

HUMANISM'S EFFECT ON FAMILY VALUES

by Samuel L. Blumenfeld

Humanism, as we all know, is the dominant belief system of the academic, bureaucratic, commercial, political and judiciary establishments of America. Humanism is the belief system of our psychologists, mass media, public educators, popular writers, and many of our political office holders. If you want to know to what extent humanism dominates the academic world simply spend some time in the bookstore on the campus of any large university where the textbooks are sold. You will find the biggest, fattest textbooks for each one of the social studies to be a product of the humanist mindset. The humanist presence in academia is overwhelming.

Recently I looked through a large textbook on human development in the university of Massachusetts bookstore in Boston. The first paragraph of the book demolished the "myth" of Genesis, thus setting the stage for a "scientific" explanation of the origin of man. If you are a Christian taking that course, you're lost on page one. You are forced to accept that initial premise if the next 600 pages are going to make sense and you want to pass the course.

Humanism, as a belief system, is like a three-legged stool. The three legs it stands on are: science, evolution, and psychology. The scientific method provides humanists with the means to fathom the mysteries of the material world; evolution provides humanists with a "scientific" explanation of the origin of life and man; and psychology has provided humanists with the scientific means to study human nature and control human behavior.

This belief system has profound ramifications for America's political system which was based on an entirely different world view: the God-centered world view of the Old and New Testaments. Our Declaration of Independence states quite clearly:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The humanists do not recognize the existence of a Creator, and so there cannot be any unalienable rights, and if there are no unalienable rights, then the purpose of government can hardly be to secure rights which don't exist. According to the humanists life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are not unalienable rights. If they were, abortion would be illegal, as it was before the humanists took power. In America we've slaughtered more unborn than the entire population of Canada, and unfortunately the slaughter will continue indefinitely. As long as the universities and schools remain the fortresses of humanist thought and sentiment, it is difficult to see how this horrible situation can be changed.

That secular humanism was intended to replace Christianity as the governing faith in America is clearly indicated in the writings of John Dewey, one of the signers of the Humanist Manifesto of 1933. Dewey wrote in 1908:

"Those who approach religion and education from the side of unconstrained reflection . . . are of necessity aware of the tremendous

transformation of intellectual attitude effected by the systematic denial of the supernatural."

Note the wording. "Systematic denial of the supernatural," ^{which} means the deliberate rejection of ^{God the Father, &} Christ, ~~as~~ the Son of God, ~~or~~ the Messiah. It means that ~~Christ is a liar or an imposter or a lunatic, and that~~ the Bible is mythology, fiction, or fairy tales, or part-history, part-mythology. It certainly means that the Bible is not the inerrant Word of God. That ^{is what} ~~became~~ the "new intellectual attitude." ^{"is all about."} Dewey continues:

"It is the part of men to labor persistently and patiently for the clarification and development of the positive creed of life implicit in democracy and in science, and to work for the transformation of all practical instrumentalities of education till they are in harmony with these ideas."

Dewey is telling us that the schools must be brought into harmony with humanism and that men must labor persistently and patiently for this to take place. Persistence and patience. Dewey knew that this transformation would take years. He wrote in 1898:

"Change must come gradually. To force it unduly would compromise its final success by favoring a violent reaction." He knew what he ^{change must take place so slowly, so gradually that most people won't even} was talking about. Dewey wrote in 1908: ^{realize that it has taken place}

"Doubtless many of our ancestors would have been somewhat shocked to realize the full logic of their own attitude with respect to the subordination of churches to the state (falsely termed separation of Church and State); but the state idea was inherently of such validity and constructive force as to carry the practical result, with or without conscious perception of its philosophy."

Dewey is quite clear in his belief that the church is subordinate to the state — a belief now shared by our state bureaucrats. He states that the concept of the separation of church and state is a false one, & that it really means subordination of the church to the state. And then he goes on to say that the "state idea" has taken over without Americans being aware of what that implies.

What Dewey is saying is that Americans have overthrown their own ~~government~~ constitutional government and replaced it with a "state idea" because it was more practical.

In other words, the state would assume supremacy over the church without our being aware that it was happening.

But there is no doubt that humanism was meant to be a new faith, a new religion. Dewey wrote:

"We measure the change from the standpoint of the supernatural and we call it irreligious. Possibly if we measured it from the standpoint of the natural piety it is fostering, the sense of the permanent and inevitable implication of nature and man in a common career and destiny, it would appear as the growth of religion. . . .

"It may be that the symptoms of religious ebb as conveniently interpreted are symptoms of the coming of a fuller and deeper religion. . . . So far as education is concerned, those who believe in religion as a natural expression of human experience must devote themselves to the development of the ideas of life which lie implicit in our still new science and our still newer democracy. . . . It is their business to do what they can to prevent all public educational agencies from being employed in ways which inevitably impede the recognition of the spiritual import of science and democracy, and hence of that type of religion which will be the fine flower of the modern spirit's achievement."

What all of this means is that public education today is built on the systematic denial of God. The denial of God has become the major purpose of American education, from kindergarten through the graduate school. And the failure, confusion and chaos we see today in American education are the end products of this philosophy. Public education operates against the will of God and that is why it has failed and will continue to fail no matter how much money is poured into it.

It is obvious that the rebellion of the sixties, the decline in American morality, the rise in divorce, pornography, drug addiction, perversion, etc., are all a direct consequence of an education system that has systematically denied the existence of God and of sin. How could it have been otherwise?

