

## Humanism, Anti-Humanism And History.

Humanism is a perversion of a truth.

The truth is we belong to one another. Minerologically, morphologically, physiologically, psychologically and spiritually we are united. All life is one, directly, without need of mediation.

Humanism throws in a mediator, government, and thereby destroys our unity. Humanism has to throw in a mediator because it won't accept the truth that we are united. Humanism rests on denial, criticism.

Government is for protection of our unity. Government cannot mediate our unity because our unity is the prius of government.

The failure of humanism raises its antithesis, anti-humanism.

Humanism has ancient roots. Modernly, it traces to Abelard, Erasmus, Rousseau, Dewey and Whitehead. Its premise is tripartite and simple: (1) educate everyone (2) in the liberal arts (3) to produce world peace. Humanism, to humanists, is civilization and nothing else is.

The political and social zenith of humanism was the United States Presidency of Woodrow Wilson. Wilson's humanism was seconded before and after his political career by some robber barons and by many of their sons and daughters down to the present day in a great outpouring of time, money and energy for "human betterment."

However, the impossibility of educating everyone, the limited value of liberal arts education and the nonsense that liberally educated people are peaceful breached the humanist premise even as Wilson strode the White House and his wealthy supports wrote checks. We call it World War One.

Humanists' response to World War One was not to scrutinize their premise, not either part of it, but rather to blame their students for non-compliance, even obduracy. Humanists did what gamblers call "doubling down" and Einstein called "insanity": they assumed their premise correct in all parts, kept at it and warned students to accept humanist education or be ostracized from the orbit of peace (implying, livability).

World War Two happened, then Korea. These phenomena convinced humanists that their students, most of them, are poor learners who will not be warned. Though seat-timed and credentialed, most students broke peace. *Man in toto* could be educated and thus made peaceful but very many do not live their lessons. Those ones are not educated even though milled by the liberal arts. They are not civilized, therefore. And being uncivilized, their deservedness goes to zero.

So concluded humanists regarding their students. That their premise (all three parts) might be non-empirical they considered not.

Their premise humanists assumed valid, left intact, unscrutinized, and pushed ahead. Progress they called it, the vision of a great enterprise. ("Vision" is everything to humanists: "we know what we want.") Unpleasantness - the lack of world peace - humanists put down to students' obstructionism, obstinacy, stupidity, cupidity, unpreparedness; to bad parenting, genetic deficiency; to ... whatever ... but not to their premise.

World peace, humanists concluded, can obtain only amongst a fraction of the population. Us. The rest are dirty and violent, incapable of civilization by refusing liberal arts education.

Following World War Two, humanists got the stink eye for most of humanity. They circled wagons (faculty senates and unions), deployed

razor wire (professional-political associations and conferences) and fostered anti-humanism (misanthropic ideologies). These initiatives they fueled with drugs both chemical and ideational (cf. Cloward-Priven, Mead, Alisky).

Simultaneously, humanists promised to conjure world peace by educating everyone available.

That was hypocrisy. They knew that it was.

World War Two was humanists' watershed. Following it, their diction conformed to their premise (cf. the build-out of post-secondary plants, rice bowls) while their action deformed their premise (cf. the build-out of misanthropic ideologies, *prana* sucking).

That was hypocrisy. They knew that it was.

Humanist spokespersons, such as Dewey and Holmes, Orwell and Rand, Ehrlich and Sagan, Mead and Commoner, Holdren and Huxley, Charles, Prince of Wales, cried terror even as they induced it.

Humanists went anti-human. They resolved upon a radical reduction in human population. That would ensure world peace. The remnant would be a relative few who tried to join, and were allowed to join, the humanist/now anti-humanist orbit, which now focused on eliminating all but its own.

(Environmentalism elimination-ism, the axis of anti-humanism, exceeds jihadi elimination-ism in power, scope and ruthlessness. Inside that fact is the deep irony that Wahhabism/Salafism birthed to hold Sunni Arabs "unpolluted" by 18<sup>th</sup> Century "enlightenment" struggles in Europe and North America ... that is to say, by humanism.)

Humanism evolved into its own opposition because humanists refused to scrutinize their premise even after experience proved its first part, educating all, impossible, its second part, liberal arts instruction, impotent, and its third part, causing world peace thereby, nonsense. Instead, they declared most of their students bad. They turned on their students, offering most of them death as their best redemption. They violated the teacher's duty to enliven by inspiring forth a student's inner necessity. They declared most students and the nation who bore them evil.

Humanists always were tyrants. They showed it by going anti-humanist.

Today there are no humanists, only anti-humanists. These control the mechanisms of national and local governments in Europe, the Americas and Asia. They seek elimination of the majority of humanity. This, they tell themselves, is the road to world peace, at last.

The churches failed to dissolve the humanist cause despite its self-evident impossibility, impotence and nonsense. When humanists' anti-humanist reaction to their own humanism set in in force following World War Two, the churches did not see it and were flummoxed by their own internal anti-humanist operators (cf. Vatican II, the World Council of Churches, many Roman Catholic social agencies and the US National Council of Churches).

The error and the failure is with the churches. They went humanist during the past three hundred years, though not all at the same time or rate.

The Gospel is not humanist. Neither is it Communist, collectivist, socialist or communistic. The Bible is not a scheme for "human betterment." It is not even a call or a wish for "human betterment." Human is human, not better or worse. There's one grade of human,

human. What is one is indivisible and non-scalar. Machines are divisible and scalar. Humans, machines' makers, are not.

The Bible calls for fulfillment through Divine Grace, not betterment through human effort.

A lot of Peanuts and Time Magazine have been preached. A lot of media polls. A lot of Jonathan Livingston Seagull and Star Wars. A lot of folk music and rock and roll. A lot of popular psychology and sentimentalism. A lot of "liberation theology."

That's a lot of humanism. It killed the churches when the churches took it in. Their own clergy killed the churches by wanting to be liked. Instead, their clergy are despised, not trusted, taken for powerless and inconsequential in the affairs of the world. Indeed they are, and their government controllers know that they are.

Will the churches be reborn, come to their senses and be their mission? No, they will not. The Word has been preached to the four corners of the earth. The mission is accomplished, to include the humanist cause. The churches, along with the humanism and now anti-humanism that they espouse, are at the end of their life-cycle.

The Church, the Spiritual Community, has concretized a form that overrides and surpasses the churches. It is called the monastery, and specifically, the monastery for families. There and there only in this world made brutal by humanists turned anti-humanists is rest and Grace. Peace must be earned. The Lord God Almighty protects the monastery, He protects the unity of love.

The future of the Church is in monasteries and families, not in parishes and congregations. The message of the Church today: be undivided in the power of your biological/matrimonial family. That is the current

functional equivalent of St. Paul's announcement to be in Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit. It is as Paul Tillich saw inchoately in his last lecture and called "religion of the concrete Spirit." Actual monasteries comprising families. That is the Church today and as far ahead as I can see.

The Rev. David R. Graham  
Ordained, The United Church of Christ  
Member, The Episcopal Church  
March 11, 2012