

Chapter 4

IS HUMANISM REALLY A RELIGION?

Yes! A Communist-Like Religion

Can a Communist-like organization that denies the existence of God and seeks political dominion over the whole world properly be called a religion? The answer is a resounding “YES!” Remember that Communism itself is a religion. Here is how the late FBI director J. Edgar Hoover described Communism:



Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the founding members of the ACLU later became the head of the Communist Party USA.

Communism is more than an economic, political, social, or philosophical doctrine. It is a way of life; a false, materialistic “religion.” It would strip man of his belief in God, his heritage of freedom, his trust in love, justice, and mercy. Under communism, all would become, as so many already have, twentieth-century slaves.⁶⁷

That description applies equally to Humanism. Humanists are very dangerous religious fanatics, and pose an even greater threat to the USA than do radical Islamists. The Humanist religion is more dangerous than Islam because Humanists have a much larger following in the USA than does Islam, because it has infiltrated our government, schools, and communications media, because its loyalty is not to the USA but to an international headquarters (International Humanist and Ethical Union), and because it has succeeded in hiding itself behind a thin veneer of false science. Humanists leaders present themselves as scientists instead of as the ministers of darkness they actually are. Humanism is what the Apostle Paul described as “science falsely so called” (1 Timothy 6:20).

Actually, to be very accurate, humanism (with a lower-case h) is the religious upon which communism is built, and the American Humanist Association (upper-case H) is an organization almost identical to communism that is promoting the same materialist religion here in the USA, and around the world. Humanism is also the religion of the Unitarian-Universalist Church, which is why you see Unitarian ministers at so many Left-wing rallies and demonstrations, along with the ACLU lawyers, NOW women, Act Up sodomites, and, of course, Michel Communist-Health-Care Moore.

Perhaps the one subject Humanist leaders discuss most frequently among themselves is humanism as a religion. Privately among themselves, they plot and plan how to proselytize the members of other religions. And quietly in courts of law, they demand tax

exempt status as non-profit religious organizations. But this religion status of humanism is the very last subject they want discussed in public. Why? ***Because by vigorously promoting separation of theistic religion and state, they have succeeded in obtaining court orders totally expelling God and theistic teachings from public schools.*** Only humanist atheistic views of such religious doctrines as the origin of the universe and man, discipline, morals, etc., may now be taught in the tax-funded schools of America. God has been expelled. Prayer is banned. The Bible is deemed pornography. They have almost

⁶⁷ J. Edgar Hoover, *Masters of Deceit* (New York, New York: Affiliated Publishers, 1958), vi.

total control of what our children are taught, and they are using this control to brainwash our children in their dogma.

But humanists realize that if enough Christians and other theists ever realize that humanism is a religion also, then Christians might successfully demand that humanist doctrines too be banned from public education! A near fatal blow would therefore be stuck to humanism in the USA. Thus humanists virtually never call humanism a religion when speaking or writing in public forums. Always publicly humanists refer to humanism as “science” and to humanist doctrines as “scientific facts.” Just how scientific humanism actually is is a topic of major importance. However, since humanism as science will be discussed in the next two chapters, this chapter will be confined to discussing humanism as a religion. Is Humanism really a religion?

Humanists Declare Humanism a Religion

As has already been shown, Humanist leaders know that Humanism is not science, but is religion. In this chapter more Humanist leaders will be quoted to prove this fact beyond any shadow of doubt. The best way to learn the truth about this issue is to read the books and other publications Humanists wrote for their own—writings meant to be read only by other Humanists or by people interested in becoming Humanists. Humanists know that God-fearing people are very unlikely to read such books.

Lucien Saumur has written a book titled *The Humanist Evangel* to teach Humanists how to spread Humanist beliefs and gain converts to Humanism. This book was first published in 1982 by Prometheus Books in Buffalo, New York, a publishing arm of the American Humanist Association, and therefore voiced the official position of the American Humanist Association. Listen to what Saumur says about humanism being not science but a religion:

But then if ***humanism cannot be defined positively as humanitarianism, socialism, or science***, must it be defined negatively as anti-religious? Is humanism just an “anti-religion”? Must it be anti-religious because it opposed to some religions? Was Christianity an anti-religion because fought so bitterly against the religion of Islam?

What is it that proposes to explain human nature and purpose if not religion? Is humanism not in fact a religion? Why can it not be so even though it is competing with other religions, with every other religion?

