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INTRODUCTION

Paul warned the Colossians: “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8). It would be a mistake to conclude that this Pauline warning marked the first time human philosophy had ever posed a threat to man’s spiritual welfare. It would be equally erroneous to conclude that Paul’s warning is outdated for our day and time.

Satan is still walking about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour (1 Pet. 5:8). We cannot afford to be ignorant of “his devices” (2 Cor. 2:11). His modus operandi is “capsulated” in 1 John 2:15-16, “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.”

Satan’s chief aim is to get us to fall in love with the world, to love the world so much that any love for God is crowded out. This corroborates Paul’s warning to the Colossians to beware of any philosophy that is “after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8, emphasis added). With Satan, it is all about the world, this world, and nothing but this world.

According to 1 John 2:16, in his effort to saturate our minds with worldly thoughts, Satan employs three main methods: (1) the lust of the flesh—what tastes good; (2) the lust of the eyes—what looks good; and (3) the pride of life—what makes me look good. Examine any worldly
philosophy and you will find one or more of these components lurking beneath the surface.

Satan’s approach has always been to suggest that his ways are better than God’s ways. He wants us to believe that his way offers us something new, something that is better than the old worn out way of living by God’s rules. Satan wants us to believe that his way is the pathway to something better than what we could ever have by following God’s narrow way. Satan wants us to believe that it is necessary for us to throw off the shackles of God’s confining rules in order to gain real freedom and knowledge.

Should the reader doubt the foregoing to be true, he/she need only read Genesis 3. Therein, we read:

Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat (Gen. 3:1-6).

We should not read over Satan’s question too quickly and fail to consider his motive for asking it. It is almost as if Satan is asking Eve: “Just how restrictive has God been with you? What is it that God is keeping from you?” Upon hearing Eve’s reply, that God had granted them access to every tree in the garden but one, and upon hearing that God had told Adam and Eve that they would surely die if they ate of that tree, Satan does not hesitate to contradict God’s revealed will. Point blank, Satan tells them: “Ye shall not surely die” (v. 4).

Satan does not stop there. He quickly fabricates a reason as to why God was barring Adam and Eve from the tree of knowledge of good and evil in the first place. Satan plants the thought into Adam and Eve’s mind that God is trying to keep them from attaining an equally godlike status. Essentially, Satan is saying, “Are you not tired of eating from all these old trees? Why not try this new tree? The fruit on this tree is
better than any of the fruit you have been eating. Besides, if you want to be as knowledgeable as God, then it is necessary that you eat of this fruit. Do you want to keep taking orders from God because you are beneath Him? Or would you rather rise to His level and be in charge of your own affairs? If you will eat of this fruit then you will be on the same level as God, and if you are on the same level, then He will not be able to treat you like one of His inferiors. But if you want this better life, it is necessary that you break away from the old rules and travel a new path instead!

Regrettably, Satan’s methods worked. According to Genesis 3:6, the woman saw that the tree was good for food (lust of the flesh), and that it was pleasant to the eyes (lust of the eyes) and that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise (the pride of life), and so she partook of the fruit, and Adam followed her lead, rather than leading her to follow after God’s lead.

There is no literal Garden of Eden today, nor are we confronted with Satan in the form of a serpent, enticing us to partake of the forbidden fruit of a literal tree. However, this is not to say that Satan is dormant in his attempts to seduce us into sin. The backdrop and props are different today, but his basic approach has not changed. Satan’s bottom line is still the same today as it was in the Garden of Eden—to convince us, by any means and method, to rebel against the will of God and to follow our own will instead. He cloaks his real purpose behind the dress of various worldly philosophies, but once you strip away the outer garments of these philosophies you expose the common denominator in them all—the elevation of man and the denigration of God, or to put it another way, up with man and down with God!

Satan does not speak directly to man today as he did in the Garden, but he is still speaking through men to men. Remember that Paul wrote: “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8, emphasis added). The personalities and proponents of these worldly philosophies have changed throughout history, but their propaganda has not. They all have said/say that the philosophy they espouse is fresh and new, and that it is better than any other philosophy, especially the philosophy of the Bible. Moreover, they aver that it is necessary to embrace their philosophy in order for society to progress to greater heights, because, to hear them tell it, the philosophy of Christianity is old, inferior, defective, and destructive. On the
contrary, we shall counter their claims that their worldly philosophy is new, better and necessary.

