
The Two Religions

Dina Nerozzit

INTRODUCTION

Is it possible to make a distinction between State and Church? Is it possible to make a distinction between State and Religion? Are we bound to respond to God's law or State laws?

In an attempt to give an answer to these everlasting questions, we need to set up the compass and unfold the charts in a time of great confusion. The goal we are trying to accomplish with the following reasoning is how we can meet the challenge of the present time and how we can live a profitable and happy life while promoting a civilized society at large.

I. THE TWO RELIGIONS

Since the beginning of time two religious systems relentlessly confront and challenge one another.

The first system is based upon the fact, hard to deny, that the Universe exists irrespective of human intervention. Human beings did not create life autonomously, nor can they be acknowledged for the world's wonders.

Since it is impossible for human beings, with their limited intellectual resources, to understand how life began and the mysteries of the Universe, the problem was solved through an act of faith: the existence of a God, the Creator and Sustainer of life.

According to this worldview, the whole Universe and all living creatures are part of a prearranged order to which they must submit. Human beings, nevertheless, can tame and preside over the arranged order provided they fully understand nature's rules and mechanisms. This is the task incumbent upon research and science.

In this worldview, science intended as "a systematic enterprise that organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about nature and the Universe" is accepted and well-appreciated.¹

† Former Professor of PsychoNeuroEndocrinology at the University of Rome Tor Vergata.

To the contrary is the attitude towards technology, which is the use of acquired knowledge to modify nature and the reality around us. The achievements coming from technological progress are not always welcome. The invention of atomic energy, just to give an example, is certainly considered a great achievement of modern technology, but at the same time it became a real threat for all mankind.²

To be responsibly applied, modern technology should be submitted to moral rules, according to the precautionary principle, which is defined as follows:

When human activities may lead to morally unacceptable harm that is scientifically plausible but uncertain, actions shall be taken to avoid or diminish that harm. Morally unacceptable harm refers to harm to humans or the environment that is:

threatening to human life or health, or
serious and effectively irreversible, or
inequitable to present or future generations,
or
imposed without adequate consideration of
the human rights of those affected.

The judgement of plausibility should be grounded in scientific analysis. Analysis should be ongoing so that chosen actions are subject to review. Uncertainty may apply to, but need not be limited to, causality or the bounds of the possible harm.⁴

Actions are interventions that are undertaken before harm occurs that seek to avoid or diminish the harm. Actions should be chosen that are proportional to the seriousness of the potential harm, with consideration of their positive and negative consequences, and with an assessment of the

¹ *Science*, MERRIAM-WEBSTER, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/science> (last visited Mar. 7, 2017).

² *The Nuclear Threat*, NUCLEAR THREAT INITIATIVE (Feb. 1, 2017), <http://www.nti.org/learn/nuclear/> (“Today, nine countries—China, India, Israel, France, North Korea, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States—hold nearly 16,000 nuclear weapons. That’s enough to destroy the planet hundreds of times over”).

⁴ The Precautionary Principle, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, COMEST, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001395/139578e.pdf> (last visited Mar. 7, 2017).

moral implications of both action and inaction. The choice of action should be the result of a participatory process in order to avoid that one day men will find that the price to pay for the benefits of modern technology, is an unbearable one.

The second religious system, Atheist Humanism, is the one that rejects the idea of the existence of a higher being and states that man is the only god on earth. It claims that the universe began from an unaccounted-for Big Bang, that all forms of living creatures are the result of an evolutionary process.

In the beginning it was not the Word, it was a culture broth from which life emerged as a miracle. From the primitive forms of life, evolution gradually produced the present forms of all diversified animal and vegetal species inhabiting the earth.

It must be said that this different worldview needs an act of faith equal to, if not greater than, the one needed to believe in the existence of a God the Creator.

According to this different anthropological and cultural vision of reality, human beings are alone in the universe, there is no higher being leading their way, and men are at the mercy of a hostile nature from which they need to be liberated by all possible means.

