

Chapter 5

IS HUMANISM SCIENCE? No! It Is Science Falsely So Called

As shown in the previous chapter, if Humanists are to remain in exclusive control of public education, it is vital for them to keep the American public ignorant of two facts: (1) that humanism is indeed being taught in public schools, and (2) that humanism has been officially declared a religion by the United States Supreme Court. As long as Humanists can keep the American public ignorant of these two facts they will be able to continue to monopolize public education to brainwash generation after generation of American youth with their atheistic propaganda, until eventually the majority of Americans will become humanists—and humanism will reign victorious over theism.

But if enough Christians are alerted soon enough to what the Humanists are doing, there is still a chance that Humanism could lose its present monopoly of public education, and in fact suffer a tremendous defeat which would set back its agenda for many decades.

Therefore, in public Humanists almost never identify themselves as Humanists or even as humanists, and almost never identify their beliefs as humanism. Instead they claim to be “scientists,” and claim that their beliefs are “proven scientific facts.” Furthermore, Humanists label those who disagree with them “opponents to science” whose teachings are based on “unproven religious faith.” One specific example of this is their zealous insistence that the theory of evolution is proven scientific fact (and therefore undeniably true), while belittling the Genesis account of creation as a mere religious fable (and therefore undeniably false). So foundational is the theory of evolution to Humanist doctrines that we will devote all of the next chapter to it.

First, however, we must examine Humanist positions on issues in general to see if Humanists actually do determine their positions by applying the scientific method to the issues as they claim. To do this we will go again to the literature that they intended to be read only by other humanists and not by the general public.

Marvin Zimmerman’s Testimony

We call to the witness stand Marvin Zimmerman, professor of Philosophy at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Humanist editor Morris B. Storer has recognized Mr. Zimmerman as among “the most careful and realistic thinkers, the lifetime students, the most articulate writers in the field” of humanist ethics.⁸⁰ Zimmerman, as a leader in the Humanist movement, knows humanists far better than do most men. What has been his observation? Are humanists scientific? Mr. Zimmerman answers our question in his essay titled “How ‘Humanist’ are Humanists?” as follows:

Are humanists scientific? Do humanists practice what they preach? Humanists have claimed their superiority to supernaturalists in their belief in scientific method and empirical truth.... Unfortunately, in practice, humanists often misuse science or do not even pretend to use it at all, in taking positions on a variety of issues.⁸¹

That is certainly a surprising opinion to be expressed by a Humanist leader. Could Mr. Zimmerman please give us a concrete example? Yes, he obviously can, for in his essay he proceeds to do so:

In fairness to the humanists, a lack of sophistication and historical insight into the judicial tyranny developing in our country characterizes a much larger segment of our people. But it does seem more prevalent in liberal, secular, and humanist quarters, and probably because of the recent thrust of the Supreme Court decisions in their direction. Compounding the error of accepting decisions on a basis of emotion rather than evidence, humanists have been indifferent to this abuse and growth of judicial power by the Supreme Court, a usurpation of the legislative and executive functions.

⁸⁰ Storer, *Humanist Ethics: Dialogue on Basics*, 3.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 262.

Almost anyone can claim to be scientific in ethics, but whether one actually looks to experience and scientific evidence is an entirely different matter. Thus, whether humans are equal, races are equal, men and women are equal, different cultures are equal, and in what ways are difficult questions to analyze scientifically. Yet, they seem to be easily answered by humanists (and others) and in anything but a scientific fashion. Thus, though there is evidence against belief in equality in all these areas, such suggestions are met by cries of racism, sexism, chauvinism, prejudice, and so on. New absolutes are proclaimed, even as old absolutes are rejected.

There is overwhelming evidence that humans are different in more ways than they are the same, whether physically, mentally, culturally, or educationally. Most are not qualified to practice medicine, law, engineering, police work, firefighting, teaching, et cetera. Yet the reality of ability and achievement or merit is being ignored in order to promote the illusion of equality by use of quotas, reverse discrimination, goals, executive and judicial decrees, charges of discrimination or what have you. In general, many humanists have condoned, if not advocated such measures.

In the name of equality, innocent individuals are being penalized because of their race or sex, and others rewarded because of their race or sex, all this under some form of quota system. Humanists who should be in the forefront of the battle against this new form of original sin, have barely voiced their opposition. Though humanists oppose discrimination against atheists, blacks, and females, they condone, if not accept, discrimination against theists, whites, and males.⁸²

Being obviously upset by the hypocrisy he sees in humanist circles, Mr. Zimmerman proceeds on to yet another example of humanist hypocrisy concerning science:

Most humanists oppose capital punishment, not on the basis of scientific evidence that it does not deter crime, but on grounds indistinguishable from religious faith or dogma, namely emotions. They accept blindly the claim that capital punishment does not deter killing because people who kill are too emotional to even consider the consequences of their actions. What about the calm premeditative killer and even the emotionally disturbed? What is the effect of capital punishment on recidivists? They accept the argument that innocent people might be executed and that minority groups make up a disproportionate number on death row. They ignore the fact that most of the victims of crime are also innocent people and also minority members. The issue is not whether the data supports capital punishment, but whether the humanists have taken a stand against capital punishment without regard to the data or scientific method.

