

On Secularism



Farooque Chowdhury

Contents

Chapter One

On Secularism and Politics
Definition of Secularism
Historical Development of Secularism
Secular Beliefs in 19th Century

The Belief in the Innate goodness of men. Progress, Liberalism, Faith in Science, Capitalism, Democracy & Nationalism.

Chapter Two

Secularism in 20th Century, Application of secularism in the society. Impact of Secularism on individual, Impact of Secularism on Family, Evil influence of Secularism on Education, Evil influence of Secularism on the work, Evil influence of Secularism on International Relations.

Chapter Three

The Concept of Secular Religion, Morality and Ethics, Secularism and Feminism, Historical Development of Feminism, Role of Mass Media, Modern Revolution, Feminism and Sexual Liberation, Freudian School Nonfiction Sex Manuals, Secularism and Contraception.

Chapter Four

Secularism and the Devils work: Feminism and the Elite Depopulation Agenda.

Chapter Five

The New Age Movement A Brief History of the New Age Movement the Present New Age Movement Who They are and What They Believe.

Chapter Six

The Coming of Antichrist New Age of Occult.

Chapter Seven

Post Secularism: The New Age Spirituality.

Chapter Eight

The Pressure of Secularism.

Chapter Nine

The Need of Evangelization Who should define themselves as secular, can one be both secular and religious What and in What do secular jews believe, secular Jews and Jewish Civilization, Jewish Secular Humanism.

Chapter Ten

Impact of Secularism on Religious Belief and Practices, Islam and Secularism, Definition, Overview, History, Modern History, Influence, Communist Influence, Secularism in Turkey, Secularism in Iran, secularism in Tunisia, Secularism in Egypt, Secularism in Syria, Secularism in Pakistan, Secularism in Lebanon.

Chapter Eleven

Secularism and Religion a Critical Analysis of Secularism and Authoritarianism.

Chapter Twelve

Modernism and secularism modernism: Characteristics, The Forces that shaped Modernism.

Chapter Thirteen

Secularism the Most Evil Philosophy Known to Human Government, The French Republic, Nazism, Communism and Marxism. The Spanish Inquisition a Comparison, Witch Hunting a Comparison, The Crusade- a Comparison, The Second World War.

Chapter Fourteen

Secularism and the Hinduism.

Chapter Fifteen

Secular Humanism and New Age Concerns.

Chapter Sixteen

Pope Benedict XVI Goes war Whit atheist extremism, Fight against Secularism Unites Jews and Catholics.

Final Remarks:

Foreword

Humanity stands at the cross-roads. It desperately needs a sale of values which may determine the direction for global peace and human progress, ascribe some sense to human endeavours and restore a sober, balanced view. The problems that it faces today are the product of a particular way of life; they are the off springs of a civilization which took birth in material advancement, scientific thinking and intellectual freedom. Hence they can be properly understood only by a careful analysis of the background of that civilization.

A research on Islam, politics, secularism, feminism and modernism would enable him to understand the nature of the contemporary problems, their historical perspective, the methods with which political thinkers, politicians, philosophers both in the East and West have attempted to seek answers to their fundamental problems regarding God, the Universe and Man, State, Politics and Divine Right, Secularism, Feminism and Modernism and how these methods and postulates shaped the overall approach of modern man towards life. But not with standing the great importance of such a research, the rescarcher has to tread his path very carefully. Despite the learning and intellectual apparatus which the Western thinkers and philosophers bring to bear on their relevant field of research, their measure of achievement is not very commendable. Besides the fact that there is very little agreement among them each appears to be lost in a fantastic world of his own. Their vocabulary is highly technical and personal. Their view of life, to say the least, is extremely partial. Their sole achievement seems to lie in bringing down the imposing structures which their predecessore had painstakingly built up. Even the basic issues are in a state of indeterminate fluidity. The researcher groping his way through the intricate world of the realists and the idealists, the Rationalists and the Intuitionlists, the Evolutionists and the Pragmatists, the Logical Positivists and the Naturalists may be compelled to abandon his

journey in despair. Human knowledge can not be true if it negates the ultimate reality and Divine Will. Islam's basic principle is that Allah (SWT) is absolute reality. He is the Creator and possesses innumerable attributes which others do not. He gave us a guideline through which we can understand the essence of existence and good life, and acting upon that we can make our lives good and peaceful. Thus if we want to know the reality, it is necessary that we should study and comprehend it as the light and framework of Divine guidance. This guidance is nothing but Divine Revelation (Wahy) bestowed upon Prophet (SAW) who interpreted and manifested it in his action (Sunnah). Allah (SWT) gives this responsibility to Prophet (SAW) who complied it. It is stated, 'So that you may explain to the people that which was revealed to them. (Al-Quran, 16:44).

The essential comprehensive characteristics of Islam and its primary basis is Tawhid, the unity of Allah, which affirms the real monotheism of Islam. Allah is one. He has no partner, and there is none worthy of worship except Him. Tawhid extends to all of creations and thus signified the unity of Allah, the unity of the community of the faithful, the unity of life as a totality, and the unity of the temporal and the spiritual. Tawhid provides one, single direction and guarantees a unified spirit for its adherents. It perfects the ethical consciousness of mankind and endows humanity, with the hidden power of 'wisdom' which nurtures and perfects it. The instrumental conception of politics and secularism is not universal but culturally specific.

Devoid of moral contents, politics both in the East and West have become a 'dirty game' or in the words of Isaac D'Israeli, "the art of mankind for deceiving them". (Cited in Bernard Crick, In Defense of Politics, London, Pelican Books, 1964, P.16). In Islam, the state is conceived not as a means to ends that are separable from the state, but as itself the laws of religio-cultural purposes. Such a conception leaves no room for separation of religion from politics. Rather, it blends the two, conducts politics in accordance with revealed

guidance, and uses the state as a servant of the Creator “inviting all to the good, enjoining virtue and forbidding vice” for the purpose of achieving piety (Al-Quran, 3:104; 5:3). The state itself is the focus of profound religio-cultural purposes which would allow them to fashion their life according to the revealed principles of individual and social behaviour and would impart a sense of their own dignity. The secular thinkers need to be exposed to this Islamic conception of the state for a more informed and more articulate response to human aspirations. In this connection, I would like to refer to the mistaken idea that revelation (religion) is something different and should, therefore, be separated from reason (secularism). This idea has been put forward by various writers, especially Christian writers, and some Muslim writers influenced by Orientalist thinking. Greek philosophy or modern trends in European thought. According to them, What is religious should be separated from what is secular. This idea is definitely false, especially concerning the Holy Qur’an. This is because the Holy Qur’an is both revelation and reason, and Islam is both religious and secular. Almost in every verse one would find this fact clearly. It is revelation from Allah and at the same time, in order to convince people, it ‘reasons’ with them. This shows that the Qur’an at least, does not ignore human reason. It tries only to side it. So, the idea of separating revelation from reason is wrong, especially with regard to the Holy Qur’an. This idea (as already indicated) is connected with another idea, which is equally wrong, the separation between what is religious and what is secular in Islam. It is a long time since, in Europe, the Church was separated from the state and from life in general. This separation does not apply to the Holy Qur’an. Because Islam, as everybody knows, is not only a religion, but a total way of life which covers all aspects of human activities. It is both a religion and a state: Din-O-Duniya. Secularism understood in this sense has no contradiction with Islam or religion. However, I am sorry to say that the concept of secularism and its relationship with religion have been misunderstood by a large

number of scholars and philosophers and there is a long debate regarding the issue. The concept is wrongly applied by the politicians and statesmen in different countries according to their convenience so as to serve their purpose. Viewed in this perspective, a clear understanding of the concept of secularism and its impact on religion, politics, feminism, role of state, family life, culture and modernism is necessary. With this end in view, Mr. Farooque Chowdhury, a veteran Islamic thinker, compiled and edited a book ‘On secularism’ which contains a rich collection of valuable articles written by eminent researchers and philosophers on secularism and the related issues of importance, even though I have some reservations and I do not agree with all the statements and conclusions of these articles in toto. However, I confidently believe that this book will definitely contribute towards the removal of many misunderstandings regarding secularism and its related impacts on different socio-cultural, religious and political issues to a large extent so as to apply the concept in the truest perspective. I congratulate Mr. Farooque Chowdhury for accomplishing this noble task. I wish wide publicity and circulation of the book. Allah Hefez.

Dr. M. Abdul Mannan Chowdhury
Professor and ex-chairman
Department of Economics
University of Chittagong.

PREFACE

Politics originated from the Greek word 'Politikos' meaning of or for, or relating to citizens. It is the theory and practice of influencing other people at a civic or individual level. It also refers to achieving and exercising positions of government organized control, over a human community, particularly state. A variety of methods are employed in politics, which include promoting its own political views (religious and other Isms, doctrines and philosophies) among people, negotiation with other religio-political subjects, making laws. Although most of the good/white laws have been adopted from Divine Scripture or gifted by the Messengers/Prophets. The history of politics is reflected in the origin of religious beliefs and legal systems. Such as Canon Law for the Christians, Halakhah for the Jews, Laws of Manu and other classical Hindu Laws for the Hindus. The Chinese Law which is based on the Confucian philosophy of social control through moral education. The Quranic Law and Sharia law for the Muslims. From history we know that the kings, emperors, pharaohs or rulers were Divine. Here the term 'divine' needs some explanation. Politically speaking 'divine' means: 1) There is a Supreme Administrator of the world who appoints the king or ruler, Imam etc. 2) Society be administered by those laws given by Him. 3) Man is not independent rather subservient to some Divine/Supernatural power/Administrator and as sovereign power He is empowered to appoint His representative on this earth. The legitimacy of ruler ship depends on His confirmation of appointment and not on assumption. This religio-political concept is recognized in all the major religions of the world. In the Quran, this type of appointment is narrated as, "And his Lord tried Abraham with certain words/orders, which he fulfilled, He said, "Surely, I make (appoint) you an Imam (leader/king/monarch) of people. Abraham said: And my offspring? My Covenant does not include the unjust, Said He. (Sura Bakara-124). Similarly it is stated in the Holy Quran that, "Oh Daud, We did in deed make thee a Caliph on earth, So judge you between man in truth (and Justice) nor follow you the lust (of your heard), for it will mislead thee from the path of Allah (Sura Saad-26). From this and other verses of the Quran we know that the

political post of earthly king/ruler is appointed by Allah as the Supreme Administrator of the universe. If we correctly try to understand religion, we must have to admit that the principal message of all the major religions of the world is theocracy, the civil rulers/leaders is believed to have a direct personal connection with civilization's Divinity (God, Allah, Ywawah Bhagoban). For example Moses (AS) led the Israilites. Jesus was the guide for the Christians, Muhammad (SM) the administrator and law giver for the Muslims, Sree Ramchandra Sree Krisna were the ruler of the Hindus. Laws proclaimed by these rulers was also considered a kind of revelation and hence the Law of God (Hadith as source of law for the Muslims) An Ecclesiocracy is a situation where the religious leaders assume a leading role in the state, but do not claim that they are instruments of divine revelation. For example, The Khilafat-e-Rasheda and subsequent Muslim Khilafats, the prince-bishop of the European Middle Ages, where the civil rulers never claim that they received revelation from God. In Christianity Pope is also a religio-political institution. Although these institutions were not truly religious, or divine, but they were considered and recognized as the supreme religio-political authority without their approval nobody could go to heaven (as the case for the Christians) and no ruler should be recognized as legal monarch without the certificate from the Khilafat of Baghdad. Even Sultan Mahmud of Gazni and Shamsuddin Iltutmish of Delhi Sultan of Bengal obtained this certificate. It should be noted that in 815 (2, Ramzan, 200 Hizri) AD Amir-ul Muminin Mamun, Khalifatul Muslimin, the illustrious son of Harun the great declared that he/they (The Abbaside/ Ummaya) are not the legitimate ruler of the Muslims. In order to set aside this political mistake (815 CE), Ahle Bayat-E-Rasul Hazrat Imam Ali Reza is the true and correct Ruler/Leader of the Muslims. Mamun ordered new coins to be minted, which would bear the statements: There is no God but Allah, Muhammad is His Messenger and Ali is the special friend of Allah and after that it said, Ali ibn Musa, who is known as Al-Reza is the heir apparent of the kingdom. "But the then Muslims were so far away from real Islamic political system or reality, that they could not accept him rather alleged to have killed

him. Similarly, when Ummaya ruler Umar Ibn Abdul Aziz wanted to set right some of the political atrocities committed by his predecessors, he was also assassinated. It is a well known fact that the world famous saint Shekih Abdul Qader Jilani. is called "Mohiuddin" meaning Life-Giver of Deen(Islam).Now the question arises, when and how the religion Islam died in the first place. Unfortunately, there is no readymade answer. One explanation may be: After the holy demise of prophet(SM) there was a big challenge for the Muslims regarding the religo-political succession. In this war, the evil doers Ummayas became successful. They waged full-fledged war against the true inheritors i.e. the Ahle Bayat-e-Rasul (SM). In the process Hazrat Hussain(R) was mercilessly killed in the battle of Karbala (Iraq) in 680 CE. Regarding this battle, Hazrat Khaja Moinuddin Chisti evaluated Imam Hussain(R)as: The master is Hossain, the Ruler is Hussain(R), The Deen(Islam) is Hussain(R), The Helper of Deen is also Hussain(R), He sacrificed his life (Head) for the sake of this religion, but did never surrender to any body (Dewan-e-Moinuddin by Khaja Moinuddin Chisti Translated by Zehadul Islam and Saiful Islam). From this incident we can conclude that after the Shahadat of Hazrat Imam Hussain(R) Deen (Islam) died. And Ahle Bayat-e-Rasul Sheikh Abdul Quader Jilani gave a new life to Islam.

The Ummayas coined a new Islamic ruling system, had adopted a new Islam, which had abandoned the concept of divine appointment, rather dynastic monarchies were established and maintained by military force which was the legal basis of the government. The Socio-economic and legal systems of the Quran such as; freedom to life, liberty, property. expression, good governance, popular government, rule of law were considered as political and to be dealt by evil rulers according to their sweet will. The religious rituals also were not followed religiously. For example, the Zakat collection and distribution which is the fundamental obligation of the Islamic government was made an individual and personal *ibadat*. Thus a sort of secular idea emerged all over Islamic society. Religion was made limited to Salat. Siam, Haj only. In ultimate analysis, religion became a socio-cultural phenomenon. This process is being

continued till the present day. In such a situation the true believers and Muslim intellectuals of highest levels having supernatural power, the token of their certificate from their Lord, developed apparently a new system of worship called Tasawwuf/Sufism/Tariqa. Since the Sharia of the new rulers were not in conformity with true Islam, these Sufis were persecuted by the evil monarchs through their Kazis in the name of preserving Shariat. At present Muslim rulers devised a new technique of religious deception. Wherein it is stipulated in some of the constitutions that Sovereignty belongs to Allah alone but He has delegated it to the state through its people to be exercised. How and when Allah has delegated His Sovereign power to a particular community/state? who knows, understands and certifies that. Since it is Allah's sovereignty it must have to be communicated by a Prophet, not any one else., By this assumed delegation of power, these people have been given extraordinary power. As a result they have abandoned Allah by using His own name. Regarding this type of rulers the Quran says: We broke them into sections on this earth. There are among them some that are righteous and some that are opposite. We have tried them with both prosperity and adversity; in order that they might turn (to us). After them succeeded an (evil) generation, they inherited the Book, but they chose (for themselves) the vanities of this world, saying (for excuse): "(Everything) will be forgiven us." (Even so, if similar vanities came their way, they would (again) seize them. Was not the Covenant of the Book taken from them, that they would not ascribe to Allah anything but the truth? And they study what in the Book. But best for the righteous is the Home in the Hereafter. Will you not understand? (Sura Araf: 168-169).

Concept of Divinity in the American Constitution

Sovereignty, it is said, is absolute, omnipotent, unlimited and ilimitable. God's supreme power is not relative to any other authority. He is the Almighty and He has power over all things. This is why He has been called Qadir-i-Mutlaq. Not only this,He is the real owner of all authority and power and is the only Malik-al Mulk, Malik-in-Nas, and hence only His is the kingdom of the Heavens and

the Earths-and He alone governs governors, kings, monarchs emperors, presidents, angels, jinns, men and living things. Recognizing this reality many of America's founding fathers were aware of the fact that if government is being used by the persons who want to conspire against the people, wish to consolidate power into their hands in the name of government which in turn can be directed against the increase in governmental powers over both national economy and the lives of its citizens. A good place to begin such a study is to examine the two sources claimed to be the source of human rights. There are only two, presuming that humans do indeed have rights, either man himself or someone or something external to man himself, a Creator or God or Allah. Thomas Jefferson for instance, stated his concern and understanding thus: "The God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can these liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God." However, the corresponding alternative explanation argues that our rights come from government, the creature of man himself. This contention hold that man creates governments to give man his rights. A stern warning for those who do not distinguish betwteen these two alternatives came from William Penn. He wrote "If men will not be governed by God, they then must be governed by tyrants. There are four references to a Creator in the Declaration of Independence .A good example of the philosophy that governments grant human rights to their citizens is found in the International Covenants on Human Rights passed in 1966 by the United Nations. It reads in part: The states, parties to the present Covenant recognize that, in the enjoyment of those rights provided by the state, in conformity with the present Covenant, the state may subject such rights only to such limitations as are determined by law. This document passed unanimously by all the

parties voting. It concluded that man's rights are granted by the government (as sovereignty belongs to government and not God). It further concluded that these rights could be limited by law, in other words, which governments grants can be controlled by the granting body, the government. That means the granting authority may also empowered to take away the rights by the same authority .In this case it is observed that man's rights are actually insecure. Since the nature of government can change, and with the change, man's rights can disappear. The authors of the American constitution were aware of this fact. Who wrote in the Declaration of Independence: We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights... Here then, is the other theory of the source of man's right, they are given to men by His Creator :Man's are inalienable(defined as incapable of being transformed) which means that they can not be taken away by anyone except the Entity that gave the rights in the first place, in this case the Creator. So here are the two competing and contradictory theories about the rights of the man, one holds that they are given by the Creator, and therefore can only be removed by the Entity that created them in the first place; the other holds that man's rights come from man himself (Sovereignty belongs to man/government) and there fore, can be limited or removed by man or other man "as determined by law". Therefore, the man who wishes to protect his rights from those who wish to limit them must protect himself and his human rights by creating an agency that has the power to exceed that exerted by those who violate human rights. The agency created is called government. But granting power to government to protect human rights also grants power to those who can abuse it as vehicle to destroy or limit the rights of the people who created the government. Those who wrote the constitution of

the USA realized that this tendency existed when they wrote the Bill of Rights, the first Ten Amendments to the constitution. The purpose of these amendments is to restrict the power of the government to violate the rights of the citizens of the nation. The constitution makers of the USA wrote these restrictions with phrases like: Congress shall pass no law. The rights of the people shall not be infringed. No person shall be deprived, The accused shall have the right; please note these are not restrictions on human rights, rather, are restrictions on the activities of the governments. If rights are granted by the Creator of those rights, what are rights granted by the government. It becomes important to distinguish between a right and a privilege by defining these two terms. A Right is a freedom to act morally without asking permission. A Privilege is a freedom to act morally but only after permission has been granted by some government entity. Thus the vast resources and immense wealth and power of the USA is to be attributed to this recognition of God as the Sovereign power of the universe. President Abraham Lincoln recognized this blessing of God to American people. He said: How did the Americans come into possession of all this vast wealth? Did they acquire it through their own human wisdom, foresight, energy, ability and power? The great president answered, "We find ourselves in the peaceful possession of the fairest portion of the earth, as regards fertility of soil, extent of territory salubrity of climate. we find ourselves as the legal inheritors of those fundamental blessings (As the successor of Hazrat Ibrahim (AS) and descendents of Ishaq (AS), we toiled not in the acquirements or the establishment of them. Again in his proclamation of April 30,1863, for a day of nationwide fasting and prayer, the President said; It is the duty of nations, as well of, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God...and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy

Scriptures and proven by all history, that these nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord...we have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers wealth and power as no other nation ever has grown, but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own." (The United States and Britain in Prophecy by Herbert W. Armstrong, page-156). It would have been better if the authors of the constitution would include- the laws on morality, the crime and punishment, also the economic sanctions against interest as mentioned in the Torah and Gospel. **“The concept of Divinity in the British Constitution”**. The first written constitution of England called Magna Carta states that, “JOHN, by the grace of God King of England, Lord of Ireland, Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, and Count of Anjou, to his archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, barons, justices, foresters, sheriffs, stewards, servants, and to all his officials and loyal subjects, Greeting.

KNOW THAT BEFORE GOD, for the health of our soul and those of our ancestors and heirs, to the honour of God, the exaltation of the holy Church, and the better ordering of our kingdom, at the advice of our reverend fathers Stephen, archbishop of Canterbury, primate of all England, and cardinal of the holy Roman Church, Henry archbishop of Dublin, William bishop of London. Peter bishop of Winchester, Jocelin bishop of Bath and Glastonbury, Hugh bishop of Lincoln. Walter Bishop of Worcester, William bishop of Coventry. Benedict bishop of Rochester, Master Pandulf subdeacon and member of the papal household, Brother Aymeric master of the knighthood of the Temple in England. William Marshal earl of

Pembroke, William earl of Salisbury, William earl of Warren, William earl of Arundel, Alan de Galloway constable of Scotland, Warin Fitz Gerald, Peter Fitz Herbert, Hubert de Burgh seneschal of Poitou, Hugh de Neville, Matthew Fitz Herbert, Thomas Bassel, Alan Basset, Philip Daubeny, Robert de Roppeley, John Marshal, John Fitz Hugh, and other loyal subjects.

+ (1) FIRST, THAT WE HAVE GRANTED TO GOD, and by this present charter have confirmed for us and our heirs in perpetuity, that the English Church shall be free, and shall have its rights undiminished, and its liberties unimpaired. That we wish this so to be observed, appears from the fact that of our own free will, before the outbreak of the present dispute between us and our barons, we granted and confirmed by charter the freedom of the Church's elections – a right reckoned to be of the greatest necessity and importance to it and caused this to be confirmed by Pope Innocent III. This freedom we shall observe ourselves, and desire to be observed in good faith by our heirs in perpetuity.

TO ALL FREE MEN OF OUR KINGDOM we have also granted, for us and our heirs for ever, all the liberties written out below, to have and to keep for them and their heirs, of us and our heirs:" ...

True secularism was prevalent in the French Revolution (1789) having a very strong anti church and anti-clerical agenda. The early Revolutionaries set out to destroy Christianity. In France because the revolutionaries felt that Christianity had protected the French monarchy. Thousands of believers, including many priests were killed in the process. Today it is often claimed that the French Republic was the first truly modern government and "the first truly liberal government", Actually, in many senses, that is perfectly true, but does this not tell us rather a lot about Liberalism and Secularism. After all, this period of French history was also totalitarian, despotic,

lacking in fairness and justice and a callous disregard for the dignity of human life. In 20th century alone, more people were slaughtered under Secularist-God denying governments and in the name of secularist ideologies, such as Nazism and Communism compared to the documented religious persecutions in the western combined. Most people know that Hitler was responsible for the deaths of 60,00,000 Jews alone (apart, that is from other groups of Slavs, Poles etc. which his henchmen slaughtered on vast scale). What is probably far less well known is that as 110-118 million people have been killed by communism alone in Eastern-Europe, Africa, Central and South America and in South Asia. It revealed from a report during 1960s that from January, 1,1935 to June 22,1941,19,840,000 enemies of the people were arrested of these seven million were shot in prison, and a majority of the others died in camps. These figures were also found in papers of politburo member Anatas Mikoyan.

In this book I have tried to identify that our Creator, the owner of Sovereign power has a definite purpose and method of administering the earth and it is our sacred duty to honour and follow that divine scheme. If mankind on their own ie. by violating in the Supernatural belief of the Creator and His political, moral, social, economic, legal and cultural values, rules, and regulations they bound to suffer in this world and sure to face serious consequence in the Hereafter. In order to justify my contention I have made use of quotations, articles and works of others freely. Since, these are the common heritage of mankind. However, I am specially grateful to all of them. But unfortunately names and identities of many of them could not be ascertained. I also pray for their welfare in this world and in the world hereafter. Thanks and gratitude are due to Prof Dr. Carrol Quigly, the Author of the world famous book Tragedy and Hope, Mr A.Ralph Epperson, author of the book The Unseen Hand, Dr Henry

Makow, PhD. I specially thank to Prof Dr Abdul Mannan Chowdhury, Ex-Chairman, Department of Economics. Chittagong University for writing foreword of this book. I also express my heartfelt gratitude to Mrs. Rowshan Ara Anjad my elder sister, my ex colleague Mr. K.M. Moazzem Hossain ex Director Triffic. Mr. Zillur Rahman, Deputy Manager (estate) CPA.

Thanks are also due to my beloved class friend Major Abul Hossain (Rtd), also my ex colleague Mr GM Faruqui, Ex-Manager Training, Chittagong Port Authority. I express my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to Mr.Farhad Chowdhury my beloved younger brother for providing funds for publication of this book. I am grateful to The members of Port Retired Officers Association for rendering assistance and support for writing this book. Of them Mr Hadi Hossain, Member (Admn&Planning), Syed Farhaduddin Ahmed, Secretary. Mr Golam Mortuza, Manager Training.Mr Ataur Rahman Khan, Sr Hydrographer Eng. Aktaruzzaman Baksh, Eng. Salimullah Khan, Eng Anjan Kanti Sarker are worth mentioning.May Allah bless us all.

Farooque Chowdhury

21 Ramjan, 1435 Hijri 20th July, 2014 Chittagong

This Book is dedicated to the living ayat of Allah Hazrat Syed Ziaul Huq Maizbhandari (K) & his illustrious son Rahbare Alam Hazrat Syed Hasan Maizbhandari(MJA)

On Secularism and Politics

Introduction

Liberal intellectuals tend to think of non-secular specially Islamic societies as backward-looking, oppressed by religion and inhumanely governed comparing to their own so-called enlightened, secular ideologies-secularism or democracy. But measurement of the cultural distance between the Islamic and western way of life is a very complex undertaking and that distance is narrower than they assume. Islam is not just a religion and certainly not just a fundamentalist political movement. Rather it is a civilization and a way of life that varies from one Muslim country to another but is animated by a common spirit far more humane than most secular people realize. The Westerners do not always recognize how their so-called ideal Western secularist societies have failed to live up to their liberal mythology. Moreover, aspects of Islamic culture that these intelligentsia regard as medieval may have prevailed in Western culture until fairly recently, in many cases. Islamic societies may be only in few decades behind socially and technologically advanced Western one. Finally the term 'secular' refers to anything that is not pertaining to religion or spirituality. Progressive means generally refers to the people or political movements which leads to the highest quality of life for the average citizen, while avoiding the worst abuses. However, the path followed by the West in the form of liberalism and secularism does not provide all the answers, and hence Islamic values deserve serious consideration.

Definition of Secularism

Secularism originates from the Latin word “secularis” meaning present. Secularism means: 1) religious skepticism, 2) the view that religious considerations should be excluded from civil affairs, 3) A philosophy or a doctrine that rejects religion, which emphasizes moral and ethical teaching, 4) the attitude that religion should have no place in civil affairs, and 5) the state of being secular. It also denotes spirit or tendency especially of a system of political or social philosophy that rejects religious faith and worship. In Medieval Europe, the Latin term 'secularis' was usually used to refer to the "Present Age. It is also said that the term refers to liberal or left values. It is also of the view that public education and other matters of civil society and civil policy should be conducted without the influence of religious beliefs. Secularism is of the view that religion and religious considerations should be ignored or excluded from social and political matters. It also refers to an ethical system asserting that moral judgments regarding reward or punishment in the life hereafter should be made without reference to religious doctrine.

From the above meanings, denotation and expression it is gathered that Secularism is the Principle of Separation of Government Institutions and the persons mandated to represent the state, from religious Institution and religious dignitaries. In one sense, this doctrine may assert the right to be free from religious rule and teachings and right to freedom from governmental imposition of religion upon people within a state that is central on matters of religious belief. In another way, it can be said it refers to the view that human efforts and activities especially socio-politico-cultural ones should be unbiased by religious influence.

The concept of secularism draws its intellectual roots from Greece and Roman Philosophers such as Marcus Aurelius and Epicurus.

Some Muslim thinkers like Ibn Rustds and other political philosopher like Denis Dederat, Voltaire, Baruch, Spinoza, John Loke, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine and more recent thinkers such as Robert Ingersole and Bertrand Russel.

The purposes and arguments in support of this doctrine vary widely. In Europe, it has been argued that it is a movement towards modernization and away from traditional/religious values.

The term “Secularism” was first used by the British writer George Jacob Holyoake (1817-1906) in 1851. Although the term was new, the general notions of free thought on which it is based had existed throughout history. Holyoake invented the term “Secularism” to describe his views of promoting a social order separate from religion, without actively dismissing or criticizing religious belief. He argued that secularism is not an argument against Christianity (broadly religion), rather secularism is independent of it. It does not claim that there is no guidance in religion but maintains that there is light and guidance in secular truth whose condition and sanctions exist independently. Secular knowledge is manifestly appears to be that kind of knowledge which is founded in this life which related to the conduct of this life, conduces to the welfare of this life and is capable of being tested by the experience of life. George Holyoake's 1890 publication on English secularism defines secularism as: Secularism is a code of duty pertaining to this life, founded on considerations purely human and intended mainly for those who find theology indefinite or inadequate, unreliable or unbelievable. Its essential principles are three: 1) The improvement of this life by material means. 2) The science is the available providence of man. 3) It is good for good. There may or may not be other good ,but, the good of the present life is good and it is good to seek that good.

Holyoake held that secularism and secular ethics were not at all in religious questions (as they were irrelevant) and was thus to be distinguished from strong free thought and atheism. The nature of a secular society should characterize a secular society as one which: 1.refuses to commit itself as one view of the nature of the universe and the role of man in it.2.is not homogenous but pluralistic .3.is tolerant. It widens the sphere of private decision making (no Divine Guidance will influence the decision making process) .4. while every society must have some common aims, which implies that there must be agreed on methods of problem solving and a common frame of work of law. In a secular society these are as limited as possible,5.problem solving is approached nationally through examination of the facts. While the secular society does not set any overall aim, it helps its members realize their aims. This is neither a society without any official images, nor is there a common ideal type of behavior with universal application.

News commentator fox coins this term 'Secular Progressive' to refer to any group of individuals holding a certain set of liberal values including but not limited to support for gay marriage and legalization of certain issues.

Historical Development of Secularism

Secularism emerged first in the Western world after Martin Luther (1483-1546) had led a religious revolt against Roman Catholicism in the sixteenth century. The revolt resulted in the formation of Protestantism. The rest of the sixteenth century saw the demarcation of the Catholicism from Protestantism which divides Europe along theological lines. By the end of the seventeenth century, some of the leading intellectuals such as Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and John Lock (1632-1704) attempted to formulate new principles of socio-political organizations that would extricate the political state from theological issues. Religious authorities of the church was considered as a major obstacle in the development of social institution. This was the first movement that contributed to the emergence of secularism in the world.

Another origin of secularism can be traced from the conflict of science on religion between the adherent of science and religious leaders, with the discoveries of modern science, its advocates began to explain religious precepts in the light of science, which started the process of reasoning. Therefore, church authorities were challenged gradually but systematically by scientists and nationalists. For instance, the influence of Copernicus (1473-1543), Kepler (1571-1630), Galileo (1564-1642), and Newton (1642-1727), revealed that the sun was the center of the universe. These discoveries were opposed to the theologians' theory and cosmology. It was in this context that the conflict of science and religion contributed to the emergence of secularism within the Western Christian tradition.

During the eighteenth century, under the impact of the Enlightenment, there were many writings of the Western philosophers which argued that religious teaching were the major obstacle to the growth and progress of man. The modern nation state

was emerging to challenge the political supremacy of the church in Europe. Consequently, the development of a political theory in Europe totally divorced the process of legislation from any reference to religious authorities. Religion became marginalized in the public affairs of the society.

The leading intellectuals of 17th and 18th centuries had argued that the interference of religion in the public affairs of society hampered its progress. The intellectuals and thinkers of 19th century gave numerous arguments for the expulsion of religion from private sphere as well. Karl Marx termed religion as merely a reflection of the material world which was and derived from the hope of human being. He criticized religion as the tool in the hands of the ruling class for keeping the men under control. Religion was made to pacify human and reconcile them to the oppression that they suffer under capitalist society and hinder their awareness of revolution. His famous quotation is "religion as opium of the masses". For mere religion seemed to promise people illusionary happiness. Therefore the abolition of religion as the illusionary happiness of the people is required for their true happiness.

