

[Humanists' Crusade Against "Faith Schools" Opens Exciting Opportunities for Christians \[1\]](#)

Submitted by Wessel on Sunday, 22 June 2014 - 22:31



Read time: 7 minutes

The [British Humanist Association](#) [2] (BHA) wages, amongst others, an ongoing [campaign against "faith schools"](#) [3]. Last week they achieved a significant milestone: these schools are now [no longer permitted to teach creationism as science](#) [4].

I think this opens exciting opportunities for Christians.

But first, let me briefly say a couple of things related to this matter. Firstly, I am [not a young earth creationist](#) [5]. This means I, to a certain degree, support in what this organisation is doing in terms of promoting proper science. The second thing that I want to mention is that what I have personally observed from these (British) humanists is a strong inclination to scepticism. I say this in the broadest sense of the word. This is a double edged sword. On the one side, the scepticism of these people drive them to debunk a lot of junk out there. This includes pretending that homeopathy is science, that young earth creationism is science¹, that infant inoculation causes autism, *et cetera*. I support debunking these things and genuinely believe that working towards doing so is making the world a better place for everyone. But the other edge of the sword is that these people can, and I think often are, hyper-sceptical. While as humanists they almost per definition need to allow for freedom of religion, they do not believe in the spiritual and would attack anyone who does not keep their spiritual beliefs exclusively to themselves². So the question becomes: what would be enough evidence to convince a sceptical humanist that there does exist something other than the natural and the material. I have said it before and I have said it again, there are [good reasons](#) [6] for believing that God exists and, by extension, the spiritual. People—sometimes the most intelligent people of their time—have thought about the question of the natural vs the supernatural for millennia. And the fact that many still do post-enlightenment—even people who do not come from a religious background and therefore would not have had a natural bias towards faith in the supernatural—is an indication that those who *have an open mind can be convinced*³ by the philosophical and theological arguments which are out there.

Now, why do I say that the crusade of the BHA against faith schools can open exciting opportunities for Christians? In their relentless quest, the BHA has sought *legislation* to "protect" the education of children. Simply put, they have requested the government to rule on what is "true" and what is not.

This raises interesting questions. Here follows an example of what I mean. Unlike many continental

European countries, the UK does not have any laws against Holocaust denial. This is another virtue which British humanists are proud of: they believe not having such laws protects freedom of speech. My question is: what would happen if a teacher, being fully convinced of Holocaust denial, proceeds to teach Holocaust denial as history to his students? What would the outcry be from the public and the BHA? Would there be one at all? And if there is, would it be more or less intense than outcry over teaching of creationism? My guess is that there would be a greater outcry and the teacher would be rebuked and disciplined immediately. What would be the reason for this? There are two ways to explain it:

1. The people objecting to what the teacher has done unquestionably accepts the Holocaust as historically accurate and that the teacher is deceiving the students by presenting Holocaust denial as truth.
2. The humanists object to the teaching of Holocaust denial because it offends people who have suffered because of the alleged Holocaust, whether it existed or not.

This highlights a tension which exists between scepticism and humanism. The sceptic, having *objectively* evaluated the *evidence*⁴ would need to side with reason number one. The true, relativist humanist necessarily needs to side with the second reason, because the inherent *relativistic* nature of humanism should leave open the possibility that the teacher has the right to believe and teach whatever *they believe* themselves. I can imagine a conversation between a humanistic sceptic and a sceptical humanist where they argue over these two points: *"Of course the Holocaust happened! Look at all the evidence!" "I'm not saying it is so, but the evidence can be construed as being subjective or falsified, so we must allow the teacher to believe what he does!"*

I believe that an organisation, such as a government, by nature needs to advocate the first reason over the second one. The British government does not say that the historicity of the p/11 terror attacks, the Tienanmen Square massacre, the automotive strikes of the 1970s in the UK, the result of the evacuation from Dunkirk in 1940, or the British Civil War are open for debate. They affirm these things as historical facts. And if the government starts legislating what is science or not (as it has done), then it also needs to start legislating what is history or not. Perhaps it is time for the UK to adopt laws against Holocaust denial.

And against claiming that Jesus was not a historical person.

Would that not be something? Have the government affirm what the vast majority of credible (both Christian and non-Christians) historians have proven become legislation. That would be quite an egg on the face of the hyper sceptics who continue to disbelieve in the face of overwhelming evidence.

But first prize would be legislating the historicity of the resurrection of Jesus. Objectively evaluating the evidence, such as [Lee Strobel](#) [7] and [J. Warner Wallace](#) [8] and many [others](#) [9] have done, would lead to this conclusion. It would have massive consequences. Suddenly, the secular government will be forced to recognise that the position of the Crown as [head of government and the Anglican church](#) [10] is no longer an unfortunate leftover from more superstitious times. And they will be forced to consider objective (as opposed to relative/subjective) morality when writing legislation. The legislators will need to become theologians! I am so excited about this that I am almost getting goosebumps just thinking about this.

And, if you think that these are just the wishful ramblings of a delusional and superstitious madman, then please wipe your mind clean of prejudice, open your mind up to the possibility of being changed, sit down with the evidence, and evaluate it for yourself. It is not my job to convince you: the evidence needs to do that.

- [1](#). It should be noted that while I am not a biologist or geologist, I do believe that there are problems with modern theories and scientific methods for assessing age, evolution, etc., but my pessimism on our scientific understanding approaches is not enough to dispel scientific theories and models which are already well established and entrenched in the minds of scientists.

- [2.](#) This is ironic, because they believe, for example, that children should, on balance, be free to choose "between science and religion", but they want to restrict the options for teaching the former
- [3.](#) This is a virtue often touted by humanist sceptics, but unfortunately they only intend it in the way where science debunks the spiritual.
- [4.](#) Which, by the way, is historic in nature and not scientific.

Categories:

- [In the Media](#) [11]

Tags:

- [bha](#) [12]
- [humanism](#) [13]
- [scepticism](#) [14]
- [freedom of religion](#) [15]
- [freedom of thought](#) [16]
- [freedom of education](#) [17]
- [uk](#) [18]
- [united kingdom](#) [19]

Source URL: <https://siyach.org/node/1073>

Links

- [1] <https://siyach.org/node/1073>
- [2] <https://humanism.org.uk/>
- [3] <https://humanism.org.uk/campaigns/schools-and-education/faith-schools/>
- [4] <https://humanism.org.uk/2014/06/18/victory-government-bans-existing-future-academies-free-schools-teaching-creationism-science/>
- [5] <https://siyach.org/170>
- [6] <https://siyach.org/107>
- [7] <http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/the-case-for-christ/>
- [8] <http://pleaseconvinceme.com/>
- [9] <http://www.thechristfiles.com.au/>
- [10] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rNu8XDBSn10&feature=youtu.be&t=2m50s>
- [11] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/17>
- [12] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/301>
- [13] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/251>
- [14] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/302>
- [15] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/76>
- [16] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/303>
- [17] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/304>
- [18] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/305>
- [19] <https://siyach.org/taxonomy/term/306>