

Chapter 17

DO THE ENDS JUSTIFY THE MEANS?

No, But Humanists Think So

Is it right to lie, steal, deceive, compromise our morality, etc., in order to reach noble objectives? Graduating from school with good grades is good, is it not? Is it, therefore, ok to cheat on tests in order to get those good grades, thereby achieving that good end? If your children were to be asked this question, what would they answer?

“Cheating and Succeeding”

Most parents want to think that their children would not cheat. However, a nationwide study conducted in 1995 by Bowling Green State University revealed that 70 percent of undergraduate students surveyed admitted to cheating in class³²⁴ And in 1998 Who's Who Among American High School Students surveyed “3,123 high-achieving 16 to 18-year-old students, all of whom have an “A” or “B” average, and 97 percent of whom plan to attend college after high school graduation.” The results were startling:

Four out of five teens at the top of their classes say they got there the easy way, according to this year's poll of students honored in *Who's Who Among American High School Students*. A full 80 percent admit to having cheated during their impressive academic careers, the highest percentage in the 29-year history of the survey. Most students seem blasé about their own ethical slips (53 percent say it was “no big deal”) and virtually all (95%) avoided getting caught. Even so, nearly two times as many students this year than last year (46% versus 25%) point to “declining social and moral values” as the biggest problem facing their generation today.³²⁵

Where did these students learn such ethics? Probably not at their church. Probably not in their home. Most likely they learned such ethics from humanist teachers in their public school. Humanist teachers set the example by cheating themselves.

“When test scores are all that matter in terms of state aid, sometimes in media rankings or rewards and punishment from states, then educators try to get scores they need by hook or by crook,” said Robert Schaeffer, public education director for Fair-Test, a Massachusetts-based organization critical of test use.

“Being human, some of them (educators) cross the ethical line, sometimes quite far,” he said.

During the past week, dozens of teachers and principals from 32 different New York City schools were accused of cheating over a four-year period.

Some of the educators have been fired and more could lose their jobs as a result of the one-year investigation, which alleges they helped students cheat on standardized exams.³²⁶

³²⁴ Stephanie Coms, “Recent Survey Says Most College Students Cheat,” *Arizona Daily Wildcat*, 1921 September 1998, http://wildcat.arizona.edu/papers/92/20/01_2_m.html.

³²⁵ *Cheating and Succeeding: Record Number of Top High School Students Take Ethical Shortcuts* (Lake Forest, IL: Who's Who Among American High School Students, 2000), <http://www.eci-whoswho.com/highschool/frame.html>.

³²⁶ Gilbert Gallegos, “Pressure Can Provide Incentive to Cheat,” *The Albuquerque Tribune*, 1920 December 2002, http://www.abqtrib.com/extras/education/121899_playing.shtml.

“Let Us Do Evil That Good May Come”

The Apostle Paul wrote of those who “slanderosly reported” that he had said “Let us do evil that good may come.” Paul described those slanderers as those “whose damnation is just” (Romans 3:8). Paul did not believe that the ends justify the means. It is never right to do wrong—no matter what the goal.

But cheating on tests, lying, violence, murder, indeed *any* wickedness, can be justified by Humanist ethics, as the following quote from Humanist Joseph Fletcher reveals:

There are no “absolute” rights, just as there are no absolute duties (obligations). Always it depends on the situation. . . . When we make moral judgments or value choices—decisions as to right and wrong, good and bad, desirable and undesirable—we are consciously or not following one or the other of two alternative ethical modes. One is rule ethics and the other is situation ethics. Humanist are situationists. No genuine humanist would ever act out of what Kant called a “sense of duty” to any general principle of conduct. . . . Humanist ethics, in a word, is goal oriented, not rule bound.

In rule ethics what we ought to do is decided *a priori*, by some predetermined precept of categorical imperative. It is decided abstractly, not on the facts. Variables are ignored or downgraded. Such rules might be “No abortion,” or “No lying,” or “No violence.” This ethical modality means that some things may or may not be done regardless of the consequences. “Right is right,” they say, acknowledging the circularity of their ethical reasoning. This also means that effectually conscience” is eliminated; responsible decision making is set aside. If you follow a rule that dictates your deeds, conscience is preempted and irrelevant. The moral agent is a null whenever a rule is relevant; he is passive and amoral.

Situation ethics (philosophers commonly call it “act ethics”) function, in contrast, with responsible moral agents—agents who judge what is best in the circumstances and in view of the foreseeable consequences. Like science, it is *a posteriori*, after or according to the facts, not *a priori*. You choose the course of action offering the greatest benefit, if need be even violation of a generally sound normative principle (“rule”) if in the particular case more good can be done.

“The end does not justifies the means” is a common but nonsensical saying. It is precisely the end sought (the consequences) which justifies the means employed. . . . A humanist is morally bound to say, for example, “It is better to end this pregnancy than to bear a baby with Tay-Sachs disease.” The humanist cannot say, “That’s too bad, but abortion is wrong.”³²⁷

Fletcher makes abortion sound good—even righteous. Let’s reword what he says, and see how it sounds: “Murder is better than compassion. Selfishness is better than love for others. Wickedness is better than righteousness.” That is what Fletcher’s words actually mean.