Another secular view can be traced in the psycho-biological arguments of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), growing up devoid of any belief in God, Freud insisted that religious claims about the world are invalid. Religious ideas according to Freud are only the outcome of a psychological process. In his 'Future of Illusion,' Freud argued that was culture that created and produced religious ideas within the individuals. According to him, like all other cultural attainments religion springs from the necessity of defending oneself against the superpower and the fate. Thus, an impotent man creates God for himself like a helpless child seeks comfort in the parent. The origin of religion in this sense is a form of self fulfillment of

mankind. For Freud, religion is both illusion and error. An illusion because it is the fulfillment of man's wishes and error because it cannot be independently established on natural or scientific grounds. Another secular thinker of the same period Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) was not interested in the metaphysical truth of either Christianity or any other religion. Being convinced that no religion is really true, he judged all religions entirely by their social effects. Nietzsche's famous proclamation is "God is dead" and in his searching for new foundation of values, he turned to the aesthetic of human nature as the most promising alternative to religion. According to him existence and the world are eternally justified only as an aesthetic phenomenon. Religious beliefs have no significance in the social life of modern society. In a contemporary discussion secularism is almost synonymously with their term secularization except the former implies belief in certain ideas and values or as an ideology, while the latter depicts a process of socio-cultural and intellectual revolution.

For Arnold Toynbee, secularization is the replacement of religion with technology and for Wilbert Moore, secularization is the substitution of traditional or supernatural solutions of human situations with natural ones. According to Harvey Cox, secularization involves the loosening of the world from religious understanding of itself and the breaking of all supernatural myths and sacred symbols and metaphysical tutelage.

Secular Beliefs in 19th Century

Professor Carroll Quigley held that the nineteenth century secularism was marked by, 1) Belief in the innate goodness of man 2) Belief in progress 3) liberalism 4) Faith in science 5) Capitalism 6) Democracy and 7) Nationalism.

1) **The belief in the innate goodness of man:** It was a challenge to the concept of "original sin" committed by Adam in the heaven and the consequent suffering of mankind in this world as followed in the Biblical Teaching. However, this belief when it appeared to many that man was born good and free but was everywhere distorted, corrupted and enslaved by bad institutions and convention. As Rousseau (1712-1778) said "man is born free yet everywhere he is in chains". Thus, it was conceived if only man could be freed, they would be freed from the corruption of society and its artificial convention, from the burden of property, of the state, of the clergy, and of the rule of the matrimony, then man, it seemed clear, could rise at such a height undreamed of before. Then he could indeed become a kind of superman, practically a person attaining the status to be worshipped. It was this spirit which let loose the French Revolution (1789 CE). It was this spirit which promoted the outburst of self reliance and optimism so characteristic of the whole period from 1770 to 1914.

Obviously, if man is innately good and needs to be good in general, the above seven factors went along together and be regarded as being compatible with one another, freed from social restriction (as imposed by religious binding). He would be capable of tremendous achievements in this world of time and does not need to postpone his hopes of personal salvation into eternity (heaven). Actually, man is God like creature whose ungodly actions are due only to the frustrations of social conventions. There is no need to worry about service to the Supreme Creator or devotion to any other divinely end. Man can accomplish most by service to himself and devotions to the goals of this world. Thus came the triumph of secularism. Related to this belief came the conception that human nature is good, that

society is bad and that optimism and secularism have reasonable attitudes were certain theories about the nature of evil.

To the nineteenth century thinking evil or sin was negative conception. It merely indicated a lack or at most a distortion of good. Any idea of sin or evil as a malignant positive force opposed to good and capable of existing by its own nature, was completely lacking in this period of time. To this mind the only evil was frustration and the only sin was repression.

2) **Belief in Progress:** The idea of community of interests were closely associated with two other beliefs in progress and in democracy. The average man of 1880 was convinced that he was a culmination of a long process of inevitable progress which had been going on for untold millennia and which would continue indefinitely into the future. This belief in progress was so fixed that it tended to regard as both inevitable and automatic. Out of the struggles and conflicts of the universe better things were constantly emerging and the wishes or plans of the objects themselves had little to do with the process.

3) **Liberalism:** Words such as Liberal, Liberty, Libertarian and Libertine, all trace their history to the Latin 'Liber' which means free. One of the first recorded instances of the word occurs in 1375 CE. When it was used to describe the liberal arts in the context of an education desirable for a free born man. The word's early connection with the classical education of a medieval University soon gave way to a proliferation of different denotations and connotations. Liberal could refer to 'free in bestowing' as early as in 1387, made without saint in 1433, 'freely permitted' in 1530, and 'free from restraint' in the 16th and 17th centuries. In 16th century England, Liberal could have

positive or negative attributes in referring to someone's generosity or indiscretion. By the middle of the 19th century 'Liberal' started to be used as a politicized term for parties and movements all over the world.

Liberalism first became a distinct political movement during the Age of Enlightenment, when it became popular among philosophers and Economists in the Western World. This Doctrine rejected the notions, common at the time of hereditary privileges, state religion, absolute monarchy and the 'Divine Rights of Kings'. The early liberal thinker John Lock is often credited with founding Liberalism as a distinct philosophical tradition. Locke argued that each man has a natural right to life, liberty and property. According to the Social Contract Theory, government must not violate these rights. Liberals opposed conservatism and sought to replace absolutism in government with democracy and or republicanism and the rule of law. The American Revolution, the French Revolution and other liberal movements from that time used liberal philosophy to justify the armed overthrow of what they say as tyrannical rule. The 19th century saw liberal governments established in nations across Europe, Spanish America and North America. In this period, the dominant ideological opponent of liberalism was classical conservatism. During the 20th century, in Europe and North America classical liberalism became less popular and gave way to social liberalism which paved the way for denouncement of all social and moral orders and discipline.

Since the idea of the nature of evil flowed from the belief that human nature was good, so the idea of liberalism flowed from the belief that society was bad. If society was bad, the state, which was the organized coercive power of society, was doubly bad and if man was good, he should be freed above all from the coercive power of the

state. In the broadest aspect, liberalism believed that man should be freed completely from coercive power as far as possible. In its narrowest aspect, liberalism believed that the economic activities of man should be freed completely from “State Interference”. These belief summed up in the battle cry “No government in Business” was commonly called “laissez-faire”. Liberalism which included laissez faire, was a wider term because it would have freed men from the coercive power of any organized religious institutions (such as concept of Halal-Haram, good-evil etc), army or other institution and would have left to society little power beyond that required to prevent the strong from physically oppressing the weak. Liberalism was based on or almost universally accepted nineteenth century superstition known as the “community of interests”. This strange and unexamined belief held that there really existed in the long run, a community of interests between the members of a society. It maintained that in the long run, what was good for one member of the society was good for all and what was bad for one was bad for all. But it went much further than this. The theory of the “community interests” believed that there did exist a possible social pattern in which each member of society would be secure, free and prosperous and this pattern could be achieved by a process of adjustment so that each person could fall into that place in the pattern to which his innate abilities entitled him. This implied two corollaries which that period of history was prepared to accept, 1) that human abilities are innate and can only be distorted or suppressed by social discipline and 2) that each individual is the best judge of his own self interest, a doctrine which maintained that if each individual does what seems best for himself, the result in the long run, will be best for society as a whole.

The idea of the “Community of Interests” were closely associated with two other beliefs: the belief in progress and in democracy. The average man of 1880 was convinced that he was a culmination of a long process of inevitable progress which had been going on for untold millennia and which would continue indefinitely into the future. This belief in progress was so fixed that it tended to regard progress as both inevitable and automatic. Out of the struggles and conflicts of the universe better things were constantly emerging, and the wishes or plans of the objects themselves had little to do with the process: The idea of democracy was also accepted as inevitable although not always desirable. The facts of political development made rule of the majority unavoidable and it came to be accepted, at least in Western Europe, especially since it was compatible with liberalism and with the community of interests.

Liberalism, community of interests and the belief in progress led almost inevitably to the practice and theory of capitalism. Liberalism is closely related with Women's Liberation Movement, Sex Revolution and Feminism. All these ideas have combined produced same adverse effect in the social structure, culture and social values.

4) **Faith in Science:** The relationship between religion and science has been a subject of study since classical antiquity addressed by philosophy, theologians, scientists and other commentators. Perspectives from different geographical region, cultures and historical epochs are diverse. Recent commentators have characterized the relationship as one of 4 categories: conflict, independence, dialogue and integration. Discussion of what is science and what is not science, the demarcation problem in the philosophy of science, have intersected with discourse on religion in some instances and both have had complex relations in their

historical interactions. Contemporary scientists such as Stephen Jay Gould, Francisco Ayala, Kenneth R. Miller and Frances Collins hold that religion and science, are non-overlapping, magisterial, addressing some mentally separate forms of knowledge and aspects of life. Some theologians or historians of science, including John Lennox, Thomas Berry, Brian Swimme and Ken Wilber propose an interconnection between them.

Every detail in this universe points to a Superior Creation. By contrast some materialists/Scientists who seek to deny the fact of creation in the universe is nothing but an unscientific fallacy. The Theory of Darwinism is based on materialism and claims to be scientific. This theory argues that life originated from inanimate matter through coincident which has been demolished with the recognition that the universe was created by Allah. American Astrophysics Hubble Ross explains this as follows:

Atheism, Darwinism and virtually all the 'isms' "emanating from the eighteenth to twentieth century philosophies are built upon the assumption, the incorrect assumption, that the universe is infinite. The singularity has brought us face to face with the cause or causes beyond/behind/before the universe and out of that it contains including life itself."

One of the primary causes of conflict and misunderstanding between science and religion is the fact that some scientists being overwhelmed by a materialistic world view have claimed too much for science. Indeed some have claimed that there is nothing science cannot explain. However, we have to realize that science is simply unable to deal with all things for their is not scientific experiment that can determine everything. There is a great hand for both science and religion to have a broader perspective each showing flexibility and openness that is not guided by either scientific or religious

fanaticism. But unfortunately, 19, 20, 21 century Europe and USA were scenically fanatic to challenge all the moral, social, ethical values which have been come down to them in the form of Christianity and Judaism. The moral break down and the social evil these people are facing can be attributed to this sort of scientific fundamentalism.

5) **Capitalism:** The term 'Capitalism' means the sovereignty of capital, a free and unrestricted economic system totally based on profit and where society is in competition within these criteria. There are three important elements in capitalism: individualism, competition, and profit-making. Individualism is important because people see themselves not as a part of society, but as "individuals" standing alone on their own two feet. "Capitalist society" is an arena where individual compete with one another under very harsh and ruthless conditions just like that described by Darwin, where only the strong survive, where the weak and powerless are crushed and eliminated.

According to the logic, capitalism is based on selfishness, In this system, every individual, a person, a company, or a nation must only fight for its own development and advantage. In this war, the producers survive, the weak and incompetent are eliminated and vanish. What is seen as worthily attention is not human beings, but economic development, and goods. For which reason the capitalist mentally feels no ethical responsibility or conscience for the person whom it crushes underfoot and climbs on top of and who has to live in great difficulty. This is Darwinism put into total practice in society in an economic way. By proposing that it was necessary to encourage competition in all areas of society, and announcing that it was necessary to provide no opportunities or support for the weak in

any field/ground the foremost theoreticians of Social Darwinism prepared a “*philosophical*” and “*scientific*” support for capitalism. In the view of Herbert Spencer, the main theorist of Social Darwinism, who introduced the principles of Darwinism to the life of society, if someone is poor, then that is his mistake; nobody must help this person to rise. If someone is rich, even if he has acquired his wealth by immoral means, that is his competence. For this reason, the rich man survives, while the poor man disappears.

Social Darwinists used Darwin’s theory of evolution as a “scientific” comment on capitalist societies. As a result of this, human beings began to lose such concepts, which religion had brought with it as mutual assistance, philanthropy, and co-operation, and instead of these virtues to give pride of place to selfishness, cunning, and opportunism.

In his article *Darwin’s Three Mistakes*, the evolutionary scientist Kenneth J. Hsu, reveals the Darwinist thoughts of America’s foremost capitalists:

Darwinism was also used in a defense of competitive individualism and its economic corollary of laissez-faire capitalism in England and in America. Andrew Carnegie wrote that the “law of competition, be it benign or not, is here; we cannot evade it.” Rockefeller went a step further when he claimed that “the growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest; it is merely the working out of a law of nature.”

As has been seen from what has been explained so far, capitalism has dragged human beings to worship only money and the power that comes from money. This capitalist morality holds sway in almost all societies in our day. For this reason, the poor, the helpless, and the crippled are denied charity, and are not looked out for or protected.

Today the reason for countries such as Ethiopia having drought affected areas and living in starvation is the dominance of this capitalist morality. While aid and support from many countries could save these hungry people, they are abandoned to starvation and poverty.

Another feature of capitalist society is the way it gives room to inequality within itself. In societies of this kind the divide between rich and poor grows ever wider, as the poor grow poorer, the wealth of the rich grows greater.

Throughout history there have always been societies where the poor and weak were down trodden where only material things were important, and where selfishness, self-interest, and cheating were seen as the only way to become rich. But from the second half of the 19th century people with such views entered a very different period. For the last 150 years people and societies which possess this ruthless make-up have begun not to be condemned or criticized like the others. Behavior of this sort began at last to be accepted as a law of nature.

Robert E. D. Clark explains the situation this way:

Evolution, in short, gave the doer of evil a respite from his conscience. The most unscrupulous behavior towards a competitor could not be rationalized; evil could be called good.

As we have seen, lack of religion and the Darwinism which inspired it lay behind all the people, system, and ideologies which have brought worry, difficulty, pain, and hopelessness to the world particularly in the last 150 years. Those who thought that they could protect their own interests saw Darwinism as a savior for themselves.

They were not aware of it, but these people who thought they were preparing a great trap for all mankind, actually prepared it for themselves. Because no matter how much they struggle to survive, there is actually one Judge, one Lord, and one Master, whether of themselves, of the whole world, of everything they try to possess. Allah is the one Judge and Power. The wealth, strength, and power which a human being thinks he gains by himself are actually given to him by Allah . No matter how much he may believe that he is in an arena of struggle, in actual fact every human being is living a test set by Allah for himself. Allah reveals in a holy verse that he tries human beings by means of the opportunities he gives them:

We made everything on the earth adornment for it so that We could test them to see whose actions are the best.
(Surat al-Kahf: 7)

Those who think that they have won what they possess as the result of a “fight for survival” will feel a heart-rending pain for which there is no compensation, and great sorrow when they come face to face with reality in the hereafter and see what an empty idea they followed:

The Companions of the Garden will call out to the Companions of the Fire, ‘We have found that what our Lord promised us is true. Have you found that what your Lord promised you is true?’ They will say, ‘Yes, we have!’ Between them a herald will proclaim: ‘May the curse of Allah be on the wrongdoers those who bar access to the Way of Allah, desiring to make it crooked, and reject the hereafter.’.... The Companions of the Ramparts will call out to men they recognize by their mark, saying,

‘What you amassed was of no use to you, nor was your arrogance. (Surat al-A’raf: 44,- 47)

As for those who have not been influenced by Darwinist-capitalist thinking and who have not forgotten the reason for their being in the world and the existence of Allah, they see other human beings as living things created by Allah. As Allah has ordered them, they always treat other human beings pleasantly, feel affection and compassion, and do everything that they possibly can to take away their difficulties and worries.

They always speak the pleasantest words, look after the orphan, help the sick and crippled, and protect and watch after them. People like this avoid sin and keep their duties to Allah as it is revealed in the Qur’an and are the most superior in Allah’s sight: they pay no attention to wealth, race, color, class, ideology, or philosophy.

It is an economic system under which the ownership of the means of production is concentrated in the hands of a class consisting of only a minor section of society, and under which there is a property-less class for whom the sale of their labour power, as a commodity is the only source of livelihood. It is not necessity coincidental with free enterprise, in the nineteenth century, especially in England the new factories repeatedly demanded free access to markets and to labour supplies, but by the beginning of the twentieth century there was a tendency towards monopolies in different industries and a growing demand for state protection against foreign competition. Under capitalism as has been defined above, the means of production and the apparatus of distribution are controlled by private owners who own them at their discretion, driven by an urge for profit. Such a system has often been attacked by social reformers, who aim to development of economic mechanism where the driving principle

being not individual profit rather but public welfare. Historically it has been observed that there is a inward tendency in capitalism which leads to ever larger concentrations of capital, the stronger enterprises ousting or absorbing the weaker ones, until a limited number of trusts, combines, and banks virtually controls a nation's economic life. Thus the liberal free-competition of capitalism of former times peruses into modern monopolist capitalism, the chromos companies and enterprises are being run along with bureaucratic lines. They are controlled by their senior executives rather than by their owners, the share holder, who have no interest in the businesses other than as reliable sums of dividends. This development is sometimes called as the managerial Revolution-Free-Competition, gradually replaced by large combines as groups, which do a great deal of planning.

In this regard it would be appropriate to discuss the poverty level in Rich or Industrialized countries not to speak of the evil effect of capitalism in poor countries the poverty.

Poverty in industrialized nations is a very important issues which is not referred to by the main stream economists, while many poor. in wealthy countries may not be in absolute poverty as the many poor people in developing countries, the relative poverty and high inequality in many wealthy nations creates significant issues.

The gap between rich and poor has grown in more than three quarters of rich countries since the mid 1980s, according to a study of income inequality and poverty by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) released in October 2008. In addition the study finds that the economic growth of recent decades has benefited the rich more than the poor. However, amongst 30 countries the results are mixed. The study finds, for example, that the past five years saw growing poverty are in equality

in two-thirds of OECD countries, Canada, Germany, Norway and The United States are the most affected. The remaining third-particularly Greece, Mexico, and The United Kingdom have seen a shrinking gap between rich and poor since 2000. As summarized by an OECD briefing the income of the richest 10% of people is on average across OECD countries nearly nine times that of the poorest 20%.

The average hides large variations, for example among the top 3 countries with the highest income gaps are:

1. Mexico where the richest have incomes more than 25 times those of the poorest.
2. Turkey where the ratio is 17 to 1.
3. U.S.A where the ratio is 16 to 1.

Portugal and Poland also have large gaps, making it the top 5, but their gaps are not as large as those first three (For many years the U.S was regarded as having the largest gap between rich and poor of any industrialized nations, but the group of industrialized nations has slightly grown since to include Mexico and Turkey also as the poorest OECD countries amongst other.)

In Nordic countries, however, such as Denmark, Sweden and Finland the gap is much smaller. The incomes of the richest 10% average around five times those of the poorest 10% (Are we growing unequal? OECD Briefing October 2008, P2)

Although the elderly are more likely to be poor the risk of them falling into poverty has reduced over the last two decades such that " People aged 66-75 are now no more likely to be poor as the population as a whole worryingly however, " children and young adults have poverty rates that are now around 25% higher than the population average, while they were below or close to that average

20 years ago (from Are We Growing Unequal? OECD Briefing October, 2008 P4)

Andrew Simms, Policy director of the Now Economics Foundation in an article mentioned about unequally rates that:

Crime and unhappiness stack unequal societies. In the U.K the bottom 50% of the population now owns only 1% of the wealth in 1976 owned 12%. Our economic system's incentive structure instead of "trickle down" is causing a flood up of resources from poor to the rich. Inequality leads to instability, the last thing the country or world needs now. Even the former hard line conservative head of the International Monetary Fund, Michel Cumdessus has come to the conclusion that "the widening gaps between rich and poor within nations" is "morally outrageous economically wasteful, potentially socially explosive". (Andrew Simms, Now for a Maximum Wage. The Guardian, August 6, 2003.)

United States had 60 billionaires and 31.5 million people living below the official poverty line. A decade later, the United States has 268 billionaires and 34.5 million people living below the poverty line about \$13,000 for a three-person family.

In the United States wealth is highly concentrated in a relatively few hands. As of 2007 the top% of household (the upper clan) owned 34.6 of all privately held wealth, an the next 19% (managerial, professional and small business stratum) had 50.5% which means that just 20% of the people owned remarkable 85% learning only 15% of the wealth for the bottom 80% (wage and salary workers). In terms of financial wealth (total net worth minus the value of one's home) the top% of household had an even greater share 42.7%. (Prof William Domhoff, Wealth, Income, and Power. Who Rules America, University of California, South Cruli last updated July, 2010. These facts and figures and statements by independent research

organization and researchers, professors and Journalists' viewpoint and comments would suffice to understand the real truth about capitalism.

6) **Democracy:** Democracy is a form of government in which all eligible citizens have an equal say in the decisions that affect their lives. It allows eligible citizens to participate equally-either directly or through elected representatives in the proposal, development and creation of law. It encompasses social, economic and cultural conditions that enable the free and equal practice of political self determination. The term originates from the Greek 'Demos' means people 'Kratos' "power" or "rule". In the 5th century BCE to denote the political systems then existing in Greek city states, notably Athens the term was used in an antonym to rule of an elite. While theoretically these definitions are in opposition in practice the definitions has been blurred historically. The political system of classical Athens for example, granted democratic citizenship to an elite class of the men and excluded slaves and woman from political participation. In virtually all democratic governments through ancient and modern history, democratic citizenship consisted of an elite class until full enfranchisement was won for all and adult citizens in most modern democracies through the suffrage movements of the 19th and 20th centuries. The English word dates to the century from the older middle French and middle Latin equivalent several variants of democracy exists but there are two basic forms, both of which concern how the whole body of all eligible citizens executes its will. One form of democracy is direct democracy in which all eligible citizens have direct and active participation in the decision making of the government. In most modern democracies the whole body of all eligible citizens remain

the sovereign power but political concept of representative democracy arose largely from ideas and institutions that developed during the European Middle Ages, the Age of Enlightenment and the American and French Revolution. While consensus exists on how to define democracy, equality and freedom have both been identified as important characteristics of democracy since ancient times. These principles are reflected in all eligible citizens being equal before the law and having equal access to legislative process, for example, in a representative democracy, every vote has equal weight no unreasonable restrictions can supply to legitimized rights and liberties which are generally protected by a constitution. One theory holds democracy require three fundamental Principles: 1) upward control i.e. sovereignty residing at the levels of authority 2) political equality and 3) social norms by which individuals and institutions only consider acceptable that reflect the first two principles of upward control and political equality.

The term "democracy" is sometimes used as short hand for liberal democracy which is a variant of representative democracy that may include elements such as political pluralism, equality before the law, the right to petition, elected officials for redress of grievances, due process, civil liberties, human rights and elements of civil society outside the government.

In the United States separation of power is often cited as a control attribute, but in other countries such as the United Kingdom the dominant Principle is that parliamentary sovereignty (while maintaining judicial independence). In other cases "democracy" is used to mean direct democracy. Though the term democracy is typically used in the text of political state. the principles also are applicable to private organizations. Majority rule is often listed as a characteristics of democracy. Hence, democracy allows for political

minorities to be oppressed by the "tyranny of the majority" in the absence of legal protection of individual or group rights. An essential part of an "ideal" representative democracy is competitive elections that are fair both substantively and operationally. Furthermore, freedom of political expression, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press are considered to be essential rights that allow eligible citizens to be adequately informed and able to vote to their own interests.

It has been suggested that a basic feature of democracy is the capacity of all voters to participate freely and fully in the life of their society, with its emphasis on notions of social contract and the collective will of the voters. Democracy can also be characterized as a form of political collectivism because it is defined as a form of government in which all eligible citizens have an equal say in the decisions that affect their lives. While democracy is often equated with the republican form of government, the term "republic" classically has encompassed both democracies and aristocracies. Some democracies have constitutional monarchs, such as the United Kingdom and Japan. Many political thinkers have presented it as an ineffective form of government highly prone to corruption, and take over by radicals and in some portrayals as a form of no rule which tramples on individual rights to appeal to public sentiment.

It can also be presented as a way which does not necessarily approve of other forms of government, but are cynical enough that they consider all forms of governments to be flawed (with the inclusion of no government at all). As Winston Churchill puts it, "democracy is the worst form of government except for all the other methods that have been tried."

Indeed before the Dutch Republic the term "Democracy" was more or less synonymous with "Anarchy" or "Mob Rule" believed by

many to be a utopian idea that could never work in practice and would lead to the collapse of society. The term is rarely used this way today. The main Anarchist critique of Democracy as it exists today is that it is not really democratic at all.

Also they would distinguish between what called "representative" democracy (in their view a small elite leading people by the nose) and participatory or direct democracy in a voluntary form i.e. if you want to live by yourself that's OK too.

As a point of interest a popular but incorrect belief is that most modern governments, being republics are not actually democracies. This is false: The definition of republic is "any form of government which is not a monarchy or theocracy and any system in which a large electorate or its elected representative wield power can legitimately be called democratic. The distinction being made is actually that between direct and representative democracy, the former, in which all issues are discussed by the electorate at large and put to a popular vote, is seen more legitimately by certain strains of political thought, though it is also generally considered impractical on a large scale. Representative democracy relies by contrast on elected agents of the people, whose job it is to draft and vote on laws full time, in theory in accordance with the values of the voters they represent. Both systems have certain weaknesses, but both are democratic by definition.

It also be noted that many modern democracies implement various "checks and balances" specially designed to make it difficult for majorities to change certain things or abridge certain rights. The concept is Tactical Rock-Paper-Scissors applied to government each department has a certain responsibility it's designed for and the others have specific ways to stop them from over stepping their bound. American Federalism for example includes a judicial branch

which is relatively independent of the legislature and possesses extensive power of oversight. The practical application of such measures are left as an extensive power or oversight. The practical applications of such measures are left to the reader.

Islam and Democracy: Islamic democracy refers to a political ideology that seeks to apply Islamic principles to public policy within a democratic framework. In practice, two kinds of Islamic democracies can be recognized in Islamic countries. The basis of this distinction has to do with how comprehensively Islam is incorporated into the affairs of the state.

1. A democratic nation state which recognizes Islam as its state religion and key source of legislation, such as Malaysia or Maldives. Many religious values are incorporated into public life, but Islam is not the only source of law.
2. A democratic state which endeavors to institute Sharia and offers more comprehensive inclusion of Islam into the affairs of the state. States like Iran are firm proponents of this form.

Not all of these states are recognized internationally as democratic under concepts of western liberal democracy. There are also states in the Muslim world which are secular democracies rather than religious democracies.

The concepts of liberalism and democratic participation were already present in the medieval Islamic world. The Rashidun Caliphate was an early example of a democratic state but the development of democracy in the Islamic world eventually came to a halt following to the Sunni-Shia split.

Sunni viewpoint

Deliberations of the Caliphates, most notably the Rashidun Caliphate were not democratic in the modern sense rather, decision-making power lay with a council of notable and trusted companions of Muhammad (SM) and representatives of different tribes (most of them selected or elected within their tribes).

In the early Islamic Caliphate, the head of state, the Caliph, had a position based on the notion of a successor to Muhammad's political authority, who, according to Sunnis, were ideally elected by the people or their representatives, as was the case for the election of Abu Bakar, Uthman and Ali(RA) as Caliph. After the Rashidun Caliphates, later Caliphates during the Islamic Golden Age had a much lesser degree of democratic participation, but since “no one was superior to anyone else except on the basis of piety and virtue” in Islam, and following the example of Muhammad, later Islamic rulers often held public consultations with the people in their affairs. The legislative power of the Caliph (or later, the Sultan) was always restricted by the scholarly class, the ulama, group regarded as the guardians of the law. Since the law came from the legal scholars, this prevented the Caliph from dictating legal results. Laws were decided based on the ijma (consensus) of the Ummah (community), which was most often represented by the legal scholars. In order to qualify as a legal scholar, it was required that they obtain a doctorate known as the ijazat attadris wa 'l-ifttd (“license to teach and issue legal opinions”) from a madrasa. In many ways, classical Islamic law functioned like a constitutional law.

Democratic religious pluralism also existed in classical Islamic law, as the religious laws and courts of other religions, including Christianity, Judaism and Hinduism, were usually accommodated

within the Islamic legal framework, as seen in the early Caliphate, Al-Andalus, Islamic India, and the Ottoman Millet system.

Legal scholar L. Ali Khan argues that Islam is fully compatible with democracy. In his book, *A Theory of Universal Democracy*, Khan provides a critique of liberal democracy and secularism. He presents the concept of “fusion state” in which religion and state are fused. There are no contradictions in God's universe, says Khan. Contradictions represent the limited knowledge that human beings have. According to the Quran and the Sunnah, Muslims are fully capable of preserving spirituality and self-rule.

Furthermore, counter arguments to these points assert that this attitude presuppose democracy as a static system which only embraces a particular type of social and cultural system, namely that of the post-Christian West. See: constitutional theocracy.

Muslim democrats, including Ahmad Moussalli (professor of political science at the American University of Beirut), argue that concepts in the Quran point towards some form of democracy, or at least away from despotism. These concepts include shura (consultation), ijma (consensus), al-hurriyya (freedom), al-huquq al-shar'iyya (legitimate rights). For example shura (Al Imran 3:159, Ash-Shura 42:38) may include electing leaders to represent and govern on the community's behalf. Government by the people is not therefore necessarily incompatible with the rule of Islam, whilst it has also been argued that rule by a religious authority is not the same as rule by a representative of God. This viewpoint, however, is disputed by more traditional Muslims. Moussalli argues that despotic Islamic governments have abused the Quranic concepts for their own ends: “For instance, shura, a doctrine that demands the participation of society in running the affairs of its government, became in reality a doctrine that was manipulated by political and religious elites to

secure their economic, social and political interests at the expense of other segments of society,” (In *Progressive Muslims 2003*).

Much debate occurs on the subject of which Islamic traditions are fixed principles, and which are subject to democratic change, or other forms of modification in view of changing circumstances. Some Muslims allude to an “Islamic” style of democracy which would recognize such distinctions. Another sensitive issue involves the status of monarchs and other leaders, the degree of loyalty which Muslims owe such people, and what to do in case of a conflicting loyalties (e.g., if a monarch disagrees with an imam).

Shia view point

According to the Shia understanding, Muhammad (SM) named as his successor (as leader, with Muhammad being the final prophet), his son-in-law and cousin Ali(RA). Therefore, the first three of the four elected “Rightly Guided” Caliphs recognized by Sunnis (‘Ali being the fourth), are considered usurpers, not with standing their having been “elected” through some sort of councilor deliberation (which the Shias do not accept as a representative of the Muslim society of that time). The largest Shia grouping – the Twelvers branch – recognizes a series of Twelve Imams, the last of which (Muhammad al-Mahdi, the Hidden Imam) is still alive and the Shia are waiting for his reappearance.

Since the revolution in Iran, Twelver Shia political thought has been dominated by the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Khomeini argued that in the absence of the Hidden Imam and other divinely-appointed figures (in whom ultimate political authority rests), Muslims have not only the right, but also the obligation, to establish an “Islamic state.” To that end they must turn to scholars of Islamic law (fiqh) who are qualified to interpret the Quran and the writings of the

imams. Khomeini distinguishes between Conventional Fiqh and Dynamic Fiqh, which he believes to also be necessary.

Khomeini divided the Islamic commandments or Ahkam into three branches:

- the primary commandments
- the secondary commandments and
- the state commandments

This list includes all commandments which relate to public affairs, such as constitutions, social security, insurance, bank, labour law, taxation, elections, congress etc. Some of these codes may not strictly or implicitly pointed out in the Quran and generally in the Sunnah, but should not violate any of the two, unless there’s a collision of rules in which the more important one is given preference (an apparent, but not inherent, violation of a rule). Therefore, Khomeini emphasized that the (elected) Islamic state has absolute right to enact state commandments, even if it (appears as if it) violates the primary or secondary commandments of Islam. This should happen when a more important primary or secondary commandment is in danger because of some limitations.

For example an (elected) Islamic state can ratify (according to some constitutions) mandatory insurance of employees to all employers being Muslim or not even if it violates mutual consent between them. This shows the compatibility of Islam with modern forms of social codes for present and future life, as various countries and nations may have different kinds of constitutions now and may have new ones in future.

Philosophical viewpoint

The early Islamic philosopher, Al-Farabi (c. 872-950), in one of his most notable works *Al-Madina al-Fadila*, theorized an ideal Islamic state which he compared to Plato’s *The Republic*. Al-Farabi departed

from the Platonic view in that he regarded the ideal state to be ruled by the prophet, instead of the philosopher king envisaged by Plato. Al-Farabi argued that the ideal state was the city-state of Medina when it was governed by Muhammad(SM), as its head of state, as he was in direct communion with God whose law was revealed to him. In the absence of the prophet, Al-Farabi considered democracy as the closest to the ideal state, regarding the republican order of the Rashidun Caliphate as an example within early Muslim history. However, he also maintained that it was from democracy that imperfect states emerged, noting how the republican order of the early Islamic Caliphate of the Rashidun caliphs was later replaced by a form of government resembling a monarchy under the Umayyad and Abbasid dynasties.

A thousand years later, the modern Islamic philosopher, Muhammad Iqbal, also viewed the early Islamic Caliphate as being compatible with democracy. He “welcomed the formation of popularly elected legislative assemblies” in the Muslim world as a “return to the original purity of Islam.” He argued that Islam had the “germs of an economic and democratic organization of society”, but that this growth was stunted by the monarchist rule of Umayyad Caliphate, which established the Caliphate as a great Islamic empire but led to political Islamic ideals being “repaganized” and the early Muslims losing sight of the “most important potentialities of their faith.”

