the book *Situation Ethics*), writing in a volume titled *Infanticide and the Value of Life*, says truthfully, “It is reasonable, indeed, to describe infanticide as post natal abortion.”⁵⁵ It is clear therefore that the Humanists who have really studied this issue realize that abortion is the same thing as infanticide. If infanticide is murder, then abortion is murder also. Humanists advocate murdering unwanted babies during the first year of life after birth. In the book just referenced (*Infanticide and the Value of Life*) Arval A. Morris submits “Proposed Legislation” which states:

Section 1. Authorization of euthanasia. Subject to the provisions of this Act it shall be lawful for a qualified physician, or his professional medical agent, as authorized by a qualified physician's written statement, to administer euthanasia to a qualified child for whom the child's parent or guardian previously has made a written declaration voluntarily requesting euthanasia for the qualified child and which declaration is lawfully in force at the time of administering euthanasia.⁵⁶

Murder by suicide. Brags the American Humanist Association about itself:

In 1974, long before the activism of Dr. Jack Kevorkian and the Hemlock Society, the National Commission for Beneficent Euthanasia was established as an AHA program. It issued through the Humanist magazine the groundbreaking statement, “A Plea for Beneficent Euthanasia.” The document was signed by medical, legal, and religious leaders and called for “a more enlightened public opinion to transcend traditional taboos and move in the direction of a compassionate view toward needless suffering in dying.” As a result of this, the ideas it presented are now a regular part of public discourse.⁵⁷

Humanists are masters at renaming words with names that sound exactly the opposite of the real meaning of the word. In this case they have renamed murder as euthanasia. “Euthanasia” means “a painless, happy death.” It sounds good—better to die happy than to die sad, right? However, it will not have such a happy ring if it is one of your own loved ones—a mate or parent or child—that is talked into committing suicide by a humanist doctor such as Dr. (Death) Kevorkian.

Paul Kurtz, the author of *Humanist Manifesto II*, tells the following interesting story:

Prometheus Books, the leading secular humanist and freethought publisher in the world, is no doubt familiar to most readers of Free Inquiry. Prometheus was recently subpoenaed to appear at the Oakland County, Michigan, criminal prosecution trial of Jack Kevorkian. Dr. Kevorkian has helped twenty-seven people to die—people who were terminally ill and/or suffered great pain and requested the right to commit suicide. He has thus far been acquitted of all efforts to convict him.

The Oakland County prosecutor's office has scheduled two trials. The first, which began in February 1996, involves the deaths of Merian Frederick and Dr. Ali Khalili, who died a month apart in 1993 by breathing carbon monoxide gas supplied by Dr. Kevorkian. He is being tried ex post facto under a now-expired law that banned assisted suicide. A second trial is scheduled to begin in April 1996. Dr. Kevorkian is being prosecuted for the deaths of Marjorie Wendt and Sherry Miller, which occurred in 1991. Prometheus Books was subpoenaed to appear in the first trial because it has published Dr. Kevorkian's book, *Prescription Medicide: The Goodness of Planned Death* (hardcover 1991, paperback 1994).⁵⁸

How fitting that Dr. Death is a Humanist! He really fits in with that group. “Planned Death” is so “good” to Humanists, that they just can't wait to help someone die. Humanists hate life; they don't even want humans to be conceived. But if a human is conceived, they plan to see him dead before birth if possible, at birth if not, during his first year of life otherwise. Else, just as soon as they catch him in pain or depressed, or weak—zap! Loving, kind people that Humanists are, some how some way they are going to “help” people die—prematurely. They have such “compassion,” and “love” humanity so! They claim to be pro-choice, but give the babies they abort no choice. No, they are not pro-choice. They are pro-death.

Again it is important to remember: *right* and *wrong* are religious issues, and it is obvious that Humanism is a religion, for it deals with religious issues only, and not with science as it pretends.

⁵⁵ Joseph Fletcher, *Religioethical Issues*, ed. Marvin Kohl (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1978), 17.

⁵⁶ Arval A. Morris, “Proposed Legislation,” ed. Marvin Kohl, in *Infanticide and the Value of Life* (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1978).

⁵⁷ “Frequently Asked Questions (FAQS) About the American Humanist Association.”