Even apart from capital punishment, the humanists' attitude toward crime appears to be based on sentimental emotions rather than reason. They express sympathy for rehabilitation, parole, and prisoners' rights, whether or not supported by evidence, and a virtual disregard for victims of crime. In spite of the increasing evidence that the use of parole, rehabilitation, and prisoners' rights have been ineffective for the most part and, as a matter of fact, tend to increase crime, the humanists continue to support them.⁸³

Still not content, Mr. Zimmerman continues to give example after example of humanists being unscientific. Unfortunately, space considerations forbid giving all of them here. One more will have to suffice:

Humanists seem to buy the antinuclear energy hysteria, an area in which science would seem to be most relevant and yet has been mostly ignored. Though so many activities are far more dangerous to life and limb (e.g., coal mining, automobile driving, flying in airplanes, or merely crossing a city street), the humanists succumb to the emotions rather than to reason.⁸⁴

Zimmerman concludes his testimony with this sweeping condemnation of humanist hypocrisy (to which we can only say, Amen):

Again and again, on issue after issue, it seems clear that the humanists have failed to practice what they preach, and can hardly be distinguished from the supernaturalists whom they ridicule for being unscientific.⁸⁵

Lucien Maumur's Testimony

It is extremely important that it be proven that humanism is not science. This is important because if humanism is not science then it must be religion. Humanist leaders know that not only is humanism not science, it is not even scientific. It is pure blind faith. Lucien Maumur in his *Humanist Evangel* confirms this:

To achieve a positive role while being anti-religious, humanists are led to pose as the defenders of science against religion. They do so by proclaiming the rationality of science against the alleged irrationality of religion. Yet in this role they fail to be particularly rational; nor are they particularly effective defenders of science. While they proclaim their rationality, they fail to do exactly what a rationalist should do, which is to give a reason. Their opponents, who are accused of being irrational, often display more rationality than they do: their opponents give more reasons than they do! Because of their obsession, these self-proclaimed rationalists firmly believe that they have cornered the market on rationality. In spite of their boast, they cannot recognize reason when they are face to face with it, and thus they dismiss their opponents without a trial and with further accusations of irrationality and superstition. Dialogue is always difficult, and as a result the humanists are usually ignored and thus remain a small and ineffective self-righteous group.

⁸² Ibid., 263.

⁸³ Ibid., 264.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 268.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

Those who pose as the defenders of science against religion are oblivious of the fact that they convince no one and that, to the contrary, they create ill feeling and confirm their opponents in their convictions. But why should these humanists care about the effect of their actions as long as they are doing their appointed duty, which is to proclaim the True Faith?

They never stop to notice that they are not performing any better than the most fanatical of their opponents. While they claim that science contradicts religion, their faith in science has the same kind of absolute quality as does the faith that their more fanatical opponents have in their God. They worship science like others worship gods. They could rightly be accused of having enthroned science as a new superstition or as a new myth.

Furthermore, the attempt of humanists to link religion to anti-science and to pose as defenders of science, in hope of defining itself positively, turns against humanism. While it is true that it is no longer defined negatively, it is no longer defined distinctively either. Thus humanism, in its role as the defender of science, becomes a subordinate part of the scientific establishment. And because it badly overplays its role, it is often unwanted in this part. Thus, when it is defined as the defender of science, the identity of humanism is no better but worse than when it is defined as either humanitarianism or socialism.⁸⁶

Well and truthfully said! Except that humanists do not “worship science like others worship gods.” Rather, humanists worship an imaginary creator force they call Evolution as their god—a idol they made with the hands of their mind. They have never seen, heard, smelt, felt, or tasted Evolution, and he, she, nor it has never answered a prayer. But humanists “got faith.” Evolution is really slow, they say—takes billions of years to do anything. Evolution is the slowest god in history! If you like to see things happen, worship Jesus.

The Plain Truth

The basic theme of this book is that humanist doctrines being taught in public schools constitutes a violation of the principle of separation of church and state. Humanists know this is true. A few theists also know this, and they are trying to make this known to the public. This has so shaken the Humanist leaders that they are now writing articles and books denying that humanism is a religion. While they used to call humanism “religious humanism,” the term “secular humanism” is now used. More than ever, humanists are stressing that humanism is based on science. Next time you read such claims, remember the above quotes, and don’t be deceived. Humanism is not substantiated by scientific facts at all (as will be shown in the next chapter). Humanism must be taken on blind faith. It is not science, but is the same pagan religion which underlies communism.

⁸⁶ Saumur, *The Humanist Evangel*, 13–14.



Humanist “science” is the same kind of superstition as practiced by the wizards of the false religions mentioned in the Old Testament. Humanist religious dogma such as “The Big Bang,” abiogenesis (spontaneous generation of life from dead matter), the evolution of animals of one kind into a different kind, etc., are all unprovable (because they are not true), and are merely human philosophy which has become the religion of atheists. In no way are any of humanism’s evolutionary doctrines provable by the scientific method. Humanists love to use big words to make people think they are highly educated, and to prevent people from questioning them. But make them present their ideas in plain and simple language that people can understand, and humanist dogma become laughable. That is why humanists don’t want creationism taught in public schools--humanism cannot survive rational questioning.