Islamic democracy in Practice

Democracy in the Middle East:

Waltz writes that transformations to democracy seemed on the whole to pass by the Islamic Middle East at a time when such transformations were a central theme in other parts of the world, although she does note that, of late, the increasing number of elections being held in the region indicates some form of adoption of

democratic traditions. There are several ideas on the relationship between Islam in the Middle East and democracy. Writing on The Guardian website, Brian Whitaker, the paper’s Middle East editor, argued that there were four major obstacles to democracy in the region: the imperial legacy, oil wealth, the Arab-Israeli conflict and militant or “backward-looking” Islam.

The imperial legacy includes the borders of the modern states themselves and the existence of significant minorities within the states. Acknowledgment of these differences is frequently suppressed usually in the cause of “national unity” and sometimes to obscure the fact that minority elite is controlling the country. Brian Whitaker argues that this leads to the formation of political parties on ethnic, religious or regional divisions, rather than over policy differences. Voting, therefore, becomes an assertion of one’s identity rather than a real choice.

The problem with oil and the wealth it generates is that the states’ rulers have the wealth to remain in power, as they can pay off or repress most potential opponents. Brian Whitaker argues that as there is no need for taxation there is less pressure for representation. Furthermore, Western governments require a stable source of oil and are, therefore, more prone to maintain the status quo, rather than push for reforms which may lead to periods of instability. This can be linked into political economy explanations for the occurrence of authoritarian regimes and lack of democracy in the Middle East. A consequence of the lack of taxation that Whitaker talks of in such renter economies is an inactive civil society. As civil society is seen to be an integral part of democracy it raises doubts over the feasibility of democracy developing in the Middle East in such situations.

Whitaker's third point is that the Arab-Israeli conflict serves as a unifying factor for the countries of the Arab League, and also serves as an excuse for repression by Middle Eastern governments. For example, in March 2004 Sheikh Mohammad Hussein Fadlallah, Lebanon's leading Shia cleric, is reported as saying "We have emergency laws, we have control by the security agencies, we have stagnation of opposition parties, we have the appropriation of political rights – all this in the name of the Arab-Israeli conflict". The West, especially the USA, is also seen as a supporter of Israel, and so it and its institutions, including democracy, are seen by many Muslims as suspect. Khaled Abou El Fadi, a lecturer in Islamic law at the University of California comments "modernity, despite its much scientific advancement, reached Muslims packaged in the ugliness of disempowerment and alienation."

This repression by secularist Arab rulers has led to the growth of radical Islamic movements, as they believe that the institution of an Islamic theocracy will lead to a more just society. However, these groups tend to be very intolerant of alternative views, including the ideas of democracy. Many Muslims who argue that Islam and democracy are compatible live in the West, and are therefore seen as "contaminated" by non-Islamic ideas.

Orientalists scholars offer another viewpoint on the relationship between Islam and democratization in the Middle East. They argue that the compatibility is simply not there between secular democracy and Arab-Islamic culture in the Middle East which has a strong history of undemocratic beliefs and authoritarian power structures. Kedourie, a well known Orientalist scholar, said for example. "to hold simultaneously ideas which are not easily reconcilable argues, then, a deep confusion in the Arab public mind, at least about the meaning of democracy. The confusion is, however, understandable

since the idea of democracy is quite alien to the mind-set of Islam." A view similar to this that understands Islam and democracy to be incompatible because of seemingly irreconcilable differences between Sharia and democratic ideals is also held by some Islamists. However, within Islam there are ideas held by some that believe Islam and democracy in some form are indeed compatible due to the existence of the concept of shura (meaning consultation) in the Quran. Views such as this have been expressed by various thinkers and political activists in the Middle East. They continue to be the subject of controversy, e.g. at the second Dubai Debates, which debated the question "Can Arab and Islamic values be reconciled with democracy?"

Practice

Following the Arab Spring professor, Olivier Roy of the European University Institute in an article in Foreign Policy has described political Islam as "increasingly interdependent" with democracy, such that "neither can now survive without the other".

- The Green Algeria Alliance is an Islamist coalition of political parties, created for the legislative election, 2012 in Algeria. It consists of the Movement of Society for Peace (Hamas), Islamic Renaissance Movement (Ennahda) and the Movement for National Reform (Islah). The alliance is led by Bouguerra Soltani of the Hamas. However, the incumbent coalition, consisting of the FLN of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika and the RND of Prime Minister Ahmed Ouyahia, held on to power after winning a majority of seats and the Islamist parties of the Green Algeria Alliance lost seats in legislative election of 2012.
- Shia Islamist Al Wafaq, Salafi Islamist Al Asalah and Sunni Islamist Al-Menbar Islamic Society are dominant democratic forces in Bahrain.

- During the Bangladesh Liberation War, the Jamaat-e-Islami of Pakistan opposed the independence of Bangladesh, but established itself there as an independent political party, the Bangladesh Jamaat-e-Islami after 1975. The Bangladesh Nationalist Party was the second largest party in the Parliament of Bangladesh and the main opposition party. The BNP promotes a center-right policy combining elements of conservatism, Islamism, nationalism and anti-communism. The party believes that Islam is an integral part of the socio-cultural life of Bangladesh, and favors Islamic principles and cultural views. Since 2000, it has been allied with the Islamic parties Jamaat-e-Islami Bangladesh and Islami Oikya Jote.
- The Party of Democratic Action is the largest political party in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Party of Democratic Action was founded in May 1990 by reformist Islamist Alija Izetbegovic, representing the conservative Bosniaks and other Slavic Muslim population in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the former Yugoslavia.
- In the Egyptian parliament election, 2011-2012, the political parties identified as “Islamist” and “democratic” (the Muslim Brotherhood’s Freedom and Justice Party, Salafist Al-Nour Party and liberal Islamist Al-Wasat Party) won 75% of the total seats. Mohamed Morsi, an Islamist democrat of the Muslim Brotherhood is first democratically elected president of Egypt. But in 2014, the Muslim Brotherhood have been ousted and Military have again took over power through democratic way.
- Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah are two very influential Islamist social movement in Indonesia. National Awakening Party, United Development Party and Prosperous Justice Party are major Indonesian Islamist parties, active in country’s democratic process.
- The Islamic Action Front is Jordan’s Islamist political party and largest democratic political force in country. The IAF’s survival in Jordan is primarily due to its flexibility and less radical approach to politics.
- Hadas or “Islamic Constitutional Movement,” is Kuwait’s Sunni Islamist party and largest group in the National Assembly.
- The Islamic Group is a Sunni Islamist and Hezbollah is a Shia Islamist political party in Lebanon.
- The Justice and Construction Party is the Muslim Brotherhood’s political arm in Libya and the second largest political force in the country. National Forces Alliance, largest political group in country, doesn’t believe the country should be run entirely by Sharia law or secular law, but does hold that Sharia should be “the main inspiration for legislation.” Party leader Jibril has said the NFA is a moderate Islamic movement that recognizes the importance of Islam in political life and favours Sharia as the basis of the law.
- The United Malays National Organization is the dominant party of Malaysia since that country’s independence in 1957. UMNO sees and defines itself as a moderate Islamist, Islamic democratic and social conservative party of Muslim Malays. The Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party is a major opposition party and is relatively more conservative and traditionalist than the UMNO.
- The Justice and Development Party has been the ruling party in Morocco since 29 November 2011. The Justice and Development Party advocates Islamism and Islamic democracy.

- Hamas is the Sunni Islamist organization of Palestine that governs the Gaza Strip with Sharia law. Hamas also has a military resistance wing, the Izz ad-Din al-Qassam Brigades.
- The Muslim Brotherhood of Syria is a Sunni Islamist force in Syria and very loosely affiliated to the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. It has also been called the “dominant group” or “dominant force” in the Arab Spring uprising in Syria. The group’s stated political positions are moderate and in its most recent April 2012 manifesto it “pledges to respect individual rights”, to promote pluralism and democracy.
- The Islamic Renaissance Party of Tajikistan is Tajikistan’s Islamist party and main opposition and democratic force in that country.
- The Ennahda Movement, also known as Renaissance Party or simply Ennahda, is a moderate Islamist political party in Tunisia. On 1 March 2011, after the government of Zine El government granted the group permission to form a political party. Since then it has become the biggest and most well-organized party in Tunisia, so far outdistancing its more secular competitors. In the Tunisian Constituent Assembly election, 2011, the first honest election in the country’s history with a turn out of 51.1% of all eligible voters, the party won 37.04% of the popular vote and 89 (41%) of the 217 assembly seats, far more than any other party.
- The moderate Islamist Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkinma Partisi*) (AKP) headed by Recep Tayyip Erdogan has held power in Turkey since 2002. It has been successful enough to prompt talk of a Turkish model of modern, moderate, liberal and democratic Islamism. This Turkish model of Islamism is hailed as an inspiration by many Arab Islamists after victories of Islamic democratic parties in post-Arab Spring democratic elections.

Pakistan

Early in the history of the state of Pakistan (12 March 1949), a parliamentary resolution (the Objectives Resolution) was adopted in accordance with the vision of the founding fathers of the Pakistan Movement (Muhammad Iqbal, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Liaquat Ali Khan). proclaiming:

Sovereignty belongs to Allah alone but He has delegated it to the State of Pakistan through its people for being exercised within the limits prescribed by Him as a sacred trust.

- The State shall exercise its powers and authority through the elected representatives of the people.
- The principles of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance and social justice, as enunciated by Islam, shall be fully observed.
- Muslim shall be enabled to order their lives in the individual and collective spheres in accordance with the teachings of Islam as set out in the Quran and Sunnah.
- Provision shall be made for the religious minorities to freely profess and practice their religions and develop their cultures.

This resolution later became key source of inspiration for the writers of the Constitution of Pakistan and is included in it as preamble. However, Pakistan is practically an semi-secular state and Islamists and Islamic democratic parties in Pakistan are relatively less influential than democratic Islamists of other Muslim democracies. In 1971 by utter disregarding the Islamic doctrines the military rulers wage a full-fledged war against the Muslims of the then East Pakistan(Now Bangladesh).

Iran

The idea and concept of Islamic democracy has been accepted by many Iranian clerics, scholars and intellectuals. The most notable of those who have accepted the theory of Islamic democracy is probably Iran's Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who mentions Islamic democracy as "Mardomsalarie Dini" in his speeches.

There are also other Iranian scholars who oppose or at least criticize the concept of Islamic democracy. Among the most popular of them are Ayatollah Naser Makarem Shirazi who have written: "If not referring to the people votes would result in accusations of tyranny then it is allowed to accept people vote as a secondary commandment." Also Mohammad-Taqi Mesbah-Yazdi has more or less the same viewpoint.

On the other hand, clergy like Hasan Yousefi Eshkevari believe that: "The obligatory religious commandments in public domain not necessarily imply recognition of religious state. These obligations can be interpreted as the power of Muslims' religious conscience and applying that through civil society". These clergies strictly reject the concept of Islamic state regardless of being democratic or not. They also believe no relationship between Islam and democracy at all, opposing the interpretation of clergy like Ayatollah Makarim al-Shirazi from Islamic state. But they do not mention how legal laws as an example can not be implemented using civil societies and how to administer a country relying on conscience only.

Practice

Some Iranians, including Mohammad Khatami, categorize the Islamic Republic of Iran as a kind of religious democracy. They maintain that Ayatollah Khomeini held the same view as well and

that's why he strongly chose "Jomhoorie Eslami" (Islamic Republic) over "Hokoomate Eslami" (Islamic State).

Others maintain that not only is the Islamic Republic of Iran undemocratic (see Politics of Iran) but that Khomeini himself opposed the principle of democracy in his book Hokumat-e Islami: Wilayat al-Faqih, where he denied the need for any legislative body saying, "no one has the right to legislate ... except ... the Divine Legislator", and during the Islamic Revolution, when he told Iranians, "Do not use this term, 'democratic.' That is the Western style." Although it is in contrast with his commandment to Mehdi Bazargan. It is a subject of lively debate among pro-Islamic Iranian intelligentsia. Also they maintain that Iran's sharia courts, the Islamic Revolutionary Court, blasphemy laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Mutaween (religious police) violate the principles of democratic governance. However, it should be understood that when a democracy is accepted to be Islamic by people, the law of Islam becomes the democratically ratified law of that country. Iranians have ratified the constitution in which the principle rules are explicitly mentioned as the rules of Islam to which other rules should conform.

From the above it is crystal clear that the Muslim states do not or can not indulge in secularism in their political system in any way.

Nationalism

It is a belief system, creed or political ideology that involves a strong identification of a group of individuals with a nation. There are two major perspectives on the origins and basis of nationalism, one is the Primordial Perspective that strives nationalism as a reflection of the ancient and perceived evolutionary tendency of humans to organize into distinct groupings based on and affinity of birth; the other is the modernist perspective that describes nationalism as a recent

Phenomenon that requires structural conditions of the modern society in order to exist. There are various definitions for what constitutes a nation, however, which leads to several different strands of nationalism. It can be a belief that citizenship in a state should be limited to one ethnic, cultural, religious, or identity group or that multi-nationality in a single state should necessarily comprise the right to express and exercise national identity even by minorities. The adoption of national identity in terms of historical developments has commonly been the result of a response by influential groups unsatisfied with traditional identities due to inconsistency between their defined social order and the experience of that social order by its members resulting in a situation of anomic that nationalists seek to resolve. Their anomic results in a society or societies reinterpreting identity, retaining elements that are deemed acceptable and removing elements deemed unacceptable, in order to create unified community. These a development may be the result of internal structural issues or the result of resentment by an existing group(s). Towards powers that are or are deemed to be controlling that.

During the period 1850 to 1871, the nation State achieved its mature status in Europe. Nationalism clearly became the Principal basis for the organization of Western civilization. This fact had earlier been demonstrated in England and in France during the course of their political revolution. In this period it became manifest throughout Europe. Nationalism is a Primary motivating element which determined the course of events in France during the regime of Napoleon III (1808-1873), Italy where unification was achieved in 1866 Germany where unification was achieved in 1870, Russia where important steps towards modernization are taken and the United States which experience the Civil War (1865) a war to Preserve The Union. The reasons why nationalism maintained such a strong hold on people on Europe during the 19th century. For one thing, the great changes of the century had taken place primarily

within the framework of nation states. Their success had depended on the acceptance of common language and loyalties. Industrialism, Scientific advances all were taking places with a national nexus. At the same time nationalism filled many of the spiritual needs of the age. For centuries the peasants of Europe had been guided in their habits by the church. But in the later half of the 19th century millions of peasant left their villages and went to live in Urban environment under entirely new conditions. Generally the 19th century population shift from county to city was accompanied by a decline in the authority of the church. Transplants often left the church back home in the country as the new urban masses Shunned the church and lost faith. These people needed an entity to fill their spiritual void and found that entity in the nation state. Nationalism became a faith (substitute for religious faith) filling a spiritual gap. By the beginning of the 20th century nationalism had become the dominant emotional bend providing Europeans with a sense of community tradition, a set of moral standards and a motivation for politic activity. But faith of nationalism suffers from 3 dangerous side effects: 1) Hatreds among nations 2) An emphases on militarism 3) An attempt to find security through international alliances. All these side effects were all the more perilous because of what the nation state had become each of the three is a partial answer to the question: How was nationalism a cause of world war-1?

The Changing Face of Nationalism

One of the basic problems in a world organized into nations is the fact that each nation is sovereign with unrestricted national sovereignty comes the permanent possibility of international conflict without any international power having the authority to intervene in international disputes, the world by the beginning of the 20th century had become to resemble international anarchy. This potential for anarchy became all the more dangerous in the early 20th century

because of what the nation state had become. Back a couple of centuries ago the nation state had represented mainly the king and the institutions surrounding the king power. But during the 19th century as the spirit of nationalism was sweeping across Europe like wildfire, the nation state become associated with people of the nation. But now if France goes to war against Germany, the result is an out war in which all of France fights all of Germany. So the dictum came “My country right or wrong.”

Secularism in 20th Century

The characteristics of secularism have been so largely modified in the twentieth century that it might appear, at first glance, as if the latter were nothing more than the opposite of the former. This change has arisen from a series of shattering experiences which have profoundly disturbed patterns of behaviour and of belief of social organizations and human hopes. Of these experiences the chief were the First World War, the long drawn out agony of the world depression and the unprecedented violence of destruction of the Second World War.

To people those believed in the doctrine of secularism the innate goodness of man, in evitable progress, in the community of interests and in evil meaning as merely the absence of good, the atrocities of human suffering, millions dead and billions of dollars wasted was a blow so terrible as to be beyond human ability to comprehend.

In contrast with the nineteenth century belief that human nature is innately good and that society is corrupting the twentieth century came to believe that human nature is, if not innately bad, at least capable of being very evil left to himself, it seems, man falls very easily to the level of the jungle or even worse lower, as the Holy Quran says, **“Many are the jinns and men, we have made for hell.**

They have hearts where with they understand not, eyes where with they hear not and ears where with they hear not. They are like ferocious animal, may more misguided for they are heedless (of warning), (Sura Al-Araf-179). This issue has been further clarified in the verse no-46 of the Sura Al-Hajj, it is stated, **“They do not travel through the land, so that their heart minds may thus learn wisdom and their ear may thus learn to heart. Truly it is not the eyes are blind, but the hearts which are in their breasts”.**

And this evil activities of man can be prevented through correct mind set training and the coercive power of the society. Thus man is capable of great evil but society can prevent this. Along this change came the concept of good man and bad society to bad man and good society has appeared as a reaction from optimism to pessimism and from secularism to religion. At the same time the view that evil is merely the absence of good has been replaced with the idea that evil is a very positive force which must be resisted and overcome. The horrors of Hitler concentration camps and Russian neo tsar Stalin's slave labour units were mainly responsible for this change.

Associated with these change are a number of others. The belief that human abilities are innate and should be left free from social duress in order to display themselves had been replaced by the idea that human abilities are result of social training and must be directed to socially acceptable ends. Thus liberalism and laissez-faire are to be replaced apparently by social discipline and planning. The community of interests which would appear of men were merely left to pursue their own desires has been replaced by the fear of social retrogression or even human annihilation. The old march of democracy now yields to the insidious advance of authoritarianism and the individual capitalism of profit motive seems about to be

replaced by the state capitalism of the welfare economy. Science in all sides, is challenged by mysticism, some of which march under the banner of science itself, urbanism has passed its peak and is replaced by sub urbanism or even “flight to the country” nationalism finds its patriotic appeal challenged by appeals to much wider groups of clean, ideological or continental scope. For example nationalism was already evident in England during the period of the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, it raged through France in the period after 1789, it reached Germany and Italy in 1815, it became a potent force in Russia and the Balkans toward the end of the nineteenth century and was noticeable in China, India, Indonesia and even in Africa only in 20th century. Some what similar patterns of diffusion can be found in regard to the spread of democracy of parliamentary government, of liberalism and of secularism. The rule however, is not so general or so simple as it appears at first glance. The exceptions the complications appear more numerous an we approach the twentieth century. Even earlier it was evident that the arrival of the sovereign state did not follow this pattern enlightened despotism and the growth of supreme public authority appearing in Germany and even in Italy, before it appeared in France. Universal free education also appeared in central Europe before it appeared in a western country live England. Socialism also is a product of central Europe rather than of Western Europe and moved from the former to the latter only in the fifth decade of the 20th century. These exceptions to the general rule about the eastward movement of modern historical developments have various explanations. Some of these are obvious, but others are very complicated. As an example of such complication we might mention that in Western Europe nationalism, liberalism and democracy were generally reached in this order. But in Germany they all appeared about the same time.

Application of Secularism in the Society

In secular society no man can disregard Allah and play a man’s part in God’s world. Unfortunately, however, there are many men and their numbers are increasing day by day who in practice live their lives without recognizing that this is world belongs to Allah alone. For most part they do not deny God on formal occasion, they may even mention his name. Not all of them would subscribe to the statement that all moral values desire from merely human conventions. But they fail to bring awareness to their responsibility to Allah into their thought and action as individuals and member of the society. This essence is what we mean by secularism. It is a view of life that limits itself to the material in exclusion of the spiritual, but to the human here and now in exclusion of man’s relation to Allah in this world and hereafter. Secularism or the practical exclusion of Allah from human thinking and living is at the root of the world prevailing today. It was the fertile soil in which such socio- political- economic monstrosities as Fascism, Nazism, Communism could germinate, grow and develop. This doctrine doing more than anything else to blight human heritage, religious culture of every description, which integrates the various aspects of human life and render to Allah, the thing that are Allah’s. Through the centuries religious culture has struggled with man’s inborn inclination to evil. The ideas of true religion specially Islam have never been fully realized. But for that reason these religious ideals can neither be ignored here nor be discarded without doubt, Muslims have miserably failed to meet their responsibilities and by their transgressions have permitted ugly growth to man the institutions of this culture. But whenever despite their lapses, they have held steadfastly to their Islamic ideals, the way to effective reform and progress has been kept open. The remedy for the shortcoming and

sins of the Muslims is surely not to substitute secularism for go liner, human vagaries for divine truth man made expedients for a God given standard of right and wrong. This is God's world and if we are to play a man's part in it, we must first submit our humble hearts to acknowledge Allah's place in this His world. Secularism does not do it.

Impact of Secularism on Individual

Secularism in its impact on the individual blinds him to his responsibilities to Allah. All the rights, all the freedom of man derive originally from the fact that he is a human person created by Allah after His own image and likeness. In this sense he is endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights. Neither reason nor history of fears any other solid ground for man's inalienable rights. It is Allah's creature that man generally and most effectively recognizes a personal responsibility to seek his own moral perfection. Only a keen awareness of personal responsibility to Allah develops in man's soul the saving sense of sin. Without a deep feet conviction (Iman) of what sin is human law and human conventions can never lead man to virtue. If in the privacy of his personal guilt of sin (papa, gunah) before Allah. It takes account of no law above man made law. Expediency, decency and propriety, in its code, the norms of human behaviour. It blurs if it does not bolt out, the ennobling and inspiring picture of man which the Holy Quran and the hadith points out. In religious divination it is stated that man is the most liked creation of Allah and he is endowed with the capability to represent Him (Khalifa, representative) for this he will have to train his body, mind and soul to attain that true status, position and authority. For this reason, self purification that is to do away with the inner evil and develop the virtues set forth by the religion itself. Actually, for this

very reason secularism blights the noblest aspirations in man which religion has implanted, And unfortunately, many who prefer to be religious are touched by this blight of secularism. The greatest moral catastrophe of our age is the growing number of religious people who lack a sense of sin (gunah-papa) because a personal responsibility to Allah-God-Ishvar is not a moving force in their lives. They live in this world which belong to Allah, quite unmindful of Him as their Creator and Redeemer. The vague consciousness of Allah which they may retain is important as a motive in daily conduct. The moral regeneration which is recognized as absolutely necessary for the building of a better world must begin by bringing the individual back to Allah and to an awareness of his responsibility to Allah. This secularism of its very nature is incapable of doing it.

Impact of Secularism on Family

Secularism has brought havoc in the family. Even the uncivilized saw something sacred and spiritual in marriage and family. In all the religions its holiness is so sublime that it is likened to mystical union of the heaven and the earth spiritually. But secularism has debased the marriage contract by robbing it of its relation to Allah and therefore of its sacred character. It has set the will and convenience of husband and wife in the place that pure religious thought gives to will of Allah and the good society it envisages.

A secularized pseudo science has popularized practices which violate nature itself and rob human procreation of its dignity, respect and mobility. Thus selfish pursuit of pleasure, lust, greed, perverted sex have been substituted for salutary self- disciplined and sacred family life. Secularism has completely undermined the stability of the family as a divine institution and has given the world especially the U.S.A and Europe the greatest divorce problem in the world. In

taking away God or Allah the Creator out of family life, it has deprived society basic educational institution of its most powerful means in molding the soul of the new born baby. Public authority and the press are constantly emphasizing our grave problem of juvenile delinquency on all sides it is heart the city that something be done about the problem. Our profound conviction is that nothing much will even be done about it unless we go to the root of the evil and learn the havoc that secularism has brought in the family. If we do not give more attention and thought to the divinely ordained stability of the family and the sanctify of the home all educational and recreational endeavor will go in vain.

The divine design of the human family gave its basic constitution when secularism discards that plan and constitution and hence it destroys the whole social fabric. Artificial family planning on the bases of contraceptive immorality, cynical disregard of the noble purpose of sex, a sixty-fold increase in the world divorce rate during last century and widespread failure of the family to discharge its educational functions are terrible evils which secularism has brought almost all over the globe. Is there any hope of any effective remedy unless people bring the religion back into family life and respect the divine laws, tradition and culture.

Evil Influence of Secularism on Education

In no field of social activity has secularism done more harm than in education. A philosophy of education which omits divine instruction of good and evil, morality, character building, self-purification in rearing children and forming of youth is considered to be most effective method of social control mechanism also a pure, sincere, truth seeking society. Thus the moral teaching of religious philosophy make the pupil considerate, self motivating god fearing,

industrious and noble. Secularism breaks with our historical religious tradition. When parents build and maintain schools, colleges and universities in which their children are trained in the religion of their forefathers, they acting in the full spirit of that tradition. But the secularists would innate the rights of parents and innate state with supreme power in the field of education, they refuse to recognize the God-given place that parents have in education of their children. Our youth problem would not be so grave if the place of Allah in life were emphasized in the rearing of children.

Evil Influence of Secularism in the Field of Work

Economic problem looms large in the social unrest and confusion of our times. The common objective is a beneficent social order that will establish reasonable prosperity, provide families with an adequate income and safeguard public welfare. There is something gravely wrong in the economic system as is envisaged in secularism, with its disregard of Allah and divine law, a potent factor in creating the moral atmosphere which has favored the growth of this evil. Pointedly, indeed an eminent modern economist has drawn attention to the fact that in one hundred and fifty years economic laws were developed and postulated as iron necessities in a world apart from (religious Christian) obligation and sentiment. He adds that the early nineteenth century was full of economic doctrines and practices which grounded in its own necessity and immutability, crossed the dictates of (religious Christian) feeling and teaching with only a limited sense of incongruity and still lot of indignation.

Allah has created man and made him brother of his fellow man. He gave man the earth and all its resources to be used and developed for the good of all. Thus work of whatever sort is a social function and personal profit is not the sole purpose of economic activity. In the

religious tradition, the individual has the right to reasonable compensation for his work, the right to acquire private property and the right to a reasonable income from productive invested capital. Secularism takes god out of economic thinking and thereby minimizes the dignity of the human person endowed by Allah with inalienable rights and made responsible to him for corresponding individual and social duties. Thus to the detriment of man and society the divinely established balance in economic relations is lost. In religious sense the work of man/woman is not a commodity to be bought and sold and economic enterprise is an important social function in which owner, manager and workman/woman co-operate for the of common good. When disregard to his responsibility to Allah makes the owner forget his stewardship and the social function of private property, there comes that irrational economic individualism which brings misery to millions. Helpless workers are exploited, cutthroat competition and antisocial marketing practices follow. When man in labour organizations lose the right, social perspective, which a sense of responsibility to Allah gives, they are prone to seek mercy the victory of their own group in disregard of personal and property rights. The fundamental Islamic view of economic life support the demand for organization of management, labor agriculture and professions under encouragement but not total control in joint effort to avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good. In default of this free cooperation public authority is finally invoked to maintain a measure of economic order but it frequently exceeds the just limits of its power to direct economic activity to the common good. In the extreme case where Marxian communism takes over government, it abolished private ownership and sets up a totalitarian state capitalism which is even more intolerable than the grave evils it pretends to care. Surely

it ought to be plain today that there is no remedy for our economic evils in a return either to nineteenth century individualism or to experiments in Marxism. If we abandon secularism and in our economic thinking in the light of religious truth, we can hopefully work for economic collaboration in the spirit of genuine democracy. Let us be on our guard against all who is exiting Allah by not following the directives of Allah to our so-called maximization of profit and ill payment and treatment towards the worker from the factory and the market place, destroy the solid foundation of brotherhood in ownership in management and in work.

The Evil Impact of Secularism in the International Relation

In the international community there can be only real bond of same common action. The natural law which regards to Allah its Creator, Owner, Administrator and desires from him its sanction. There is objective right and objective wrong in international life. It is true that positive human law which comes from treaties and international conventions is necessary, but even these covenants must be in accord with Allah's given laws. What may seem to be expedient for a nation cannot be tolerated if it contravenes with divine law of right and wrong. In the international community that law has been flouted more openly more widely and more disastrously in the present time than ever before the earlier times. Shocking crime against weak nations are being perpetrated in the name of national security. Millions of men in many nations are in the thrall of political slavery. Religion is persecuted because it stands for freedom the most fundamental human rights are violated with utter ruthlessness in a calculated systemic degradation of man by blind and despotic leaders. Details of the sad and sickening story seep through the wall of censorship which encloses police states. Men long for Peace and

Order, the world stands on the brings chaos. It is significant that irreligious forces brought it there Nazism and Fascism and Japanese militarism lie buried in the debris of fairest cities of the world the vowed to rule the ruin.

Secularism which exits Allah from human life cleans the way for the acceptance of minus Allah, subversive ideologies just as religion, which keeps Allah in human affairs, has been the one outstanding opponent of totalitarian tyranny. Religion has been the first victim, for tyrants, persecute what they bear, thus secularism, as the solvent of practical religious influence in the everyday life of men and nations is not indeed the most patent, but in a very true sense the most insidious hindrance to world reconstruction within the strong frame work of god's natural law, there would be more hope for a just and lasting place of the leaders of the nations were really convinced that secularism which disregard god as well as militant atheism which utterly denies Him offer no sound basic for stable international agreements for enduring respect for human rights or for the freedom under law. It is to be appreciated that the causes of present evils of the existing social disorder does not lie in the true religious belief but rather the misconception, misunderstanding, misinterpreted and misapplication of religion. As such, fact of Allah and the fact of the responsibility of men and nations to Allah for their actions are the supreme realities calling insistently for recognition in a truly realistic ordering of the life in the individual in the family, in the school, in the economic activity and in international community.

The Concept of Secular Religion, Morality and Ethics

Secular religion is the ideas, theories or philosophies that involve no spiritual component yet possess qualities similar to those of a

religion. Such qualities may include elements such as dogma, a system of indoctrination the prescription of an absolute code of conduct, an ideologically tailored creation of story and end times narratives of designated enemies and unquestioning devotion to a higher authority.

In 1936, a protestant priest referred explicitly to communism as a new secular religion. A couple of years later, on the eve of world war II, both Marxism and national socialism as secular religions akin at fundamental level in their authoritarianism and messianic beliefs as well as in their eschatological view of human history, both he considered were waging religious war against the liberal enquiring mind of the European heritage. After the war, the social philosopher, Raymond Aron would expand on the exploration of communism in terms of a secular religion. While AP Taylor, for example would characterize it as a great secular religion the communist manifesto must be counted as a holy book in the clan as the Bible. The Quotations of Mao TSE Tung was also used to be treated as a divine guidance in the pre-Cultural Revolution (1966) in China. The term secular religion often applied today to communal belief systems as for example with the view of love as our post modern secular religion. Paul vitz applied the term to modern psychology in as much it fosters a cult of the self, explicitly calling the self theory ethic this secular religion. Sports has also been considered as a new secular religion particularly with respect to Olympics. For pierre-de-Coubertin founder of the modern Olympic guess, belief in them as a new secular religion was explicit and life long.

Secular ethics is a branch of moral philosophy in which ethics is based solely on human faculties such as logic, reason or moral intuition and not derived from purported supernatural revelation or guidance (which is the source of religious ethics). Secular ethics

comprises any ethical system that does not draw on the supernatural, such as humanism, secularism, liberation and free thinking. The majority of secular moral system accept either the normatively of social contracts, some form of attribution of intrinsic moral value, intuition based deontology or cultural moral relativism. A smaller minority believe that scientific reasoning can reveal moral truth. This is known as science of morality. Secular ethics system can also vary within the societal and cultural norm of a specific time period.

Secularism and Feminism

According to Merriam-Webster dictionary, feminism is defined as the theory of the political economic and the social equality of the sexes. The feminist movement also known as the women's liberation movement has been an on-going battle for the last 100 years. The history of women has been one of submission marriage were arranged and women were expected to be obedient to their husband. Women did not typically work outside of the home and were expected to raise children. Mary Wool Stone Craft was the first feminist when she wrote a book in 1792 A vindication of the Rights of Woman in which she advocated for the social and moral Equality of Sexes. . In 1848 the seventy year fight for the women right to vote began. This fight for equality was latter termed as the first wave of feminism. The second wave began in the sixties and ran through the late 1980. In this women strived to reach a further sense of equality with men and allow women to have greater control over their body and protection from physical abuse.

However, the sexual revolution that began in the late sixties among college-age hippies was reaching mainstream, middle class, even middle aged America. The revolution was recognized by profound shifts in the attitudes on women's sexuality and homosexuality and

the freedom of sexual expression. Writers of Freudian theories such as William Reich and Alfred Kinsey sparked the revolution along with the battle of pornography and the right to free sexual speech and the social movements of the time period contributed to the revolution including the counterculture movement, women's movement and the gay rights movement. The Counterculture contributed to the awareness of radical cultural change that was the social matrix of the sexual revolution. The sexual revolution had shifted how we think about sexuality in two different ways. One way was the development of ideas proceeded from tremendous strides in sex research and technological advances in birth control; but on another level the ideas of the revolution grew out of everyday lives of the men and women who refused to obey the codes of behavior from their parents, resisted the etiquette of polite language, expressed sexual fantasies in media and exploited sexual imagery to sell commodities.