⁵⁸ Paul Kurtz, “Notes from the Editor: Jack Kevorkian on Trial,” *Free Enquiry* 16, no. 2 (Spring 1996) *Notes from the Editor* (Amherst, New York), http://www.SecularHumanism.org/library/fi/kurtz_16_2.html.

What Is Our Purpose In Life?

Why are you alive? What is your purpose in life? What are you doing here on this big ball called earth? Is there any good news to encourage you in the right direction? Everyone needs a purpose in life lest he be constantly frustrated and confused. Everyone needs to know why they are here and what they should be doing. But again, these are religious questions which science cannot answer. Christianity answers these questions, and so does Humanism—but with irreconcilably opposing answers.

The Christian Purpose of Life

Christianity teaches that humans exist to worship and serve their Creator, who loved them, and gave Himself for them. Christians are to worship God by loving Him with all their hearts, obeying His commands, and fulfilling the Great Commission which He gave them in Mat. 28:18-20. Millions of Christians (the author included) testify to the fact that serving Christ brings not only joy and peace, but also a marvelous sense of eternal importance and significance to life. The word “eternal” needs to be emphasized in the last sentence, because eternal importance and significance is something Humanism obviously cannot give. According to Humanism, once you die life is over. But according to the Bible of Christianity, once you die conscience existence continues forever.

The Humanist Purpose of Life

Humanism also endeavors to provide people with an answer to the question, What is the purpose of life? There is a document on the website of the American Humanist Association titled “Friends of Religious Humanism.” This document, as its name implies, solicits people to become members of a Humanist organization called Friends of Religious Humanism. According to this document

the Friends of Religious Humanism is an organization founded by Edwin H. Wilson, Lester Mondale, and others in 1962 as the “Fellowship of Religious Humanists” to advance humanism within the Unitarian-Universalist denomination and to promote religious humanism in general. . . . The FRH office is located in Humanist House, which also contains the offices of the American Humanist Association. . . . Mira Poudrier is the office manager for FRH and oversees the publication of *Religious Humanism*, the FRH semi-annual journal. . . . The friends of Religious Humanism is an affiliate organization of the Unitarian Universalist Association. Our stated purpose is as follows: “To promote and encourage the religious, ethical and philosophical thought and life of our members and society. To this end, (we) shall arrange lectures, encourage writing, publish periodicals and other literature, hold discussion groups, seminars and conferences, endeavoring to provide both inspirational materials and scholarly studies which apply the scientific spirit and methods to the materials of ethics and religion.”⁵⁹

In an effort to encourage people to join The Friends of Humanism, this American Humanist Association document gives the following testimony from a man named Peter Samson:

“YES: Humanism can be religious; indeed, the most meaningful and livable kind of humanism is itself a religious way of understanding and living life. It offers a view of [people] and [their] place in the universe that is a religious philosophy . . . overarching and undergirding it all, there can be a haunting sense of wonder which never leaves one for whom life itself is a mystery and miracle. Where did we come from, why are we here, where are we going with all the effort, frustration, the grief, the joy? To be caught up in this sense of wider relatedness, to sense our being connected in live ways with all the world and everyone in it, is the heart dimension of religion, whatever its name.”⁶⁰

So, the leaders of Humanism also agree that Humanism is a religion. But what is their answer to the question, “What is the purpose of life?” Their answer may surprise you. Edwards gives the Humanist answer to our question as follows:

One dances for the sheer joy of the activity. It is the process more than the product that counts. And this is how the Humanist good life is to be lived.

So, when someone asks a Humanist, “What is the purpose of life?” the Humanist should answer, “Life is not purpose, life is art.” The meaning is found in the doing.

⁵⁹ “Friends of Religious Humanism” (Amherst, New York: American Humanist Association, Yr. on web 1997), [Http://www.humanism.net/frh/html](http://www.humanism.net/frh/html).

⁶⁰ Ibid.

This is a revolutionary and truly unique way of looking at the world. It is a way that finds the question of cosmic purpose irrelevant.⁶¹ So, to a Humanist, life has NO purpose! Humanists are here, but they don't have any idea why. Therefore they devote themselves to trying to create the "Humanist good life," by ignoring their duties to God, family, and country, and living for their own selves, indulging in illicit sex, drugs, alcohol, getting rich, buying new cars and houses, etc., because they think the only heaven they will ever have is the one they create for themselves here on earth. Not only do humanists have no purpose, they also have no hope for the future. No hope for seeing again their loved ones that pass into eternity before them. No hope for an improvement over this life. No hope at all. They are, as the Bible puts it, in the condition of "having no hope, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:12).