In this different worldview, a separation between science and technology does not exist; every single enterprise that human beings are able to imagine and achieve is considered good in itself. In this different perspective, research and science have only one task, to curb and subjugate nature to the supremacy of man without any restrictions.⁵

II. ATHEIST HUMANISM: THE OTHER RELIGION

All peoples living on the planet embrace some sort of religion. In the past, popular tribute was addressed to the power of nature for its ability to enhance well-being and fertility or, on the other hand, to bring about death and devastations. The ancient Egyptians worshipped the sun and the moon as well as their pharaoh; the Greeks and the Romans had a

⁵ JULIAN HUXLEY, UNESCO ITS PURPOSE AND ITS PHILOSOPHY 8 (1946) (According to Huxley, the guiding philosophy of UNESCO should be what he termed, World Evolutionary Humanism).

specific god for everyday activity, a god that had to be petitioned, questioned, and honoured in order to acquire his benevolence.⁶

Human beings were at the mercy of nature and of all kinds of divinities; therefore, the only way to achieve the gods' benevolence was through the intercession of priests. Superstition and fear, the fruit of ignorance, ruled undisputed and it was possible to find people ready to take advantage of man's gullibility and weakness.

Proverbial was the devotion that the Greek people bestowed upon Delphi's oracle. They entrusted to it their hopes and fears and would often refer to the oracle in search for advice. Many soldiers on the verge of leaving for the never-ending wars used to go to Delphi's oracle to know what their destiny would be. Without fail, they received this answer "Ibis, redibis. Non perieris in bello." (You will go and you will be back. You will not die at war).⁷

Reassured from the answer, they went to a war from which they often did not come back. When the bewildered relatives returned to the oracle's priests asking for some explanations, they were told that the message was not well understood, since the oracle stated: "Ibis, redibis non. Perieris in bello." (You will go and you will not be back. You will die at war).⁸

All this was a shell game for the populace, a shameful trick whose victims were the confident petitioners. Obviously nobody knew what would have happened, who would have returned from war and who would have not. Nevertheless the role envisaged for the oracle was that it had the power to forecast the future and could not refrain from revealing it to the devout petitioners.

The ploy allowed the oracle to go on for a while, until the deception was discovered and from that moment the time had arrived for the oracle and its priests to shut down. To tell the truth, it seems that the oracle simply moved from the original place to a worldwide center, in fact these days

⁶ Lucas Livingston, *GREEK AND EGYPTIAN RELIGIOUS PARALLELS: Egyptian Gods with Greek Names in Herodotus and Votive Statuary*, ART INSTITUTE OF CHICAGO (Jun. 7, 2002), http://www.artic.edu/~llivin/research/greeks_egyptian_gods/.

⁷ Nathan Bailey, *Oracles*, THE UNIVERSAL ETYMOLOGICAL. ENG. DICTIONARY (2d Ed. 1736).

⁸ *Id.*

million people are ready to entrust horoscopes and fortune tellers to be their guides in the countless problems and pitfalls of life.⁹

The undeniable fact that over time some priests took advantage of popular gullibility to acquire prestige and personal power gave vitality to the opposing view, the one that calls itself lay and would like to compare every religion to a quackery to be erased from the face of the earth.

At this point a question arises: what is the use of religion? Why did it enter the history and life of mankind? Why did it turn out to be so difficult to remove it from the soul, the mind, and the lives of the peoples in spite of all the repeated efforts to destroy it along the course of time? The answers may be many. One proposal is that religion seems to be a defensive embankment raised by men against their own destructive power. Men are, in fact, the only creatures in nature capable of implementing their own destruction.

Atheist Humanism, the system that counteracts the profound religious feeling of the people, is not a new achievement of man due to its amazing technological advances as the progressive ideology would like us to believe. Its origin is not even to be found in the Enlightenment, nor at the time of the Renaissance.¹⁰

The Other Religion is rooted in the hearth of man ever since time began and depicts his eternal temptation to be the master of himself and king of the Universe.

Atheist Humanism makes its entry in the history of man when, according to the Bible, the snake tempted Eve saying, "You surely will not die! For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:1, 4-5).

Since the beginning of time there has been somebody who opposed the idea that man has to submit to a higher authority and to natural laws and tried to become the master of the Universe.