Nisker cites the *San Francisco Oracle*, which described the 1967 Human Be-In as a "spiritual revolution". In the late 1970s and 1980s, newly won sexual freedoms were exploited by big businesses looking to capitalize on a more open society, with the advent of public and hardcore pornography. Historian David Allyn argues that the sexual revolution was a time of "coming out": about premarital sex, masturbation, erotic fantasies, pornography use and sexuality.

Historical Development of Feminism

The sexual revolution can be seen as an outgrowth of a process. Though its roots may be traced back as far as the Enlightenment (Marquis de Sade) and the Victorian era (Algernon Charles Swinburne's scandalous *Poems and Ballads* of 1866). It was a development in the modern world which saw the significant loss of

power by the values of amorality rooted in the Christian tradition and the rise of permissive societies, of attitudes that were accepting of greater freedom and experimentation that spread all over the world and were captured in the concept of "free love".

The sexual revolution was indicated by those who shared the belief of the detrimental impact of sexual repression that was argued by Wilhelm Reich. The counterculture wanted to explore how protection of body and mind can free oneself from the confines of modern America. The sexual revolution of the sixties was an uprising routed in conviction that the erotic should be celebrated as a normal part of life and not repressed by family, industrialized sexual morality and the state. There was an increase of sexual encounters between unmarried adults. Divorce rates were dramatically increasing and marriage rates were significantly decreasing in this time period. The number of unmarried Americans aged twenty to twenty-four more than doubled from 4.3 million in 1960 to 9.7 million in 1976. Men and women sought to reshape marriage by instilling new institutions of open marriage, mate swapping, and swinging and communal sex. There is an introduction of casual sex during the revolution that was never seen or heard before. Americans were gaining a set of relaxed moves and with the contribution of premarital sex on the rise, the development of birth control, and the fact that all sexually transmitted diseases were curable at the time when casual sex between adults was becoming very popular and was truly casual sex.

Role of Mass Media

This mass communication device, along with other media outlets such as radio and magazines, could broadcast information in a matter of seconds to millions of people, while only a few wealthy people would control what millions could watch. Some modern historians

have theorized that these media outlets helped to spread new ideas, which was considered radical. The counterculture of the 1960s was becoming well known through radio, newspapers, TV and other media outlets by the end of the 1960s.

One suggested cause of the 1960s sexual revolution was the development of the birth control pill in 1960, which gave women access to easy and reliable contraception. Another likely cause was a vast improvement in obstetrics, greatly reducing the number of women who die due to child birthing, thus increasing the life expectancy of women.

Other data suggest the "revolution" was more directly influenced by the financial independence gained by many women who entered the workforce during and after World War II, making the revolution more about individual equality rather than biological independence. Many historians, however, feel that one specific cause cannot be selected for this large phenomenon. French feminist writer Simone de Beauvoir was particularly adamant that economic equality greatly contributes to improved gender equality.

Modern Revolutions

The Gay Rights Movement started because the Stonewall Riots of 1969 crystallized a broad grassroots mobilization of the homosexual movement. New gay liberationist gave political meaning to "coming out" by extending the psychological-personal process into public life. During the 50s the most feared thing of the homosexual culture was "coming out", the homosexual culture of the 50s did everything they could to help keep their sexuality a secret from the public and everyone else in their lives, but Alfred Kinsey research on homosexuality proved that 39% of the male population had at least one homosexual experience to orgasm between adolescence and old age. By the gay liberationist making "coming out" public they helped

mobilize people to live full-time as a homosexual, they no longer had to live in secret. Homosexuals could now enjoy sexual relationships and encounters much more often than ever before. They no longer had to sneak around and occasionally receive the sexual attention that they desire or force themselves into a heterosexual relationship in which they had no interest, and was full of lies. The 1970 gay novelist, Brad Gooch, wrote the "Golden Age of Promiscuity" meaning that the gay male community finally had reached a rich culture of "easy sex", "sex without" commitment, obligation or long-term relationships. The gay rights movement was reclamation of cultural, social, and political citizenship through sex and decriminalized gay sex, by removing gay sex as a psychological sickness.

The Women's Movement in the time of the Sexual Revolution helped contribute to redefining women's sexuality, not in the terms of simply pleasing men any longer but instead there was recognition of women's sexual satisfaction and sexual desire. Finally "The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm" by Anne Koedit discovered an understanding of a women's sexual anatomy. The female anatomy was now given some scientific fact and reasoning for how and why women orgasm the way they do instead of Freud's basis of women's vaginal orgasm which was not based on a women's anatomy, but rather upon his "assumptions of women as inferior appendage to man, and her consequent social and psychological role. The women's movement was able to develop lesbian feminism, freedom from heterosexual act, and freedom from reproduction as distillation of feminism during the time of the Sexual Revolution. Feminist Betty Freidan wrote the *Feminine Mystique* in 1963, concerning the many frustrations women had with their lives and with separate spheres, which established a pattern of inequality.

The Industrial Revolution during the nineteenth century and the growth of science and technology, medicine and health care, resulted in better contraceptives being manufactured. Advances in the manufacture, production of rubber made possible the design, production of condoms that could be used by hundreds of millions of men and women to prevent pregnancy at little cost.

Advances in Chemistry, Pharmacology, and Biology, and human Physiology led to the discovery and perfection of the first oral contraceptives also known as "the Pill". Purchasing an aphrodisiac and various sex toys became "normal". Sado-masochism ("S&M") gained popularity, and "no-fault" unilateral divorce became legal and easier to obtain in many countries during the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s.

All these developments took place alongside and combined with an increase in world literacy and decline in religious observance. Old values such as the biblical notion of "be fruitful and multiply" were cast aside as people continued to feel alienated from the past and adopted the lifestyles of modernizing westernized cultures.

Another contribution that helped bring about this modern revolution of sexual freedom were the writings of Herbert Marcuse and Wilhelm Reich, who took the philosophy of Karl Marx and similar philosophers, and mixed together this chant for freedom of sexual rights in modern culture.

When speaking of sexual revolution, historians make a distinction between the first and the second sexual revolution. In the first sexual revolution (1870-1910), Victorian morality lost its universal appeal. However, it did not lead to the rise of a "permissive society". Exemplary for this period is the rise and differentiation in forms of regulating sexuality.

Feminism and Sexual Liberation

Coincided with the Second-wave Feminism or the Women's Liberation Movement initiated in the early 1960s, the sexual

liberation movement was aided with the vast and inexhaustible radical feminist ideologies to explicitly challenge the conventional view on female and queer sexuality. The eradication of sexual objectification of women, and avocation of consensual sexual intimacy for women, as well as the rectification of the normalized and ocentric culture were the main themes associated with sexual liberation from the feminist perspective. Since during the early stages of contemporary feminist movement, women's liberation was often equated with sexual liberation rather than associated with it, and many feminist thinkers believed that assertion of the primacy of sexuality would be a liberatory gesture, thus women were urged to initiate sexual advances, to enjoy sex, to experiment with new relationships, and hence to be sexually free. Therefore, the feminist movements insisted and focused on the sexual liberation for women, both physical and psychological. The appropriation and rightful pursuit of sexual pleasures for women was the core ideology, which subsequently sets the foundation to allow women's independence and insurrection from male dominance and manipulation. Although whether or not sexual freedom should be a feminist issue is currently a much-debated topic, the feminist theory overtly defines itself as the movement for social, political, and economic equality of men and women. Consequently, the feminist movement to end sexual oppression directly contributed to the sexual liberation movements. Furthermore, feminist movements are also accountable to the fight against Sexism. Since sexism is a highly complex notion, it is inefficient to separate the feminist critique toward sexism from its fight against sexual oppression. Thus, the foundational feminist ideals in one of the core theoretical support within the sexual liberation movement, rather than the peripheral. As the feminist movement to end sexual oppression has create a social climate in which lesbians and gay men are no longer oppressed, a climate which their sexual choices are affirmed, a climate that also affirms the freedom of heterosexual practice for women, it enacted the

spiritual liberation in the realm of sex, and served as a vessel to explain and analyze sexual liberation, which is a movement occurred based on much more than the mere liberation of pleasures and desires.

Freudian School

Sigmund Freud of Vienna believed that human behavior was motivated by unconscious drives, primarily by the libido or "Sexual Energy". Freud proposed to study how these unconscious drives were repressed and found expression through other cultural outlets. He called this therapy "psychoanalysis".

While Freud's ideas were ignored and embarrassing to Viennese society, his work provoked a serious challenge to Victorian prudishness by providing the groundwork for the ideas of sex drive and infant sexuality. Freud's theory of psychosexual development proposed a model for the development of sexual orientations and desires; children emerged from the Oedipus complex, a sexual desire towards their parent of the opposite sex.

According to Freud's theory, in the earliest stage of a child's psychosexual development, the oral stage, the mother's breast became the formative source of all later erotic sensation. This new philosophy was the new intellectual and cultural underpinning ideology of the new age of sexual frankness. Nonetheless, much of his research is widely discredited by professionals in the field.

Anarchist Freud scholars Otto Gross and Wilhelm Reich (who famously coined the phrase "Sexual Revolution") developed a sociology of sex in the 1930s.

Nonfiction Sex Manuals

In 1962, Helen Gurley Brown published *Sex and the Single Girl: The Unmarried Women's Guide to Men, Careers, the Apartment, Diet, Fashion, Money and Men*. The title itself would have been unthinkable a decade earlier. (In 1965 she went on to transform *Cosmopolitan* magazine into a life manual for young career women.

In 1969 Joan Garrity, identifying herself only as "J", published *The Way to Become the Sensuous Women*, with information on exercises to improve the dexterity of one's tongue and how to have anal sex.

The same year saw the appearance of Dr. David Reuben's book *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex (But Were Afraid to Ask)*. Despite the dignity of Reuben's medical credentials, this book was light-hearted in tone. For many readers, it delivered quite literally on its promise. Despite the book's one-sided and prejudiced statements about gay men, one middle-aged matron from a small town in Wisconsin was heard to say "Until I read this book, I never actually knew precisely what it was that homosexuals *did*".

In 1970 the Boston Women's Health Collective published *Women and Their Bodies* (which became far better known a year later under its subsequent title *Our Bodies, Ourselves*). Not an erotic treatise or sex manual, the book nevertheless included frank descriptions of sexuality, and contained illustrations that could have caused legal problems just a few years earlier.

Alex Comfort's *The Joy of Sex: A Gourmet Guide to Love Making* in 1972. In later editions though, Comfort's libertinism was tamed as a response to AIDS.

In 1975 Will McBride's *Zeig Mal!* (Show Me!), written with psychologist Helga Fleichhauer-Hardt for children and their parents, appeared in bookstores on both sides of the Atlantic. Appreciated by many parents for its frank depiction of pre-adolescents discovering

and exploring their sexuality, it scandalized others and eventually it was pulled from circulation in the United States and some other countries. It was followed up in 1989 by *Zeig Mal Mehr!* ("Show Me More!").

These books had a number of things in common. They were factual and, in fact, educational. They were available to a mainstream readership. They were stacked high on the tables of discount bookstores, they were book club selections, and their authors were guests on late-night talk shows. People were seen reading them in public.

In a respectable petty bourgeois middle-class home, *Playboy* magazine and *Fanny Hill* might be present but would usually be kept out of sight. But at least some of these books might well be on the coffee table. Most important, all of these books acknowledged and celebrated the conscious cultivation of erotic pleasure.

The contribution of such books to the sexual revolution cannot be overstated. Earlier books such as *What Every Girl Should Know* (Margaret Sanger, 1920) and *A Marriage Manual* (Hannah and Abraham Stone, 1939) had broken the silence in which many people, women in particular, had grown up in.

By the 1950s, in the United States, it had become rare for women to go into their wedding nights not knowing what to expect. But the open discussion of sex as pleasure, and descriptions of sexual practices and techniques, was revolutionary. There were practices which, perhaps, some had heard of. But many adults did not know for sure whether they were realities, or fantasies found only in pornographic books.

Were they "normal", or were they examples of psychopathology? (When we use words such as *fellatio* we are still using the terminology of Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathic Sexualize*). Did married

ladies do these, or only prostitutes? The Kinsey report revealed that these practices were, at the very least, surprisingly frequent. These other books asserted, in the words of a 1980 book by Dr. Irene Kassorla, that *Nice Girls Do - And Now You Can Too*.

Secularism and Contraception

As birth control became widely accessible, men and women began to have more choice in over the matter of having children than ever before. The 1916 invention of thin, disposable latex condoms for men led to widespread affordable condoms by the 1930s; the demise of the Comstock laws in 1936 set the stage for promotion of available effective contraceptives such as the diaphragm and cervical cap; the 1960s introduction of the IUD and oral contraceptives for women gave a sense of freedom from barrier contraception. The opposition of Churches (e.g. Humane Vitae) led to parallel movements of secularization and exile from religion. Women gained much greater access to birth control in the "girl's world" decision in 1965, in the 1960s and 1970s the birth control movement advocated for the legalization of abortion and large scale education campaigns about contraception by governments.

United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom, the new generation growing up after World War II had grown tired of the rationing and austerity of the 1940s and the Victorian values of their elders, so the 1960s were a time of rebellion against the fashions and social moves of the previous generation.

An early inkling of changing attitudes came in 1960, when the government of the day tried unsuccessfully to prosecute Penguin Books for obscenity, for publishing the D. H. Lawrence novel *Lady*

Chatterley's Lover, which had been banned since the 1920s for what was considered racy content. The prosecution counsel Mervyn Griffith-Jones famously stood in front of the jury and asked, in his closing statement: "Is it a book you would wish your wife or servants to read?" When case collapsed, the novel went on to become a bestseller, selling two million copies.

The Pill became available free of charge on the National Health Service in the 1960s, at first restricted to married women, but early in the 1970s its availability was extended to all women.

In 1967 laws prohibiting abortion and homosexuality were repealed.

Free love/Sex

Beginning in San Francisco in the mid-1960s, a new culture of "free love" emerged, with thousands of young people becoming "hippies" who preached the power of love and the beauty of sex as part of ordinary life. This is part of a counterculture that continues to exist. By the 1970s, it was socially acceptable for colleges to permit co-ed housing.

Free love continued in different forms throughout the 1970s and into the early 1980s, but its more assertive manifestations ended abruptly (or at least disappeared from public view) in the mid-1980s when the public first became aware of AIDS, a deadly sexually transmitted disease.

Explicit sex on screen

Swedish filmmakers like Ingmar Bergman and Vilgot Sjöman contributed to sexual liberation with sexually themed films that challenged conservative international standards. The 1951 film *Hon dansade en sommar* (*She Danced a Summer* AKA *One Summer of*

Happiness) starring Ulla Jacobsson and Folke Sundquist was notable in this regard for depicting explicit nudity.

This film, as well as Bergman's *Sommaren med Monika* (*The Summer with Monika*), caused an international uproar, not least in the United States, where the films were charged with violating standards of decency. Vilgot Sjoman's film *I Am Curious (Yellow)*, also created an international uproar, but it was very popular in the United States. Another of his films, *491*, highlighted homosexuality among other things. *Karlekens språk* (*The Language of Love*) was an informative documentary about sex and sexual techniques that featured the first real act of sex in a mainstream film, and inevitably it caused intense debate around the world.

From these films the concept of the "Swedish sin" (licentiousness) developed, even though Swedish society was at the time still fairly conservative regarding sex, and the international concept of Swedish sexuality was and is largely exaggerated. The image of "hot love and cold people" emerged. Sexual liberalism was seen as part of the modernization process that by breaking down traditional borders would lead to the emancipation of natural forces and desires. These films caused debate there as well. The films eventually progressed the public's attitude toward sex, especially in Sweden and other northern European countries, which today tend to be more sexually liberal than others.

Explicit sex on screen and frontal nudity of men and women of stage became acceptable in many Western countries, as the twentieth century ended. Special places of entertainment offering striptease and lap dancing proliferated. The famous Playboy Bunnies set a trend. Men came to be entertained by topless women at night-clubs which also hosted "peep shows".

Normalization of Pornography

Sexual character is closely linked with developments in technology, and pornography was a new technology in the time of the sexual revolution. Pornography operated as a form or "cultural critique" insofar as it transgresses societal conventions. Manuel Castells claims that the online communities, which emerged in 1970s, and 1980s around early bulletin board systems originated in the counterculture movements and alternative way of life emerging out of the sexual revolution.

Lynn Hunt points out that early modern "pornography" is marked by a "preponderance of female narrators", that the women were portrayed as independent, determined, financially successful and scornful of the new ideals of female virtue and domesticity, and not objectifications of women's bodies as many view pornography today. The sexual revolution was not unprecedented in identifying sex as a site of political potential and social culture. It was suggested during the sexual revolution that the interchangeability of bodies within pornography had radical implications for gender differences and that they could lose their meaning or at least redefine the meaning of gender roles and norms. Porn had portrayed sexual honesty and bluntly in fiction, on stage and in movies. It could reinforce the crudest stereotypes of sex roles, standards of beauty, and power dynamics or contribution in the education of desire.

In 1971 *Playboy* added pubic hair to its centerfolds in 1971, this new addition to *Playboy* caused the magazine to hit all-time peak circulation of more than seven million copies in 1972 and men started having more choices when it came to magazines.

In 1972 *Deep Throat*, became something of a date movie, being kind of a kinky-wink-wink-let's-check-it-out entertainment for

heterosexual couples. The movie played all over America and was the first porn movie to earn a gross of a million dollars.

The fact that pornography was less stigmatized by the end of the 1980s, and more mainstream movies depicted sexual intercourse as entertainment, was indicative of how normalized sexual revolution had become in society. Magazines depicting nudity, such as the popular *Playboy* and *Penthouse* magazines, won some acceptance as mainstream journals, in which public figures felt safe expressing their fantasies.

Feminists have had mixed responses to pornography. Some figures in the feminist movement, such as Andrea Dworkin, challenged the depiction of women as objects in these pornographic magazines. Other feminists such as Betty Dodson went on to found pro-sex feminist movement in response to anti-pornography campaigns.

Premarital Sex

Premarital sex, which had been heavily stigmatized for some time became more widely accepted during the sexual revolution. The increased availability of birth control (and the quasi-legalization of abortion in some places) helped reduce the chance that pre-marital sex would result in unwanted children. By the mid-1970s the majority of newly married American couples had experienced sex before marriage.

The central part of the sexual revolution was the development of relationships between unmarried adults, which resulted in earlier sexual experimentation reinforced by a later age of marriage. The counterculture and the new left was the source of this later age of marriage. Americans were attending colleges and rebelling against their parent's ideals, which caused them to marry later in age if at all. Therefore meaning that Americans were becoming more sexually

experienced before they entered into monogamous relationships. The increasing divorce rate and the decreasing stigma attached to divorce during this era also contributed to sexual experimentation. By 1971, more than 75% of America thought that premarital sex was okay, a threefold increase from the 50s, and the number of unmarried Americans aged twenty to twenty-four more than doubled from 1960 to 1976. Americans were becoming less and less interested in getting married and setting down; less interested in monogamous relationships, 35% of the country in 1971 thought marriage was obsolete.

The idea of marriage being out-of-date came from the new development of casual sex between Americans. It's hard to image for those who weren't there to experience how risk-free sex was during the 60s and 70s, casual sex could truly be casual. With the development of the birth control pill, and the legalization of abortion in 1973 there wasn't a threat of unwanted children out of wedlock. Also during this time every sexually transmitted disease was treatable, there was no incurable STDs, no AIDS.

Swinger clubs were organizing in places ranging from the informal suburban homo to disco-sized emporiums that promised a smorgasbord of sexual possibilities and free mouthwash. In New York City in 1977, Larry Levenson opened Plato's Retreat it was probably the closet heterosexual America has ever gotten to the sexual frenzy of gay bathhouses. The retreat was eventually shutdown in 1985 because of the constant hassle from public health authorities.

Politics of Sex

Politics in the United States has become intertwined with sexually related issues, called the "politics of sex". A differing view of abortion pitted pro-life activists against pro-choice activists.

Women and men who lived with each other without marriage sought "palimony" equal to the alimony. Teenagers assumed their right to a sexual life with whomever they pleased, and bathers fought to be topless or nude at beaches.

25 Signs American Women Are Being Destroyed By The Sexual Revolution And Our Promiscuous Culture

Michael Snyder

American Dream

Jan 22, 2013

Has the sexual revolution been good for American women? Not at all. In fact, when you look at the facts it becomes clear that the sexual revolution has been an absolute disaster for American women. In the United States today, men have been trained to primarily view women as sex objects, and our culture has become exceedingly promiscuous. As a result, the United States leads the world in teen pregnancy, there are 19 million new STD infections every single year, more than half of all children born to women under the age of 30 are being born out of wedlock and we are witnessing the systematic breakdown of the family unit in America. And yet anyone tries to teach our young women that they should dress modestly and keep themselves pure for marriage is severely criticized. Well, if all Americans actually did keep themselves pure until marriage, we wouldn't have nearly the problems with STDs, teen pregnancy and abortion that we do today. The consequences of

teaching our young women that they should be "free" to run around and sleep with a whole bunch of different men have been dramatic. The following are 25 signs that American women are being destroyed by the sexual revolution and our promiscuous culture...

There are 19 million new STD infections in the United States **every single year**. Approximately half of them happen to young people in the 15 to 24-year-old age bracket.

It costs the U.S. health care system approximately \$17,000,000,000 every single year to treat sexually transmitted diseases.

There were more than 1.4 million cases of Chlamydia reported in the United States in 2011. An astounding 33 percent of those cases involved Americans that were younger than 20 years of age.

It is estimated that about out of every six Americans between the ages of 14 and 49 have genital herpes.

24,000 American women become infertile each year due to undiagnosed STDs.

In the United States today, approximately 47 percent of all high school students have had sex.

Sadly, one out of every four teen girls in the U.S. has at least one sexually transmitted disease.

According to one survey, 24 percent of all U.S. teens that have STDs say that they still have unprotected sex.

Amazingly, one out of every five teen girls in the U.S. actually wants to be a teenage mother.

If you can believe it, the United States has the highest teen pregnancy rate on the entire planet. In fact, the United States has a teen pregnancy rate that is more than twice as high as Canada, more than three times as high as France and more than seven times as high as Japan.

When men don't have to wait until they get married to have sex, then they are likely to delay marriage or never get married at all. According to the Pew Research Center, only 51 percent of all Americans that are at least 18 years old are currently married. Back in 1960, 72 percent of all U.S. adults were married.

Today, an all-time low 44.2 percent of all Americans between the ages of 25 and 34 are married.

In the United States today, more than half of all couples "move in together" before they get married.

The divorce rate for couples that live together first is significantly higher than for those that do not.

American has the highest divorce rate on the globe by a wide margin.

For women under the age of 30 living in the United States today, more than half of all babies are being born out of wedlock.

At this point, more than one out of every four children in the United States is being raised by a single parent.

Approximately 42 percent of all single mothers in the United States are on food stamps.

The sexual revolution has caused women to be primarily looked at as sex objects. In this kind of environment, it should be no surprise that there has been an absolute explosion of pornography in recent years. An astounding 30 percent of all Internet traffic now goes to pornography websites, and the U.S. produces more pornography than any other nation has in the history of the world.

One survey discovered that 25 percent of all employees that have Internet access in America visit sex websites while they are at work.

Overall, more than 50 million babies have been killed in America since Roe v. Wade was decided in 1973.

When you total up all forms of abortion, including those caused by the abortion drug RU 486, the grand total comes to more than a million abortions performed in the United States every single year.

The number of American babies killed by abortion **each year is roughly equal** to the number of U.S. military deaths that have occurred in all of wars that the United States has ever been involved in **combined**.

It has been reported that a staggering 41 percent of all New York City pregnancies end in abortion.

One study found that 86 percent of all abortions are done for the sake of convenience.

So what can be done about any of this?

Unfortunately, turning our culture around would not be an easy thing. Loose sexuality is glorified on television, in the movies, on our radios and in our magazines. Just about everywhere you turn there are very powerful sexual images. The following is an excerpt from a recent article by Devvy Kidd...

America's culture has come a long way since the 60s. For decades it has resembled a filthy sewer and shows no signs of returning to decency. Children are being sexualized with markets targeting little girls as young as kindergarten age. Cable television (which includes ABC, CBS, NBC) has become nothing more than a purveyor of soft porn. Sexual imagery is everywhere. The filth used to be confined to porn channels like HBO, Cinemax and others which I have never had in my home. Now, it's the 'big three' (ABC, CBS, NBC) and all the other networks that consistently pump sin and sex into households every night of the week.

Meanwhile, we have raised an entire generation of young males that don't know how to be men. Our culture has taught them to be extremely hesitant to be husbands and fathers, and instead it has taught them to be sex-obsessed idiots that want to "score" with as many women as possible.

As long as our culture pushes these values, we will continue to suffer the kinds of consequences listed above.

Secularism and The Devil's Work: Feminism and the Elite Depopulation Agenda

February 20, 2002

by **Henry Makow, Ph.D.**

As my readers know by now, I believe the world has for the last hundred years or more been in the grips of a conspiracy by an ultra rich elite whose goal is nothing less than the destruction of civilization, as we know it. I believe we are in the advanced stage of a gradual decline into a "New World Order" which combines monopoly capitalism with communist totalitarianism.

Believe me, this is an argument I would be delighted to lose.

We have been conditioned of scoff at the mention of conspiracy (<http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/shaffer8.html>) The idea that people might plan something without telling the intended victims is much too farfetched! Nor would they ever disguise their aim! My purpose is not to convert you to my view. Rather, I want you to seek information that either confirms or refutes it.

We are like the passengers on a bus that keeps having "accidents" which cause untold death and suffering. These are wars, depressions and epidemics etc. We have just completed the bloodiest century in human history: Auschwitz, Dresden, Ruanda, Hiroshima, Cambodia. Over a hundred million people were murdered, and that's not counting abortions.

We keep changing the 'driver' but the accidents do not cease. This is because the drivers all take their orders from the same diabolical source.

Because the human race keeps running off the road, we are not reaching our destination. The road is God's plan. For Christians, this is Jesus' Gospel of Love. The destination: to know God. Mankind evolved for this purpose. God wishes to be known by His Creation.

Our purpose is to know ourselves to be Divine. God is the principle of our evolution, both personal and collective. Truth and Goodness are Absolutes: they are God. All great religions teach us to listen for God's voice and obey it.

When we deny the existence of God, we are denying the principle of our own evolution and stunting our development. When we deny God, we deny ourselves. When we deny man's divinity, we open the door for genocide.

A reader "Pat" wrote last week that he has "a hard time believing that a group of elites could agree on anything, let alone a far reaching evil agenda...[It] seems like the process of achieving this agenda is too slow for any bad people...requires too much flawless, seamless, secretive, cooperation...The only entity with that kind of and patience with that kind of plan and patience would have to be the devil himself, wouldn't it?"

I replied that he was on something. At the beginning of the 20th Century, huge fortunes were built by monopoly capitalists like J.P. Morgan and J.D. Rockefeller. The "D" stands for "devil." What is monopoly but the desire to "have it all," and to drive everyone else out of existence. Evil is the spiritual cancer that seeks to "fulfill" itself not in God, but in limitless material acquisition and sensual excess.

It was not a large leap for a J.D. Rockefeller to go from owning the oil Industry, the pharmaceutical Industry, the banking Industry etc. to wanting to own the whole world. This is the reason that Rockefeller and his foundation have been in the forefront of the population

"control" and eugenics movement (<http://www.thinkaboutit.com/Omega/files/omega29.htm>). Ultimately the goal is to reduce the earth's population for the simple warped reason that the less there is for you and me, the more there will be for J.D. and his cronies(<http://www.radioliberty.com/pca.htm>).

The elite just loves birth control. Warren Buffet, Bill Gates, Ted Turner are among the ultra rich that have donated billions to spreading the gospel of contraception, abortion, and feminism using the United Nations and "US Aid." Rockefeller funded the invention of the pill, the IUD and owns the rights to the abortion drug RU-486 (<http://www.iahf.com/other/20000929.html>). In the last 50 years, billions of public dollars have been spent on "family planning" designed to limit population by deceit and coercion, including compulsory abortion and infanticide. In "The War Against Population (1988)," DC listed 92 private (but mostly publicly funded) agencies, 12 United Nations and 57 agencies of the US government (p, 198). "The real problem of government family planning is not one of families out of control but of planners out of control," she wrote (p, 211).

For the same reason, the Elite is behind "Sexual Liberation" and "Gay Liberation." Through funding and media control, they make us regard sex as a recreation/physical release rather than as the expression of a spiritual bond (i.e. a loving marriage) resulting in children.

The Elite modus operandi is to finance and promote disgruntled minorities in order to destabilize and undermine the world. Feminism is a prime example. It pretends to be about giving women equal opportunity in the workplace when in fact it is devoted to discouraging women from seeking fulfillment in motherhood.

In the Bible of modern feminism, "The Feminine Mystique" (1963) Betty Friedan makes this obscene comparison between housewives and Nazi concentration camp inmates:

"They were reduced to childlike preoccupation with food, elimination, the satisfaction of primitive bodily needs: they had no privacy, and no stimulation from the outside world. But above all, they were forced to spend their days in work which produced great fatigue...required no mental concentration, gave no hope of advancement or recognition, was sometimes senseless, and was controlled by the needs of others..."(306)

Clearly Friedan is talking about mothers. Comparing the nurturing of their children to the brutal slavery and poisoning of Auschwitz inmates is psychological warfare of the most vicious kind. Friedan, who hid the fact that she was a paid Communist activist (<http://www.savethemales.ca/150801.html>), should have been denounced as a hate monger. Instead she was celebrated as the new oracle and received honorary degrees and fellowships at Harvard, Yale and Columbia. Saturday Review called her book "a scholarly work, appropriate for serious study" and anthropologist Ashley Montagu said it was "the wisest, sanest, soundest, most understanding and compassionate treatment of American woman's greatest problem."

Do we need further proof that the world is one-horse company town, and J.D. and his cabal own the company? They decide which politicians, universities and academics get funding, which books get published and reviewed, which movies get made. We are condemned to look into mirrors that don't reflect reality. That's why we are so skeptical of conspiracy. That's why most people on this web site don't get published. On the other hand, Eve Eisler is reading her pornographic play "The Vagina Monologues" on HBO this month.

This "play," which features women looking at their genitals with hand mirrors and describing steamy scenes of lesbian sex with minors, masquerades as feminist empowerment (<http://www.savethemales.ca/241001.html>). In fact, it is an invitation to lesbianism.

Feminism fits the elite's depopulation agenda. Since 1963, when "The Feminine Mystique" was published we have experienced an unprecedented breakdown in the family. More than half of all children are now born out of wedlock; the number of single parent households has tripled. In "The Broken Hearth," William Bennett writes: "Most of our social pathologies, crime, imprisonment rates, welfare, educational underachievement, alcohol, and drug abuse, suicide, depression, STD's, are manifestations, direct and indirect, of the crackup of the American family (p.4)."

We are now suffering from underpopulation. (<http://www.pop.org/briefings/robpoor.htm>) The US birthrate has been cut from 4 to 2 children per woman, the European and Canadian is 1.5. (We need 2.2 just for replacement.) Russia (1.17 children) will see its population plummet from 145 million to 115 million by 2015. In the "Death of the West," Pat Buchanan argues that population decline is responsible for the inevitable extinction of the West.

Reproduction requires the most delicate care. In the case of human beings, the female must be prepared for motherhood and honored for her contribution to society. The male must be shown that the standard of manhood is to provide leadership and sustenance for mother and children. Both mother and father must be able to give their children intellectual and spiritual guidance.

Instead, in schools and universities, the tender shoots of feminine sexuality are crushed under the feminist jackboot. Young women are taught that heterosexual sex, marriage and family are inherently

oppressive. Homosexuality on the other hand is an act of rebellion that is "chic" and "normal."

Frieden's comparison of mothers with the concentration camp inmates is pertinent. Betty Frieden, agent of the elite cabal, has put mothers in the concentration camp. Mother!?! The ultimate aim is genocide (<http://www.conceptual.net.au/%Ejackc/depopulation.htm>). The Elite want the world's population to be much smaller. Can there be any question that this is the devil's work?

The New Age Movement (New Secularism)

By Dr. Dale A. Robbins

For nearly two thousand years, Christians have pondered the end-time prophecy's of the New Testament, and especially the revelation of John. In his apocalyptic writing he described the coming of a diabolical world leader called the "Beast" or the "Antichrist," who would arise among a one world religion and government in the fast days (Rev. 13:2).

During the recent years of international turmoil and crisis, an enormous neopolitical/religious order, called the New Age movement, has quietly emerged. They are made up of a world-wide network of thousands of cooperating organizations. They are united under the common bond of esoteric or occult teachings, with the goal of forming a "one world order."

Many students of Bible prophecy have carefully watched the development of this movement, and feel this may very well be that predicted entity from which the Antichrist will emerge.

