

## SECULAR HUMANISM CRITICISED

It is inaccurate for the Church to campaign for human rights. It does not care about human rights as such. It's God allegedly wants us to have certain rights so the Church works for them for his sake not ours.

The Church is anti-human rights in principle.

The Church denies that human beings are self-sufficient which leads to further opposition to human rights being acceptable in principle.

Humanism is about belief in the self-sufficiency of human beings. It says we don't need God. We are autonomous and can make our own laws and don't need God's laws.

This is not necessarily a rejection of God. We always have to take man's word for it that such and such is a revelation from God. To believe what man says about God is to accept a picture of God. Even if there is a real God, this picture is not intended to look exactly like him. It is intended to look like what you want to be true. Believers get mad when their God is insulted for you have upset them because you are challenging their creation and therefore their ego.

The Humanist seeks facts not beliefs. To find the facts, the humanist has to question all things and take nothing for granted. Everybody should be the same. Religious people should be able to give us facts not dogmas. Religion embraces ideas it will not change. Science only accepts ideas based on the evidence and even if there are some things it will not change its mind about it says that in principle it can.

Humanists are accused of thinking that if people are educated better and helped to think for themselves and decide for themselves they will live better lives. Critics think we have never heard of the educated criminal. Humanists should be realistic and not be trying to make out that anybody can be perfect. Most of us are somewhere in-between in relation to perfection and badness.

Humanists are said to be guilty of overlooking the fact that most of us do not feel self-sufficient. But maybe we all do at times. And feeling we are not enough in control of our lives may be down to a failure to recognise that we are.

Humanists are said to be guilty of seeing science as objective when in fact scientists come to scientific conclusions that are influenced by subjective matters and their prior beliefs. That can happen yes but we have to assume that science is objective until proven subjective. Innocent until proven guilty. And science unlike religion says what the evidence says is what matters. Science is an attempt to keep things objective. It is not the fault of science if many fail to be objective.

Humanists teach that God is not responsible for us but we are responsible for one another. The critics say the Humanists have too high of a view of human responsibility. They mean that humanists tend to be liberal. They feel humanists trust people too much. But not all humanists are liberal. Many are just as restrictive as the pope! And many Christians are as liberal as the humanists.

Humanists are without God and not necessarily anti-God. But if God comes first or alone matters, then it follows that they are in a sense anti-God even if their anti is not hostile.

Human responsibility is the the Humanist's basic starting point. That is why Humanists argue strongly for tolerance. We should be tolerant of the views and moralities of others and try to understand them for we might be the ones that is wrong not them. Even we are unlikely to be wrong, we may still be wrong.