In order to better understand the meaning of a puzzle as old as the world, there comes to our help an interesting book written by Henry Delassus more than a century ago: *Le Problem de l'Heure Presente*.

⁹ Kerry Kolaska-Sikiaridi, *From Delphi to Google: Ancient Oracle to Modern Day Search Engines*, GREEK REPORTER (Jul. 26, 2016), <http://greece.greekreporter.com/2016/07/26/from-delphi-to-google-ancient-oracle-to-modern-day-search-engines/>.

¹⁰ *A Secular Humanist Declaration*, THE COUNCIL FOR SECULAR HUMANISM, <https://www.secularhumanism.org/index.php/11>.

*L'Antagonisme de deux Civilizations (1905). (The Problem of Present Time. The Clash of Civilizations.)*¹¹

The introduction to the book gives us the opportunity to realize how effective and fashionable is the old saying, "nothing new under the sun."

His writings provide the opportunity to better understand the serious crisis currently faced, and at the same time it gives the possibility to witness the never ending conflict between the two religious systems that are confronting one another since the beginning of time.

The thought that gave origin to this book is linked to the need to investigate the nature of the evil that is burdening our society, and to realize whether there is some hope for healing. The moans are unanimous and are arising from all social classes forming a shout that seems to bring about the most severe misfortunes. "We are crumbling" say unanimously the farmers, the industrialists and the traders. They see approaching the time when it will be for them impossible to satisfy the needs of the workers, because of the conditions imposed by taxation, by the legislation, by the global competition, and by those conditions imposed by themselves through their own lifestyles. This ruin of the State and of the private sector is not the worst evil. Scourge of money is a curable one; but we are struck by what constitutes the vital forces of society. The clergy is clumsy in its social actions as well as in the religious ones; is humiliated in the eyes of the people that he is supposed to educate, ennoble, sanctify; is enslaved to the State, that can withdraw the bread or can decide to buy it with its favours, at will. The Judiciary has been corrupted and **the Army has left insulting and disorganized**. Which nation can survive without these three forces? The nations that loose them, dissolve; the social elements disintegrate and pretty soon – this is the story of all the peoples that are bound to perish – their provinces fall in the hands of the close nations that absorb them in their life.

May I say that evil is even more profound? Evil affects not only the nation, but also the social state; and this does not

¹¹ Henri Delassus, *Le Problem De L'heure Presente*, 2 DESCLEE 17, 18 (1904).

occur in France only. The three pillars of social life: private property, family, religion are shaken everywhere, in whole Europe, in the whole civilized world.

Leo XIII in His Encyclical "Humanus Genus" has observed it.

"the ultimate aim of Freemasonry is to uproot completely the whole religious and political order of the world which has been brought into existence by Christianity and to replace it by another in harmony with their way of thinking."

The work is in progress and the Church has to defend herself at the same time from external enemies that are willing to make Her vanish, and from Her own sons that are studying the way to corrupt the doctrine.

Each person who cares about his interests, those of the family, of the nation, of the entire mankind, must ask himself: **where does this destructive fury come from, why this inconceivable folly that is shacking France and, with her, Europe and pretty soon the whole world?**

From these ruins shall we be able to see a renovation? This is the great problem of the present time.¹²

It is worth remembering that in 1914 World War I began, with its heavy burden of death and destruction.

In Delassus' book, it is also possible to find the speech given on October 28th, 1901 in Toulouse by Waldeck-Rousseau, a French politician and member of the Masonry. In 1901, Waldeck-Rousseau signed his Law Associations Bill, which would produce as a result the abolition of all religious orders, convents, and Catholic schools all over France.