And what if they are unable to create their "good life?" What if their labors don't make them rich? What if their immorality causes them to get AIDS? What if their unfaithfulness causes the destruction of all the relationships in life that really matter? What if their "quality of life" does not match their expectations? Well they have an answer for that also—suicide! Just as they use contraception and abortion to prevent having to share wealth with children now, so humanists depend on death to deliver them from the consequences of their depraved lifestyle later. Christianity offers a much cleaner, and rewarding life in the here and now, plus eternal life and Heaven. Humanism offers something it can seldom deliver in the here and now, then everlasting death. Humanist leader Fredrick Edwords puts it like this:

"What is the promise of Humanism?"

Well, we already know what we can't promise. As sober realists and no-nonsense straight-shooters, we're experts in throwing the wet blanket of rationalism over the fondest hopes of our fellows. We know the "bad news," but what's our "good news," what is the gospel of Humanism? . . . The promise of Humanism is a good life here and now. . . . But now we can ask, if this is the promise of Humanism—if this is the promise of liberal religion—is it a promise limited only to the affluent, the intelligent, the educated? If so, then are we making a promise we can't always keep? This is the criticism leveled against us by the otherworldly religions. While we say that they can't keep their otherworldly promises, they explain that they turned to this other world because we Humanists didn't keep our worldly promises. . . . And when, in those rare instances, we find that the realization of the promise is futile, as in the case of an agonizing terminal illness, Humanism offers the freedom to exit this life at will and with dignity. This is voluntary euthanasia, an area of great importance to Humanists, so much so that there will be two major workshops on this topic at the national conference of the American Humanist Association next weekend.

So, in the end, the promise is not a perfect one. But we admit that. Others may seem to offer more perfect promises, but can they deliver? I have no evidence that anyone has ever gotten to heaven, realized Nirvana, or merged with God. But I see evidence every day that the promise of the good life is no mirage.⁶²

So, if Humanism should not work, and instead turns our lives into messes, let us be comforted to know that the Humanists are conducting workshops to show us the best way to commit suicide! Unfortunately, after reading stacks and stacks of Humanist books, magazines, and other literature in preparing to write this book, I have found no evidence whatsoever that there is no God. So I think I'll pass on the suicide. True Christianity doesn't drive one to suicide, but I can certainly understand how Humanism or Humanist Christianity (often called liberal—that is, phony—Christianity) might.

Let us be very blunt. Not only is the promise of Humanism not a perfect one; it is a mirage in spite of what Edwords says. And I see evidence every day that the Humanist promise will never be attained for the general population by any godless, humanist, socialist economic system. Humanism NEVER fulfills its promise to the masses. The humanist economic system, socialism, is economic gambling—there are a few winners at the expense of a huge multitude of losers, with most of the money going into the pockets of the casino state. The casino state then magnifies the winner, to lure in more sucker voters, totally ignoring the multitude of suffering losers. Witness the poverty brought upon every country that has tried communist

⁶¹ Fredrick Edwords, "The Promise of Humanism," in *Library: Modern* (Amherst, New York: American Humanist Association, 1989), http://infidels.org/library/modern/fred_edwards/promise.html.

⁶² *Ibid.*

humanism, or Buddhist humanism, or any other brand of socialist economy. In country after country humanists advocate socialism in spite of the fact that it unfailingly fails. Under socialism the wealth always ends up in the hands of a few corrupt government officials and their friends, while everyone else lives in poverty. The closest that humanity has ever come to a good life materially has been attained here in the USA as a result of our Christian heritage and the free enterprise system based upon it.

Humanism has a gospel, and humanism claims to give people purpose of life. Humanism is therefore a religion. But the Humanist religion's gospel is false, and its purpose of life leaves one without hope and without God.

Is There Life After Death?

Since all men know that they will someday die, this is a question of great interest to everyone. Science, however, has never been able to give an answer to this question one way or the other. This, therefore, is an immensely religious question.