THEY SAY, “IT IS NEW”—BUT IT IS NOT!

In the physical realm, we are bombarded by advertisements that promise “new and improved” products. Some products deliver what they promise and some do not, but the thrill of trying something new will cause many to at least try the product. Satan is very much aware of this human attraction to things that are new. Not surprisingly then, he often promotes his worldly philosophies as “new” in an effort to give them “curb appeal.” Consider just two worldly philosophies that have adopted this tactic of offering something “new.”

**Humanism**

Some hear the word “Humanism” and equate it with the terms “humane, humanitarian, and the humanities.” This is incorrect. Humanism is a philosophical system that asserts there is nothing which exists that is morally superior to man. Whereas Theism worships God as the source of all knowledge and truth, Humanism worships man as the source of all knowledge and truth. Put another way, Humanism promotes faith in man instead of faith in God.

Of course, Humanists say that their philosophy is new. John Dunphy, whose article appeared in the January/February 1983 edition of *The Humanist* magazine, authored one of the most chilling articles one could ever read. He entitled his article, *A Religion For A New Age*. Note the emphasis in the following quotations:

I am convinced that the battle for humankind’s future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the *proselytizers of a new faith*: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being ...”

These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the educational level—preschool day care or large state university. The classroom must and will become an *arena of conflict between the old and new—the rotting corpse of Christianity*, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and *the new faith of humanism*, resplendent in its promise of a world
in which the never-realized Christian ideal of ‘love thy neighbor’ will finally be achieved.²

The assertion in these quotations, that Humanism is a new faith, is absolutely false! Proponents of this philosophy have been trying openly to remake America for over 75 years, not to mention the world. In 1933, with John Dewey, the father of progressive education, leading the way, thirty-four professors signed a document known as the Humanist Manifesto I. In 1973, Humanist Manifesto II was authored, with over 200 individuals signing their names to it. Another Humanist Manifesto was published in 2000 (known as Humanist Manifesto 2000). It was not regarded as a comprehensive statement of Humanist views and so Humanist Manifesto III was published in 2003. The content of these manifestos proves that this philosophy is nothing new. Consider the evidence.

1. Atheism is not new. One of the fundamental tenets of Humanism is the denial of God’s existence. “Religious Humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.”³ “We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of the supernatural ... As non-theists, we begin with humans not God, nature not deity.”⁴ Denying the existence of God is not exactly a new approach. Psalm 14:1, which affirms, “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God,” was penned approximately 1,000 years before Christ, and long before anyone coined the term “Humanism.”

2. Relying on self instead of God is not new. In a brochure explaining the membership rules for joining a Humanist organization, Julian Huxley explains:

I use the word “Humanist” to mean someone who believes that man is just as much a natural phenomenon as an animal or plant; that his body, mind and soul were not supernaturally created but are products of evolution, and that he is not under the control or the guidance of any supernatural being or beings, but has to rely on himself and his own powers.⁵

Corliss Lamont agrees that man must rely totally upon himself. In his book, Philosophy Of Humanism, he wrote: “Humanism assigns to man nothing less than the task of being his own saviour and redeemer.”⁶ Humanist Manifesto II declared: “While there is much that we do not know, humans are responsible for what we are or will become. No deity will save; we must save ourselves.”⁷
A children’s book, written by Humanist Chris Brockman, is called *What About Gods?* He wrote: “We no longer need gods to explain how things happen. By careful thinking, measuring and testing we have discovered many of the real causes of things, and we’re discovering more all the time. We call this thinking.”

The arrogance and smug self-sufficiency on display in the foregoing quotes are nothing new. In the 5th century B.C., Protagoras affirmed that “man is the measure of all things.” The 5th century B.C. does not exactly qualify as “new!” Furthermore, even earlier in history, we read that in the days of the Judges, “there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes” (Jgs. 17:6; 21:25).

Solomon warned: “The way of a fool is right in his own eyes” (Pro. 12:15), and declared that the one “that trusteth in his own heart is a fool” (Pro. 28:26). The inspired admonition of the Psalmist—“It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man. It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in princes” (Ps. 118:8-9)—offers proof that man’s tendency to trust in man is nothing new.

