Beware of the real humanist agenda

By Don Feder
Heritage Features Syndicate

In the past presidential election, the very existence of secular humanism was hotly contested. It was, we were assured, a bugaboo—a term concocted by fundamentalist preachers, tripping on apple pie, to sway their credulous flocks.

For a fictitious philosophy sans adherents, the creed appears to be thriving. On April 24, an organization called the American Humanist Association placed a large display ad in that premier organ of establishment wisdom—the *New York Times*.

"What On Earth Is Humanism?" the solicitation rhetorically inquires. "A Joyous Life-Affirming Philosophy That Relies On (a flourish of trumpets would be nice here) Reason, Science And Democracy"—the trinity of our secular society. Sounds like a promotion for an underarm deodorant: Convenient, goes on dry and helps stop wetness three ways.

Humanism, the ad advises, abjures faith in God and "believes in an ethics of morality that grounds all human values in this-earthly experiences and relationships and holds as its greatest goal the happiness, freedom and progress of all humanity in this one and only life."

The non-theistic theology has a venerable lineage. "Humanism was initiated by the ancient Greeks, such as Aristotle...incorporates in its synthesis the sound elements of other philosophies, including the naturalistic viewpoints of John Dewey, George Santayana and Bertrand Russell."

Now we're getting somewhere. Russell was a hoary apologist for Soviet repression. Dewey (a founding member of the American Humanist Association and signer of the 1933 Humanist Manifesto I) is the father of progressive (read *permissive*) education.

What children learn is irrelevant, it's how they're conditioned for the coming new order that's important, Dewey held. Public schools which produce functional illiterates, while socializing students via sex education and peace studies, are a testimony to his influence over the institution.

"There may be humanists all around you," the ad exults. Indeed. The signers of the Humanist Manifesto II (1973) include Alan Guttmacher, past president of Planned Parenthood; Betty Friedan, founder of the National Organization for Women and environmental determinism guru B. F. Skinner.

Humanism has spawned the melange of movements which dominate and direct the social policy debate: feminism, population control/abortion, gay rights, a crusading secularism and the see-no-evil disarmament movement.

The legions of humanism include Hollywood screenwriters selling relativism and hedonism, social scientists who deny individual responsibility, hemophiliac jurists, advocates of one-world/collectivist government and prelates who substitute social activism for Scriptures.

But the Humanist Association is far too modest in its historical name-dropping. Other forerunners of the ism include French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau (intellectual progenitor of the Reign of Terror) and Karl Marx. Said the latter, "Humanism is the denial of God and the total affirmation of man....(as such) Humanism is nothing else but Marxism."

While spurning God, the Humanist Association attempts to cleverly cash in on popular regard for the Judeo-Christian ethic. Thus the ad avows that humanism "embodies the ethical ideals of various religions, especially Christianity....Jesus in the New Testament gave voice to such Humanistic hopes as social equality, human brotherhood and peace on earth."

Wrong. Very wrong. In fact, humanism and monotheism are metaphysical galaxies apart. The former espouses situational ethics (a morality of convenience) the latter ethical absolutism. Like Rousseau, humanists believe man, resplendent in his natural goodness, is corrupted by society. Christians and Jews believe in sin, the failings of the heart.

The monotheistic faiths teach free will and personal accountability. Humanists deny the existence of one and thus the applicability of the other.

Without God, morality is impossible. Right and wrong become matters of personal preference. You think murder is wrong; I don't. It's your opinion against mine. In the Decalogue, Thou-shalt-not-kill is followed by the declaration "I am the Lord your God." The commandment's force comes from its source.

Reason, democracy, science? All fine within their realm, but none an adequate substitute for transcendental values. Each can be corrupted.

Reason has been employed to justify the most monstrous evils. The German philosophers (Nietzsche, Hegel) provided the rationale for Nazism. Adolf Hitler came to power through the democratic process. The German scientists were devoted servants of the state, willing suppliers of the technology for Auschwitz.

Humanists are all around us, many blissfully unaware of the ideology they've embraced. Humanism is the dominant ethos of our culture, deadly, deterministic creed which seeks to set up mankind as an idol, upon the desecrated altar of God. Hosannas are offered to the secular trinity, but totalitarians will be the ultimate beneficiaries of the service.

Professor says TV violence teaches children violence

Dr. Leonard Eron, professor of psychology at the University of Illinois at Chicago, says TV violence teaches violence. Dr. Eron said that the more violence children see on TV, the more aggressively they behave. He followed 800 eight-year-olds, including the entire 1960 third grade of Columbia County, New York, until they were 30. He explored many factors including IQ, economic background, and parents' attitudes, and found that the amount of TV violence the children watched at the age of eight was the best indicator of how aggressive they would become at 19.

He said: "TV violence teaches children to be aggressive, to solve interpersonal problems through physical violence. They see that law enforcement officials, good guys, bad guys and (almost) everybody uses violence. It becomes an accepted way of behaving."

Religion's influence losing ground to TV

Religion's influence on American life is declining, according to 49% of Americans surveyed by the Princeton Religion Research Center. The Gallup Poll affiliate said only 36% of Americans think religion's influence is increasing, down from 48% in 1985 and a peak of 69% in 1957, when the survey began.