Through the words of Waldeck-Rousseau we are able to understand the meaning of the clash underway, then as well as now, and what is at stake:

The Church is always there continuously proclaiming that the real process of civilization is the one which really gives an answer to the true condition of man, to the destiny

¹² Pope Leo XIII, HUMANUM GENUS ¶10 (LIBRERIA EDITRICE VATICANA, 1884), http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_18840420_humanum-genus.html.

assigned to him by his Creator and made possible by the Redeemer; therefore, as a consequence, society must be built and governed in a way to favour all the efforts towards sanctity. And Revolution is also always there saying that man has only a earthen end and his intelligence was provided just to find the proper way to better satisfy his appetites and therefore, as a consequence, society must be organized and governed in a way to give the highest possible quantity of mundane and carnal satisfactions to all the people.¹³

Atheist Humanism is therefore nothing new. It is an old and recurrent temptation. It represents the exaltation of man, his reason, his wishes, and his will that must become the measure for everything. According to the Humanist worldview, man is the only master of his own destiny, capable of ensuring material well-being and happiness in full autonomy.

For the Humanist philosophy, personal fulfilment, happiness, love, and justice are sought individually without any reference to a metaphysic reality. Man does not need to look outside himself to find salvation. The Humanists believe that moral values are relative, devised according to the needs of a specific group of people. Ethics are likewise situational, and therefore changeable, according to the technological advancements acquired by scientific progress.¹⁴

For a long time, laws, as the product of human intelligence, were inspired by the principles of logic and Natural Law, but as time went by, and with the new technological acquisitions, these pillars have disappeared. The core of the Humanist creed is not limited to denying the existence of a God the Creator, it also considers the natural order an enemy to subdue. Therefore, Natural Law, as well as logic, have to be pushed into a corner each time they conflict with individual wishes and will. This is the reason why, as time went by, for the humanist creed it became necessary to enact laws that are, as a matter of fact, laws against nature and against the principle of logic.¹⁵

¹³Delassus, *supra* note 12.

¹⁴JOHN B. WONG, CHRISTIAN WHOLISM: THEOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS IN THE POSTMODERN WORLD 34 (2002).

¹⁵Fred Hutchinson, *The revolt against reason: The culture war and the fight to save*

Some of the ways modernism enacted laws against nature and the principles of logic are explained thusly: abortion is against Natural Law since life in the mother's womb is not a disease to be cured with abortion, and gender ideology not only is against the natural law but is also against the principles of logic since there is no way that homosexual partners can achieve the gift of life.

Humanists reject Judeo-Christian morals and ethical laws, as expressed in the Ten Commandments, because they are considered dogmatic, obsolete, authoritarian, and above all a hindrance to human progress. It is solely in the name of progress that Natural Laws are sacrificed, it is in the name of progress that unborn life in the mothers' womb is considered a disease to be cured with abortion, and it is in the name of progress that "lives not worth living" are ended. Moreover, it is always in the name of progress that male/female polarity must be rejected in an irrational project of reorganization of all mankind.

According to the Humanist worldview, human beings would achieve the higher peak of their greatness, the final goal and their full self-realization, the moment in which they stop believing in a higher being. When man wipes out the idea of God from the face of the Earth, he can feel free to do whatever he wants and, especially, he can enjoy the grandiosity arising from his extraordinary achievements.

To reach the coveted goal, steps are thus obliged. First of all, men must be freed from the idea of a God Who sets limits and immovable rules deriving from Natural Laws; subsequently, he has to proceed in the task of liberation from the idea of good and evil to reach the final goal of liberation from the idea of guilt and justice.

All ties that lead to the idea of a higher justice, not manipulated by human will, must not survive God's disappearance. The aim of the liberation fight is thus set, and the compass towards the brave new world is oriented against the writings of the Bible and the New Testament to their total demolition and reset.¹⁶

According to these premises, Humanist philosophy must, as a first step, open the road to the liberation of erotic minorities, as advocated by Lars Ullerstam, a Swedish psychiatrist whose book "*The Erotic Minorities*"

rationality, RENEW AMERICA, (Jan. 17, 2013),
<http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/hutchison/130117>.

¹⁶ *Secular Humanism*, ALL ABOUT PHILOSOPHY,
<http://www.allaboutphilosophy.org/secular-humanism.htm> (last visited Mar. 7, 2017).

defends the right to any sexual perversion; a term lately renamed as sexual orientation, since, in a politically correct world, the term "perversion" is not featured in the dictionary. In a world in which there are no fixed codes of behaviour to follow and what matters is only individual will, the inevitable consequence will be that all wishes and behaviours must be considered equal, right, and unchallengeable.