*The New Age Movement*

Another philosophy, which “they say” is a new way of thinking and living, is the New Age Movement. Despite the name, the New Age Movement is anything but new. Although the roots of the New Age Movement were present much earlier, the growth of the New Age Movement exploded in this country in the mid to late 1980s. However, the thrust of the New Age movement is so old that its roots can be traced back ultimately to the philosophy espoused by Satan in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3).

What is the New Age Movement? Author Elliot Miller explains that it is an extremely large (but loosely structured) network of organizations and individuals bound together by certain common values and a common vision of a coming “new age” of peace and mass enlightenment, i.e., the dawning of the age of Aquarius. A precise definition of the New Age Movement is elusive because the movement is so diverse, and loosely structured.

New Age philosophy is essentially a marriage of the Humanism of the western world with the occultic mysticism of the Eastern religions (primarily Hinduism and Buddhism). Hinduism is one of the world’s oldest religions. Its adherents teach that there is one God, known as “Brahman,” who is said to be an impersonal divine essence. They
further believe that many other gods emanate from the source of the one God, Brahman. Thus, Hindus actually believe in one Supreme Being with a plurality of gods perceived as creations of that one Being. In fact, Hindus are on record as believing in a total of 333 million gods.

Hindus believe that the universe undergoes endless cycles of creation, preservation and dissolution. Hindus believe in *karma*, the law of cause and effect by which each individual creates his own destiny by his thoughts, words and deeds. Hindus believe that the soul reincarnates, evolving through many births until all karmas have been resolved, and *moksha*, spiritual knowledge and liberation from the cycle of rebirth, is attained. They teach that not a single soul will be eternally deprived of this destiny.

Closely related to Hinduism is Buddhism, which was born in India, the home of Hinduism. It is based on the teachings of Siddhartha Gautama, who wandered through India approximately 2,500 years ago. Gautama became known as Buddha, or “the Enlightened One.” His influence is still being felt. There are over 300 million Buddhists in the world today. Professional golfer, Tiger Woods, is a confessed Buddhist, as is Phil Jackson, the head coach of the Los Angeles Lakers.

On January 18-19, 1987, actress Shirley Maclaine’s book, *Out On A Limb*, came to ABC television in the form of a much publicized five-hour mini-series. The movie documented her journey to the so-called realization of her godhood and alleged reincarnation experiences. Other big-name celebrities quickly followed with their own endorsements of New Age thinking (John Denver, Willie Nelson, Tina Turner, Stephen Spielberg, Dennis Weaver, Sharon Gless (Cagney and Lacey), Levar Burton (“Roots” and “Star Trek: The Next Generation”). New Age views were given frequent airing on three major talk shows: *Oprah Winfrey*, *Geraldo*, and *Phil Donahue*. Oprah Winfrey is a self-professed New Ager.11

Several years ago, the movie, *The Last Temptation of Christ*, created a furor of controversy. The movie was based on Nikos Kazantzakis’s 1955 novel, and portrayed a Jesus who doubted His Messiahship, struggled with lustful temptations, and taught the pantheistic doctrine that “Everything’s a part of God.” Furthermore, on the introduction page of the script is this quotation from Kazantzakis: “It is not God who will save us—it is us who will save God, by battling, by creating and transmuting matter into spirit.” The novel portrays “a
very Eastern concept of the pathway to godhood and release from the
cycle of birth and death into bliss."\textsuperscript{12}

New Ager, Benjamin Creme, elaborates:

\begin{quote}
Every manifested phenomenon is part of God. And the space
between these manifested phenomena is God. So, in a very real
sense, there isn’t anything else. You are God. I am God. This
microphone is God. This table is God. All is God. And because
all is God, there is no God. God is not someone that you can
point to and say “That is God.” God is everything that you have
ever known or could ever know—and everything beyond your
level of knowing.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