And two church officials say the role of shaping society is being taken over by television. Isabel Rogers, moderator of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), worried about TV's "clout" during a Pennsylvania speech, and William Fore of the National Council of Churches warned that TV, rather than churches, "is becoming the place where people find a worldview."

How major news sources censor moral issues coverage

By Joseph Farah, Editor
Between the Lines

Imagine a series of massive and militant demonstrations against South African apartheid that take place over a two-day period in New York City. Over 900 protesters, including 30 clergy, are arrested and carried away by police for obstructing business at the consulate. So great are the numbers being held that the Nassau Coliseum has to be used as a booking facility.

It is described as the largest civil disobedience demonstration of its kind in the history of the nation.

Now imagine how you would expect the three major television network newscasts to cover these events. Since they have given far more publicity to far smaller and less militant demonstrations against South Africa, it is reasonable to assume the protests would be covered extensively, correct?

That would be a safe assumption, if, indeed, there were such a demonstration against apartheid, or against Israeli occupation of the West Bank, or even against U. S. support for anti-communist freedom fighters. Could you imagine—even in the most bizarre scenario—that such a protest would not be covered at all by the networks?

Well, indeed, such a protest did occur earlier this month [June] and it did go totally unreported by the networks. But, it wasn't a protest against apartheid or against Israel or against U. S. foreign policy. A demonstration, exactly as described, actually took place. But it was against abortion. And that's why you probably never even heard about it.

This...illustrates the media elite's contempt for balanced reporting and clearly demonstrates its strong pro-abortion bias.

Randall Terry, a leader of Operation Rescue and an organizer of the series of protests at abortion clinics, said he believes there is a conspiracy of silence among the news divisions of ABC, CBS and NBC because not a word about the dramatic event was aired on any of the networks.

Andrew Freedman, a spokesman for NBC, said his network did not cover the demonstrations because the events were overshadowed by events in the Middle East. But they were also apparently overshadowed—at least in the minds of network news producers—by every other news event covered by the network for several nights in a row. ABC and CBS did not comment on why they neglected to cover the protests.

This example of network news judgment—or lack of judgment—illustrates the media elite's contempt for balanced reporting and clearly demonstrates its strong pro-abortion bias.

During 1979 and 1980, Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, political scientists and researchers, surveyed 238 journalists at the most influential news organizations in the United States: *New York Times, Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, Time, Newsweek, U. S. News & World Report*, ABC, NBC, CBS and PBS.

It should surprise no one who reads or watches the reports of these journalists, that the survey showed the media elite to be ideologically far more liberal than mainstream America. And while polls of the general population have shown the country pretty well split down the middle on the abortion issue, 90 percent of those in the media believe women should have the right to choose abortion.

On related social issues, 97 percent of the media elite agreed that government should not regulate sex; only 25 percent believe homosexuality is wrong; only 15 percent believe homosexuals should not teach in public schools and, incredibly, only 47 percent could bring themselves to agree that adultery is wrong. (With that statistic in mind, it's surprising we ever found out about Gary Hart's monkey business.)

Of course, nothing would be wrong with this kind of homogeneity in the media if our journalists could keep their opinions to themselves and give us fair and balanced news reports on the issues of the day. But this latest example of self-censorship on some major abortion demonstrations shows that the media's own biases are being reflected in their news judgments. It is simply unimaginable that a similar protest on an issue near and dear to the hearts of journalists could be overlooked in this way.

...in the media's eyes, the abortion issue has already been decided in their favor. So it's a dead issue now.

While the demonstration organizers may think a conspiracy must exist to prevent coverage of anti-abortion protests, that is probably not the case. A conspiracy is not really necessary when there is near unanimity of opinion on an issue. You see, in the media's eyes, the abortion issue has already been decided in their favor. So it's a dead issue now, hardly worth debating or covering. For the liberal media, there are far more important issues and crusades—like apartheid, curbing U. S. military power and pulling in the reins on U. S. allies around the world.

Fifteen years and 20 million abortions after the U. S. Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision, the media are still pretending that there is really only one side to this issue, only one argument that is valid.

And what is the result of this kind of selective coverage? It can only be interpreted by protesters as a signal that their nonviolent protests, however massive, are not newsworthy. It's a message that only the clinic bombers get on television.

Read 'Between the Lines'

***Between the Lines** is a new publication, offering its first monthly issue in January this year. It calls itself "The Conservative Watchdog of the Establishment Media.". The June issue included the artice above plus others such as "Why media go so easy on the Soviet Union," "Drug guru (Dr. Timothy Leary) now a social lion of Hollywood," and "What's really wrong with network news." Some are re-prints, but most are excellent analyses of the issues by **BTL** editor Joseph Farah.*

*AFA recommends **BTL** as an excellent source to maintain a balanced view of events of our time. Send $14 for six months, or $25 for a year's subscription. Send check or money order (payable to **BTL**) with name and address to **Between the Lines**, P. O. Box 2870, Palos Verdes, CA 90274.*