The Atheist Humanists, the people who want to change the world, are convinced that to establish a new world order and to end all conflicts and tensions among men and nations it would be enough to remove the idea of good and evil.

The basic idea of the pioneers of the new world is the following: man must be freed from the idea of good and evil, from the nightmare of a vengeful and violent god, and from religions considered the mainly responsible for inequalities and prevarications. Once these goals are achieved it would be possible to reach peace and well-being for all mankind.

If the problems of human beings are God and His Church, as promoters of "change" claim, then it would be enough to erase them to be witnessing the miracle of men becoming, as by magic, mild and gentle to one another, without resorting to the rigors of law and to policemen.

By now we know for sure that things did not evolved as forecasted by the Humanist revolutionaries. Time has shown us that if the "polis" is organized regardless of the God-given precepts of good and evil, we will not free men from a self-imposed yoke, but we will contribute to a rampant social chaos that must be stopped as soon as possible.

In the response to the alarm coming from increased social malaise due to drug addiction, alcoholism, generalized violence, irresponsible sexuality, pornography, robberies, racketeering more or less organized, the Humanist project had to stop its course and find a way out.

After the negative experiences, the enlightened revolutionaries decided that it would have been better to keep a distinction between good and evil, and they decided that it is better for man to pursue good. In itself this is already good news.

Since humanists feel free from the idea of a superior being, and have no intention of changing their opinion, or script, they think men should pursue good only for the pleasure of doing so. In fact, the American Humanist Association addressed a message to the public using the modern

propaganda of billboards on city buses saying: "Why believe in god? Just be good for goodness' sake."¹⁷

Is that all? That's all. It seems that the Humanist project can go on upon these new foundations with no need to disturb anybody else.

When the reasoning is set, once again, according to the Atheist's standpoint, it is necessary to say that they have few problems to face. If the starting point is "there is no God," then one must come to the conclusion that there is no free will.

Man is the only creature on earth able to choose his behaviour. What distinguishes man from other animals resides essentially in his ability to forecast the result of his actions and his capacity to make moral choices. Man is the only creature on earth free to choose between good or evil because he has the moral code written inside, as Immanuel Kant taught, or written in his genoma, as underlined by Pope Benedict XVI.¹⁸

Morality, the legal system, and the penal code stand only on this unique and distinctive ability of human beings. To delete freedom of choice from human beings would mean that morality has no meaning whatsoever, and at that point, the penal code would be meaningless as well.

A person can be judged, morally or through the penal code, only if held responsible for his actions. If there is no responsibility, there can be no sanction. Persons with mental disorders are not punishable according to the principle that they cannot make conscious choices, and therefore cannot be held responsible for their actions.¹⁹

If the starting point of the reasoning is "God does not exist and men are animals like all others," then there can be no freedom of choice since man is, unavoidably, a prisoner either of his biological constitution or the environmental conditions, or both. If man does not have freedom of choice, then there can be no good and evil and human behaviour becomes unsanctionable.

¹⁷*Humanists Launch First-Ever National Godless Holiday Campaign*, AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION, (Nov. 23, 2009), <https://americanhumanist.org/press-releases/2009-11-humanists-launch-first-ever-godless-holiday>.

¹⁸Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, *Cardinal Ratzinger On Europe's Crisis of Culture*, CATHOLIC EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER (Apr. 1, 2005), <http://www.catholiceducation.org/en/culture/catholic-contributions/cardinal-ratzinger-on-europe-s-crisis-of-culture.html>.

¹⁹Stephen J. Morse, *Mental Disorder and Criminal Law*, 101 Northwestern L.J. 885, 892-94 (2011).