In her book, \textit{Out On A Limb}, Shirley MacLaine offers several
affirmations of the godhood of man. Her New Age guru allegedly told
her: “You are God. You know you are Divine. But you must
continually remember your Divinity and, most important, act
accordingly.”\textsuperscript{14} After she supposedly discovered her own “godhood,”
she affirmed: “Each soul is its own God. You must never worship
anyone or anything other than self. For you are God. To love self is to
love God.”\textsuperscript{15} Swami Muktananda—a great influence on Werner Erhard,
founder of EST and Forum—pulls no pantheistic punches when he
says: “Kneel to your own self. Honor and worship your own being.
God dwells within you as You!”\textsuperscript{16}

As we noted in the introductory material, the teaching that man
may become as God/gods is not new! This is the very lie Satan told
Adam and Eve in the Garden (Gen. 3:6). In response, we remember that
the Bible affirms that there is One God (Deut. 6:4). He is in heaven and
we are on earth (Ps. 33:13-14). Jeremiah quoted the Lord, saying:
“Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and
whose heart departeth from the Lord ... Blessed is the man that trusteth
in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is” (Jer. 17:5, 7).

The ruler of Tyre was rebuked because in his arrogance he had
said: “I am a God” (Ezek. 28:2). He was quickly reminded: “[Y]et thou
art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God”
(Ezek. 28:2). When the people shouted out their praises to Herod,
claiming that his voice was the voice of a god, and not man, he
apparently soaked it all up. Immediately, “the angel of the Lord smote
him, because he gave not God the glory” (Acts 12:23). Paul condemned
the Gentiles for worshipping and serving the creature rather than the
Creator (Rom. 1:25).
The words of Solomon may be applied in principle to the claims of the Humanists and the New Agers, that what they are espousing is a new philosophy. “The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us” (Ecc. 1:9-10, emphasis added). The worldly philosophy and vain deceit associated with Humanism and the New Age movement is not new!

**THEY SAY, “IT IS BETTER”—BUT IT IS NOT!**

We must revisit the earlier quotation from Dunphy to explore his claim that Humanism is a better philosophy than Christianity.

The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and new—the *rotting corpse of Christianity*, together with *all its adjacent evils and misery*, and the new faith of *humanism*, resplendent in its promise of a world in which the *never-realized Christian ideal of ‘love thy neighbor’ will finally be achieved*. Then perhaps, we will be able to say with Tom Paine that “the World is my country, all humankind are my brethren, and to do good is my religion.”

One thing is certain—Dunphy can never be accused of mincing words! He writes that Christianity is a “rotting corpse” and blames it for “adjacent evils and misery.” On the other hand, Dunphy claims that what Christianity could not get done with the “love thy neighbor” principle, will finally be realized by practicing the new faith of Humanism!

Mr. Dunphy needs to do a little research before making such outrageous statements. It is a documented fact that societies have been uplifted wherever a knowledge of God and the Bible have gone. How many hospitals have been built by the atheists, compared to the number built by those who are trying to love their neighbors as taught in the Bible?

It is also fair to ask Mr. Dunphy how long it is going to take until Humanists usher in the promised Utopia? After all, Humanism has been taught in our public schools for decades now, has dominated the airwaves in music, movies, television and other forms of mass media, but our society does not seem to be getting better. In fact, it appears to be getting worse. The truth is that the worldly philosophies of Humanism and New-Ageism cannot make society better. Why is this so?
1. Because man is robbed of his special place in creation. The Journal of American Pediatrics Association issued the following statement in July of 1983: “We can no longer base our ethics on the idea that human beings are a special form of creation, made in the image of God, singled out from all the other animals and also possessing an immortal soul.” It is frightening to think that an organization devoted to taking care of children would adopt such a godless philosophy of ethics. According to this, when a doctor treats a human being it is no different than a veterinarian treating an animal, except that the human would be considered a more highly developed animal. With this type of thinking, it is not hard to figure out why human life has been so devalued, both among the unborn and the elderly.

2. Because man is left without Divine help. Consider the following: “As in 1933, humanists still believe that traditional theism, especially faith in the prayer-hearing God, assumed to love and care for persons, to hear and understand their prayers, and to be able to do something about them, is an unproved and outmoded faith.” Humanists ridicule Christians for believing that someone actually listens to their prayers and cares about their trials, but this is the teaching of Holy Scripture (Mt. 7:7-11; Heb. 4:15). How can it be better to believe that no Divine Being cares for us in our time of trial? The Book of Psalms would be pointless to read if God does not exist/hear our petitions. But, He does listen and He does care (Ps. 42; 142; 1 Pet. 5:7).