Humanism has brought us moral and social chaos, the rise of satanic cults, widespread paganism, and a plague called AIDS -- a direct result of promiscuous and perverted sexual behavior. And no one is safe. Men and women, going into hospitals for surgery, are given contaminated blood. They are paying for their tolerance and permissiveness with their lives. They were told by the sexual revolutionaries that all sexual behavior is permissible, as long as no one hurts anyone else. But many will get hurt. Many will die.

A nation that proudly proclaims its rejection of God in its greatest institutions of learning, and proudly steepes itself in sin in the name of humanist liberation will pay the price for its folly. Make no mistake about it. The wages of sin is death. Don't let anyone fool you. God will not be mocked.

The American family has suffered in this humanist nightmare. Feminism, sexual liberation, the Playboy syndrome, perversion, abortion have all battered the family. But the family still remains the basic social unit of our society. And it is in the family where the return to Judeo-Christian values is making the greatest headway. The Christian revival is basically centered around young families where children are being nurtured, cared for, educated.

It is no small coincidence that both the Christian school and homeschooling movements are manifestations of Christian families

returning to traditional values. These young families recognize humanism for what it is: a satanic religion, and they will not allow their children to be infected by it.

The humanists never expected that when they would be so very close to total victory, Americans would begin finding their way back to the Word of God. Why? Because the moral chaos, misery, self-destruction and social ruin brought about by humanism has sent people back to the faith of their fathers, a faith that once produced social order, moral sanity, decent behavior, lasting marriages, happy children. Faith in science has not brought us closer to earthly paradise but to nuclear extinction.

But we are only at the beginning of this long process of return. Besides, while Christians may view humanism as a bankrupt philosophy, the humanists maintain that their atheism is as valid as ever, and that their sinless society the very paradigm of the New Age social order. To them AIDS is not a moral issue, but a medical one; and all of the social disorders caused by moral relativism represent career opportunities for the new humanist elite of psychologists, counselors, social workers and educators -- the new clergy of the new religion.

The family, of course, is under heavy attack by the behavioral psychologists who see parents as the obstacles to their new utopia. B.F. Skinner, probably the world's leading behavioral psychologist, wrote in Walden Two:

"Group care is better than parental care. In the old pre-scientific days the early education of the child could be left to the parents. . . .
with
but/the rise of a science of behavior all is changed. . . . The control of behavior is an intricate science, into which the average mother could not be initiated without years of training. . . . Home is not

the place to raise children."

And now you know why the behavioral psychologists so vehemently oppose home education. It goes against everything they believe in. Yet, James McKeen Cattell, the father of educational psychology, in his latter years seemed to have a change of heart. He said:

"Mankind will last only so long as children are born and cared for; and no plausible substitute for the family has been proposed. . . . The school by its nature weakens the family, for it takes the children away from home and gives them interests not centered in the home." (Science, Feb. 25, 1944).

On Cattell's death, Edward L. Thorndike, his most illustrious disciple, wrote: "Cattell believed in the possibility of a science of education and was on the lookout for educational implications in his experiments on perception, association and individual differences. He had theories about the educative process, notably the theory that a home with many children of different ages was in certain respects superior to a classroom filled with children as nearly alike as possible."

Cattell believed that education could be turned into a science. He said: "Science . . . has freed us from superstition and unreason; it is in itself the most perfect art and the best religion, the force not ourselves that makes for truth and righteousness."

I wonder what Cattell would say today with the growth of paganism, satanism, astrology and superstition in this age of science and technology. Rejecting the true God has not freed us from superstition and unreason. It has enslaved many Americans to them.

Because the family has now become the stronghold of the Christian faith, we can expect the attacks on it to intensify. No issue, therefore, is more important for Christians than that of parental rights. Do parents have the unalienable right to ~~xxxxxx~~ educate their children without interference from the state? Can parents delegate this right to the Christian school?

An unalienable right is a God-given right, not a state-given privilege. The function of government, according to the Declaration of Independence, is to secure the unalienable rights of the people, not to deprive them of them. Parents are given children by God, and God has given parents the responsibility for educating their children. The earliest Puritan school laws required parents to fulfill ^{educative} ;their / responsibilities. Those laws did not require parents to hand over their children to the state. Even King George III did not interfere with home or church education.

But a funny thing happened on the way to the 20th century. The state usurped the concept of unalienable rights, and now we hear about the right of the state to do the educating and supervising in its own fashion for its own purposes. But only individuals have unalienable rights, not states. The state has no intrinsic rights of its own. Its function is to protect the rights of ~~xxxxxxx~~ the citizens who created it. The state does not own the children. Yet there are many in the education bureaucracy who believe the state does.

We now have a doctrine known as "compelling state interest," and this doctrine is being used to persuade parents to allow the state to supervise their home school. Supposedly the state now has a "compelling" interest to see that children are educated. But if this is the case,

why aren't the children in the state's own schools not being educated? Why do so many of them emerge from the government schools functionally illiterate, with no employable skills? Why ~~xxx~~ does the state allow these schools to destroy the minds of so many children? If the state does indeed have a compelling interest in the education of children, why isn't this compelling interest exercised in the public schools?

Obviously, this whole idea of "compelling state interest" is a fraud. But they are compelling something. They are compelling children to suffer ^{the} terrible risks inherent in humanistic education.

Resist the devil, & he shall flee from you.