“Situation Ethics”

Before discussing the consequences of humanist morality, it needs to be pointed out that it is generally a mistake to use humanist terminology without close scrutiny. The term “situation ethics” as used by humanists is deceptive. Since humanism is the opposite of Christianity, using the term “situation ethics” in describing humanist morality implies, for example, that Christianity gives no consideration whatsoever to the situation. That is exactly the implication humanists intend; but it is, of course, not true. Rather, the Bible teaches that within the marriage *situation* sex is righteous, but that outside the marriage *situation* sex is wicked (see Heb 13.4). The Bible therefore condemns fornication (sex outside the marriage situation) always and absolutely. Humanism, on the other hand, concocts a *man-made* rule that condones or even encourages fornication in some *humanly defined* situations, and condemns marriage in some *humanly defined* situations. (For instance, humanist Ellen Key in the May 1914 issue of *The Woman Rebel*, page 2, says, “Love is moral even without legal marriage, but marriage is immoral without love.”) In both Christian and Humanist ethics morality depends on the situation. But in Christianity God defines the situation, while in humanism man defines the situation. Humanism thus denies the depravity of man, saying that men are “responsible moral agents.” We must ask the humanists, however, why, if humans are “responsible moral

³²⁷ Joseph Fletcher, “Humanist Ethics: The Groundwork,” in *Humanist Ethics* (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, c1980), 258–59.

agents,” do they murder, rape, rob, cheat, lie, etc.? The very fact that civil governments are necessary to prevent anarchy shows that unregenerate men are not by nature “responsible moral agents,” and that they are not capable of defining the situations in which an action becomes wrong.

“The End Sought”

The humanist says, “It is precisely the end sought (the consequences) which justifies the means employed.” The problem is that the ends humanists seek are often actually what they claim are only the means. For example, the murder of an innocent unborn baby to make possible a selfish and immoral life-style is portrayed as concern for freedom of choice. The baby, of course, is given no choice.

Another example: the humanists’ fight to protect themselves from punishment for their crimes by banning capital punishment is called the fight to protect the sanctity of human life. Thus the sanctity of the human life of unborn babies is ignored while the sanctity of the inhuman life of criminals is hypocritically made a noble cause.

Another example: the legalization of robbery by the state (socialism) for the enrichment of—usually already very rich—humanists is called the fight to protect the poor.

Another example: the desire to commit sodomy without legal consequences is termed the fight for human rights.

Another sodomy example: the protection of pedophiles by the law branch of the American Humanist Association—the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)—so that pedophiles can continue to advocate on their web site the rape of little boys is termed protecting the First Amendment.

BOSTON -- The American Civil Liberties Union will represent a group that advocates sex between men and boys in a lawsuit brought by the family of a slain 10-year-old.

The family of Jeffrey Curley of Cambridge said the North American Man/Boy Love Association and its website which is now offline incited the attempted molestation and murder of the boy on Oct. 1, 1997.

One of two men convicted in the killing, Charles Jaynes, 25, reportedly viewed the group's website shortly before the killing, and also had in his possession some of NAMBLA's publications. Also convicted in the killing was 24-year-old Salvatore Sicari.

“For us, it is a fundamental First Amendment case,” John Roberts, executive director of the Massachusetts branch of the ACLU, told *Boston Globe* Wednesday. “It has to do with communications on a website, and material that does not promote any kind of criminal behavior whatsoever”.³²⁸

What is their true goal?

According to the *Globe*, NAMBLA officials in the past have said their main goal is the abolition of age-of-consent laws that classify sex with children as rape.³²⁹

What is the specific crime these pedophiles are alleged to have committed?

At two separate trials last year, prosecutors said Jaynes and Sicari were sexually obsessed with the boy, lured him from his Cambridge neighborhood with the promise of a new bike, and then smothered him with a gasoline-soaked rag when he resisted their sexual advances. They then stuffed him into a concrete-filled container and dumped it into a Maine river.³³⁰

By the way, as of this writing, the NAMBLA web site is back on-line.³³¹

Another example of a hypocritical humanist end: the hateful crime of attempting to rob Christians of freedom of speech in order to stop them from preaching what the Bible says about sodomy is called the fight against...hate crimes! NAMBLA can publicly publish material advocating men to rape little boys, and according to humanist ethics that is not promoting “any kind of criminal behavior whatsoever,” and is protected by the First Amendment. But for Christians to expose NAMBLA’s hypocrisy is promotion of hate crimes, and not protected!

³²⁸ Associated Press, “ACLU to Defend Pedophile Group,” *Wired News*, 1931 August 2000, [Http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,38540,00.html](http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,38540,00.html).

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ Ibid.

³³¹ A check on December 3, 2007 before sending this book out for publication found the Nambla web site still up.

Do the Ends Justify the Means?

Therefore, the true consequence of situation ethics is that right becomes wrong and wrong becomes right; the criminals are declared righteous, and the righteous are declared criminals. Isaiah 5:20-24 (the verses quoted in the last chapter) need now be quoted again—the Bible is so true!

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.



A NAMBLA parade. The NAMBLA web site says, "NAMBLA is strongly opposed to age-of-consent laws and all other restrictions which deny men and boys the full enjoyment of their bodies and control over their own lives...We call for fundamental reform of the laws regarding relations between youths and adults." The ACLU defends NAMBLA humanists RIGHT to advocate sodomy with underage boys, but works to enact laws to deny Christians the right to say such behavior is wrong. That is the Humanist idea of "free" speech—sin is right and right is sin.