Is it not only as a religion that humanism can have an identity? Is it not only as a religion that humanism can be defined simply and clearly as something distinct from everything else? That it is not a duplicate of something else? That it is defined as something positive rather than as what it is not: that it is defined for what it is for, rather than for what it is against?

Evidently, ***humanism, being a religion, can be classified with other religions. It shares the essential characteristics of a religion.*** But it is not those other religions: ***it is a religion*** essentially different from every other religion, it is itself; it has an identity. And it is in describing this essential difference that the identity may be defined.⁶⁸ [Emphasis added.]

It is clear then that Humanist leaders know what every American needs to know: “Humanism cannot be defined positively as . . . science. . . . it is a religion.” Humanist leaders all know this, but they don’t want the American people to know it, for that would mean the end of the domination of Humanist influence in America.

Edward L. Ericson is a humanist minister and the author of *The Humanist Way: an Introduction to Ethical Humanist Religion*. In a forward to Ericson’s book, Isaac Asimov, famous writer and past president of the American Humanist Association, says that Ericson is the Humanist minister that preformed his marriage ceremony.⁶⁹ After giving an extended history of Ericson’s personal involvement as a leader in the religious humanist movement (he was president of the American Ethical Union), Ericson makes the following statement:

With this extended association spanning three continents, imagine my astonishment to read in the press from time to time that Humanist religion does not exist. It is said to be merely a “myth” invented by extremists of the Fundamentalist right! Some of those who subscribe to this “explanation” grudgingly concede that a few attempts to organize Humanist congregations have been undertaken but usually with the implication that such efforts have been unsuccessful or short-lived.

⁶⁸ Lucien Saumur, *The Humanist Evangel* (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1982), 16.

⁶⁹ Edward L. Ericson, *The Humanist Way: An Introduction to Ethical Humanist Religion*, foreword by Isaac Asimov (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1988), vii-ix.

Yet if one counts the total number of Ethical Culture societies and fellowships and then adds the Unitarian Universalist churches and societies that are explicitly or predominately Humanist in orientation and practice, plus the various congregations of the Society for Humanistic Judaism—all existing examples of Humanist religious organization in the United States and Canada—the sum of such congregations would be in the hundreds. To that number must be added the members-at-large of the Fellowship of Religious Humanists and the considerable body of religious Humanists within the American Humanist Association, an “umbrella” organization that includes both the religious and the non-religious. (In the case of the Unitarian Universalist churches and fellowships an exact estimate of members is not possible, since there exists a gradation from societies that are explicitly Humanist in orientation to those in which more traditional theistic views prevail.) So while the religion of Humanism in North America is small when compared to other religious movements, it can hardly be dismissed as a myth created by its enemies.⁷⁰

Mr. Ericson could hardly have stated the facts more clearly—**HUMANISM IS A RELIGION.**

The Supreme Court Declares Humanism a Religion

As seen above, the statement that humanism is a religion is not just a baseless accusation of the Fundamentalist Right as humanist journalists would have us believe. Indeed, in the writings Humanists intend to be confined to fellow humanists and humanist sympathizers, Humanists freely admit—even brag—that humanism is a religion. But it is the *legal* status of humanism in the USA that is of crucial importance. The fact is that the Supreme Court has ruled Humanism to be an officially recognized religion, and furthermore has granted Humanist organizations full non-profit-organization, tax-exempt status. Mr. Ericson explains:

Having no God to propitiate, nontheistic religious devotion is directed toward other ethical and spiritual ends. In a footnote to a 1961 Supreme Court decision that extended the full protection of the freedom of religion clause of the First Amendment to a nontheistic Ethical Humanist (a member of the Washington, D.C., Ethical Society), Justice Hugo Black observed: “Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others.”

The decision in this case (*Torcaso v. Watkins*) held that a nontheist is entitled to the same rights of conscience under the Constitution as a believer in God. The Court did not “establish” Humanism as the preferred religion of the secular state as some right-wing Catholic and Fundamentalist polemicists have since absurdly contended. The Court only assured to Ethical Humanists and other nontheists the same rights that Baptists, Lutherans, Catholics, and other religious citizens have always claimed for themselves. A contrary decision would have reduced Humanists and all other nontheists to second-class citizens whose full liberty of conscience would be infringed upon. (The government’s refusal for many years to accept nontheists as conscientious objectors under the military draft resulted in prison terms for many—a grievous example of religious discrimination on the basis of theology.)