3. Because man is left without an objective standard. According to Humanism, man is not bound by any absolute standard of ethics. Action “X” can be morally right for one person, but action “X” can also be morally wrong for another. In our broad-minded age, the following statements sound like music to the ear of the man who does not want to be governed by any authority.

We believe, however, that traditional dogmatic or authoritarian religions that place revelation, God, ritual, or creed above human needs and experience do a disservice to the human species. We affirm that moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction.
We reject all religious, ideological, or moral codes that denigrate the individual, suppress freedom, dull intellect, dehumanize personality.22

If you are wondering just how far Humanists will take the concept of not being under an authoritative standard, consider this: “In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures, unduly repress sexual conduct. The right to birth control, abortion and divorce should be recognized.”23 Are we really expected to believe that abortion and divorce have made our world a better place? The practice of abortion has definitely not made the womb a better place for the innocent children. Moreover, think of all the emotional pain associated with those women who are trying to find a way to forgive themselves for deliberately killing a fellow human being.

In the 1980, March/April issue of Humanist, Corliss Lamont, urged Humanists to take the lock out of wedlock. He wrote: “The greatest danger in marriage is lack of variety. Most marriage partners need more diversity in sex interplay than they can give each other and should therefore have ample contacts with friends of the opposite sex outside the family circle.”24 Of course, those who have followed this philosophy of marriage are often the very ones who are getting divorced. Think of all the emotional pain and loneliness brought about by divorce. And this has made our world a better place? How can anyone argue such nonsense with a straight face?

Supposedly, for those who are not married, promiscuity is the better way to live, rather than waiting for marriage. Albert Ellis, a signer of Humanist Manifesto II, authored a book, called Sex Without Guilt, in which he wrote: “Since premarital sex relations are no longer viewed as morally reprehensible or sinful by most educated and informed individuals, there need be no intrinsic guilt attached to them.” Ellis went on to say, “Premarital sex relations are fine and the Bible is hardly a good guide to sane sex conduct.”25 Can you see the sarcasm dripping from Mr. Ellis’s pen? If you are pro abstinence before marriage, then you just are not educated and informed! Why, you are probably one of those insane, Bible thumping radicals!

The permissive attitude toward sexuality is evidenced in The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction’s Sex Education Policy Statement, which states: “At one time sex education was based ... on innocence, ideals and moral codes ... but ... we are now moving toward
a more humanistic approach." In other words, there are no absolute rights or wrongs for young people when it comes to the subject of human sexuality. As sick as it sounds, some Humanists are even referring to incest as “the last taboo.”

Of course, the Bible way is the better way. It still declares: “Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge” (Heb. 13:4). Some recoil at the very mention of God and His Word as the better way. They do not want to hear it! One cannot help but think of Paul’s description of some who “did not like to retain God in their knowledge” (Rom. 1:28). At least Aldous Huxley was honest in admitting the truth about why many Humanists are so antagonistic against God and His Word. Huxley wrote an article, entitled Confessions Of A Professed Atheist, in which he confessed:

I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently, assumed it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption ... The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics; he is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do ... For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom.

This heart-breaking quotation admits that a philosophy of liberation is not better—it leads to meaninglessness!

In the New Age world, anything can be true for the individual, but nothing can be true for everyone. Consider the following quotes from Ramtha, the giant warrior who supposedly channels his teachings from beyond this world through a petite blond woman named J.Z. Knight:

I expect you to do only what you feel is right.
Never believe in anything. Never! That is convincing yourself of something you have yet to know and understand through experience.
Always trust the wisdom of your feelings.
Truth is a feeling, a knowingness; it is not intellectual. To know what the truth is for you, is to know what you feel the truth is.\textsuperscript{28} Ramtha also affirms that “the splendid thing about God is that he is, indeed, lawless ... Your beloved Father has created no law—save one. And that law is to express your life according to your own sovereign will.”\textsuperscript{29}

How different this advice is from that of Holy Scripture. The writer of Proverbs admonished his readers to trust in the Lord with all of their hearts, and not to lean unto their own understanding (Pro. 3:5). We repeat for emphasis: “There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death” (Pro. 14:12; 16:25). The one who trusts in his own heart is not enlightened; according to Scripture, he is a fool (Pro. 28:26). “O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps” (Jer. 10:23).