A Brief History of the New Age Movement

The origin of the movement dates back to at least 1875 with the theosophical teachings of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, and later in the 1920's with the teachings of Alice Ann Bailey. The Theosophical Society, as it was called, espoused the abolishment of Christianity, Judaism and Islam, promoting the unity of other world religions. They claimed that their teachings were revealed by "spirit" or elemental guides (demons). They emphasized heavily the evolution of a self deified, master aryan society, and a one world "New Age" religion and social order.

In 1922, Baily founded the "Lucifer Publishing Company," which printed and distributed their teachings (Lucifer was Satan's first name). These teachings were very complete in their and goals. Step by step they plotted the coming new age with instructions for the institution of the necessary new world order.

Baily's teachings established the symbol of a rainbow as their identification sign, and discussed extensively, plans for religious war, forced redistribution of the world's resources, mass planetary initiations, theology for a new world order, world-wide disarmament, and elimination of obstinate religions. She even discussed the sacredness of the new world leader's number, 666 (the number of the Beast).

The Present New Age Movement

Today, the New Age movement appears to be a loose knit group of innocent organizations with ambiguous goals or leadership. But beneath the surface there is a definite, organized, secret leadership and strategy which guides the vast movement. The main body of leadership resides in an organization called "The Planetary Initiative For The World We Choose."

One of their most celebrated demonstrations of unity and public relations occurred on August 16-17, 1988. Over eighty million New Agers unified themselves for what was called the largest assembly of mass meditation in history. Widely reported by the news media, the "Harmonic Convergence," also referred to as the "Planetary Surrender," occurred simultaneously in nearly every nation and major city. Led and organized largely by 144,000 Shamans, witches, witch doctors and a whole assortment of New Age mystics, they joined in a period of meditation agreement for the release of "spiritual forces" which would bring about their desire for a "one world government and world religion." Only two years earlier, on December 31, 1986, a slightly smaller gathering of fifty million New Age adherents joined in meditation for the purpose to "alter the manner which humanity understands reality."

In actually, these gatherings of meditation were acts of worship and service to the Devil. One can only imagine what kind of demons and evil spiritual forces were unleashed upon the world as witch doctors, shamans and mystics called upon the powers of darkness to distort humanity's perception of truth.

Is it no wonder that evil and wickedness has intensified in the world since that time? Think of the power of God that could be released if eighty million Christians combined their faith in one massive prayer meeting!

Who They Are And What They Believe

Publications which list the numerous cooperating groups are the "Spiritual Community Guide," and "The New Age Magazine," with thousands of listings. New agers claim that all mind science groups are a part of the new age. They also include various occult groups, mystic religions, witchcraft organizations, pagan religions, ecological organizations, neo-political and secular organizations. In

the U.S. and Canada over ten thousand organizations are identified as New Age, such as "Amnesty International, Greenpeace, The Sierra Club, Zero Population, The Guardian Angels," and thousands of other secular and religious organizations. Other groups synonymous with the New Age are "The Age of Aquarius, The Aquarian Conspiracy, The Human Potential Movement, The Holistic Movement, Humanistic Psychology," and a host of others.

The modern New Age movement has a definite agenda which has been agreed upon by their constituents. Adopted much after the same original ideals as Alice Ann Baily, the manifesto of the New Age movement calls for a:

1. New world order
2. Universal credit card system
3. World food authority
4. World Health Authority
5. World water authority
6. Universal tax
7. Universal military draft
8. Abolishing of Christianity, Judaism and Islam
9. One world leader

After extensive analysis of its teachings and goals, expert political scientists agree that the New Age movement parallels the ideals and philosophy of Nazism of the 1930's. New Age writings even claim that leaders such as Adolph Hitler and Jim Jones were disciples of the movement. Before the Jonestown, Guyana massacre, Jones' Peoples Temple was listed as a New Age "Spiritual Center," in the "Spiritual Community Guide" (a handbook for New Agers).

The Coming Anti Christ

In the late 1980's, prominent New Agers, David Spangler and Benjamin Creme ran full page ads in many of the world's newspapers announcing the soon appearance of the "Christ." This personality was introduced as the "Lord Maitraya," alleged to be a world-class "messiah" and great teacher whom they claimed would bring world peace and solutions to the world problems. To date, their Maitraya has not yet emerged as a celebrated leader, and may not. But the aspirations of Creme, Spangler and other New Agers are clearly seen. They are seeking a man, whether god or devil, who will be their image of a messiah, coming to save the planet.

Finally, what we know about the New Age movement so far is this: It is extremely large and is made up of an extensive network of mystic, occultism figures devoted to the goals of a forced global government and religion. They have expressed their rejection and hostility toward Christianity and other major religions, and seek to establish a universal leader who will fulfill the description of a satanic deity.

Truly there has never been a more ideal environment to produce that man of deception, the personification of the Devil himself. And if this is the organization of the Beast, we know that this means the rapture, the tribulation period, and the second coming of Jesus Christ is close at hand (2 Thes. 2:2-9, Rev. 13:11-18).

Acknowledgements:

"Dark Secrets of the New Age," Texe Marrs

"The Hidden Dangers of the Rainbow," Constance Cumbey

New Age or Old Occult?

The New Age Movement (NAM) is both a religious and a social movement. In fact, Western culture is currently experiencing a phenomenal, spiritual, ideological, and sociological shift. It is a religious world view that is alien and hostile to Christianity. It's a multi-focused, multi-faceted synthesis, in varying degrees, of the Far Eastern, mystical religions, mainly Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, and Western Occultism, adapted to and influenced by Western, materialistic culture. It sometimes appears in secularized forms.

Prominent expressions of the NAM were carried on into more modern times in Europe and America by Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772), transcendentalists like Thoreau, and Emerson, and Wordsworth (early 1800s), and Theosophy introduced by Madame Helena Blavatsky (1831-1891) (*The New Age Rage*, pp. 22-24). The decade of the sixties witnessed a revival of Eastern mysticism as traditional values were being challenged, Zen, Carlos, Castanada, the Beatles, Transcendental Meditation, and yoga all became popular.

The New Age Movement consists of an incredibly huge and well organized network consisting of thousands of groups, trusts, foundations, clubs, lodges, and religious groups whose goal and purpose is to prepare the world to enter the coming "Age Of Aquarius." A small sampling of only a few of the organizations involved would include: Amnesty International, Zero Population Growth, California New Age Caucus, New World Alliance, World Goodwill, The Church Universal and Triumphant, The Theosophical Society, the Forum, Planetary Initiative for the World We Choose, the Club of Rome, Church Universal & Triumphant, Christian Science, and the Unity School of Christianity. This list, by no means all inclusive, demonstrates the diversity of organizations operating in economic, political, and religious spheres of influence.

The New Age movement is not a unified, traditional cult system of beliefs and practices, even though its roots derive from Eastern religions and the occult. It has no official leader, headquarters, nor membership list, but instead is a network of groups working toward specific goals. One of its main goals is to bring to the forefront a one-world leader who is called "The Christ" or "Maitreya." Nevertheless, it is estimated that there are millions of worldwide followers of various New Age practices and/or holders of one or more of the major beliefs of the New Age.

The NAM has gained significant influence, affecting almost every area of the culture - sociology, psychology, medicine, the government, ecology, science, arts, education, the business community, the media, entertainment, sports, and even the church. The movement expresses itself in widely divergent and various mutated forms, from the blatantly obvious to the subtle. It is expressed in organized religious forms such as Christian Science, Unity, and even forms of Witchcraft. Yet, it shows up in secular forms as well, in various human potential seminars, and much in between, i.e., transcendental meditation, some alternative practices, and certain curriculum in public (and private) schools.

The book *Networking* lists over 1,200 organizations, centers, cooperatives, groups, communities, and networks in fields ranging from health care and spiritual growth, through politics, economics, and ecology, to education, communications, personal growth, and intercultural relations. There is hardly any area of human interest that does not have some people somewhere exploring it from a New Age point of view. Due to the lack of a central organization and the diversity of emphasis adhered to by the various New Age groups, there are literally hundreds of publications. Some popular

publications and journals are *New Age Journal*, *Body Mind Spirit*, *Yoga Journal*, *Gnosis*, *East West*, *Noetic Sciences*, and *Omega*.

The major goal of the New Age Movement is to bring peace to the world upon entering the Age of Aquarius. This will be accomplished primarily through the leadership of "the Christ" (also known as "Lord Maitreya"), who will supposedly come to teach us to live at peace with each other. Some of the other stated goals of the movement are to establish a World Food Authority, World Water Authority, World Economic Order, and an entirely New World Order. It should be noted here that one of the requirements for a person to enter the New Age is that he or she will have to take what is known as a "Luciferic Initiation," a kind of pledge of allegiance to the Christ of the New Age and to the New World Order. The primary goals of the movement then, are to prepare the world to receive the Christ and to enter the Age of Aquarius, thus establishing the New World Order.

The New Age Movement professes a broad-minded openness to all religions, but its basic underlying philosophy represents a carefully calculated undermining of Judeo-Christian beliefs with various combinations of Gnosticism and Occultism. [Gnosticism is an ancient world-view stating that Divine essence is the only true or highest reality, and that the unconscious Self of man is actually this essence. It is through intuitional discovery, "visionary experience or initiation into secret doctrine" (not the plenary revelation of propositional truth in the Bible), that man becomes conscious of this true Self (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 10, 1968, p. 506; *New Bible Dictionary*, J.D. Douglas, ed., pp. 473-474).] It bears a remarkable resemblance to the apostate world religion that H.G. Wells claimed as his own and predicted would one day take over the world. It also fits the description of "The Plan" for establishing the new world

government that is described in various psychic communications from alleged E.T.'s and ascended masters. There is one more connection: the New Age Movement fits the description of the Antichrist's religion - a rejection of the Judeo-Christian God and the declaration that Self is God. (Source: *The Seduction of Christianity*.) Douglas R. Groothuis, author of *Unmasking the New Age* and *Confronting the New Age*, identifies six distinctive of New Age thinking: (1) all is one; (2) all is God; (3) humanity is God; (4) a change in consciousness; (5) all religions are one; and (6) cosmic evolutionary optimism. Norman Geisler details 14 primary "doctrines" of New Age religions: (1) an impersonal god (force); (2) an eternal universe; (3) an illusory nature of matter; (4) a cyclical nature of life; (5) the necessity of reincarnations; (6) the evolution of man into Godhood; (7) continuing revelations from beings beyond the world; (8) the identity of man with God; (9) the need for meditation (or other consciousness-changing techniques); (10) occult practices (astrology, mediums, etc); (11) vegetarianism and holistic health; (12) pacifism (or anti-war activities); (13) one world (global) order; and (14) syncretism (unity of all religions). **[HJB]**

The New Age also encompasses a wide array of notions: spiritualism, astrology, bioenergy, *Chi* energy, chakras, nirvana, Christ-consciousness, Native American Spirituality, Prajna, out-of-body/near-death experiences, reincarnation, and the occult disciplines, as well as unorthodox psychotherapeutic techniques and pseudoscientific applications of the "healing powers" of crystals and pyramids. Some commonly used New Age terms are: guided imagery, reincarnation; positive thinking; human potential; holistic; holographic; synergistic; unity; oneness; transformation; awaking; networking; communal sharing; one-world/globalism/new world order (i.e., one language, one government, one currency, one

religion); cosmic consciousness; etc. (See New Age Dictionary below.)

It is important for Christians to recognize even the most disguised forms of the New Age Movement. Some New Age practices are: rebirthing; inner healing; biofeedback; yoga; I Ching; reflexology; black and white magic; fire-walking; witchcraft; parapsychology; Magick; Tai Chi; Shamanism; hypnotherapy; acupuncture/acupressure; TM; martial arts; Zen; Relaxation; Erhard Seminar Training (est); Silva Method (formerly Silva Mind Control); visualization; etc. Some prominent New Agers are: Alice Bailey, Alvin Toffler, Dr. Barbara Ray, Benjamin Creme, Levi Dowling, George Trevelyan, Fritjof Capra, Abraham Maslow, Barbara Marx Hubbard, Ruth Montgomery, Shirley MacLaine, J.Z. Knight, Marilyn Ferguson, David Spangler, Jeremy Rifkin, Norman Cousins, Elizabeth Clare Prophet, John Denver, George Lucas, and Norman Lear.

Many New Agers attach great importance to artifacts, relics, and sacred objects, all of which can be profitably offered for sale: Tibetan bells, exotic herbal teas, Viking runes, solar energizers, colored candles for "chromotherapy," and a plethora of occult books, pamphlets, instructions, and tape recordings. Crystals are the favorite New Age object. These are not only thought to have mysterious healing powers, but are considered programmable, like a computer, if one just concentrates hard enough. Other New Age objects would include the rainbow; butterfly; pyramid; triangle, eye in triangle/pyramid; unicorn; Pegasus (winged-horse); swastika; yin-yang; Godhead on pentagram; concentric circles; rays of light; crescent moon; ect.

New Age music is a term applied to the works of various composers and musicians who strive to create soothing audio environments

rather than follow song structures. Born of an interest in spirituality and healing in the late 1970s, it is often used as an aid in meditation. The defining features of New Age music are harmonic consonance, contemplative melodies, nonlinear song forms, and uplifting themes. New Age performers may use traditional ethnic, acoustic, electric, or electronic instruments, or even sounds from nature. New Age music is meditative, almost invariably instrumental style with roots in Oriental, jazz, and classical music; often derivative, New Age compositions can sound like minimalist music or like lush evocations of the natural environment. Prominent New Age musicians include electronic-music pioneer Brian Eno, multi-instrumentalist Kitaro; solo-piano artist George Winston, vocalist Liz Story; harpist Andreas Vollenweider, and electric violinist Jean-Luc Ponty.

Athletes are using guided imagery. Graduate schools of business are invoking Zen, yoga, and tarot cards in teaching courses on creativity in business (e.g., Stanford Graduate School of Business). Stock market gurus employ Fibonacci numbers are "wave theory" in their forecasting, both based upon astrology. Even some churches teach that the best way to get to know God is to visualize Christ, ignoring that visualization is a powerful occult device. (Visualizing an entity, even God or Christ, ultimately puts one in touch with a masquerading demon.)

In summary, the term "New Age" is an informal term derived from astrology, which indicates that this earth, if not the cosmos, is on the verge of an evolutionary transition from the Piscean Age (rationality) to the Aquarian Age of spirituality, bliss, and harmony of all things. Even though it is undergoing a significant revival, the "New Age" is hardly new. In fact, it is very old. A better term would be the "Old Occult."

Keeping in mind that the myriads of New Age groups are quite eclectic, drawing from several religious traditions mentioned earlier, the following is a general description of the more prominent unifying themes of the NAM. i.e., the highlights of what New Agers believe concerning their source of authority, God, Christ, sin and salvation, good and evil, Satan, and future life:

1. Source of Authority. New Agers claim no external source of authority - only an internal one ("the god within"). They believe the individual is the standard of truth, saying that "truth as an objective reality simply does not exist" (Shirley MacLaine, *It's All in the Playing*) (cf. 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:21; Matt. 5:18).

[HJB]

2. God. New Agers confuse the Creator with His creation and think that God is part of creation, not separate from it. They borrow from Eastern religions the belief in monism - that "all is One" - only one essence in the universe, everyone and everything being a part of that essence. Everything is a different form of that essence (energy, consciousness, power, love, force). But the belief in monism is *really* Hinduistic pantheism (all is God). New Agers view God as an impersonal life force, consciousness, or energy (M. Ferguson, *Aquarian Conspiracy*, p. 382; S. Gawin, *Living In the Light*, pp. 7-8) (e.g., the "Star Wars Force"), rather than a Person. They believe that every person and thing is "Intertwined" with God (evolving spiritually to the state of "the Christ" being), and use Luke 17:21 ("the kingdom of God is within you") to support this idea (despite the fact that "within you" in this passage means "in your midst"). They claim every human has a divine spark within him because of being part of the divine essence. The state of God is called by various terms among different New Age groups, i.e., God-consciousness, Universal Love, Self-Realization, the I AM, Higher Self, Brahman, Nirvana, etc. New Agers are obviously part of a religion or idolatry and self-worship.

4. Sin and Salvation. There is no place for the concept of sin in the New Age. There can be no sin because there is no transcendent God to rebel against. There are no rules or absolute moral imperatives. New Agers have a "New Thought" view of sin, which knows nothing of a representative man (Adam) by whose sin all men sinned. Nor does New Thought teach that there is any original sin, but that man's true essence is divine and perfect. Indeed, it finds nothing which is of the nature of sin. Instead, it speaks of "troublesome desires" which appear to be natural human impulses which direct men from consciousness to their identity with God, and, therefore, are troublesome but hardly sinful. Since New Agers believe that each person is god, thereby having endless potential for self-improvement, sin is denied as the Bible defines it (man being inherently sinful and utterly depraved - Rom. 5:12). Sin is merely ignorance of one's "inner divinity." Because sin does not exist, there is no need for repentance or forgiveness, and Jesus did not die for our sins. They think that any perceived lack that man might have is merely a lack of enlightenment, thereby eliminating the need of salvation or a Savior. [In fact, salvation is not even an issue for New Agers. The soul is part of the universe and never dies. It is reborn or reincarnated in different physical bodies in a succession of future lives. The good or bad "karma" earned in the present lifetime determines one's subsequent incarnation. Humans should seek to progress to higher states of consciousness and higher planes of existence. There are many different paths to the goal of spiritual perfection. No one path is the only correct path. The assumed cycle of reincarnation and karma presupposes a salvation by works, contrary to the principle of salvation by God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ (Eph. 2:8-9).]

5. Men's Destiny. The salvation of the world depends upon human beings. When enough people harmonize their positive energy and turn their thoughts to peace, the world will be cleansed or negative elements and New Age ideals will be realized in an era of spiritual enlightenment. Since man is intrinsically divine and perfect, his only real problem is ignorance of that fact. Man has a perception of finiteness which is, in reality, an illusion (Ken Keyes, Jr. *Handbook to Higher Consciousness*, pp. 125-29). Salvation in the New Age is for man to become enlightened through experiential knowledge (gnosis). New Age groups offer various occultic techniques to enable individuals, and ultimately the world, to evolve into this oneness (unitive) consciousness (James Redfield, *The Celestine Prophecy: An Experimental Guide*, pp. 243-60). These techniques may include altered states of consciousness (often transcendental meditation), yoga, crystals, channeling (spirit guides), psychics, past-life therapy, acupuncture, etc.

6. Good and Evil. Mimicking the Eastern religions, New Agers distort the distinction between good and evil. They believe that because "all is One," ultimately there is neither good nor evil. They think that a person can transcend his consciousness and go beyond the bounds of moral distinctions, so that even murder sometimes becomes an acceptable way of serving one's gods (e.g., Charles Manson). [HJB]

7. Satan. The traditional view of Lucifer as the devil or Satan is clearly absent in New Age literature. Rather, he is described as a mighty being of light and the "Ruler of Humanity," as Alice Bailey, foundational apostle and leading writer of the New Age Movement, puts it. As to the history and achievements of Lucifer, Benjamin

Crete, a leading lecturer and proponent of the New Age, says, "Lucifer came from the planet Venus 18.5 million years ago; he's the director of our planetary evolution, he is the sacrificial lamb, and the prodigal son. Lucifer made an incredible sacrifice, a supreme sacrifice for our planet."

8. Future Life (Reincarnation). New Agers believe in the ancient [Hindu] Eastern religious concept of reincarnation - that through a long process of rebirths, man can eventually reach spiritual perfection (cf. Heb. 9:27). New Agers often place animal rights above human rights, because many New Agers believe animals are reincarnated souls. They also teach the Hindu principle of "karma" - that what a person sows in this life, he will reap in the next life in his reincarnated state. This belief in reincarnation has led to believing in the power of "spirit guides" or "channels" - those who allow spirits from another dimension to speak through their bodies. [HJB] These entities always seem to repeat the three-fold error: (1) There is no death, (2) man is god, (3) knowledge of self is salvation and power (Brooks Alexander, *Spiritual Counterfeits* project). New Agers misrepresent church history, the doctrines of Christianity, and often twist Scripture to support the idea that original Christianity taught reincarnation. They wrongly argue that the early

POST-SECULARISM: NEW AGE SPIRITUALITY

2. Post-secularism: New Age Spirituality

Just as in Christianity, not everything in New Age spirituality is bad from an Islamic point of view. A number of practices and bits of information fostered in the New Age movement are consonant with not only Islam, but with just being a human being. However, the central doctrines of the movement are inimical with Islam.

The effect of religious relatives has been the proliferation of other types of spirituality than the Christian one. Of course, bankrupt Christianity has left a spiritual void, and this has been filled by an interest in oriental religions, primitive religions, and pseudo-spiritualities based on them. All of the Western interests in these other spiritualities are based on secularism, that is, on the idea that personal well-being is the core of any spirituality. There has been a shift away from the traditional Christian concern with salvation or future well-being toward spirituality or present well-being. Given the morbidity of Christian soteriology or the doctrine of salvation, the trend was predictable. It has already been noted that the proliferation of sects in Christianity almost never questioned Christian soteriology. It remained for the New Age spirituality to do so.

It should be clearly understood that New Age spirituality, or the morbid concern for health and well-being as a spiritual exercise and function, is the direct result of this misplaced concern in Christianity, namely the focus on salvation. As a reactionary trend in dialectical relationship with Christianity it is susceptible to all of the criticism that might be directed towards the original Christian doctrine. It is first of all morbid and self-centred. It is furthermore selfish and raises the individual out of his or her proper place in the family into a competitive position vis-a-vis society as a whole. New Age spirituality is merely the old Christianity couched in a more

immediate form and more susceptible to marketing consumerism. All of the many sectarian movements of New Age thought, whether based on traditional Oriental religions, traditional primitive religions, or on something developed on the West, can be reduced to this one bare reality. They speak of individual health and well-being to a populace which, through secularism, has grown tired of thinking about future salvation.

The second common feature of New Age thought is the belief in reincarnation. It is clear that the doctrine of emanations, so often presented by the great names is Islamic philosophy, is susceptible to interpretations reminiscent of reincarnation, or the rebirth of the same soul in a new body. The New Age concept of reincarnation is rather developed on the basis of Hindu karma. The word karma has come to have a somewhat fluid meaning, and the whole configuration of belief differs greatly from that of India. First of all, karma is taken as the law of cause and effect, which gives it a rational coating. Without any rational justification, however, and without any proof, karma is taken to imply reincarnation. New Age thought specifically uses karma and reincarnation for several experiences. The first of these is in social relations. When people meet who either like each other or desire further contact for some motive, they use reincarnation as a justification, saying that they were associated in a former life. The second most common use of reincarnation is the attempt to explain behaviour and events in such a way as to relieve the individual of immediate responsibility. The event or behaviour is seen as the result of an action or a choice in a past life. The implication is that nothing can be done to change matters. The third most common use of reincarnation is the enhancement of a dull life with a colorful past. Those who believe in reincarnation in the West have always and invariably been more interesting, or at last more famous, people ages ago than they are now

Reincarnation and karma are also reactions to the Christian doctrine of salvation. There is a reversal from future salvation to past salvation. The past salvation is precisely what might be expected from the secular mentality: salvation by being rich and famous, and thus happy, in the past. The configuration is again susceptible to the same criticism as the original Christian doctrine, that is, an attempt to escape the responsibility of obeying divine law in the present. The west is curiously willing to believe that God has a desire to enslave them by giving advice on how to behave. Rarely does a Westerner come to the conclusion that God's law might have as its purpose the best possible way of living together as families in society, that is, the greatest possible freedom and happiness for everyone.

THE PRESSURE OF SECULARISM

David Phillips

“Do not let the world squeeze you into its mould.” – Rom 12.1 (J.B. Phillips translation)

There is continuing pressure within the United Kingdom to see ourselves as a secular nation. This manifests itself in various ways including the continuing debates about the place of faith schools and even the coronation oath. But secularism creates a tension for the Christian because it requires that we be shaped by the world's mould, that we allow our faith to impact only certain areas of life.

What is Secularism?

Secularism is “the view that religious considerations should be excluded from civil affairs or public education.” (dictionary.com) Therefore in a purely secular state there would be no preferential treatment given to any religious viewpoint, indeed in both local and

national affairs there would be no place given to religious convictions. In education comparative religion is permissible and the simple description of religious practices or history, but such teaching must not attempt to present religion as attractive and certainly not appear to favour a particular religion.

Taking a definition along the lines above, it is quite clear that, whatever the pressure, Britain is not a secular state (see article below). But the pressure to become such is very evident and perhaps growing. For those who are atheists of whatever strand (or creed) it is perfectly understandable why they should wish the state to ditch any association with Christianity. However, the argument for a secular state are more complex than this and are being put forward by some evangelical Christians. Part of the reason for this is the perception that Britain is now a multi-faith society and the growing influence of Muslims.

Holding Islam at Bay

Faced with a growing Islamic militancy, and growing numbers of Muslims in Britain, there is a strong temptation to affirm that Britain is a secular state where there is a clear division between religion and politics. Therefore, on this basis, Muslims are free to practice their religion in Britain but should not bring their religion into the political sphere. Similarly there is a fear that Muslim faith-schools will exacerbate divisions within society, so the argument is put forward that we should not have faith-schools at all. Alongside this we have the recent innovation of lessons on Britishness which are an attempt to articulate values which mark out what we presently are as against what we might become. Secularists endeavour to sound reasonable in all this, and not to sound anti-Islam by ensuring that they equate fundamentalist Islam with fundamentalist Christians. So Christians

who are involved in education are often portrayed as dangerous and wacky.

It would appear that in the eyes of many Muslims the battle between Christianity and secularism has been won by the secularists. In their view Christians have largely retreated from the public sphere and they see this as evidence for the weakness of the Christian faith. Many Muslims see secularism as the great enemy of their faith. If secularists are preventing them from living out their faith in particular ways then secularism must be the work of the devil. The only possible hope for the secularists is if Muslims do what many Christians have done which is make their faith secondary to their secular values, so that they become secular-Muslims. This is certainly how many feminists approach Islam, they believe, or have believed, that exposure to western values will change the outlook of Muslims and there is some evidence that this is so, but on the whole it is not working.

Christianity and Secularism

What about Christians? History shows that Christians can live and flourish in any state, indeed one could almost say that the more antagonistic the state is to Christianity the more the Christian faith has flourished. But there are out workings of Christian faith which impact on the public sphere. Some of these have to do with the desire of Christians to love God and some to do with our desire to love our neighbor.

A classic example of love for neighbor would be the treatment of young and unborn children. In the Greco-Roman world into which the gospel burst forth abortion was common, and so was infanticide. When Christianity began to take hold of the empire these practices were challenged not simply because Christians believed them to be a

sear on society but because of a love for neighbor, a concern for those unable to help themselves including the baby and unborn child. Yet here is an area where Christian faith impacts on the public sphere. The best way to prevent such horrors is to change people's hearts so that they no longer wish to do such things, and this is to a large extent what happened, but Christians have also been prepared to use the law to protect the weak and promote what is good.

Another example would be gambling. In recent years the state has encouraged gambling and used it to raise funds. Christians have traditionally opposed gambling for various reasons including that we do not believe the universe is ruled by chance. The National Lottery is almost the official religion of Darwinism; pay your tithes and the great god of Chance will bless you, or not. But Christians historically have also opposed gambling, and state sponsored gambling in particular, because of the great social evil it creates and the damage done to individuals and families. Thus we oppose such practices partly because it is based on a lie, and partly because we love our neighbors, and do not wish to see them ruin their lives and turn themselves into slaves to addiction.

So too with education. Christians provided the great impetus for education. Whilst there is a strong desire amongst Christians to ensure that their children are taught within a Christian context and framework, this has not been the main motivation for Christian education. Rather what drove people was the desire to love their neighbour. Christians have been concerned to teach a clear moral framework. We believe that the world will be a better place without murder, theft, adultery and so on. Therefore, by teaching these commands to others we are showing the love of God. But Christians have also wanted to use the opportunities education provides to present the gospel, because we do not wish anyone to perish. The

motive for such involvement in education, at its purest, is love. It is not hard to see why some atheists are infuriated by this. Christians have wanted to be involved in education although it is not hard to see why some atheists are infuriated by it. Of course we do also want our children to be taught in a Christian context and it seems only right therefore to allow others, whether atheists, Jews or Muslims have the same opportunities. But strident secularists are not prepared to allow such parity, they want to ensure that all children are taught in a purely secular context.

What is Secularism?

This brings us back to the question of what secularism really is. We have defined it as the desire to exclude religion from public life. Some argue for secularism purely on the basis that they wish to allow different religious groups to co-exist and believe this is the only way to allow such to happen. Yet for many people secularism is itself an ideology and as such can perhaps be better defined as secular humanism. This is the belief that religion is irrelevant and unnecessary and the genuine secular humanist will therefore be seeking to eradicate all religions. Some states, in particular communist countries, have pursued this as a goal. There is the famous quotation from the French Revolution when one of the revolutionaries boasted to a peasant “we are going to pull down everything that reminds you of God”. This indeed is the objective of many political movements in recent centuries. But the peasant responded “Citizen, then pull down the stars.” In the same way, to the obvious infuriation of some secular humanists, religion of all sorts has proved remarkably durable. At present in western democracies secular humanists do not try to suppress religion outright. Nevertheless there are those who take every opportunity to

ridicule religion and to misrepresent it and the mainstream media is their chief tool and apparently all too willing to promote their views. The pernicious thing is that broadcasters appear unwilling to allow the promotion of religious views through their media but are content to promote anti-religion. In the same way the goal of a secular state is pursued by some because they see this as a positive step in achieving the marginalization of religion along the way to eradicating it entirely.

Christians are in danger of responding to the growing presence of other religions by capitulating to secularism. Part of the motivation for this is fear of Islam, yet we have no evidence secularism can resist Islam. By doing this we are also playing into the hands of those who oppose the Christian faith. It is a policy of defeat of admitting that we are beaten, that Christians cannot confidently live out our faith in the public arena. But it also means that we privatize our religion, largely keeping it out of the public arena, which involves us in large part rejecting the commands to love God and to love our neighbour.

THE NEED OF EVANGELIZATION RE-EXAMINED

Pope John Paul II, speaking on the vocation of the laity in the Church in 1989, spoke of the ever-growing religious indifference among many of the baptized as evidence of the inroads of secularism. This “*phenomenon of dechristianization,*” he said, *strikes long-standing Christian people, and continually calls for evangelization.*”

The Holy Father is speaking here, not of the evangelization of non-Christians, but of the **re-evangelization** of Christians, whose faith has been weakened, and whose love has been cooled. He was more explicit of this need in his encyclical “*Veritatis Splendor:*”

*“This separation (of morality from religion) represents one of the most acute concerns of the Church amid today’s growing secularism, wherein many...people think and live ‘as if God did not exist.’ ... It is urgent to rediscover and to set forth once more the **authentic reality of the Christian faith**, which is not simply a set of propositions to be accepted with intellectual assent. Rather, **faith is a lived awareness of Christ, a living remembrance of His commandments, a truth to be lived out.** A word...is not truly accepted...until it is put into action. Faith is a decision involving one’s whole existence. It is an encounter, a dialogue, a communion of live and of life between the believer and Jesus Christ, the WAY, the TRUTH, and the LIFE. It entails an act of entrusting abandonment to Christ which enables us to live as He lived, in profound love of God and of our brothers and sisters.”* (n. 88)

This “*authentic reality of the Christian faith*” is the fire that Christ came to enkindle in the hearts of men. “*I have come to cast fire upon the earth, and how I wish that it were already enkindled.*” (Lk.

12:49) That fire was ignited and burned brightly in the minds and hearts of the apostles, and that is why they were so instrumental in the spread of the faith. A fire gives forth both **light** and **heat**, and both are needed for evangelization. Both are needed for a “*living faith,*” one that enlightens the mind with the TRUTH handed down by the Church, and proclaimed by the successor of Peter; and **inflames the heart** with the LOVE that urges one to make the sacrifices required to love God above all things, and to love one’s neighbor as oneself.

While our Blessed Lord became incarnate “*to cast fire upon the earth,*” notice that He did not deeply touch the hearts of his followers until He had given his life for them. That fire was ignited on Calvary. Only after that did the Holy Spirit come with those enlightening and strengthening graces, those purifying and healing graces, that transformed the apostles into the instruments of grace they became.

For us too, we will not deeply influence the lives of others until we have borne the cross and undergone trials with patience in union with our divine Savior. Pope John Paul II reminded the Catholic laity of this in San Francisco in 1987:

“You are in the forefront of the struggle to protect the authentic Christian values from the onslaught of secularization. Your great contribution to evangelization of your own society is made through your lives. Christ’s message must live in you – in the way you live, and in the way you refuse to live. At the same time, because your nation plays a role in the world far beyond its borders, you must be conscious of the impact of your Christian lives on others. Your lives must spread the fragrance of Christ’s gospel throughout the world.”