This is the assumption upon which political action was founded since the end of World War II with the disastrous results that everybody can see.²⁰

Not only are the legal and penal systems rooted in morality, the ideas of liberty and equality reside upon the same transcendental matrix. Men can be sure that their inalienable rights will be preserved only if they, as society, decide to believe in God the Creator. If we don't look beyond the biological rules and cultural dimensions of each person, how can we say there is equality among human beings? Looking around it is easy to realize how biology can be very generous with some people and much less with others, and the same is true about environmental conditions. How can we, then, talk about equality? It is possible to talk about equality among human beings only if we look up in the sky, beyond material borders, searching for God. There are no other possibilities.

Atheist Humanism has no biological or juridical bases upon which build its idea of equality and liberty. The destiny of the peoples, deceiving themselves and following the path set by the Humanist creed, is already traced - slavery and inequality on a large scale, exactly as it was before Christianity and exactly as it is, even now, where the idea of God has been rejected.

Seventy years after the beginning of the revolutionary process, Humanists had to change the original program due to the decay they have produced in society.²¹

After changing their mind about the usefulness of keeping a distinction between good and evil, they now claim that to convince men to behave morally it is enough to rely upon their natural tilt towards morality.

Once again, the idea of entrusting the ideals of liberty and equality to a transcendent principle is precluded; thus, their goal seems to be far from reachable. Since when have men shown an inborn tension towards morality? We all know that man's inborn tension is totally different and it is the one rampaging each time the idea of God was removed from the horizons of the peoples.

²⁰ See HUXLEY, *supra* note 6 (the idea is also captured at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Iqv5Q8Ujj2s>).

²¹ G.A. Res. 53/144 (Dec. 9. 1998), <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/RightAndResponsibility.aspx> (The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the UN only talked about rights, from 1998 they changed it and decided to introduce the idea of responsibility which is personal and not collective).

The people asking “Where was God in Auschwitz?” must also know where to find the answer: God was not there because He was chased out by the regime that built those concentration camps. It has occurred many times before, such as during the French Revolution, in Lenin’s and Stalin’s Russia, in Kemal Ataturk’s Armenia, in Mao’s China, in Pol Pot’s Cambodia, just to mention some of the more renowned tragedies.²²

This is the reason why the Holy Father Benedict XVI, just before the beginning of his pontificate, urged nonbelieving political leaders to organize their countries “*velut si Deus daretur*” (As if God existed), to avoid the recurrence of such tragedies. Cardinal Ratzinger recalled this admonishment was the one used by Blaise Pascal when dealing with his nonbeliever friends.²³

It has been shown many times along the course of history, that Atheist Humanism, as an ideology inspiring the political action, decrees the moral bankruptcy of the political system adopting it, followed inevitably by the economic bankruptcy and sometimes war.

Atheist Humanism has a meaning and a reason to be, only at individual level. It is possible, in fact, to meet some atheists behaving beyond reproach, and at the same time, it is possible to watch the miserable show of certain religious people on whose morality we need to draw a veil.

Even though history has shown Atheist Humanism’s infeasibility as a political system, there are some people who insist on the same wrong path, trying to make small changes to deceive their aim, hoping to be able to replace the genuine religious feelings of the people with a false religion in the attempt to safeguard the coexistence of civil society.²⁴ In the brave new world, designed according to the Humanist spirit, freedom of religion can not be abolished outright, as it happened during the French revolution and at the beginning of the Russian revolution, because Humanists like to depict themselves as “tolerant,” and mainly because a violent revolution would start a counterrevolution from the people. Religious liberty is thus granted, but it must submit to the State’s power and control. The facade remains unchanged, but beyond it the core of Christian teaching must disappear. The Church should become part of the State bureaucracy and

²²Pauly Fongemie, *Freemasonry: Foundation of the Revolution*, CATHOLIC TRADITION, <http://www.catholictradition.org/masonry.htm> (last visited Feb. 5, 2017).

²³Ratzinger, *supra* note 18.

²⁴Fongemie, *supra* note 23 (Masonry is the red thread that links all these revolutions).

glorify the actions of the government, as it happens in many secularized countries.²⁵

The war waged against the Church is invisible, deceptive, and it materializes in several ways. It can show up as true persecution leading to martyrdom, or as attempts of economic strangling, it can be done with its infiltration of questionable characters, with the slander of the saintly ones, with the imposition of laws contrary to the doctrine, or through the denied conscientious objection; but the more subtle trap materializes in endless time consuming bureaucratic impositions, which is damaging to culture, knowledge, and pastoral support for the disbanded flock.