What does the Bible teach about ethics and morality? Right and wrong is determined by God’s commandments (Ps. 119:172). “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:16-17). This is certainly the better way!

4. Because it confines the hope of man to this life. Humanists reject the idea that man has an immortal soul which resides in his human body. Accordingly, in the words of Corliss Lamont, “... for Humanism the central concern is always the happiness of man in this existence, not in some fanciful never-never land beyond the grave.”\textsuperscript{30} Averring the same position, the Humanist Manifestos repeatedly affirms:

- Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.\textsuperscript{31}
- Modern science discredits such historic concepts as ‘the ghost in the machine’ and the ‘separable soul’.\textsuperscript{32}
- There is no credible evidence that life survives the death of the body.\textsuperscript{33}
- Salvationism, based on mere affirmation, still appears harmful, diverting people with false hopes of heaven hereafter. Reasonable minds look to other means for survival.\textsuperscript{34}
Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful. They distract humans from present concerns.35

Humanists live for actions, ideals on this earth in our one and only life. Heaven must be built in this world or not at all... while we’re here, let’s live in clover, for when we’re dead, we’re dead all over.36

All I can say after reading the above quotations is, “How sad!” Imagine how sad the atmosphere must be at the funeral of an Atheist/Humanist! How sad it must be to live with no hope! How can this view possibly be better than the opportunity to live forevermore with God in heaven above?

THEY SAY, “IT IS NECESSARY”—BUT IT IS NOT!

In describing the battle between worldly philosophy and Christianity, Mr. Dunphy concludes: “It will undoubtedly be a long, arduous, painful struggle replete with much sorrow and many tears, but humanism will emerge triumphant. It must if the family of humankind is to survive.”37 The last phrase from Dunphy indicates his conviction that, in order for humankind to survive, Humanism must of necessity be followed.

The New Agers teach that it is necessary to embrace their philosophy in order that we may rediscover our divinity. As preposterous as it sounds, they believe that we have forgotten our divinity, and that it is only ignorance that keeps us from realizing our divine reality. Thus, the goal, according to New Age analyst Theodore Roszak, is “to awaken to the god who sleeps at the root of the human being.”38

How can we overcome our ignorance of our alleged divinity? The New Age Movement has taken the old-fashioned methods of talking to the dead, tweaked them a bit, and come up with its own brand of spiritism, call “channeling.” According to New Agers, all information is contained in what they call the “Akashic Records.” To access the information contained within these records, they believe it is necessary to have it channeled from some entity or personality beyond this earth unto another person here on earth. This is called “channeling.”

Culturally, America is increasingly receptive to the idea that we can gather information from the dead. From 1973 to 1984, the number of Americans who claimed contact with the dead increased from 27% to 45%. Television personalities, like John Edwards, claim an ability to
speak to the dead. Almost two decades ago, there were only two professed channelers in Los Angeles—today, there are well over 1,000 who claim this ability. One of the reasons the channeling industry has grown so much is that it has become a very lucrative industry. Most channelers charge a minimum of $100 per hour for their services.

The New Age Movement claims that it is necessary to tap into the Akashic Records, in order to learn what we need to know. Meditation, yoga, chanting and channeling are a few of the ways they claim this can be done. However, because of the message of 2 Timothy 3:16-17, it is not necessary to tap into the so-called Akashic Records. Again: “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:16-17, emphasis added). As long as we have the Bible, it will be unnecessary to follow the philosophies and vain deceit of men.

Using the Bible as our one and only guide, if there is anything that man needs his consciousness raised about, it is his own sinfulness. Nowhere in Scripture do we see any inspired teacher attempting to persuade his hearers of their divinity. Rather, we see sinners indicted and boldly admonished to recognize their lost and undone condition apart from God (Isa. 59:1-2; Ezek. 18:31-32; Acts 2:23; 3:14-15; Rom. 3:10, 23; 6:23). Man also needs to be conscious of the fact that Jesus Christ is his only hope for salvation (Jn. 14:6; Acts 4:12).