Yet the de-Christianization of our society is so widespread and deeply rooted, that only special help from heaven can turn this trend around. However, divine providence requires that we do what we can. Although it is grace that turns hearts back to God, the Lord wants us to use the human means at our disposal. St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that it would be tempting God if we omit to do what we can and expect everything to be done by Him. (II II,53,1, ad 1)

As to the disregard for God in our society, if every follower of Christ truly lived his or her faith, a veritable deluge of graces from heaven would flood this world. Only when the fire that Christ came to enkindle has been ignited in the minds and hearts of enough Christians, will the tide of secularism begin to be reversed.

Our Blessed Lord so yearns for the return of those who have gone astray, that He will mercifully pardon them, if only there is a sincere desire to return and a humble acknowledgement of guilt, and if sufficient prayers and sacrifices are offered to make up for what is wanting on the part of other members of the Mystical Body. So widespread is the crisis of faith that there is needed as never before on a world-wide scale sincere apostles (among the laity, religious and clergy) who will become the leaven, the salt, and the light of the world. Pray that God will raise up leaders in whose hearts that enlightening and strengthening fire burns brightly, to lead and inspire others to follow.

In those petitions do not fail to call on Mary, the Mother of Jesus and of us all, who, in her own hidden way, far excelled all other humans in the one goal that counts – that of perfect love of God and neighbor. In her the fire of love and light burned immeasurably more brightly than in all others. In her was her Son's wish most perfectly fulfilled. *"I have come to cast fire upon the heart, and how I wish that it were already enkindled."*

Secular Humanistic Judaism Rejecting God

The author's characterizations of Jews in other religious streams, e.g., his suggestion that religious spirituality and ethics are contingent upon the threat of divine punishment, and his claim that those who believe in a God who does not control their lives are actually secularists, are not necessarily identical to the ways in which these Jews characterize their own religious positions. *Reprinted with permission from Judaism in a Secular Age: An Anthology of Secular Humanistic Jewish Thought, edited by Renee Kogel and Zav Katz.*

Secular Jews come in different shapes and forms: nonreligious Zionists, nonreligious Yiddishists, and those who do not choose to identify as either Zionists or Yiddishists but are acculturated to the host society, such as many North American Jews who are quite happy where they are, speak and think English, are at home in the American culture, but also feel their Jewishness quite strongly and wish to identify with Jewish matters and causes. Regardless of which of these categories they fall into, secular Jews seek an interpretation of Jewish civilization that accords with their own preferences, attitudes, and beliefs.

Who Should Define Themselves as "Secular"?

Secular can be defined most simply as "nonreligious." If you believe that the idea of a God is irrelevant to your life, either because you do not believe in a God, or because you think that even if a God exists, he (or she) is not the kind of being that controls the universe and your own life, then you are a secularist. Many Jews who belong to religious congregations are "closet" secularists. They may pay lip service to organized religion in its various forms because they know of no other way to express their membership in the Jewish community. They may believe that by keeping "something" they

remain attached to the Jewish people, although what they do in the synagogue, if and when they go there (and most Reform and Conservative Jews do not attend regularly), has no intrinsic meaning for them.

It is one thing to read prayers when you believe there is somebody there who hears and cares; it is quite another thing to mumble words—especially when you do not really understand what you are reading—when you are convinced that there cannot possibly be anyone who listens and cares. It is one thing to follow ancient practices and obey ancient taboos (about food, for instance) because you really believe that they were ordained by a God who is intent on ensuring that you do not eat shrimp; it is quite another thing to follow the same habits and customs when you are quite certain that these are meaningless remnants of ancient taboos and superstitions.

To come out of your “closet,” then, is a matter of personal integrity: to assert to yourself and to others that whatever you do, you believe in, and what you do not believe in, you do not do. At the same time, though, if you are like most secularists, you are the first to demand that those who do believe in the religious customs you do not observe should have every right to follow them. You are a pluralist, a supporter of a democratic and humanistic way of life. You believe in the right of all individuals to live their lives in accordance with their convictions, as long as their actions do not impinge on the rights and well-being of others.

Can One Be Both Secular and Religious?

There are secular Jews who call themselves religious because they define religion differently from the popular notion. They may say, for instance, that a religious attitude is a spiritual one: not just going beyond crass materialism, but relating to nature and to society in a way appreciative of beauty, external and internal, for example,

experiencing, enjoying, and internalizing art, music, philosophy, and literature. They may view spirituality as a way to grapple with the many unsolved problems of human existence without reference to a supreme being onto whose shoulders such problems can be unloaded.

Secular Jewish religionists say that a belief system that does not acknowledge a godhead but fulfills the spiritual needs of individuals and communities by providing meaningful seasonal and life-cycle ceremonies that relate to the Jewish past is, by definition, religious. You may belong to a group of people who hold such beliefs and enact them in appropriate ceremonies. If so, and if you do not believe in a world-creating authority that supervises you throughout your life, you are a secularist, a religious secularist. You simply define the term “religion” in a different way from the usual one.

The impact of Secularism on Religious Beliefs and Practices

Adibah Binti Abdul Rahim

Introduction

Secularism as An Ideology and A Principle of Social Organization

As one of the elements of modernity, secularism emerged first in the Western world after Martin Luther had led an ecclesiastical revolt against Roman Catholicism in the sixteenth century. The revolt resulted in the formation of Protestantism. Generally speaking, the rest of the sixteenth century saw the demarcation of the Catholic-Protestant divide in Europe along theological lines. By the end of the seventeenth century, some of the leading intellectuals, such as Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and John Lock (1632-1704) attempted to formulate new principles of political and social organizations that would extricate the political state from theological issues. Religious authorities of the Church at that time were seen as a major obstacle in the development of social institutions. This was the first movement that contributed to the emergence of secularism in the world.

Another origin of secularism can be traced from the conflict of science and religion between the advocates of science and the religious traditionalists of the Church. With the discoveries of modern science, its advocates began to explain religious precepts in the light of science, which involved the process of reasoning. Therefore, Church authorities were challenged gradually but systematically by the scientist and rationalist movements. For instance, the influence of Copernicus (1473-1543), Kepler (1571-1630), Galileo (1564-1642), and Newton (1642-1727) revealed that the Sun was the center of the universe and that the Earth was vast in extent. These discoveries were opposed to the Christian theologians'

theory of creation and cosmology. It was in this context that the conflict of science and religion contributed to the emergence of secularism within the Western Christian tradition.

During the eighteenth century, under the impact of the Enlightenment, there were many writings of the Western philosophers, which argued that religious teachings were the major obstacle to the growth and progress of man. By the end of the eighteenth century, the Enlightenment attitude towards religion became a part of the intellectual debate taking place in Europe. The position of the philosophers on the need to remove religion from the public sphere was strengthened by developments in the socio-political realm. The modern nation-state was emerging to challenge the political supremacy of the Church in Europe. Consequently, the development of a political theory in Europe totally divorced the process of legislation from any reference to religious authorities. Religion became marginalized in the public affairs of the society.

Whereas the leading intellectuals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had argued that the interference of religion in the public affairs of society hampered society's progress, the nineteenth century saw the emergence of thinkers who argued that the effects of religion were so pernicious that it should be banished from even the psyche of the individuals. The nineteenth century thinkers gave numerous arguments for the expulsion of religion from the private sphere as well. Karl Marx, for example, saw religion as merely a reflection of the material world and derived from the hopes of human beings. He criticized religion as a tool in the hands of the ruling class for keeping the masses under control. Religion was made to pacify humans, and reconcile them to oppression that they suffer under capitalist society, and hinder their awareness of revolution. His famous quotation is "religion as opium of the masses." For Marx,

religion seemed to promise people illusionary happiness. Therefore, the abolition of religion as the illusionary happiness of the people is required for their true happiness.

Another secular view can be traced in the psychobiological arguments of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). Growing up devoid of any belief in God, Freud insisted that religious claims about the world are invalid. He sought to account for the empirical phenomenon of religion in naturalistic terms. Religious ideas, according to Freud, are only the outcome of a psychological process. In his *The Future of an Illusion*, Freud argued that it was culture that created and produced religious ideas within the individuals. According to him, like all other cultural attainments, religion springs from the necessity of defending oneself against the superpowers of nature and fate. Thus, an impotent man creates God for himself like a helpless child seeks comfort in the parent. The origin of religion, in this sense, is a form of wish fulfillment of mankind. For Freud, religion is both illusion and error- an illusion because it is the fulfillment of man's wishes and error because it cannot be independently established on rational and scientific grounds. Unlike empirical assertions, the assertions of religion are not based on observations of the external world that can be either verified or falsified but rather on inner convictions. Therefore, Freud sees all religious ideas as illusion and error. They are indemonstrable; thus, no one can be compelled to believe them.

Another nineteenth century secular thinker was Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). Nietzsche was not interested in the metaphysical truth of either Christianity or any other religion. Being convinced that no religion is really true; he judged all religious entirely by their social effects. Nietzsche's famous proclamation is the "death of God," and in his searching for a new foundation for values, he turns to the

aesthetic of human nature as the most promising alternative to religion. According to him, existence and the world are eternally justified only as an aesthetic phenomenon. Religious beliefs have no significance in the social life of modern society. In a contemporary discussion, secularism is related almost synonymously with the term secularization except that the former implies belief in certain ideas and values or as an ideology, while the latter depicts a process of socio-cultural-cum-intellectual revolution. The term secularism has been defined in various interpretations. According to C. Williams, secularism is derived from a Latin word *saeculum*, which means 'of this age' which pertains to this world, is temporal and related to worldly things. N. Berkes defines it as emphasis on the worldly affairs regardless of what happens in the hereafter. *Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary* defines secularism as the belief that the state, morals, education and all aspects of life should be independent of religion. Meanwhile, the *Lexicon Webster Dictionary* explains it as a system of beliefs, which rejects all forms of religious faith and worship. *The Encyclopedia America* defines secularism as an ethical system founded on the principles of natural morality and independent of revealed religion or supernaturalism. Its first postulate is freedom of thought, that is, the right of every man to think for himself. Secularism asserts this right to discuss and debate all vital questions, such as opinions regarding the foundations of moral obligation, the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the authority of the conscience. Secularism also maintains that the good of the present life is the real good.

Other writers on secularism basically emphasize on the replacement of religion with scientific and rational thought as well as separation of religion from the core institutions of the society. For instance, G. A. Almond and G. A. Powell cite secularization as the process

whereby men become increasingly rational, analytical, and empirical in their political action. It involves the replacement of traditional orientations and attitudes with a more dynamic one. For Arnold Toynbee, secularization is the replacement of religion with technology, and for Wilbert G. Moore, secularization is the substitution of traditional or supernatural solutions of human situations with rational ones. According to Harvey Cox, secularization involves the loosing of the world from religious understanding of itself, and the breaking of all supernatural myths and sacred symbols. It symbolizes the liberation of the human mind from religious and metaphysical tutelage.

Islam and Secularism

The role of Islam or religion in the Muslim-majority countries as outlined in the constitutions, including Islamic or secular states.

The idea of secularism in Islam means favoring a secular state and secular society with separation of Islam and public life. Secularism in the Muslim countries refers to the ideology of promoting the secular political and social values as opposed to the Islamism. It is often used to describe the separation of public life and civil/government matters from religious teachings and commandments. Secularism is regularly condemned by Muslims who do not feel that religious influence should be removed from the public sphere.

Secular states had existed in the Muslim world since the Middle Ages. The quest for Secularism has inspired some Muslim scholars who argue that secular government is the best way to observe sharia: “enforcing [sharia] through coercive power of the state negates its religious nature, because Muslims would be observing the law of the

state and not freely performing their religious obligation as Muslims,” says Abdullahi Ahmed An-Na’im, a professor of law at Emory University and author of a book on the future of sharia. A majority of Muslim countries have a dual system in which the government is secular but Muslims can choose to bring familial and financial disputes to sharia courts. The exact jurisdiction of these courts varies from country to country, but usually includes marriage, divorce, inheritance, and guardianship.

Secularism has generally acquired negative connotations in most of Muslim-majority countries, is often criticized for being against real spirit of Islam as an civilizational ideology and for having links with anti-religion forces, colonial legacy and imperial intervention.

Definition

The etymology of the Arabic word for secularism can be controversial in itself. While some refer to '*almaniyya* which is derived from the word *alam*, suggesting that secularism is *worldy*, others prefer to think of *ilmanniyya* relating the word for secularism to the Arab word *ilm* (science, or knowledge). Some writers suggest another Arabic term '*alamaniyya* to avoid the confusion while others prefer *dunyawiyya*, meaning temporal, in contrast to *dini* (religious).

Overview

Many Muslims argue that, unlike Christianity, Islam does not separate religion from state and a majority of Muslims around the world welcome a significant role for Islam in their countries' political life. It is apolitical Islam, not political Islam, that requires explanation and that is an historical fluke of the "short-lived heyday of secular Arab nationalism between 1945 and 1970s."

In contrast, scholar Oliver Roy argues that "a defacto separation between political power" of sultans and emirs and religious power of the caliph was "created and institutionalized ... as early as the end of the first century of the hegira," what has been lacking in the Muslim world is "political thought regarding the autonomy of this space." No positive law was developed outside of sharia. The sovereign's religious function was to defend the Islamic community against its enemies, institute the sharia, ensure the public good (*maslaha*). The state was an instrument to enable Muslims to live as good Muslims and Muslims were to obey the sultan if he did so. The legitimacy of the ruler was "symbolized by the right to coin money and to have the Friday prayer (*Jumu'ah khutba*) said in his name.

The concept of Secularism in Islam has been claimed to have religious sanction too. The Sahih of Imam Muslim, the second most authentic book on Hadith, dating from the 2nd century Hijrah, contains a chapter headed as following: "Whatever the Prophet has

said in matters of religion must be followed, but this does not apply to worldly affairs."

The Hadith is as follows: *Once Prophet Muhammad came across some people doing artificial pollination of palm trees. Due to some reason he disliked the idea and commented that it would be better not to do any pollination at all. However for the following year the harvest was poor. When he came to know about this Prophet Muhammad admitted his limitation of knowledge regarding secular affairs and said: "If a question relates to your worldly matters you would know better about it, but if it relates to your religion then to me it belongs."*

Maulana Wahiduddin Khan, the prominent Indian Muslim scholar, comments on this Hadith: "Islam separated religious knowledge from physical knowledge. The source of religious knowledge which came into general acceptance was divine revelation (the authentic version of which is preserved in the form of the Quran), while full freedom was given to enquiry into physical phenomena, so that individuals could arrive at their own conclusions independently".

He further says: "According to this Hadith, Islam separates religious matters from scientific research. In religious affairs, there has to be strict adherence to divine guidance. But in scientific research, the work must proceed according to human experience." For this reason a positive and acceptable definition of secularism in the Islamic perspective has been suggested as a separation of Religion and Science rather than Religion and State and the scientific view of Islam is even claimed by many religious and Islamist Muslims to be secular, rather than religious but political and social secularism is still a very controversial and generally unaccepted idea in Muslim world particularly among Muslim masses around the globe.

History

Secular governments had existed in the Muslim world since the 10th century. According to the scholar Ira M. Lapidus:

In fact, religious and political life developed distinct spheres of experience, with independent values, leaders, and organizations. From the middle of the tenth century effective control of the Arab-Muslim empire had passed into the hands of generals, administrators, governors, and local provincial lords; the Caliphs had lost all effective political power. Governments in Islamic lands were henceforth secular regimes – Sultanates – in theory authorized by the Caliphs, but actually legitimized by the need for public order. Henceforth, Muslim states were fully differentiated political bodies without any intrinsic religious character, though they were officially loyal to Islam and committed to its defense.

In the same period, religious communities developed independently of the states or empires that ruled them. The *ulama* regulated local communal and religious life by serving as judges, administrators, teachers, and religious advisors to Muslim. The religious elites were organized according to religious affiliation into Sunni schools of law, Shi'ite sects, or Sufi *tariqas*. [...] In the wide range of matters arising from the Shari'a – the Muslim law – the 'ulama' of the schools formed a local administrative and social elite whose authority was based upon religion. Thus though the Muslim *madhahib* were not organized in the same way as Christian churches, they had many of the religious and social functions we associate with churches. But whether or not we wish to speak of churches, religious organizations, institutions, personnel and activities were clearly separate from the ruling regimes.

As long as two decades ago, Sir Hamilton Gibb, in his essay 'Constitutional Organization', showed that Muslim political thinkers themselves had become aware of the separation of state and religion and recognized the emergence of an autonomous sphere of religious activity and organization. For example, Ibn Taymiyya held that apart

from the Caliphate, the *ulama* constituted the true *umma* of Islam, and that ruling regimes were 'Muslim' regimes not by any intrinsic quality but by virtue of the support they lent the Muslim religion and religious communities.

In early Islamic philosophy, Averroes presented an argument in *The Decisive Treatise* providing a justification for the emancipation of science and philosophy from official Ash'ari theology, thus Averroism has been considered a precursor to modern secularism.

Modern History

Many of the early supporters of Secularist principles in Middle Eastern countries were Baathist and non-Muslim Arabs, seeking a solution to a multi-confessional population and an ongoing drive to modernism.

The most controversial work is that of Ali abd al-Raziq, an Islamic Scholar and Shari'a judge who caused a sensation with his work "Islam and the Foundations of Governance" (Al-Islam Wa Usul Al-Hukm) in 1925. For the first time in Muslim history, he argued there was nothing in the texts that made it obligatory that Muslims had to have the Caliphate form of religious government and that they can choose a system that suits them. This publication caused a fierce debate especially as he recommended that religion can be separated from government and politics. He was later removed from his position. Rosenthal commented on him saying:

"we meet for the first time a consistent, unequivocal theoretical assertion of the purely and exclusively religious character of Islam". Fauzi Najjar considers the secularization in Turkey as "anti-religious" and claims that "The term '*almaniyya*' acquired a bad connotation and was associated with irreligion in the Muslim world after the establishment of an anti-religious political system, but portrayed as secular, in Turkey in 1924 by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk".

Influences

When colonial rule was established, the process of secularization began to expand into Muslim lands. Secularism thus came as the European colonialists dominated the region and supplanted rule with their own processes and procedures.

“Modernization was seen as a legacy of European colonialism perpetuated by western-oriented elites who imposed and fostered the twin processes of westernization and secularization.”

Colonial powers in many cases replaced indigenous political, social, economic, legal, and educational institutions. For instance, in many former colonized Middle East countries, the *Kuttab* or the *madrassas* (the Quranic schools) were moved to the western format. The French colonial government in the protectorates of the Maghreb changed the education system into a secular model closely modeled on their own. The colonialists firmly believed that their secular system was more modern, efficient, and progressive than the incumbent practices. Naturally, these changes had far-reaching social consequences and laid the foundation of *Arab Secularism* by separating the Islam from government affairs, education, and justice.

In consequence, “perception of the public, political, and social domain through the prism of religion became marginal and was replaced by a new perception, a perception that was modern, temporal, ideological, ethical, evolutionary, and political.” This provided a challenge to some governments, which had no choice but to change in the face of overwhelming force. It is from this experience that secularism gained also its perceived foreign identity.

Communist Influence

In 1918 the Soviet Union opened the Commissariat for Muslim Affairs, which activity opposed the colonial powers in the Middle East and their system of Mandates.

In the 1920s the formation of the first communist parties in the Middle East started playing a key role in the anti-colonial struggle

and promoting their ethos regarding workers rights. During the Second World War they also played a role fighting against fascism and participating in the international peace movement.

A key element of the Communism movement was the well organized network of parties in different countries that provided support to each other and enabled communist organizations to become an effective outlet against oppression.

Communism went on to become one of the key components of Arab Nationalism and was particularly prominent during the rule of Gamel Abdel Nasser in Egypt in which Egyptian communists stood aside. And even though communism was often a prominent supporter of Arab nationalism, the international relationships which allowed it to be such a potent force were also used by opposition regimes, and to some extent third parties during the Cold War.

Secularism in Turkey

Secularism in Turkey was both dramatic and far reaching as it filled the vacuum of the fall of the Ottoman Empire after World War I. With the country getting down Mustafa Kemal Atatürk led a political and cultural revolution. “Official Turkish modernity took shape basically through a negation of the Islamic Ottoman system and the adoption of a west-oriented mode of modernization.”

In 1924 Atatürk’s Revolution brought Islamic authority under the full and absolute control of the secular state. The institutionalization of secularism involved bringing all religious activity under the direct control of the extremely authoritarian secular state.

- The abolition of the Caliphate.
- Religious lodges and Sufi orders were banned.
- A secular civil code was adopted to replace the previous codes based on Islamic law (shari’a) outlawing all forms of polygamy, annulled religious marriages, granted equal right

to men and women, in matters of inheritance, marriage and divorce.

- The religious court system and institutions of religious education were abolished.
- The use of religion for political purposes was banned.
- The article that defined the Turkish state as Islamic was removed from the constitution.
- The alphabet was changed from Arabic to Roman.
- A portion of religious activity was moved to the Turkish language, including the *Adhan* (call to prayer) which lasted till 1950.

Throughout the 20th century the authoritarian secular Turkish nationalism was continuously challenged by Islamists. Finally at the end of 20th century and beginning of 21st century, political Islamists and Islamic democrats such as the Welfare Party and Justice and Development Party (Turkey) gained enough power through democratic process to gradually convert extremely secular and authoritarian state of Turkey into an softly Islamic and relatively much more liberal state. These groups oppose laws that limit the freedom of Islam or forbid the external display of religious symbols, including the headscarf in public spheres.

Secularism in Iran

Following the military coup of 21 February 1921, Reza Khan had established himself as the dominant political personally in the century. Fearing that their influence might be diminished, the clergy of Iran proposed their support and persuaded him to assume the role of the Shah.

1925-1941: Reza Shah began to make some dramatic changes to Iranian society with the specific intention of westernization and removing religion from public sphere. He changed religious schools to secular schools, built Iran's first secular university and banned the hijab in public. Nevertheless, the regime became totally undemocratic and authoritarian with the removal of Majles power (the first parliament in 1906) and the clampdown on free speech.

1951-1953: During the early 1950s the Prime Minister Dr Mossadeq was again forming a pro secularization government with a socialist agenda with the specific aim of reducing the power held by the clergy. However his plans for nationalization the oil industry were a step too far. Britain, with the help of the CIA they supported a coup which replaced the government with Mohammad Reza Shah.

1962-1963: Using the mandate of Westernization, Mohammad Reza Shah introduced White Revolution. During this time a number of changes were made to put Iran on the path to become a Westernized Secularist Capitalist country.

1963-1973: Radically authoritarian secular changes alienated many of Mohammad Reza Shah's political opponents and majority of Iranian masses and any dissent was crushed by the brutal secret police of Shah. Opposition rallied united behind Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and by the end of the 1970s the Shah was overthrown in an Islamic Revolution (1979).

Secularism in Tunisia

Under the leadership of Habib Bourguiba (1956-1987), Tunisia's post independence government pursued a program of secularization. Bourguiba, *who has been one of the most avowedly secularist political strategies in the Arab world*, modified laws regarding habous (religious endowments), secularized education and unified the legal system so that all Tunisians, regardless of religion, were subject to the state courts. He restricted the influence of the religious University of Ez-Zitouna and replaced it with a faculty of theology integrated into the University of Tunis, banned the headscarf for women, made members of the religious hierarchy state employees and ordered that the expenses for the upkeep of mosques and the salaries of preachers to be regulated.

Moreover, his best known legal innovations was the 'Code du Statut Personel' (CSP) the laws governs issues related to the family: marriage, guardianship of children, inheritance and most importantly the abolishing of polygamy and making divorce subject to judicial review.

Bourguiba clearly wanted to undercut the religious establishment's ability to prevent his secularization program, and although he was careful to locate these changes within the framework of a modernist reading of Islam and presented them as the product of *ijtihad* (independent interpretation) and not a break with Islam, he became well known for his secularism. John Esposito notes that "*For Bourguiba, Islam represented the past: the west Tunisia's only hope for a modern future, but he was mistaken, Islam is modernization*".

Following increasing economic problems, Islamist movements came about in 1970 with the revival of religious teaching in Ez-Zitouna University and the influence which came from Arab religious leaders like Syrian and Egyptian Muslim Brotherhoods. There is also

influence by Hizb ut-Tahrir, whose members issue a magazine in Tunis named Azeytouna. In the aftermath, the struggle between Bourguiba and Islamists became uncontrolled and in order to repress the opposition the Islamist leadership were exiled, arrested and interrogated.

Ennahda Movement, also known as Renaissance Party or simply Ennahda, is a moderate Islamist political party in Tunisia. On 1 March 2011, after the secularist dictatorship of Zine El Abidine Ben Ali collapsed in the wake of the 2011 Tunisian revolution, Tunisia's interim government granted the group permission to form a political party. Since then it has become the biggest and most well-organized party in Tunisia, so far outdistancing its more secular competitors. In the Tunisian Constituent Assembly election, 2011, the first honest election in the country's history with a turn out of 51.1% of all eligible voters, the party won 37.04% of the popular vote and 89 (41%) of the 217 assembly seats, far more than any other party.

Secularism in Egypt

Secularism in Egypt has had a very important role to play in both the history of Egypt and that of the Middle East. Egypt's first experience of Secularism started with the British Occupation (1882-1952), the atmosphere which allowed propagation of western ideas. In this environment, pro-secularist intellectuals like Ya'qub Sarruf, Faris Nimr, Nicola Haddad whom sought political asylum from Ottoman Rule were able to publish their work. This debate had then become a burning issue with the work of Egyptian Shaykh Ali abd al-Reziq (1888-1966), "*The most momentous document in the crucial intellectual and religious debate of modern Islamic history*".

By 1919 Egypt had its first political secular entity called the 'Almani (Secular Party) this name was later changed to the Wafd party. It

combined secular policies with a nationalist agenda and had the majority support in the following years against both the rule of the king and the British influence. The Wafd party supported the allies during World War II and then proceeded to win the 1952 parliamentary elections, following these elections the prime minister was overthrown by the King leading to riots. These riots precipitated a military coup after which all political parties were banned including the Wafd and the Muslim Brotherhood.

The government of Gamel Abdel Nasser was secularist-nationalist in nature which at the time gathers a great deal of support both in Egypt and other Arab states. Key elements of Nasserism:

- Secularist-Nationalist dictatorship: No religious or other political movements allowed to impact government.
- Modernization, Industrialization and Nationalization; Socialist economy
- Concentration on Arab values, identity and nationalism rather than Muslim values, identity and nationalism.

Secular legacy of Nasser's dictatorship influenced dictatorial periods of Anwar Sadat and Hosni Mubarak and secularists ruled Egypt until 2011 Egyptian revolution. Despite continuous secularist oppression, the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood has become one of the most influential movements in the Islamic world, particularly in the Arab world. For many years it was described as “semi-legal” and was the only opposition group in Egypt able to field candidates during elections. In the Egyptian parliamentary election, 2011-2012, the political parties identified as “Islamist” (the Brotherhood's Freedom and Justice Party, Salafi Al-Nour Party and liberal Islamist Al-Wasat Party) won 75% of the total seats. Mohamed Morsi, an Islamist

democrat of Muslim Brotherhood is first democratically elected president of Egypt. Nowadays, most Egyptian proponents of secularism emphasize the link between secularism and ‘national unity’ between Coptic Christians and Muslims.

Secularism in Syria

The process of secularization in Syria began under the French mandate in the 1920s and went on continuously under different governments since the independence. Syria has been governed by the Arab nationalist Baath Party since 1963. The Baath regime combined Arab Socialism with secular ideology and an authoritarian political system. The constitution guarantees religious freedom for every recognized religious communities, including many Christian denominations. All schools are government-run and non-sectarian, although there is mandatory religious instruction, provided in Islam and/or Christianity. Political forms of Islam are not tolerated by the government. The Syrian legal system is primarily based on civil law, and was heavily influenced by the period of French rule. It is also drawn in part from Egyptian law of Abdel Nasser, quite from the Ottoman Millet system and very little from Sharia. Syria has separate secular and religious courts. Civil and criminal cases are heard in secular courts, while the Sharia courts handle personal, family, and religious matters in cases between Muslims or between Muslims and non-Muslims. Non-Muslim communities have their own religious courts using their own religious law.

Muslim Brotherhood of Syria is Sunni Islamist force in Syria and very loosely affiliated to the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. It has also been called the “dominant group” or “dominant force” in the Arab Spring uprising in Syria. The group's stated political positions

are moderate and in its most recent April 2012 manifesto it “pledges to respect individual rights”, to promote pluralism and democracy.

Secularism in Pakistan

Early in the history of the state of Pakistan (12 March 1949), a parliamentary resolution (the Objectives Resolution) was adopted in accordance with the vision of founding fathers of Pakistan (Muhammad Iqbal, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Liaquat Ali Khan). proclaiming:

Sovereignty belongs to Allah alone but He has delegated it to the State of Pakistan through its people for being exercised within the limits prescribed by Him as a sacred trust.

- The State shall exercise its powers and authority through the elected representatives of the people.
- The principles of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance and social justice, as enunciated by Islam, shall be fully observed.
- Muslims shall be enabled to order their lives in the individual and collective spheres in accordance with the teachings of Islam as set out in the Quran and Sunnah.
- Provision shall be made for the religious minorities to freely profess and practice their religions and develop their cultures.

This resolution later became key source of inspiration for writers of Constitution of Pakistan and is included in constitution as preamble. However, Pakistan is still a semi-secular state and Islamists and Islamic democratic parties in Pakistan are relatively less influential than democratic Islamists of other Muslim democracies.

Secularism in Lebanon

Lebanon is a parliamentary democracy within the overall framework of Confessionals, a form of consociationalism in which the highest offices are proportionately reserved for representatives from certain religious communities.

A growing number of Lebanese, however, have organized against the confessionalist system, advocating for an installation of laicite in the national government. The most recent expression of this secularist advocacy was the Laique Pride march held in Beirut on April 26 2012, as a response to Hizb ut-Tahrir's growing appeal in Beirut and its call to re-establish the Islamic caliphate.

Secularism and Religion: a Critical Analysis

Islamists believe that Islam fuses religion and politics, with normative political values determined by the divine texts. It is argued that this has historically been the case and the secularist/modernist efforts at secularizing politics are little more than jahiliyyah (ignorance), kafir (unbelief), irtidad (apostasy) and atheism. “Those who participated in secular politics were raising the flag of revolt against Allah and his messenger.”

Saudi scholars denounce secularism as strictly prohibited in Islamic tradition. The Saudi Arabian Directorate of Ifta', Preaching and Guidance, has issued a directive decreeing that whoever believes that there is a guidance (huda) more perfect than that of the Prophet, or that someone else's rule is better than his is a kafir.

It lists a number of specific tenets which would be regarded as a serious departure from the precepts of Islam, punishable according to Islamic law. For example:

- The belief that human made laws and constitutions are superior to the Shari'a.
- The opinion that Islam is limited to one's relation with God, and has nothing to do with the daily affairs of life.
- To disapprove of the application of the *hudud* (legal punishments decreed by God) that they are incompatible in the modern age.
- And whoever allows what God has prohibited is a *kafir*.

In the words of Tariq al-Bishri, “secularism and Islam cannot agree except by means of *talfiq* [combining the doctrines of more than one school, i.e., falsification], or by each turning away from its true meaning.”

Secularism and Authoritarianism

There is a direct relationship between secularism and oppression in the Middle East. Spread of Islamism and Islamic revival made secular leaders more repressive and authoritarian in order to protect secularism. At the same time the more repression from the government made society opposed to secularism and this opposition made Islamists more popular in the Middle East.

Authoritarianism has left in many countries the mosque as the only place to voice political opposition. Scholars like Vali Nasr argue that the secular elites in the Muslim world were imposed by colonial powers to maintain hegemony.

Secularism is also associated with military regimes, such as those in Turkey and Algeria. Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) succeeded in December 1991 elections in Algeria and Welfare Party succeeded in 1995 elections in Turkey. Both of these parties are example of relatively democratic minded Islamic parties. However, both of these

parties were eliminated through military coups in order to protect secularism. While Welfare Party government in Turkey was forced to resign from the office by Turkish military in February 1997 with a military intervention which is called as “post modern coup”, FIS in Algeria lived an austere military coup which carried the country in to civil war in 1992. Military forces in those countries could use their power in undemocratic ways in order to ‘protect secularism’.

In some countries, the fear of Islamist takeover via democratic processes has led to authoritarian measures against Islamist political parties. “The Syrian regime was able to capitalize on the fear of Islamist coming to power to justify the massive clampdown on the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood.” When American diplomats asked Hosni Mubarak to give more rights to the press and stop arresting the intellectuals, Mubarak rejected it and said, “If I do what you ask, the “fundamentalist” will take over the government in Egypt. Do you want that?” Or when President Bill Clinton asked Yasser Arafat to establish democracy in Palestine in 2001, Yasser Arafat also replied similarly. “He said that in a democratic system Islamist Hamas will surely take control of the government in Palestine”. Most of the Middle Eastern secularist autocrats drew upon the risk of Islamism in order to justify their autocratic rule of government in the international arena.

Modernism and Secularism **(Denounced by faith leaders)**

“We denounce modernism and secularism in the Church and call upon our faithful to heed the words of the ever-memorable Metropolitan Philaret (Voznesensky) – “Hold fast what you have.” Many Orthodox in America are looking to the Russian Church for an

example of steadfastness and loyalty to the traditions of Orthodoxy. We are committed to preserving that which has been handed down to us by our pious ancestors, and we call upon the faithful to increase their support of the Church, so that our mission will not be hindered.” – Metropolitan Hilarion of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, October 12, 2012 the Joint Pastoral Conference of the Eastern American Diocese and Moscow Patriarchate.