Unfortunately, in the footnote quoted above, Justice Black did not help to clarify matters by referring to Humanist religion as “Secular Humanism.” The use of this combination of terms in the Supreme Court’s *Torcaso* decision has since confused the distinction between the secular, and religious types of Humanism.

The confusion came about in the following manner. Shortly before the Supreme Court heard the *Torcaso* case, a congregation of religious Humanists in California had won in state courts their claim to be a church, a decision that was argued in the *Torcaso* case as a precedent. Unfortunately, a legal brief that cited the precedent referred to the California congregation as “Secular Humanists,” an ambiguous and problematic conjunction of terms to use when referring to a religious body. But Justice Black apparently accepted the label as an accurate and usual designation, and the practice ever since of identifying Humanist religion as “Secular Humanism” has stirred endless misunderstanding and befuddled public comprehension.⁷¹

Mr. Ericson has inadvertently made an extremely important point! All humanism—even “Secular Humanism”—has been officially recognized as a religion by the Supreme Court of the United States of America. Secular does not mean “non-religious” as so many people think; rather it simply means “excluding God.” Not only do most Humanists consider humanism—even that called “secular humanism”—a religion, so does the United States government. Therefore court rulings declaring legal in public schools the teaching of only humanist doctrines concerning such religious subjects as the origin of the universe and of man constitutes the “establishment of a religion” by the United States government.

Ericson’s claim that the Supreme Court did not establish humanism as the “preferred religion” of the United State in the *Torcaso v. Watkins* case is true but deceptive. Ericson is implying that even now humanism has not been established as a preferred religion, and that is not true. In later rulings the Court protected the teaching in public schools of humanist doctrines (e.g. evolution), while banning the teachings and practices of other religions (e.g. the Genesis account of creation and prayer). The following is a statement of present law taken directly from the American Humanist Association web site:

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 9–10.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, xiii–xiv.

Schools may teach about explanations of life on earth, including religious ones (such as “creationism”), in comparative religion or social studies classes. In science class, however, they may present only genuinely scientific critiques of, or evidence for, any explanation of life on earth, but not religious critiques (beliefs unverifiable by scientific methodology). Schools may not refuse to teach evolutionary theory in order to avoid giving offense to religion nor may they circumvent these rules by labeling as science an article of religious faith. Public schools must not teach as scientific fact or theory any religious doctrine, including “creationism,” although any genuinely scientific evidence for or against any explanation of life may be taught.⁷²

It is what is taught in the science class as scientific fact—truth provable in a scientific laboratory—that is important. Evolution, which is merely a dogma—an unprovable religious teaching—of the Humanist religion, should not be allowed to be taught in science class as a proven scientific fact to the exclusion of all debate on the matter, as is now the case. Freedom of speech is essential for truth to prevail. But there is no freedom of speech in the classrooms of public schools today. Instead, public “schools may not refuse to teach evolutionary theory,” but “public schools must not teach as scientific fact or theory any religious doctrine, including ‘creationism.’” Note that creationism may not even be taught as “scientific theory!” So, humanist religious dogma must be taught as scientific fact even though it isn’t, but creationism may not even be taught as scientific theory even though it is the absolute truth.

According to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU),

though social studies classes can survey creation-of-the-world beliefs, U.S. Supreme Court rulings (Epperson v. Arkansas, 1968 and Edwards v. Aguillard, 1987) have made clear that creationism may not be taught as science in public schools because it is a religious dogma.⁷³

The ACLU is one of the most important of all Humanist organizations, so we see once again that Humanists leaders know the untruth of their denial that Humanism has been made the state religion of the USA. U.S. Supreme Court rulings have declared evolution to be science (truth), and have declared creationism be in opposition to science (error). Court rulings, therefore, have in fact made Humanism the established state church of the USA in violation of the Bill of Rights. We the people are forced against our wills by taxation to fund a religion which is opposed to everything we believe to be true and sacred. No religion should be so funded, even if it is the true religion. It is wrong to force people to fund teachings they cannot with a clear conscience endorse.

Let us, now call to the witness stand Paul Kurtz, who “in 1973 ... took the initiative, as editor of *The Humanist* magazine, in drafting the landmark consensus statement, *Humanist Manifesto II*.”⁷⁴ We will have him read to us from his preface of that document that was published together with *Humanist Manifesto I* as a small book titled *Humanist Manifesto I & II*. Wrote Kurtz: “Humanism is a philosophical, **religious**, and moral point of view as old as human civilization itself”⁷⁵ [Emphasis added].