How does the Humanist State impose itself? Abolishing the idea of a violent revolution, due to the fact that it does not grant victory and starts a reaction, the process must advance slowly and through the dialectic process: thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

The State's apparatuses are already tuned with the Humanistic "logic" and philosophy: from the school system to the judiciary, from the mass media system to the performing arts. The Humanist propaganda enfolds every sector of everyday life and reaches most with the glorification of sport and corporeality, as happens in all dictatorial regimes whose leaders focus more on bodily efficiency of their citizens and much less on their mental ability to discern.

The culturally-massed artillery is working at full capacity at a global level, since the end of World War II. Nevertheless, there is still some resistance. To eliminate the last resisters, it became necessary to have the judiciary, with all its coercive power, enter the battlefield. The judicial systems of the countries are increasingly leaning towards globalization of laws; therefore any State can look for and utilize laws already operative in other countries considered "more advanced" in the revolutionary process.

From the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case *Roe v. Wade* (1973), when seven out of nine Justices decided that abortion was a legal procedure, the steps taken in this direction have been countless.

Italy is also facing a great activism of some magistrates who have abandoned their institutional task and are trying to impose their own

²⁵ In England Henry the Eight became the head of the Church of England because he wanted to be free to do what he wanted to do. In all communist countries there are national churches that must submit to the state. If religious freedom is gone, all freedom is gone. STÉPHANE COURTOIS ET AL., *THE BLACK BOOK OF COMMUNISM: CRIMES, TERROR, REPRESSION* 407 (Jonathan Murphy & Mark Kramer, trans., Mark Kramer, ed. 1999).

worldview on moral issues dealing with life and death, as clearly shown in the case of Luana Englaro, the Italian Terry Schiavo.²⁶

They are also trying to impose their power and pressure on the debate surrounding medically-assisted procreation, and in every other field dealing with ethics - issues that should be far from the reach of the judiciary.

Following this path, the decision-making capacity, or sovereignty, moves from the desks of the political leaders, elected by the people, to those of the magistrates who are State officials, and inevitably, the same concept of democracy crumbles.

The problem with the judiciary is not only an Italian one, it is a global phenomenon, as clearly pointed out by Robert Bork in his book "Coercing Virtue: the worldwide Rule of Judges."²⁷

In spite of the fact that Atheist Humanism is a religion in every aspect, it does not show itself in its true role, but shows up as a Humanist philosophy, a cultural-religious movement in which everything stands together. It is some sort of syncretism used to give an answer to those poor in spirit, still existing on the face of the Earth, who are looking for a religious creed to believe in.

The aim of the movement was well-described in the Humanist Manifesto appearing in the pages of the *New Humanist* in 1933. The stated goal of the new Humanists was to offer a new religion suitable to a modern scientific era and a new ethics that had to be universal.

Aldous Huxley, Bertrand Russell, and Thomas Mann, just to mention the more renowned Humanists, were the heralds of the new religion that was supposed to wage war at war. We must not forget Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud were also pursuing the same goal, as indicated in the chapter "Warum Krieg?" (Why War?).²⁸

Julian Huxley, in his paper for the preparatory commission of the United Nations' Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization "UNESCO: its purpose and its philosophy" (1946), declared quite clearly what the goals were of the humanist movement:

1. To go beyond traditional philosophies, theologies, and political economic doctrines;

²⁶ *Eluana Englaro, Italy's Terri Schiavo, Dies*, AM. LIFE LEAGUE (Feb. 10, 2009, 9:00 AM), <http://www.all.org/eluana-englaro-italys-terri-schiavo-dies/>.

²⁷ ROBERT H. BORK, COERCING VIRTUE: THE WORLDWIDE RULE OF JUDGES 1-2 (2003).

²⁸ ALBERT EINSTEIN, EINSTEIN ON PEACE 186-203 (Otto Nathan et al. eds.) (New York Schocken Books 1960) (1931-32).

