

DO HUMANISTS EVER TELL THE TRUTH?

Seldom, Usually They Lie

Do we want liars to teach our children? A teacher should be a role model—an example of what we want our children to become. Do we want our children to become liars? This is an extremely important question, because humanism considers lying a virtuous way of life. Humanists live in a shadowy way of darkness and lies. They lie to get your vote. They lie to get you off their case. They lie to cover up their lies. They lie even when they don't need to, just out of habit. It is vital to your health when dealing with humanists to realize that absolutely nothing they say can be believed without reservation. Not only do humanists lie as a means to obtain their goals, but they also greatly reward their own for lying—thus encouraging them to tell more and more lies.

The Cooney Example

A good example of a humanist lying to achieve an end, and then being rewarded by other humanists for doing so, is seen in the life of Timothy J. Cooney, the author of *Telling Right From Wrong: What Is Moral, What Is Immoral, and What Is Neither One Nor the Other* (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1985). Prometheus Books is the publisher for the American Humanist Association that publishes *Humanist Manifesto I & II*, and hundreds of other humanist books. It is important to remember the name of this publisher.

Cooney begins his book by admitting that up to his own time “hard pressed, philosophers came up with solutions to the problem of morality without God, only to have them knocked down by other philosophers.”³²⁰ Cooney nevertheless attempts to offer a solution to the problem himself. To emphasize the fact that he rejects God as the basis of morality, Cooney makes such statements as, “But what a tragic answer God was to the basic metaethical question [of what is morality],”³²¹ and “Religion [Christianity] is to get us through dark nights; it is not for instruction on how to behave.”³²²

The important question is, What did Cooney's humanist philosophy of morality do for Cooney? The answer to this question is very enlightening.

It seems that Cooney was having trouble finding a publisher willing to read his book. In a “Publisher's Note” at the beginning of Cooney's book, Paul Kurtz, well-known Humanist writer and editor at Prometheus Books which eventually published Cooney's book tells what Cooney did to overcome these problems:

Acting out of desperation and in the hope of gaining entrance to the publishing world, Cooney wrote a letter extolling the virtues of his manuscript and signed the name of Robert Nozick, a well-known American philosopher.

Prior to this forgery, however, and quite independent of it, an editor at Random House expressed interest in seeing the manuscript on the basis of reading the introduction and an outline of the book, which Cooney had submitted. The editor had heard of the endorsement and requested to see it as well. Cooney then forwarded the remainder of his manuscript accompanied by the falsified letter. Soon thereafter a contract was issued and the process of publication began. However, the editor eventually learned the facts of the forgery, and Random House decided to withdraw publication of the book.

In an afterward to his book Cooney comments rather half-heartedly on the morality of what he did:

³²⁰ Timothy J. Cooney, *Telling Right From Wrong: What Is Moral, What is Immoral, and What Is Neither One Nor the Other* (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1985), 14–15.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, 124.

³²² *Ibid.*, 148.

The publication of this book has had, to say the least, an unusual history, a history that has raised serious doubts in the minds of more than a few people about my qualifications for saying anything at all about morality. . . . Many people assumed that what I did was immoral because it involved a lie, but **lying is not necessarily immoral and, indeed, in certain situations it can be the moral thing to do**, e.g., telling an axe murderer the axe is in the basement when in fact it is in the attic. Nevertheless, what I did was immoral—it was an act of stealing.³²³

Obviously, Cooney did not actually believe that what he did was immoral, but simply said this because he felt forced to in order to get his book published. After all, “lying is not necessarily immoral” to a humanist. As Joseph Fletcher, author of *Situation Ethics*, said, “It is precisely the end sought [in this case to get a book published] which justifies the means employed [forgery and lying].”

If a Christian author had done something like this the dominate humanist news media would have deplored the immorality of it continuously for years, and no publisher would have touched it. Why then did Prometheus Books publish Cooney’s book? Said Paul Kurtz,

The central issue was the relative merit of the work itself. Was it worthy of publication, notwithstanding the moral transgressions of the author? Our answer to that question was yes. . . . No doubt it will be perplexing to the reader to learn that an author who writes so eloquently on moral philosophy should violate his own principles. In spite of this, we firmly believe that *Telling Right From Wrong* is an insightful, thought-provoking, and controversial book that deserves to be published.

But Cooney **didn’t** violate his own principles! He lived by them, as Paul Kurtz well knows. The real reason the editors at Prometheus Books published Cooney’s book is because they share Cooney’s principles. Perhaps by publishing Cooney’s book they felt they could demonstrate that humanist ethics do indeed work. After all, Cooney’s forgery and lying did generate a lot of publicity for his book, and it did therefore get published. So publishing Cooney’s book was their way of saying, See! evil does accomplish good!

Let the public therefore be aware that humanists can never be trusted. To humanists, lying is simply a tool to accomplish their agenda. Nothing they say or promise can be believed. By their own confession they do not believe lying to be immoral. This fact should help us understand the Clintons and the Democrat Party a little better.

In closing, it is interesting to note what humanist ethics imply. If unrighteousness and lies could actually accomplish good, then evil would not be evil, but good. Evil conduct should therefore be praised, not punished. To denounce evil would then be evil, for you would be keeping someone from accomplishing good. Humanism thus turns true morality upside down and inside out. Good people are considered criminals, and criminals are considered righteous. This is the present situation in the United States.

Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto *them that are wise* in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight! Woe unto *them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink: Which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him! Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because they have cast away the law of the LORD of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.* (Isaiah 5:20-24)

Considering all this, are humanists the kind of people we want to teach our children and lead our nation? If not, then why are we letting them teach and lead?

Important Facts About Lies and Liars

Liars want to believe a lie: “A wicked doer giveth heed to false lips; and a liar giveth ear to a naughty tongue.” (Proverbs 17:4)

³²³ Ibid., 147 and 156.

Liars are inferior people: *"... a poor man is better than a liar."* (Proverbs 19:22)

It is stupid for a person to think he or she knows better than God: *"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."* (Proverbs 30:6)

Humanists don't want to believe this, but lies are not true: *"... no lie is of the truth."* (1 John 2:21)

This is what Jesus said to people that rejected the truths taught in the Bible: *"Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not."*

People who deny that Jesus is the Messiah (the Christ) are liars: *"Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son."* (1 John 2:22)

Christians are commanded not to lie, but to speak the truth: *"... putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another."* (Eph. 4:25)

Liars will not be allowed into Heaven: *"Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie."* (Rev. 22: 14-15)

Liars will spend eternity in the Lake of Fire: *"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. 21:8)

Lies Humanist Teachers Tell