Christianity Says There Is Life After Death

The Bible very clearly declares that upon dying believers in the Lord Jesus Christ go to Heaven, and unbelievers go to the Lake of Fire:

For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. (1 John 5:4)

He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death. (Rev. 21:7-8)

Humanism Says There Is No Life After Death

What about immortality? Does Humanism take a purely scientific stand by avoiding this purely religious question? Absolutely not! Declares Humanist Manifesto II:

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.⁶³

Where is their proof that modern science discredits the existence of a separable soul? They give none, for they have no proof to give! Nor can they show us an experiment proving that humans emerged from natural evolutionary forces—or even that such forces exist. Again, this is purely a religious doctrinal statement. No proof is given to back up this superstitious faith. Humanists give no credible evidence that there is no soul, nor that the soul does not survive the death of the body. Clearly the Humanist movement is based on religious faith, and not on scientific fact. Humanism is a pagan religion pure and simple. There is nothing scientific about it.

How Can I Be Saved?

The subject of salvation certainly is a religious subject if ever there was one. It implies that there is something to be saved from. More than anything else humans want to be saved from the horrors and uncertainties of death and whatever follows death. They want to be saved from the penalty God said would

⁶³ Paul Kurtz, *Humanist Manifestos I & II*.

result from sin—specifically eternal torments in Hell and the Lake of Fire and Brimstone. So far science has not been able to prevent life from leaving a body, nor give life back to a dead body. Nor is there any indication that science will ever be able to do so. So, Humanists are unable to offer science as a solution to this problem. They can only offer a religious answer, and they do.

Let us contrast Christian salvation with Humanist salvation.

Christian Salvation

The Bible teaches that we cannot save ourselves; only God can save us. “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:8-9).

God took upon himself a human body by being born of a virgin. “Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us” (Mat. 1:23). As a human, He “was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Hebrews 4:15). Being sinless, He was able to die for our sins on the cross of Calvary. 1 Corinthians 15:1-4 tells us that the gospel (meaning “good news”) is “how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.” God’s promise to us is

that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. . . . For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. (Rom. 10:9-13)

The believer in the Lord Jesus Christ is instantly passed from death unto eternal life, and knows it.

And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God. . . . And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. (1 John 5:1-20)

Humanist Salvation

Humanism, as is to be expected, teaches just exactly the opposite of what the Bible says. Declares *Humanist Manifesto II*, “No deity will save us; we must save ourselves.”⁶⁴

Now that is an interesting statement, remembering that Humanists don't believe in sin or Hell—how can they save themselves from something if it doesn't exist? Many of the signers of *Humanist Manifestos I and II* have already gone on to meet their Maker. Why didn't they save themselves? The above statement from *Humanist Manifesto II* shows again just how proud, conceited, and foolish Humanists are.

In conclusion, Humanism is a religion, based not on science, but on faith. Two more quotes from documents from the American Humanist Association web site will further confirm this point. Says Beverly Earles in “Friends of Religious Humanism”: “Humanism is religion come of age.”⁶⁵ And says the executive director of the American Humanist Association, in his essay “What Is Humanism”: “Religious Humanism is ‘faith in action.’”⁶⁶ Did you catch that? Humanism is religion. Humanism is not science, but “**faith**” in action.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ “Friends of Religious Humanism.”

⁶⁶ Frederick Edwords, “What is Humanism?”

The Religious Status of Humanism Matters

If humanism is scientific, then it would surely be wrong, even stupid, to oppose it. However, *if humanism is merely a religion, then for public schools to teach humanist doctrines constitutes the establishment of a state religion, and is therefore illegal according to the First Amendment to the Constitution.*



"UUs Continue to Protest Impending War with Iraq in Large Numbers—Demonstrations held in New York, San Francisco. (Boston, Feb. 19, 2003) During January and February, across the United States and around the globe, demonstrations which oppose pre-emptive U.S. military action against Iraq have continued, with Unitarian Universalists participating in large numbers in organized marches, rallies, and demonstrations. On January 31, UUA President William Sinkford joined nearly 400 UUs from the greater Los Angeles area in a candlelight vigil against pre-emptive military action in front of the Westwood Federal Building. On February 15, an estimated 350,000-500,000 people participated in a demonstration in New York City. Hundreds of UUs from across the US and Canada attended" (<http://www.uufh.org/newsdetail.html?key=101&back=>). Is this using tax exempt status to influence politics?