CONCLUSION

As we conclude, it is interesting to observe that there is something new, there is something better, and there is something necessary, but it is not worldly philosophy and vain deceit. It is Christianity!

Christianity Is New

God predicted through Jeremiah that He would someday establish “a new covenant” with His people (Jer. 31:31-34). The writer of Hebrews confirmed that this promise of God had been fulfilled and that the new covenant was now operative (Heb. 8:8-13; 9:15-17). Because of the new birth, “of water and of the Spirit” (Jn. 3:5), we are made brand new creatures in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17).

Christianity Is Better

The same Book of Hebrews refers to the New Covenant as a “better covenant,” established upon “better promises” (Heb. 8:6), by a “better”
mediator (Heb. 1:4; 8:6), who offered “better sacrifices” (Heb. 9:23), so that He might bring us to live with Him someday in a “better country” (Heb. 11:16). Christianity is not just better than the Old Covenant—it is better than anything else in the world!

Humanist can make fun of “God-intoxicated” believers all they want—but at least we know exactly where we came from, and we know exactly what we are doing here. While the worldly philosopher stumbles through life, tripping over the consequences of following his own desires, we trust in the Lord with all our hearts instead of leaning to our own understanding (Pro. 3:5-7). We do not glory in our own wisdom, but rather in the infinitely superior wisdom of God (Jer. 9:23-24; 1 Cor. 3:18-21).

If we trust in the wisdom of our own hearts we are fools—if we follow the wisdom of God we shall be delivered from “philosophy and vain deceit” (Col. 2:8). The wisdom of this world is foolishness compared to the wisdom of God. Therefore, in deciding what our purpose is here on earth, we reiterate: “It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man” (Ps. 118:8).

Christianity offers a dignified answer to the question: “Where did I come from?” I am not the accidental happenstance of ocean slime. I am a member of the human race. As a human being, I am a descendant of the man who was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26). As a human being, I (or we) can say of God: “[I]n him we live, and move, and have our being ... For we are also his offspring” (Acts 17:28). As long as I live upon the earth, I have the opportunity to lovingly serve the God Who sent His Son to die for me (Jn. 3:16; Gal. 2:20).

**Christianity Is Necessary**

Because of the fault within the people (Heb. 8:7), and the inability of the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin (10:1-4), it was a must, it was necessary for Christ to come and suffer (Mt. 16:21; Lk. 9:22; 24:7, 44; Acts 17:3). It was necessary for Jesus to die for the New Testament to come into force (Heb. 9:16). To gain the benefits of His blood, it is necessary for us to possess an obedient faith, “for he that cometh to God must believe that he is” (Heb. 11:6, emphasis added). For this faith to be a saving faith, it must lead us to be born again, born of water and of the Spirit (Jn. 3:5). Jesus said it was necessary when He said: “Ye must be born again” (Jn. 3:7, emphasis added).
It is necessary for me to be born again because *it is also necessary for me to stand before God in judgment.* “For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad” (2 Cor. 5:10). To prepare for the Judgment Day, I must first, as a penitent, confessing, believer, be buried with my Lord in baptism (Col. 2:11-12). After I have risen with Christ as a new creature, I must maintain an affection for “things which are above ... not on things on the earth” (Col. 3:1-4; Mt. 6:19-21), for this earth will pass away and the lusts thereof, but if I do the will of God I will abide forever (1 Jn. 2:15-17). Consequently, I will labor, not for the meat which perishes, but for that which endures unto everlasting life (Jn. 6:27).

As a human being I am more than mere flesh. I have a soul that will live on after my body is dead (Mt. 10:28; 22:32). When I die, I will either spend eternity in pleasure or torment (Lk. 16:19-31; Mt. 25:46). My destiny is up to me. I can either accept the grace of God by living according to His will, or I can despise being governed by His authority (Ps. 2:3; 2 Pet. 2:10) and suffer the consequences (2 Thess. 1:7-9).

Satan will do everything within his power to deceive you and me with worldly philosophies, but let us, like Mary, choose the good and better part, the teaching of Christ (Lk. 10:42). Let us choose the New Covenant which will lead us to the New Heavens and New Earth above (2 Pet. 3:9-14; Rev. 21:1-27).
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