Modernism: Characteristics

Arising out of the rebellious mood at the beginning of the twentieth century, modernism was a radical approach that yearned to revitalize the way modern civilization viewed life, art, politics, and science. This rebellious attitude that flourished between 1900 and 1930 had, as its basis, the rejection of European culture for having become too corrupt, complacent and lethargic, ailing because it was bound by the artificialities of a society that was too preoccupied with image and too scared of change. This dissatisfaction with the moral bankruptcy of everything European led modern thinkers and artists to explore other alternatives, especially primitive cultures. For the Establishment, the result would be cataclysmic; the new emerging culture would undermine tradition and authority in the hopes of transforming contemporary society.

The first characteristic associated with modernism is nihilism, the rejection of all religious and moral principles as the only means of obtaining social progress. In other words, the modernists repudiated the moral codes of the society in which they were living in. The reason that they did so was not necessarily because they did not believe in God, although there was a great majority of them who were atheists, or that they experienced great doubt about the meaninglessness of life. Rather, their rejection of conventional morality was based on its arbitrariness, its conformity and its exertion of control over human feelings. In other words, the rules of

conduct were a restrictive and limiting force over the human spirit. The modernists believed that for an individual to feel whole and a contributor to the re-vitalization of the social process, he or she needed to be free of all the encumbering baggage of hundreds of years of hypocrisy.

The rejection of moral and religious principles was compounded by the repudiation of all systems of beliefs, whether in the arts, politics, sciences or philosophy. Doubt was not necessarily the most significant reason why this questioning took place. One of the causes of this iconoclasm was the fact that early 20th-century culture was literally re-inventing itself on a daily basis. With so many scientific discoveries and technological innovations taking place, the world was changing so quickly that culture had to re-define itself constantly in order to keep pace with modernity and not appear anachronistic. By the time a new scientific or philosophical system or artistic style had found acceptance, each was soon after questioned and discarded for an even newer one. Another reason for this fickleness was the fact that people felt a tremendous creative energy always looming in the background as if to announce the birth of some new invention or theory.

As a consequence of the new technological dynamics, the modernists felt a sense of constant anticipation and did not want to commit to any one system that would thereby harness creativity, ultimately restricting and annihilating it. And so, in the arts, for instance, at the beginning of the 20th-century, artists questioned academic art for its lack of freedom and flirted with so many isms: secessionism, fauvism, expressionism, cubism, futurism, constructivism, dada, and surrealism. Pablo Picasso, for instance, went as far as experimenting with several of these styles, never wanting to feel too comfortable with any one style.

The wrestling with all the new assumptions about reality and culture generated a new permissiveness in the realm of the arts. The arts were now beginning to break all of the rules since they were trying

to keep pace with all of the theoretical and technological advances that were changing the whole structure of life. In doing so, artists broke rank with everything that had been taught as being sacred and invented and experimented with new artistic languages that could more appropriately express the meaning of all of the new changes that were occurring. The result was a new art that appeared strange and radical to whoever experienced it because the artistic standard had always been mimesis, the literal imitation or representation of the appearance of nature, people, and society. In other words, art was supposed to be judged on the standard of how well it realistically reflected what something looked or sounded like.

This mimetic tradition had originated way back in ancient Greece, had been perfected during the Renaissance, and had found prominence during the nineteenth-century. But for modern artists this old standard was too limiting and did not reflect the way that life was now being experienced. Freud and Einstein had radically changed perception of reality. Freud had asked us to look inwardly into a personal world that had previously been repressed, and Einstein taught us that relatively was everything. And, thus, new artistic forms had to be found that expressed this new subjectivity. Artists countered with works that were so personal that they distorted the natural appearance of things and with reason. Each individual work begged to be judged as a self-sufficient unit which obeyed its own internal laws and its own internal logic, thereby attaining its own individual character. No more conventional cookie-cutter forms to be superimposed on human expression.

What were some of the artistic beliefs that the modernists adopted? Above all they embraced freedom, and they found it in the artistic forms and emotions of the primitive cultures of Africa, the Orient, the Americas and Oceania. This act was the repudiation of all of the stylistic refinements that were the basis of 19th-century artistic endeavor. On the one hand, primitivism represented the simplification of form, which was to become one of the hallmarks of

modernism. This abstraction of form suggested that some essential structure, previously hidden by realistic technique, would come to light. Art had, according to the modernists, become too concerned with irrelevant sophistications and conventions that detracted from the main purpose of art: the discovery of truth. On the other hand, primitivism was the expression of all that civilized man had to repress in order to enter into contract with society. According to Sigmund Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents*, In order for man to partake in civilized society, he had had to lay aside many uncivilized urges within the self, such as the natural appetite for adultery, incest, murder, homosexuality, etc., all held as taboos. It is this repression of natural desires that, Freud argues, is the source of modern neurosis. As a Jew, Freud was too well acquainted with the THOU SHALL NOTS of the Ten Commandments. Symbolically, the embrace of primitivism is a negation of the very principles of the Judeo-Christian tradition and an affirmation of authentic expression of that hidden self that only finds expression at night when we dream.

The modernist interest in primitivism also expressed itself in its correlative, the exploration of perversity. This obsession with the forbidden and the lurid was tantamount to the re-discovery of passion, a way of life which so many creative people at the time believed to have been repressed or had lain dormant. Frederick Nietzsche blames this dormancy on the 19th-century's preoccupation with form. In his seminal work *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche had traced the origins and development of drama back in Ancient Greece to the balance that existed between two gods who existed in opposition to one another, Apollo and Dionysius, Apollo represented the essence of light, rationality, civility, culture, and restraint. In contrast, Dionysius suggested wine, the primitive urge, all that was uncivilized. Although these two gods existed in opposition to one another, they were both, nevertheless, revered equally, thus striking a balance between form (the Apollonian) and creative impulse

(Dionysius). The modernists concurred with Nietzsche that art had degenerated because it was too concerned with the rules of form and not enough with the creative energies that lie underneath the surface. It is that exploration of what is underneath the surface that the modernists were so keen about, and what better way to do so than to scrutinize man's real aspirations, feelings, and actions. What was revealed was a new honesty in this portrayal: disintegration, madness, suicide, sexual depravity, impotence, morbidity, deception? Many would assail this portrayal as morally degenerate; the modernists, on the other hand, would defend themselves by calling it liberating.

Ironically, the modernist portrayal of human nature takes place within the context of the city rather than in nature, where it had occurred during the entire 19th-century. At the beginning of the 19th-century, the romantics had idealize nature as evidence of the transcendent existence of God; towards the end of the century, it became a symbol of chaotic, random existence. For the modernists, nature becomes irrelevant and passé, for the city supersedes nature as the life force. Why would the modernists shift their interest from nature and unto the city? The first reason is an obvious one. This is the time when so many left the countryside to make their fortunes in the city, the new capital of culture and technology, the new artificial paradise. But more importantly, the city is the place where man is dehumanized by so many degenerate forces. Thus, the city becomes the locus where modern man is microscopically focused on and dissected. In the final analysis, the city becomes a "cruel devourer", a cemetery for lost souls.

The Forces That Shaped Modernism

The year 1900 ushered a new era that changed the way that reality was perceived and portrayed. Years later this revolutionary new period would come to be known as modernism and would forever be

defined as a time when artists and thinkers rebelled against every conceivable doctrine that was widely accepted by the Establishment, whether in the arts, science, medicine, philosophy, etc. Although modernism would be short-lived, from 1900 to 1930, we are still reeling from its influences sixty-five years later.

How was modernism such a radical departure from what had preceded it in the past? The modernists were militant about distancing themselves from every traditional idea that had been held sacred by Western civilization, and perhaps we can even go so far as to refer to them as intellectual anarchists in their willingness to vandalize anything connected to the established order. In order to better understand this modernist iconoclasm, let's go back in time to explore how and why the human landscape was changing so rapidly. By 1900 the world was a bustling place transformed by all of the new discoveries, inventions and technological achievements that were being thrust on civilization: electricity, the combustion engine, the incandescent light bulb, the automobile, the airplane, radio, X-rays, fertilizers and so forth. These innovations revolutionized the world in two distinct ways. For one, they created an optimistic aura of a worldly paradise, of a new technology that was to reshape man into moral perfection. In other words, technology became a new religious cult that held the key to a new utopian dream that would transform the very nature of man. Secondly, the new technology quickened the pace through which people experienced life on a day to day basis. For instance, the innovations in the field of transportation and communication accelerated the daily life of the individual. Whereas in the past, a person's life was circumscribed by the lack of mechanical resources available, a person could now expand the scope of daily activities through the new liberating power of the machine. Man now became literally energized by all of these scientific and technological innovations and, more important, felt a

rush emanating from the feeling that he was invincible, that there was no stopping him.

Modernity, however, was not only shaped by this new technology. Several philosophical theoreticians were to change the way that modern man perceives the external world, particularly in their refutation of the Newtonian principle that reality was an absolute, unquestionable entity divorced from those observing it. The first to do so was F. H. Bradley, who considered that the human mind is a more fundamental feature of the universe than matter and that its purpose is to search for truth. His most ambitious work, *Appearance and Reality: A Metaphysical Essay* (1893), introduced the concept that an object in reality can have no absolute contours but varies from the angle from which it is seen. Thus Bradley defines the identity of a thing as the view the onlooker takes of it. The effect of this work was to encourage rather than dispel doubt. In one of the most seminal works of this century, "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies," Albert Einstein's theory of relativity held that, if, for all frames of reference, the speed of light is constant and if all natural laws are the same, then both time and motion are found to be relative to the observer. In other words, there is no such thing as universal time and thus experience runs very differently from man to man. Alfred Whitehead was another who revised the ideas of time, space and motion as the basis of man's perception of the external world. He viewed reality as living geometry and believed in the essential relevance of every object to all other objects: "all entities or factors in the universe are essentially relevant to each other's existence since every entity involves an infinite array of perspectives." For all of these thinkers, subjectivity was now the main focus.

Several psychological theoreticians were to also fundamentally alter the way that modern man viewed his own internal reality, an unexplored heart of darkness. Sigmund Freud was the first to gaze

inwardly and to discover a world within where dynamic, often warring forces shape the individual's psyche and personality. To explain this internal world within each of us, he developed a complex theory of the unconscious that illustrated the importance of unconscious motivation in behavior and the proposition that psychological events can go on outside of conscious awareness. And so, according to Freud, fantasies, dreams, and slips of the tongue are outward manifestations of unconscious motives. Furthermore, in explaining the development of personality, Freud expanded man's definition of sexuality to include oral, anal, and other bodily sensations. Thus his legacy to the modern world was to expose a darker side of man that had been hidden from view by the hypocrisy of 19th-century society.

Freud was not the only psychological theoretician who asked us to gaze inwardly to better understand the human psyche. His disciple, Carl Jung, was also to develop another theory delving into the unconscious which explored the nature of the irrational self and which explained the common grounds shared by so many cultures. Jung's Theory of the Collective Unconscious, about an area of the mind that he believed was shared by everyone, states that there are patterns of behavior or actions and reactions of the psyche which he calls archetypes that are determined by race. These instinctive, universal patterns manifest themselves in dreams, visions, and fantasies and are expressed in myths, religious concepts, fairy tales, and works of art.

The French philosopher Henry Bergson was also to turn his gaze to the unconscious to explore the nature of memory as experienced in the present moment. Bergson's *Time and the Free Will* was an attempt to establish the notion of duration, or lived time, as opposed to what he viewed as the spatialized conception of time measured by the clock and commonly known as chronological time. According to Bergson, states of conscious memory permeate one another in

storage within the unconscious, in the same way that “oldie-goldies” are stored in a juke-box. A sense impression, such as whiff of cologne or the taste of sweet potato pie, might trigger consciousness to recall one of these memories, much like a coin will cause the record of your choice to play. Once the submerged memory resurfaces in the conscious mind, the self becomes suspended, there might be a spontaneous flash of intuition about the past, and just maybe, this insight will translate into some kind of realization of the present moment. In fact, isn't this what we do when we listen to an old song, forget the present, re-experience the past, and then, all of a sudden, apply it all to our lives in the present? And thus, intuition leads to knowledge.

Politics and the economy would also transform the way that modern man looked at himself and the world in which he lived. Science and technology were radically changing the means of production. Whereas in the past, a worker became involved in production from beginning to end, by 1900 he had become a mere cog in the production line, making an insignificant contribution. Thus, division of labor made him feel fragmented, alienated not only from the rest of society but from himself. One of the effects of this fragmentation was the consolidation of workers into political parties that threatened the upper classes. And thus, the new political idealism that was to culminate in the Russian Revolution that swept through Europe.

SECULARISM – *THE MOST EVIL PHILOSOPHY KNOWN TO HUMAN GOVERNMENT*

It became somewhat fashionable during the 20th century to claim that the most wicked governments in human history were governments with a religious (usually a Christian) agenda. This claim – totally

unsubstantiated by the facts – started to be heard everywhere, especially, of course, among liberals and socialists, and atheists often threw this claim at believers. Indeed, even in this early 21st century, Richard Dawkins still uses this outdated (and now well disproven) argument – *not the only outdated and now discredited argument which Dawkins uses against Christianity!*

The true facts are rather different, indeed, quite *dramatically* different. I want to give five or six examples which amount to very powerful evidence that it is *God-denying Secularism* which has caused more violence and suffering than anything else in history.

1. The French Republic

It is sometimes forgotten that the French revolution held a very strong *anti-church* and *anti-clerical* agenda (apart from its more obvious *anti-aristocratic* motivation). The early revolutionaries set out to destroy Christianity in France because they felt that it had protected the French monarchy. Thousands of believers, including many priests, were killed in the process. In all, post-revolution, the French murdered about one million of their own people; often this was without trial or after a ‘trial’ which can only be called cruel, shambolic and cynical in the extreme. The revolutionaries may have considered the French monarchy somewhat unresponsive and uncaring towards the masses (in fact, the French king had refused to use force against his opponents), but this would prove ‘small fry’ compared to the wholesale slaughter which followed that revolution. Indeed, in the end the guillotine could not handle the multitudes accounted worthy for slaughter and mass drowning was employed as a tool of execution. No historian worthy of his salt doubts that *many*

thousands died as a result of that revolution simply because they went the victims of envy, greed and jealousy!

For a period of about 20 years following the actual revolution per se, scores continued to be settled in a most brutal and blood thirsty manner with many deaths and with the rule of law often being an utter sham. The interesting thing about this particular example is that here is an example of a society which overturned not only the rule of the aristocracy but of the church also. As already briefly outlined, the revolution held a strongly anti-Christian and anti-clerical agenda. Today it is often claimed that the French Republic was the first truly modern government and “*the first truly liberal government*” – actually, in many senses, that is perfectly true, but *does this not tell us rather a lot about Liberalism and Secularism?* After all, this period of French history was also totalitarian, despotic, frequently highly lawless, raging as it did with a hatred of fairness and justice and a callous disregard for the dignity of human life?

Maximilien Robespierre (1758-1794) was one of the chief architects of the French Revolution and the infamous ‘reign of terror’ which followed it. He had absorbed all the leftist, *man-cenred* concepts of the Enlightenment and was influenced by arch-atheist Voltaire and also by Rousseau. He hated organized religion and wanted to replace worship of the Christian God with acknowledgement of the Deist ‘god’ (in which God continued to reign supreme but in complete isolation from Mankind to whom He had delegated full moral authority and autonomy). Robespierre was instrumental in the blood-letting and wholesale brutality of the ‘reign of terror,’ and even had many fellow revolutionaries executed for being ‘too moderate.’ As his vanity, persecution-complex and megalomania grew, he himself, ironically, was betrayed, finally going to the guillotine in 1794. The first five years of the ‘Reign of Terror’ ended then, but historians are

in error when claiming that that ‘reign’ only lasted for five years – 15-20 years is closer to the mark.

Is it not most interesting that every human government which has resulted from the overturning of the authority of the Church has also been cruel, despotic and willing to kill with impunity?

Moreover, it was *this* revolution which would later encourage people like Marx and Lenin and, yes, Hitler and Stalin too in their evil designs. How come? Because what happened in France around 1789 showed these 19th and 20th century demagogues and despots how a formerly stable society could be radically – and quite rapidly – changed by the will of the masses when those masses are fed a *continual diet* of the ideologically appropriate philosophy, the message of France was: get the propaganda right, then find a way of feeding that to the masses and *anything becomes possible!* Late 18th century France was their ‘blueprint.’ In France, eventually, it was none other than Napoleon Bonaparte who restored the traditional French respect for Christianity, and French Roman Catholicism again became a great force.

2. Nazism, Communism and Marxism

In the 20th century alone, more people were slaughtered under Secularist God-denying governments and in the name of secularist ideologies, such as Nazism and Communism, than *in all the documented religious persecutions within western history combined!* Most people know that Hitler was responsible for the deaths of 6,000,000 Jews alone (apart, that is, from the other groups of Slavs, Poles etc., which his henchmen slaughtered on a vast scale). What is probably far less well-known is that as many as 110-118 million people have been killed by Communism alone – in eastern Europe, Africa, Central and South America and in southeast Asia.

Regarding communist Russia, rarely, if ever, has a regime taken the lives of so many of its own people. Mark Weber has compiled some horrifying statistics and several paragraphs here are based on mark's extensive research:

Citing newly-available Soviet KGB documents, historian Dmitri Volkogonov, head of a special Russian parliamentary commission, recently concluded that "from 1929 to 1952 21.5 million [Soviet] people were repressed. Of these a third were shot, the rest sentenced to imprisonment, where many also died." 32(Cited by historian Robert Conquest in a review/article in *The New York Review of Books*, Sept. 23, 1993, p. 27).

Olga Shatunovskaya, a member of the Soviet Commission of Party Control, and head of a special commission during the 1960s appointed by Premier Khrushchev, has similarly concluded: "From January 1, 1935 to June 22, 1941, 19,840,000 enemies of the people were arrested. Of these, seven million were shot in prison, and a majority of the others died in camp." These figures were also found in the papers of Politburo member Anastas Mikoyan.

Robert Conquest, the distinguished specialist of Soviet history, recently summed up the grim record of Soviet "repression" of its own people: (Review/article by Robert Conquest in *The New York Review of Books*, Sept. 23, 1993, p. 27.; In the "Great Terror" years of 1937-1938 alone, Conquest has calculated, approximately one million were shot by the Soviet secret police, and another two million perished in Soviet camps, R, Conquest, *The Great Terror* [New York: Oxford, 1990), pp. 485-486.; Conquest has estimated that 13.5 to 14 million people perished in the collectivization ("dekulakization") campaign and forced famine of 1929-1933, R, Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow* (New York: Oxford, 1986), pp. 301-307].

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the post-1934 death toll was well over ten million. To this should be added the victims of the 1930-1933 famine, the kulak deportations, and other anti-peasant campaigns, amounting to another ten million plus. The total is thus in the range of what the Russians now refer to as "The Twenty Million."

A few other scholars have given significantly higher estimates. Russian professor Igor Bestuzhev-I ada, writing in a 1988 issue of the Moscow weekly *Nedelya*, suggested that during the Stalin era alone (1935-1953), as many as 50 million people were killed, condemned to camps from which they never emerged, or lost their lives as a direct result of the brutal "dekulakization" campaign against the peasantry. "Soviets admit Stalin killed 50 million," *The Sunday Times*, London, April 17, 1988.; R. J. Rummel, a professor of political science at the University of Hawaii, has recently calculated that 61.9 million people were systematically killed by the Soviet Communist regime from 1917 to 1987. R. J. Rummel *Lethal Politics: Soviet Genocide and Mass Murder Since 1917* (Transaction, 1990)].

In China, in particular, the destruction has been imagination-defying (the true figures for the governmentally-caused famines of the Chinese '*Cultural Revolution*' and '*Great Leap Forward*,' for example, are only just emerging and historians have been stunned. Anything from twenty to forty million people perished in China).

Statistics historian R.J. Rummel's estimates are as follows:

1. TRANSFORMATION AND THE NATIONALSIT STRUGGLE, 1900 TO SEPTEMBER 1949.
2. 105,000 Victims: Dynastic and Republican China.
3. 632,000 Victims: Warlord China.

4. 2,724,000 Victims: The Nationalist Period.
 5. 10,216,000 Victims: The Sino-Japanese War.
 6. 3,949,000 Victims: Japanese Mass Murder in China.
 7. 4,968,000 Victims: The Civil War.
- II. THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA.
8. The People's Republic of China: Overview.
 9. 8,427,000 Victims: The Totalization Period.
 10. 7,474,000 Victims: Collectivization and 'The Great Leap Forward.'
 11. 10,729,000 Victims: The Great Famine and Retrenchment Period.
 12. 7,731,000 Victims: The "Cultural Revolution."
 13. 874,000 Victims: Liberalization.

R.J. Rummel's '*China's Bloody Century*' is [here](#).

These figures, if accurate, amount to something like 54 million people in China alone!

Obviously some of the above incredible figures are pre-communism but the figures *do* show the appalling wastage of human life in the vast land. Obviously, none of these outrageous figures are in any sense attributable to Christianity, or indeed to any other organized religion!

What of the *Khmer Rouge*? These Communists caused carnage and havoc in the Cambodia of the 1970s. It has been estimated that due to their activities *a full one fifth* of Cambodia's population of that period was lost! This was about 2 million people, although some have claimed higher figures than this.

Neither can we ignore the horrific *Rwandan Genocide* of 1993-94. The figures for those killed are somewhere between 500,000 and one million people (probably the second figure is closet). Tutsis and

Hutu moderates were slaughtered in their tens of thousands, mainly by two Hutu militia groups, one known as the MRND ('National Republican Movement for Democracy and Development') and the Impuzamugambi ("Those who have the same goal"), the latter group being especially committed to genocide. These were secularist, 'democratic,' leftist-type movements of Marxist origin. Sadly, among the slaughtered were a very large number of churchgoing Christians.

So we start to learn that in the 20th century alone, many more have been killed by God-denying Secularist movements and governments than ever died in religious conflicts. Some, though, will still want more examples and comparisons before being convinced...

3. The Spanish Inquisition – A Comparison

What of *The Spanish Inquisition*? It has been claimed that this was one of the greatest evils in European history and this could certainly be called an act of Christianity, at least in an organized, institutionalized sense. But what is the truth? I am not going to apologize for things carried out in Roman Catholic countries and one cannot excuse torture, but I think we should always strive for the truth. Many of us have long suspected that some of the figures quoted somewhat hysterically for this "*Christian outrage*" may have been wildly exaggerated. Now two books give us much greater information and careful analysis; Henry Kamen's *The Spanish Inquisition* and *The Inquisition*, edited by Brenda Stalcup. In referring to these sources, J.P. Holding writes this, '*Kamen reports that the threat of the Spanish Inquisition has been particularly overblown. Without minimizing the atrocities that were committed. It is nevertheless a fact that many skeptical sites (relying at times on Helen Ellerbee, a notoriously unreliable source) frame the Spanish Inquisition particularly as one might elsewhere frame Mao's Great*

Leap Forward. Kamen [K60, 203] notes that, “Taking into account all the tribunals of Spain up to about 1530, it is unlikely that more than two thousand people were executed for heresy by the Inquisition... for most of its existence that Inquisition was far from being a Juggernaut of death either in intention or in capability.” By Kamen’s estimate, for example, “it would seem that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries fewer than three people a year were executed in the whole of the Spanish monarchy from Sicily to Peru, certainly a lower rate than in any provincial court of justice in Spain or anywhere else in Europe.” [K203]. This was weighted against people of Jewish and Muslim origin, but let it never be said that the numbers themselves are anything to be flabbergasted about. It is also notable that the impetus for the Inquisition in Spain came first not from the church, but from the king and queen of Spain who asked for an Inquisition to be conducted.

‘Stalcup notes that the Catholic Church (CC) in the Dark Ages “was the one stable institution that provided leadership and order” and quotes historian Bernard Hamilton as saying that “as the sole vehicle of a more civilized tradition in a barbarous world” the CC “became involved in social and political activities which formed no part of its essential mission, but which it alone was qualified to discharge.” [14] With the exception of a few Jews and Muslims, all people in Western Europe depended on the CC for meaning and survival. Any undermining of this social construct was a threat to the physical, mental, and spiritual well-being of the whole. (Kamen likewise says of the Spanish variation. “It fulfilled a role...that no other institution fulfilled.” [K82]) (Quoted from ‘Were You Expecting It?’ by J.P. Holding.

There is no doubt that certain points here are never taken into account when one hears discussions of the ‘Inquisition,’ yet atheists and liberals love to throw in this actually very poor example of “*Christian Inquisition.*” I’m afraid that not only the cults and sects,

but we Protestants too have often been guilty of making exaggerated claims about the Inquisition – but we should not exaggerate these things. It seems, then, that despite the horror which any discussion of this topic raises in some people, the truth is probably that as few as two thousand people were ever executed due to the Inquisition. *Even if we double that figure it remains an absolutely tiny figure in comparison with the many millions who have died as a result of Communism, especially in China.*

4. ‘Witch-hunting’ – A Comparison

Many liberals and atheists have had enormous fun with this one! Some of their claims of the numbers involved have frankly bordered on the lunatic. Many modern historical revisionists appear to see this as a sort of ‘*suppression of women’s rights*’ issue, the general idea being that thousands of witch-hunters spent their entire lives searching for poor, confused women because they were just sadistic bullies who loved to see women being put to death! Moreover these modern writers always operate from the modernist *assumption* that there is no world of the supernatural. Such people are almost invariably atheists, holding no concept of God, or of Satan. But, as regarding the numbers, Philip Sampson has pointed out.

‘In recent years...scholars have studied witchcraft more carefully. The picture which emerges is not the one we have been led to expect. As long ago as 1928, Montague Summers called the belief that witches went to the stake in England, “a popular and fast-grounded, if erroneous, opinion” of the “ignorant,” best suited to the “romanticist and story book” (Philip J. Sampson, Six Modern Myths, p. 133).

Today a picture is often painted of ignorant and superstitious churchmen who were finally put out of their ‘witch-hunting’ work

endeavors by the brave and clever scientists of the Enlightenment; this, of course, is pure hokum, truly a modernist myth if ever there was one. Fact is: Many have always believed that witches with supernatural powers exist even if tiny in numbers. Even today in England we have ‘white witches’ and ‘black witches’ (noting to do with race, the terms refer to severity of doctrine). I am informed (by an informant who came from that background) that witch covens are especially strong in a band stretching across southern England from Cornwall in the west to the New Forest in Hampshire in the east! Yes, an absolutely tiny group no doubt but a fact nevertheless. This is worth pointing out since those who use this issue to attack Christianity always proceed on the assumption that witches cannot possibly be a reality, and that this whole matter was just something somehow dreamed up by hateful fundamentalist, persecuting religious misogynists.

The actual quoted numbers of women executed as witches have been placed well and truly within fantasyland by writers like Carl Sagan, bristling with a hatred of Christianity and a desire to belittle us wherever possible. Sagan has quoted over ten million (Sagan, *The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a Candle in the Dark*, p116), as has M. Daly (Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p183, 208). But such figures are absurd and lack any sort of historical credibility, indeed, one only arrives at such silly figures by insisting on being purely emotional and rejecting all wise historical counsel. As Sampson has pointed out.

‘More recent estimates put the number of executions at about 150 to 300 people per year throughout all of Europe and North America...Over a period of about three hundred years this amounts to between 40,000 and 100,000 people.’ (Sampson, p138).

Of course, one does not wish to excuse outrage where outrage really occurred, but it is high time that some of the ludicrous figures quoted by some who simply want to discredit Christianity were challenged.

Some have even called the burning of witches a “*holocaust*” – again, this emotive talk is fully without any foundation. The suggested numbers, though lamentable, are not of holocaust proportions! Indeed, if some of the suggested figures of people like Sagan were true, even today Europe would suffer from a serious lack of women and would never have built up present population levels! I myself have into the same facts and figures which are available, though often hard to track down, and my estimate would be lower than that of Philip J. Sampson, perhaps – in absolute total-between 25,000 and 80,000 – very lamentable but, don’t forget, this is for a period of perhaps 350 years and covering the entirety of Europe and north America. Meanwhile Sagan’s “*ten million*” should be regarded as sheer fantasy and fiction!

5. The Crusades – A Comparison

This is a nowise objection to Christianity but nowadays it always seems to come up and I don’t think I should leave it out. Recently some very naïve liberal Christians were saying that relations between Christianity and Islam might improve if Christians apologized for the “*death and destruction*” of the Crusades. Once again, in no time, distortion came into the picture with “*many millions*” being quoted as the likely figure of deaths caused by the Crusades – but what is the truth?

The Crusades originally had the goal of recapturing Jerusalem and the Holy Land from Muslim rule and were launched in response to a call from the Eastern Orthodox Byzantine Empire for help against the expansion of the Muslim Turks into Anatolia. There were nine principle ‘crusades’ (and several more minor ones) covering a period from 1095-1272, however, several were very brief with the Eighth Crusade lasting less than a year and the Fourth Crusade lasting just two years. As the Crusades progressed, however, they often seem to have been motivated more by politics and greed than by true religious reason and it is doubtful whether ‘Christianity’ itself should

be held responsible for some of the dreadful things which happened, especially when *plainly political papal power* used ‘crusades’ to attack Eastern Orthodoxy (the Fourth Crusade)! Indeed, the common perception that the ‘crusades’ were all about Christians attacking Muslims is totally incorrect; perhaps only two or three of the crusades were more major conflagrations and involved attacking Muslims on a large scale.

A total figure of 9 million deaths has been cited for all of the crusades – but it is very debatable how much Christianity can truly be held accountable for this when a particular crusade was clearly political; also, ‘soldiers of fortune’ joined some of the expeditions and raped, pillaged and torched villages along route in total defiance of orders: can that ever be considered a Christian responsibility? In some terrible cases Muslim women were mercilessly exterminated by the victorious “Christians” – but was this typical behavior? No. The evidence is strong that mercy also played a large part in many of the campaigns; unfortunately, however, war always has, and always will, lead to unjustifiable excesses. I think we must concede that something from 8 to as many as 11 million people probably did die during the crusades but when we narrow this down to the *plainly religious* crusades intent on recapturing the Holy Land (which we surely should) this might well be reduced to something up to 7 to 9 million. This, of course, while deeply regrettable, would be tiny compared to the carnage of perhaps 54 million people in China during a period of less than 100 years, but it remains a lamentable fact and we can’t deny that.

6. The Second World War

Some have given the Second World War as an example of Christian outrages resulting in millions of deaths perpetrated by one group of

Christians upon another, but this is a very poor example which can be very quickly refuted. Let us look at this:

The claim is that both Great Britain and the United States on the one hand and Germany on the other hand were “*Christian nations.*” However this is simply untrue. The Nazi party had negated the authority of the German Lutheran Church and the sincere, godly pastors (like Dietrich Bonhoeffer) were imprisoned if they did not agree to support Hitler. Thereafter the Nazis embarked on their reign of bloodshed, terror and genocide.

Hitler and Minister for Propaganda Joseph Goebbels made a determined effort to *replace* the great respect which the German people had held for Lutheran Christianity with *another ideology and another philosophy*. Respect for pagan, Teutonic and Nordic mythologies started to be actively encouraged, this coupled with the stress on atheistic ‘survival of the fittest’ Darwinism.

So, in embarking on their evil and doomed path, the Germany of 1939-1945 *cannot* – by any stretch of the imagination – be considered as a “*Christian nation.*” *However*, it was two Christian nations in particular, Great Britain and the United States (plus several other ‘Christian nation’ allies, including Canada, Australia and New Zealand) which were determined to stand up to Hitler’s despotism! – So this is actually a very strong argument for the moral integrity of Christianity! It was, perhaps, the world’s two major Christian nations which felt that Hitler could not be allowed to get away with his hideous outrages forever and that some national sacrifices were necessary in order to defeat him!

Conclusion

We have not here even considered the great *non-religious* conquering warlords of earlier times, including Genghis Khan and Atilla the Hun, but there were several others too. These conquerors presided over the slaughter of untold millions. How many died as the result of their campaigns? 7 million? That sounds much too low. 20 million? 45 million? Nobody knows for sure. But what we should by now clearly be able to see from our brief study is that all-herd 20th century claim (still upheld by people like Richard Dawkins), that Christianity and organized religion in general have caused more violence and suffering than anything else in human history, is not only defeated but defeated with some ease. Indeed we have learned that it is Secular human governments, whether pre-Christian or motivated by Communism, Nazism or Liberalism (the French Republic), which have unleashed untold human suffering upon this planet – much of this occurring within the 20th century alone. Incidentally, of that huge portion of this death and destruction which took place in the 20th century, a large part is directly attributable to the influence of Charles Darwin and Darwinism, a major *atheistic* influence.

Secularism (in its many forms) when adopted by human government is a mass-killer!