2. To recognize the evolutionary bases of culture;
3. To integrate science with other humanistic activities.

Thus the general philosophy of UNESCO should, it seems, be a scientific world humanism, global in extent and evolutionary in background."²⁹

The aim of UNESCO is to enhance scientific Humanism, having as its basic point the evolution hypothesis and its expansion at global level as its final goal.

This explains why politics is so much involved in the defence of the Evolution Theory taken to the extreme. (Resolution 11297 June 8th 2007 of the Council of Europe and Resolution 1580/2007 of the general Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe).³⁰ Council of Europe Resolution 1580 is concerning: The dangers of creationism in education. The document starts as follows:

1. The aim of this resolution is not to question or to fight a belief – the right to freedom of belief does not permit that. The aim is to warn against certain tendencies to pass off a belief as science. It is necessary to separate belief from science. It is not a matter of antagonism. Science and belief must be able to coexist. It is not a matter of opposing belief to science, but it is necessary to prevent belief from opposing science
2. ...the Parliamentary Assembly is worried about the possible ill-effects of the spread of creationist ideas within our education system and about the consequences for our democracies. If we are not careful, **creationism could become a threat to human rights**, which are a key concern of the Council of Europe.³¹

Darwinian Evolutionary Theory is the main pillar of the Humanist creed. If Evolution Theory crumbles, then the entire scientific scaffolding supporting the political “progressive” movement crumbles as well.

In fact, in spite of the enormous efforts brought about by a myriad of researchers around the world in the last one-hundred and fifty years, the fascinating evolutionary hypothesis could never reach the point of

²⁹HUXLEY, *supra* note 6.

³⁰Guy Lengagne, *The dangers of creationism in education*, (Former) Committee on Culture, Science and Education, Socialist Group, Eur. Parl. Ass., Doc. No. 11297 (2007), <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/X2H-Xref-ViewHTML.asp?FileID=11678&lang=EN>.

³¹ Eur. Parl. Ass., *The dangers of creationism in education*, 35th Sess., Doc. No. 1580 (2007), <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17592&lang=en>.

becoming a theory since there are too many missing links, starting from the first essential one: a rational and convincing scientific explanation on how life began.³²

Not even resorting to the ploy of festering Darwin's figure will be enough to rescue an interpretation of reality, showing in full its weakness the moment in which to survive it needs to lean on the crutches of politics. At the beginning of the third millennium, it seems to revive the modern edition of Galileo's case, when the establishment had to support a shaking scientific hypothesis to protect an ideological worldview.

CONCLUSION

From what so far exposed thus far, the inescapable conclusion is that while it is possible to make a distinction between State and Church, this becomes impossible when State and Religion are at stake.

Since society is governed by a set of laws, decrees, and norms aiming at strengthening a social order, the system of laws enforced in a country depicts the religion in place in that country.

Each law enacted in a country reveals a sealed morality and each legal norm embodies, de facto, the primary religion in that country.

While the State can behave neutrally in front of Churches, provided they only take charitable actions in support of the existing social order, it can not be neutral in front of Religions because no State can survive without laws, and the legislative system operating in a country reveals the religious faith which inspires it.

The proponents of Atheist Humanism have promoted the State neutrality myth in face of Religions in order to wage an underground war targeting Christianity. The more structured and convincing myth, where people spontaneously submit to the lowest common denominator of a civilized world, would consequently eradicate the concept of democracy which can exist only in a virtuous society, and is represented, for millennia, by the biblical Ten Commandments; those Commandments that The Supreme Court banned from public school prayers for the first time in 1962.³³

³²HARUN YAHYA, *EVOLUTION DECEIT: THE SCIENTIFIC COLLAPSE OF DARWINISM AND ITS IDEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND* (Global Pub. Ltd. 2001) (1991).

³³*Facts and Case Summary - Engel v. Vitale*, U.S. CTS., <http://www.uscourts.gov/educational-resources/educational-activities/facts-and-case-summary-engel-v-vitale> (last visited Feb. 5, 2017).