Humanist Manifesto I Declares Humanism a Religion

Perhaps the scariest declaration of Humanism as a religion is found in *Humanist Manifest I*. In *Humanist Manifest I*, not only is Humanism boldly declared to be a religion but is also shown to be one and the same with Communism in basic ideology and goals. Note that even the word “manifesto” is used in naming the document. Remember the *Communist Manifesto*?

Boldface italic emphasis has been added to the words religion, religious, etc. in the following excerpt from *Humanist Manifest I* so you can note how often they are used, and how clearly Humanism is declared to be a new “religion” for this age.

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. 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. . . .

⁷² “RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A Joint Statement Of Current Law,” *The American Humanist Association*, April 1995, <http://www.americanhumanist.org/press/Religionpublicschools.html>.

⁷³ “Creationism,” in *Threats to Civil Liberties* (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1996), 1, <http://www.aclu.org/about/right4.html>.

⁷⁴ Storer, *Humanist Ethics: Dialogue on Basics*, 3.

⁷⁵ Kurtz, *Humanist Manifestos I & II*, 2.

Today man's larger understanding of the universe, his scientific achievements, and his 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 traditional *religions*, it is 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.

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

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

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 to that culture.

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 possibilities 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 relation to human needs. *Religion* must formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method.

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

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.⁷⁶

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.

Ninth: In 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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 it; and (c) endeavor to establish the conditions of a satisfactory life for all, not merely for the few. By this positive moral and intention humanism will be guided, and from this perspective and alignment the techniques and efforts of humanism will flow.

So stand the theses of *religious humanism*. Though we consider the *religious* forms and ideas of our fathers no longer adequate⁷⁷, 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.⁷⁸ [Emphasis added]

The religious doctrines presented in *Humanist Manifesto I and II* are discussed in other chapters of this book. The point of importance to be emphasized here is that *Humanist Manifesto I* professes to be (and obviously is) the statement of faith and aims of a "religion." It claims as its purpose "to establish... a vital, fearless, and frank religion." Four times it refers to "religious humanism." Sixteen times it uses the terms "religion" or "religious." Note also that all its theses are religious in nature. They discuss issues one would expect to be discussed in a Sunday School class at church, though they admit that their religious

⁷⁶ Please reread this important statement number seven, which is true! Everything in life is religious, including philosophy, science, and public education. Humanists usually lie about this fact, but here they tell the truth. This proves that Humanist leaders know that evolution is a religious teaching. Let this fact sink deep into your memory.

⁷⁷ This is an inadvertent admission by Humanists that the USA was founded on Christian principles, and not on humanist principles as Humanists so often claim.

⁷⁸ Kurtz, *Humanist Manifestos I & II*, 7–11.

beliefs and forms are not the same as the religious beliefs and forms of the founding fathers of this country. The evidence that humanism is a religion is thus overwhelming.

The chilling truth: the United States of America has combined with the Humanist church in direct viola-



This December 3, 2007 screen shot of the Communist Party USA web site shows the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) at the very top of the list of organizations recommended by the Communist Party USA for protecting civil rights. The ACLU is perhaps the most important arm of the American Humanist Association. Both groups have often had the same head. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a communist was one of the founding members of the ACLU. She later went on to become the head of the Communist Party USA.

tion of the first amendment to the Constitution. The citizens of the USA are now forced by taxation to support the propagation of a pagan atheistic religion which despises everything Christianity stands for. Oppression of free speech in public schools began years ago. Teachers may no longer teach the Genesis account of creation, but are forced to teach the humanist religious doctrine of evolution. Freedom of religion is denied to public school teachers and public school students. When we enter the school yards, we are no longer a free people. If you do not believe this important fact, you definitely need to read the rest of this book and open your eyes—**especially you need to wake up to the religious oppression your children are experiencing every day they attend public school.**

We will close by letting Roy Wood Sellers, professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan, and the man who wrote the initial draft of

Humanist Manifest I, tell us what Humanism is:

Is Humanism a religion, perhaps, the next great religion? Yes, it must be so characterized, for the word, religion, has become a symbol for answers to that basic interrogation of human life, the human situation, and the nature of things—which every human being, in some degree and in some fashion, makes. What can I expect from life? What kind of universe is it? Is there, as some say, a friendly Providence in control of it? And, if so, what then?⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Bob Green, "Sixty Years Of A Humanist Manifesto," *Humanists of Utah*, May 1993, [Http://www.humanistsofutah.org/1993/artmay93.html](http://www.humanistsofutah.org/1993/artmay93.html).