Secularism in India

The preamble to the Constitution of India claims India to be a SOCIALIST, SECULAR, DEMOCRATIC, REPUBLIC. What does it mean to call a country “Secular”? What does secularism imply? Is India really secular in practice? This article tries to find answers to all these questions.

Secularism has been defined differently in different countries in the world. The two ways in which it usually is understood are following:

1. Separation of State and Religion – This concept can be found in practice in France where State has no religion. It neither favors nor condemns any religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth.
2. Multiculturalism – This concept is in practice in India. In India too, by the virtue of being a secular State’ the State has no religion but it favors all religions. That in a way implies that the State has all religions.

It was the famous 42nd amendment which inserted the word “Secular” in the Preamble of our Constitution. How do we know that the concept of Secularism in India is different from that in France and other South Asian countries?

Right to freedom of Religion under our Constitution not only allows establishing religion based schools but these schools can also be subsidized by the State. Thus, State encourages all religions. State is not separate from religion.

Sometimes the State seems to be in a confused state! Rather State seems to be in a state which leaves citizens in a confused state. One very commonly talked about example is subsidy given to Muslims going for Haj which discriminates against those Hindus who go to their pilgrimage example; Vaishno Devi Yatra on their own expenses. Here, I am not advocating that the State should not give subsidy for Haj or should also give subsidy for Vaishno Devi Yatra or say Char Dham Yatra, All I am concerned with is the fact that in the effort of practicing multiculturalism State would knowingly or unknowingly end up favoring one section and discriminating against the other.

This reminds me of *Article 48* of the Constitution which is although targeted towards organization of agriculture and animal husbandry but has raised different questions in the past. The intention of the State must have been clean in providing for prohibition on slaughter of cows and calves but this still has a potential to offend a group of people who enjoy having beef in their dinner plates. Since, cows are worshiped in Hinduism, although the State might not have intended such, the Article has the potential of being interpreted in a way that it favors a particular religion.

This again raises a question. If India has to be a “Secular” country as it has been added in the Preamble to the Constitution, which interpretation of Secularism is better?

Unity and secularism will be the motto of the government. We can't afford divisive polity in India. –Manmohan Singh

India is, no doubt, a diverse country. With so many religions, casts and communities, can State really practice multiculturalism? Can State actually support or encourage or subsidize activities of every religion that exists in the world's seventh largest country with second largest population?

Well, respecting every counter opinion, to me “Separation of State and religion” seems a better option. Why not let each of them survive on their own? Why does State need to interfere in the matters of religion at all. This state interference has often given an opportunity to political parties use the pre-independence technique of ‘divide and rule’. Although Communal electorates have been abolished in India long back but votes from a particular constituency are often sought on the bases of caste, community, religion etc.

When preamble to the Constitution of a country uses the word “Secular”, it means the country is constituted in a way where all religions, races, casts and communities are treated equally. When,

with such diversity, State finds it difficult to practice multiculturalism, it must give a thought to separate itself from all cultures to be able to do justice to all.

Secularism and the Hinduism

Introduction

As I realize the sociological implications of the social engineering going on in the name of Secularism. I am filled with a deep sense of nausea and revulsion for the concept of Secularism as it is practiced in India today. This essay is an attempt to explain the reasons for my belief

Secularism in India today is bereft of any integrity and/or intellectual honesty, nor is there any internal consistency. What is good for the goose (the minority) is rarely good for the gander (the Hindu).

What is the dictionary meaning of secularism.

1. Religious skepticism of indifference.
2. The view that religious considerations should be excluded from civil affairs or public education.

Secularism is a form of governance that is not affiliated with any particular religion. In political terms Secularism is a movement toward the separation of church and state as opposed to a union.

As the term “secularism” is often used in different contexts, its precise definition can vary from place to place. A democracy need not necessarily be secular. For example, the United States of America is a democracy but still has “in God we trust” printed on its currency. Another example is the Iraqi Constitution which seeks to establish a democratic government but also calls for the Supreme Federal Court to be made up of judges who are experts in Sharia (Islamic Law).

Its proponents argue secularism is the concept that states should be governed by a process of reasoning rather than dogmatic belief. Its opponents argue that secularism is a concept which, instead of preserving freedom of religion, actually holds all religions in contempt.

A government based on the peoples ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity being protected by the rule of law are seen as superior to a government based on the divine rights of kings, however the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity existed for over a century before the Laicite law (introduced in France in 1880) was introduced.

Secularism may also be defined as the idea that religion should not interfere with or be integrated into the public affairs of a society.

The reason I draw attention to the above definitions is that the Indian model of secularism does not conform to any of these definitions. In fact no definition of secularism is offered in the Indian constitution. While the general public in India understands it to mean “equal respect for all religions, and Morarji Desai’s Janata Party government introduced the Constitution (45th Amendment) Bill seeking to define ‘secular’ to mean ‘equal respect for all religions’, the Congress Party refused to endorse such a definition.

1. In practice the Government of India and the legal system do not treat all religions and in particular the Hindu faith with equal respect, nor does it treat all religions equally under the law. There are countless examples, of which some of the most egregious are the separate civil law provisions for Muslims, in which the civil law sections of the Indian Penal code do not apply to Muslims.
2. Another is the special status of Jammu and Kashmir State simply for no other reason than the fact that it is a majority Muslim state.

3. A third is the special subsidy given to Muslims to undertake the Hajj pilgrimage, which runs into very large sums of money. No such subsidy is available for Hindus to visit their places of pilgrimage even to proximate locations such as Mt. Kailash.
4. While the government maintains a hands off attitude to the administration of Mosques, it administers Hindu trusts through the appointment of a Administrative officer (there is no requirement for him or her to be a Hindu) and not only does not subsidize the maintenance of Hindu temples many of which are in disrepair but diverts money from Hindu trusts to Muslim religious Waqfs.
5. Minority Educational institutions get subsidies that are not available to Hindu educational trusts. The situation became so dire that the Ramakrishna math started by Swami Vivekananda himself, petitioned to be classified as a non Hindu institution, in order that they be eligible to receive subsidies.

Such unequal treatment under the law is becoming intolerable to the Hindu, who is becoming increasingly alienated in the land of his own forefathers, which is another reason for the nascent self awareness of the Hindu and his increasingly vocal participation in the Hindu renaissance movement of increasing, despite the palpable effects of the Hindu renaissance. In numerical terms this is the single largest ideological grouping in the country. However, little attempt is made by the strategic thinkers to coalesce other groups around this admittedly largest single group. In contrast the attempt to garner Muslim votes is unabashedly anti-secular in tone and most of the parties fall over each other trying to appease this second largest group in India. The remainder of the Hindu population appears to be content to be reduced to second class status in the land of their

forefathers. Of course the simple answer to this is that the Hindu should adopt a unified stand at least on those key issues that affect the exercise of their faith. However, one constant characteristic of the Hindu, throughout the ages, has been his inability to stay unified even when confronted by blatantly disruptive forces and there seems to be little hope that he will change his behavior anytime soon.

I do not see a practical way out of this impasse. This is evident in the increasing frustration of the 23% of the electorate that regards itself as Hindutva. They see themselves as increasingly embattled and under siege. It is dangerous for the future health of the republic that such a large constituency, even though it may not be a majority, sees itself as helpless to influence the politics sufficiently to advance Hindu causes. However, in May, 2014 election, the Indian people have abandoned the political doctrine of Secularism by electing Bhartiya Janata Party. As such it is proved that Hinduism can be a guiding force of a modern state of India.

Secular Humanism & New Age

What does the Bible say about the beliefs of secular humanism and the New Age movement?

Secular humanism is a subtle yet extremely injurious cancer eating away at the moral health of society. It is subtle in that it exalts human beings as capable of solving any problem and charting humankind's destiny. On the surface the philosophy sounds good as a means of building one's self esteem. But the exaltation of human abilities means the elimination of a Creator who is higher and sets standards for human behavior. This cancer eats away at the principles of Christianity, traditional public education, and general morality. It provides the foundation for a variety of popular anti-biblical philosophies.

At the center of this fatal evolutionary belief is the teaching that there is no God or personal Creator (atheism), and that humans are the apex of all reality. Its subtly appeals to many by saying that all humans are innately good (ignoring the Fall of the human race) and have unlimited potential to evolve into perfect creatures. Humanism teaches total self-sufficiency, completely denying any need for Deity.

The New Age movement has kindred elements with secular humanism. The movement maintains that humankind stands at the threshold of a "new age" toward which individuals now must evolve mentally and spiritually. New Age evangelists proclaim that the good within all people is actually the dormant god existing in each person. The New Age goal is to awaken the god who sleeps deep within each human. In order to realize this false spiritual state, a new consciousness is needed to usher in a worldwide transformation of individuals and society, as people come to realize that they themselves are gods and therefore divine. Interestingly, what is called "new" in the western world has influences from ancient eastern philosophy.

Another falsehood of New Age is the monistic belief, taken from the Hindu religion, that all matter, including human beings, are of the same origin. Thus "all is one." This pantheistic belief maintains that "all is god."

New Agers also believe that through enlightenment and gaining a higher consciousness of one's inner deity, one is able to save both himself and the world from destruction. New Agers have also borrowed from the Hindu concept of reincarnation. By being born again over and over in cyclic births, New Age followers believe they are able to purge themselves of sin and bad karma. They also believe

that since they share a divine oneness with all things, they can create whatever is visualized through the power of the mind.

An announced purpose of the New Age Movement is prevention of the extinction of the human race, expected to occur either by nuclear holocaust or through depletion of the world's natural resources. Thus protecting the environment is a top priority for the New Age movement. New Agers support the establishment of a New World Order that will police the globe and bring the East and West together in harmony.

Sadly, New Age thinking has permeated nearly every aspect of modern life. Large corporations send their decision-making managers to seminars on mind enhancement. Therapists employ techniques based on inner reflection and exploration of consciousness. Marketing experts emphasize human potential for its motivation power. Entertainers turn inward to discover an inner power that will catapult them to popularity. What was once an insignificant subculture of devotees has now moved into the mainstream of American life? The church must resist every expression of this perversion of the truth.

Scripture exposes the deception of this subtle dishonesty. "There is no one righteous, not even one; there is no one who understands, no one who seeks God. All have turned away, they have together become worthless; there is no one who does good, not even one" (Rom. 3:10-12). Unlike New Age, the Bible declares that truth is found, not by looking inward to self, but by looking upward, not by looking to men, but by looking to God (Jer. 17:59). Paul's rhetorical question says it best: "Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?" (1 Cor. 1:20). Indeed, "Salvation is found in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

On the basis of God's inspired Word, the Assemblies of God rejects the lies of secular humanism and New Age heresy as contrary to the Truth.

CONCERNS:

The church today must be vigilant, always alert to the godless philosophies that are seeking to creep into control everywhere around us. Sweet sounding statements spoken by secular humanists and New Agers can lull unsuspecting Christians into allowing a takeover of public schools, colleges, universities, political structures, and the whole fabric of society. But the total philosophy behind the innocent sounding ideas of individual rights and freedoms must be understood. We are not called to make everyone believe just the way we believe, but God expects us to stand for truth and resist Satan's efforts to seduce and draw unsuspecting innocents away from God's plan for every human being.

The reality is that the State Religion is "Anything But Christianity." (Islam, Judaism, Hindusim)

Those who hate Christ (Religious Leader) have won politically. Some people say that Humanism is not a religion, so it's OK that the United States has established Humanism as the Government-Established State Church... since the Secularist denomination known as Humanism isn't a religion anyway. That idea is so weird that it is difficult to address. Some people say Humanism is not a religion, or that it is only a religion some of the time. That is a moot point. The naturalistic and materialistic pseudo-faith groups act as a religion, so the argument is one of semantics. Powerful individuals are also promoting other Secular pseudo-faith groups such as **Agnosticism, Atheism**, or even occult religions disguised as science.

Darwinism Liberalism, Cult Humanism, Agnosticism, Atheism, Materialism, Naturalism, Rationalism, Evolutionism and many other false religious concepts are inter-twined. A few years ago, they decided to band together in a loosely knit networking association that they called, “New Age.” Since several books have blown the whistle on New Age, the term is no longer used, but the networking goes on. For instance, none of these concepts could stand without the foundation of Rationalism.

The periodical, The Humanist, certainly takes a stand on the issue:

“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.”

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.”

That’s what the U.S. constitution says. Yet, the ungodly have established their own religions, **as the State established religions** and have been successful at **bringing the Christian Church under the thumb of their Government religions such as Humanism, Atheism, and Agnosticism and New Age denominations.**

All the **social programs** are the activities of **Humanist Government Church.** The schools are set up to **teach New Age**

Humanism and the other anti-Christ religions. They teach ungodly precepts.

Activist judges have declared:

1. Congress must establish the Secular/Religions Humanist and other New Age religions as the established religion in the United States.
2. Congress must prohibit the free exercise of the Christian religion, and that only the New Age Religions, the ungodly religions will be allowed to be freely exercised.

Both of these directives are in direct conflict with the Constitution. Activist judges, however, have boldly set out to **change the Constitution without going through the legal process that is required to make changes to the Constitution.** They have done this through a process called, “deconstructionist.” **They simply ignore what is written and say that it means what they want it to mean.** Deconstructionist challenges the meaning of any language, taking the stand that no language has any concrete meaning. It is a work of the ultimate liar, Satan. In addition, other members of the Liberal religion, who control almost all of the **leftist news services and leftist educational institutions,** have put out a unified message to deceive the United States public. That unified message accuses non-deconstructionist judges of being **“constructionists,” as if it were a bad thing to not illegally change the Constitution. Deconstructionism is a doctrine of Postmodernism.**

The ungodly have made great inroads into **converting the governments of the world into the long-awaited New Age Religious organization.** In the U.S., the ungodly are forever talking about the separation of Church and State, but **the Federal Government has largely become the State Sponsored Humanist**

Church. Church has a specific meaning to Christians, but to the ungodly the church means a religious organization. **The Federal Government has become a religious organization, but not a Christian religious organization.** It is following **the ungodly religions.** Mostly, it is controlled at present by the New Age denominations and Secular **Humanism, Atheism, and Agnosticism.** People get their eyes on side issues. The central issue is a struggle between Jesus Christ (Religious Scriptures and Religious Preachers” and the forces of all that is against Christ.

The State Religion is Ungodliness, especially Secular Humanism, Atheism, and Agnosticism. These religious structures, that have almost total control, want to keep the control.

The home was to educate and teach ethics to one’s own children. The home was to care for sick, disabled, and aged members of one’s own household. The home was to provide food, shelter and clothing.

The Church had the responsibility for educating children, teaching morals, determining what was moral and what was not moral, determining what is ethical, determining what is right and what is wrong, teaching ethics, teaching morals, encouraging good works, providing care when families can’t, helping the poor, helping the oppressed, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, caring for the hopeless, and caring for widows, orphans, and the aged.

The government was responsible for protecting from foreign threats, irresponsible people, murderers, rapists, thieves, and gross immorality.

The separation of Church and State, though not part of the U.S. Constitution, was mentioned in a letter written by Thomas Jefferson. In the letter, Thomas Jefferson is referring to the necessity of protecting the church from the state. There is no mention of protecting the state from the church.

That has all been reversed by the ungodly, their activist judges, and ungodly politicians.

The U.S. Constitution plainly says that the U.S. Federal Government will make no law that establishes or limits religion or freedom of speech.

The First Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Americans have let the members of the Liberal religion get control of U.S. courts, and Liberal Judges have re-written the third amendment. **American Christians have decided to spend their money on bigger buildings, better Christian entertainment, and highly-paid professionals and have been glad to have the Government take over the functional work of the Church. By abdicating their responsibility, they have helped the ungodly to set up the machinery needed to persecute Christians throughout the world.**

The Liberal Judges have ignored what the Third Amendment clearly states and have deconstructed it to mean that the Congress must establish the ungodly religions as established religion in the United States. These activist judges have declared that the Congress must prohibit the free exercise of the Christian religion, and that only the ungodly religions will be allowed to be freely exercised.

Now, the U.S. Government and state and local governments have taken over almost all of the responsibilities of the church and the home. Christians have foolishly allowed this to happen, **never realizing** that another religion was taking over and being established as the official State-sponsored religion.

This is why it has become reality that there is no separation of Church and State as required by the constitution.

The Constitution states that the Federal Government will make no law that establishes a certain religion, **but we have an established religion: New Age, including Liberalism, Secular Humanism, Atheism, and Agnosticism.**

Repeatedly, the New Age religious doctrines of evolution, promiscuity, perversion, socialism/covetousness, polytheism, pantheism, agnosticism, atheism, disrespect, anti-family, anti-Christ, anti-God, chaos theory/lying and bearing false witness, and many others are being taught in our schools and promoted on our mass-communication systems while Christian messages are filtered out and suppressed.

Every effort is made by the governmental enforces of this established religion to **stop any Christian expression.** Christians are continuously assaulted by every form of legal and coercive action to **limit their free speech.** If Christian any dares to speak up effectively, they are slandered repeatedly by many ungodly mechanisms. The ungodly owns virtually all news, entertainment, education, and public information channels. The amazing thing is that the power of the ungodly religions would fall without Christian support. If, for instance, Christians were to stop watching Liberalism's news programs, those programs would immediately stop having their flow of money, and they would all fall. Many, if not most, Christians are addicted and under the control of these worldly counselors, however. As a result, Christians continue to fund the enemy.

Recently, a high school student was forced to take legal action because he was discriminated against regarding his free expression of his religious beliefs. Those beliefs, which are the clear statements

of the Bible in Romans 1:27 among other references, said that homosexuality is shameful. While other students were free to express their conflicting opinion (based on nothing other than the fact that they were declaring their opinion to be correct), The Christian student was expelled from school for his expression.

These are but examples of what goes on throughout our country, not only in public schools, but also in many other areas of life.

This government take-over of the Church is a terrible thing. It is especially terrible since the **new State church is an anti-Christ church. It stands against every precept of God.** The socialization of the Church is a mistake. In fact, the socialization of the Church has been one of the greatest social disasters that has ever taken place. The Government should get out of the Church business, but that would move many government workers to unemployment lines. It would make the Government that would only keep people from hurting each other in America and would only keep people from outside America from hurting Americans. All the social programs would go back to the Churches and religious organizations.

At present **the U.S. Government is an extension of the Secular/Religious Humanist Religion.** It is the arm of Secular/Religious Humanism by which Secular/Religious Humanism attempts to do what the Church has done all along, except that the Secular Humanism, Liberalism, and other New Age religions require that everyone else bear the cost. Secularism/ Humanism has, in practice, become the State Religion.

The Church has always born its own cost. In Scripture, God gave the method for financing this work. God's method is the tithe and the offering, not taxing the unbelievers. Fleshly people have created other ways of financing the work that are not God's ways. **They are trying to create the Kingdom of God without King Jesus. All**

they have created is a mess. That's why taxes have to be so high. It's very expensive to create a utopia.

Evolution isn't science. As Darwinism finds itself, because of advances in sciences, going outside of the realm that can be talked about without laughing, we find the government officials and all the coordinated voices of the ungodly are starting to go toward other New Age religions. They will talk of the goddess Ghia and Mother Nature more and more. We are hearing more about the god of forces that the angel foretold in a vision that was given thousand or years ago to the prophet Daniel.

Pope Benedict XVI goes to war with 'atheist extremism'

Benedict XVI used the first papal state visit to Britain to launch a blistering attack on "atheist extremism" and "aggressive secularism", that "the exclusion of God, religion and virtue from public life" had done in the last century.

The leader of the Roman Catholic Church concluded a speech, made before the Queen and assembled dignitaries at the Palace of Holy Roodhouse in Edinburgh, with the argument that the Nazi desire to eradicate God had led to the Holocaust and a plea for 21st-century Britain to respect its Christian foundations.

"Today, the United Kingdom strives to be a modern and multicultural society," he said, "In this challenging enterprise, may it always maintain its respect for those traditional values and cultural expressions that more aggressive forms of secularism no longer value or even tolerate.

"Let it not obscure the Christian foundation that underpins its freedoms; and may that patrimony, which has always served the

nation well, constantly inform the example your government and people set before the two billion members of the Commonwealth and the great family of English-speaking nations throughout the world."

The pontiff's speech set the wide-ranging tone for his four-day visit: despite attacking atheism, he paid tribute to the UK's historic achievements and offered "a hand of friendship" to all its people.

After touring the streets of the Scottish capital, which were lined with 125,000 people, and having lunch with Cardinal Keith O'Brien, the leader of the Roman Catholic church in Scotland, the pope traveled to Glasgow where, beneath a cloudless blue sky, he celebrated mass in front of a congregation of around 60,000 in Bella Houston Park.

The pope's comments on secularism and atheism came in marked contrast to the conciliatory and contrite words he offered victims of Catholic sexual abuse.

In a 15-minute long briefing to journalists aboard the papal plane this morning, Benedict described pedophilia as an "illness" whose sufferers had lost their free will.

Using his strongest language to date on his church's record on clerical sex abuse, he deplored its failure to act swiftly and decisively in the past.

"It is difficult to understand how this perversion of the priestly mission was possible," he said, adding that the church was "at a moment of penitence, humility and renewed sincerity".

He said the first priority was to help the victims to recover from the trauma they had undergone "and rediscover too their faith in the message of Christ".

On Friday he will be in London to meet religious leaders, among them the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, before traveling by pope mobile to parliament to address and 1,800-strong

audience in Westminster Hall including Margaret Thatcher, John Major, Tony Blair and Gordon Brown.

Benedict's opening address followed the publication of an interview in which a senior Vatican advisor described Britain as a "secular, pluralistic" land that had fallen prey to "a new, aggressive atheism". Cardinal Walter Kasper – the Vatican's leading expert on relations with the Church of England – was immediately dropped from the papal visit following the remarks on the eve of the visit, which included his observation that arriving at Heathrow airport was sometimes like landing "in a third world country".

The Vatican, which said the decision not to bring Kasper had been taken "for health reasons", was swift to issue a statement on Wednesday, explaining that the cardinal "had no negative intention" and that he "recognized the great values of British culture".

Benedict was more explicit in his condemnation of militant atheism, nothing that Britain had fought the atheistic evil embodied by Adolf Hitler.

"Even in our own lifetime, we can recall how Britain and her leaders stood against a Nazi tyranny that wished to eradicate God from society and denied our common humanity to many, especially the Jews, who were thought unfit to live," he said.

His pronouncements brought immediate condemnation from humanities and secularists, and some other religious groups. Terry Sanderson, the president of the National Secular Society, said the pope had hardly waited to get off the plane before attacking secularism.

He added: "The British people have embraced a secular identity of their own free will, perhaps as a reaction to the ultra-conservatism of this recent papacy and the extremism that has been manifested by

some forms of Islam. The secular identity of the British people is not something to criticize, but to celebrate."

Fight against Secularism unites Jews, Catholics, Pope says

Vatican City, Jun 24, 2013/01:32 pm (CAN/EWTN News). – Christians and Jews can work together to challenge the contemporary problems of secularism and disrespect for the human person, Pope Francis told representatives of Judaism in a Vatican audience.

"Humanity needs our joint witness in favor of respect for the dignity of man and woman created in the image and likeness of God, and in favor of peace which is above all God's gift," the Bishop of Rome told members of the International Jewish Committee for Inter-religious Consultations June 24.

"Friendly relations are in a way the basis for the development of a more official dialogue," he added.

The audience with the Jewish leaders was also attended by Cardinal Kurt Koch, who is president of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, as well as head of the Vatican's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, and members of that office.

The Committee has held 21 meetings with Catholics so far, and Pope Francis said this has "certainly helped to reinforce mutual understanding and the links of friendship" between them. He welcomed their next meeting, which will be held in October in Madrid, which will consider challenges to faith in contemporary society.

In his first meeting as Bishop of Rome with official representatives of Judaism, he noted the Vatican II document *Nostra Aetate*, on the relation of the Church to non-Christian religions, as the Church's "key point of reference for relations with the Jewish people.

"In that Council text, the Church recognizes that the beginnings of its faith and election are to be found in the patriarchs, Moses and prophets," he said.

He emphasized that “due to our common roots, a Christian cannot be anti-Semitic,” and pointed to the writings of Saint Paul, who “firmly condemned hatred, persecution and all forms of anti-Semitism” and called the gifts and call of God “irrevocable.”

Nostra Aetate, he said, has been the basis for “greater awareness and mutual understanding” between Jews and Catholics in the past 40 years, and reflected on the good relations he had with the Jewish community when he was Archbishop of Buenos Aires.

“I had the joy of maintaining relations of sincere friendship with leaders of the Jewish world,” Pope Francis remarked. “We talked often of our respective religious identities, the image of man found in the Scriptures, and how to keep an awareness of God alive in a world now secularized in many ways.”

While head of the Church in Buenos Aires, Pope Francis even authored a book of dialogue between him and Abraham Skorka, an Argentine rabbi. “On Heaven and Earth” was written in Spanish, and was recently translated and published in English.

Pope Francis told the members of the International Jewish Committee that he met with Argentine Jews on various occasions to discuss the challenges which Jews and Christians both face.

“But above all, as friends, we enjoyed each other’s company.” he said, “We were all enriched through encounter and dialogue, and we welcomed each other, and this helped all of us grow as people and as believers.”

“I encourage you to follow this path trying, as you do so, to involve younger generations,” he added.

Final Remark

The Religion and the Secularism in the Modern World

The modern world, in its self-awareness, is the product of the disengagement of the secular from the religious, which makes the discussion of this issue particularly fraught. The religious overshadowed the secular at one point in the history of the Western

world. The secular realm then emerged from under the shadow of the religious, by liberating the political, the legal, and the educational dimensions of public life from religious dominance. We have now reached a point, when the secular overshadows the religious to such an extent, that it is the secular constitutions which guarantee religious freedom. In the heyday of secularism, right after the Second World War, the progressive secularization of the rest of the world, along the lines it had occurred in the West, especially Europe, was considered axiomatic. This belief was shared by the otherwise rival economic systems of capitalism and communism, and also by the rival political systems of liberal democracy and totalitarianism. Liberal democracy saw religion as ultimately turning into a purely private affair, like one’s appreciation of art and music; Marxism foresaw not merely its retreat from public life but from life itself. Thus the general intellectual climate, in the middle of the last century, saw religion as on its way out of the public square, if not out of life altogether.

The Iranian Revolution of 1979, however, upset this eschatological apple cart, and, since then, the role of religion in public life the world over has been gaining in salience. Thus the question of the relationship of the religious and the secular, once taken as settled is back on the table, with a new sense of relevance, in our modern world.

We might begin by looking at some lessons provided by history on the nature of their relationship, in order to assess their relationship in the modern world. And as soon as we cast such a didactic glance at history, it becomes apparent that we have enough historical evidence to indicate what happens when either of the two elements in the dyad gain virtual ascendancy over the other. The medieval times bear witness to what happens when religion comes to prevail over the

secular, and the modern times, until very recently, bear witness to what happens when the secular comes to prevail over the religious.

The antithetical variation in the equation may contain many lessons, depending on the lens used to view them. Let us choose to look at them through the lens of human rights, as embodying the human aspiration for political and religious freedom.

A survey of the history of the Western world yields a curious coincidence of opposites, when viewed through this lens. In the medieval period, the religious supervened over the secular, so that the rights, even of kings in the political realm, were abridged, to say nothing of the common person. One might expect this to be the case but another consequence was unexpected – that the religious freedom of the faithful was also abridged. Orthodoxy reigned supreme during this period and heresy-hunting remained the flavor of the times. In other words, the collapse of the two realms ironically resulted in the diminution of both political and religious freedoms. Modern times saw a role-reversal in this respect and the secular came to supervene over to the religious. The extreme example of this is provided by the communist countries. The collapse of the two realms in these countries, which came about with the dominance of the secular over the religious, also ironically resulted in the curtailment of both religious and political freedom in these countries. One would have expected the curtailment of religious freedom in a situation in which the secular realm supervened over the religious, but what ensued in the communist countries was the loss not only of religious but also political freedoms. It is important to recognize this point (namely, that in the event of one of the two realms – the religious and the secular – being overwhelmed by the other, a contraction of freedom in both the realms follows) as it is counter-intuitive. The parts of the world where such a development did not

occur were those characterized by liberal democracies, which clearly provided for religious freedom as part of the secular dispensation. They were able to preserve both their political and religious freedoms.

The lesson from history then is clear. When the relationship between the religious and the secular is such that it involves the complete dominance of one over the other, then it results in the curtailment of both religious and political freedoms. As noted earlier, this conclusion contains an element of expectation-dissonance, as one would expect religious freedom to flourish in the case of the dominance of the religious over the secular, and expect political freedom to flourish in the case of the dominance of the secular over the religious.

Any vision of utopia then must recognize that it will not be achieved by one of the two obliterating, or dominating over, the other. Attractive as such options might appear in the thoroughness of the erasure of the other, the obliteration or domination of one by the other is a recipe for dystopia. The sobering lesson which one derives from a study of history in respect to the relationship between the two is that both the realms must enjoy relative freedom; that if one of the two dyads prevails over the other, both lose their freedoms.

But how does this lesson apply to our times?

We need to revert now to the belief in the inevitability of the long-term secularization of the globe, to which such eminent thinkers as Peter Berger once subscribed along with many others. We must now recognize that this belief – that the secular realm was destined to overwhelm the religious – was entertained by both capitalist and communist countries, although encountered in its more virulent form in the communist countries. In other words, the state of affairs, which the communist countries were seeking to bring about by the

use of drastic measure, was expected to come about on its own, through the operation of impersonal and also invisible forces, in the liberal capitalist democracies. The liberal capitalist democracies did not have to take recourse to such measures adopted by communist countries, as the churches would close down on their own, when people stopped attending them, as religion became a purely personal matter and retreated into the private square.

The events of the past few decades in the modern world have demonstrated that this covert triumph of the secular worldview is as dangerous as the overt triumph of secular totalitarianism. And further, that each of the two realms – the secular and the religious – should recognize the inevitable presence of the other as an empirical fact, and further recognize the historical fact that the complete dominance of one realm by the other ends up in the diminution of freedoms in both.

The long discussion on secularism presented above has made an attempt to show the contrast between the Western mode of political system and state based on secularism and the Islamic alternative which helps illuminate not merely the deficiencies inherent in the former, but more importantly, highlights the characteristic set of features inherent in the latter. The picture that emerges is that the secular political system, its methodology and epistemology as the final product, is built around the seemingly limitless power of nature. The subjective and ideological nature of secular political system has been effectively exposed from its own epistemic landscape and real life situations. There is no such thing as knowledge for the sake of knowledge. The image of a dispassionate, objective and value-free political system is no longer in vogue. The instrumentalist conception of political community, governance, state, theoretical formulation, empirical verification and final packaging of knowledge are all coloured with the social, cultural and historical experiences of Western secularism which is also paradoxically materialistic and

religious to the core. Such a system has not fulfilled and cannot fulfill the needs and requirements of mankind and as such it cannot take social and cultural root in a Muslim Society.

The Islam alternative considers the pursuit of knowledge within the divine and value framework of Islam. It abandons all claims to approximating natural science and its consideration of the nature of political system and governance which is guided by the instrumental conception of the community but by the question of ends for which it exists. The decisive basis of political science is the distinction between part and whole and not that of fact and value. The part takes on significance by being situated within an encompassing whole with its matrix of eternal values enshrined in the Holy Qur'an and the divine guidance and the Sunnah of the beloved Prophet Muhammad (PBUH).

Finally, Islamic political system and governance aim at approximating the Madinah model (Charter of Medina Prophet (PBUH), which embodies understanding of human ends. When human ends are at issue, there is moral reflection. As such, secularism in Islam is not a value-free enterprise. Islam insists the politics must be a quest for ethics and that political system and governance, as well as individuals, have an obligation to implement divine will and act morally. Divinity, ethics and politics are inseparably linked a lesson mankind must learn a new if it wants restore sanity to the world gone awry.

“Ilm” or knowledge in Islam is an obligation enjoined upon mankind by the Creator. This knowledge can be acquired through revelation as well as reason, from observation as well as intuition, through tradition as well as theoretical reflection. These diverse ways of studying political phenomena must. However, be subservient to the eternal values, of divine revelation. This entails association the pursuit of knowledge with such Qur'anic concepts as Tawhid, Khilafah, Ibadah, Ilm, Adl and the like. Only the knowledge pursued within the matrix of eternal values of Islam, as Khilafah (Imamat or leadership) and ultimately for the pleasure of Allah (SWT) attains the status of ‘Ibadah’. This means, inter alia, avoiding all haram (illegal) activities promoting corruption, exploitation and injustices.

The values enshrined in the Holy Qur'an impart a universal character to Islam. This universality of Islamic values grants a universal character to Islam. This universality of Islamic values grants a universal status to discipline subservient to the Islamic framework. In any case, the Muslim community which is under obligation to enjoy good and forbid evil has no viable future without recasting its political system and governance into an Islamic framework guided by divine order and divine right of leadership as reflected in true Sufi order based on the Qur'an and Sunnah.

Viewed in this perspective, the integration of the concept of the true spirit of secularism with the religious framework of Islam as stated above will have no contradiction. The Holy Qur'an states, "He who receives guidance, benefits his soul and he who strays, injures himself" (Al-Qur'an: 39: 41)