

EVALUATION OF SECULAR HUMANISM AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR MORALITY

Chukwuma Joseph Nnaemeka, Ph.D

*Department of Philosophy,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka,
+2348037723330*

nnaemeka.chukwuma@unn.edu.ng

Ezeanya, Chioma Winifred

*Department of Philosophy
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
+2347035780556*

winifred.ezeanya@unn.edu.ng

&

Okoye, Uche Miriam

*Department of Philosophy
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
+2347062666476*

okoye.uche@unn.edu.ng

Abstract

The scientific restrictions and scholastic dominance during the dark ages raised so many questions in the minds of thinkers. These questions led to a shift from a restricted pattern of thought to a liberal pattern where human beings started believing that they can solve their problems. This line of thought ushered in humanism. Humanism is an attitude or doctrine which upholds human agency and dignity in problem-solving. It also promotes existence as a mode of living over dependency on the supernatural to solve the problems of man. Morality which is a generally accepted rules or principles of right conduct in a society becomes relative in relation to humanism. This is because a considerable proportion of objectivity is accorded to morality through religion. Religion, in turn, gives a formidable consideration to the supernatural which humanism pays minute attention to. Placing these on a scale, this paper is aimed at demonstrating that humanism has done more harm than good by promoting moral relativism. Until a convincing alternative or substitute is provided to the idea of religion, it still remains the best available answer to the challenge of moral relativism. The historical, descriptive, expository, analytic and evaluative methods will be used for this research.

Introduction

In our world today, there are lots of disinterestedness for authentic religion. This is, perhaps, because humans prefer empiricism over the invisible with considerable quest for liberalism. However, the substructure did not just spring up in a jiffy but by the experience of the antecedents to renaissance - the dark age. The era was characterized by war, restricted reasoning and the sort and by extension, immediacy or redirected human orientation. Individuals sought for ways of doing things as they can access within the realm of the given. It ushered in free-thinking and free experience as man became the centre of both thought and action. He became both the thinker and the actor. This background ushered in humanism. In this paper, humanism is presented as a doctrine because of its diversified nature with focal interest on secular humanism. Yet, in all of its diversity, one thing is common to all, and that is *man-centredness*. Humanism is humans depending on themselves as capable of living their lives, confronting and solving their challenges with less or no dependency on the supernatural world. It is where man is at the centre, curtailing extremism and promoting rationality based on logic and science (Rational Debate, 2014).

Humanism as a socio-political concept has an inestimable nexus with morality, especially moral relativism. On this basis, in trying to come to terms with the challenges associated with moral relativism, arts and humanities as faculties of discipline ensure that each idea is neither neglected nor overrated. One thing about moral relativism is the uniqueness of diverse moral beliefs yet not forgetting 'value' with which morality is identified. This value is to maintain the good conduct and stable interpersonal relationship. It is at this juncture that the need for this paper arises. Humanism is moral relativism exemplified in its multiple versions. Therefore, this paper examines the implications since it pays little or no attention to religion and the idea of the supernatural which it sustains. Religion is said to be when there is a harmonious relationship between unequal beings, say, a person and a deity. In religion, there is an expectation of some sort from the two. The lower expects providence and the likes from the higher being, while the lower remains loyal. And, this is what humanism discredits. This paper is aimed at examining how successful this venture by humanism is. In line with this, the paper will argue that humanism has implications for morality by promoting moral relativism. It has done more harm than good to moral values.

The partial or complete denial of the supernatural sustained by religion is a challenge to morality. This paper argues that until a convincing alternative/substitute is provided to the idea of religion, it still remains the best available answer to the issue of humanism and moral relativism. It should be noted, at this juncture, that the kind of humanism examined in this paper, with reference to moral relativism, is secular humanism.

On Humanism

The central focus of humanism is the denial of religion and God which promote the supernatural as solutions to human problems. Feuerbach insists that God is a myth in which the aspirations of human consciousness are expressed. It means that gods are men's wishes in corporeal form. For him, man is alienated most in religion owing to the fact that religion alienates the self to benefit an illusory (God) where all the human limitations are made perfect. God becomes the sum of the attributes that make up the greatness of man. As such, God, for Feuerbach, is man himself. For him, man actualizes himself in the community of fellow species through the practical action of love and altruist morality. He is of the opinion that whatever limitations of man which is perfected in God should be reaffirmed and returned to man himself (Lubac, 1998). His humanist inclinations are centred on bringing down divinity to man and the idea of altruist morality due to the fact that the need to fellowship with same species is paramount; but the Christian religion is neither alienating or isolatory. Rather, it promotes communalism as its essence and at the same time promotes the divinity of God. One can infer that religion as a way of life is not the problem but different doctrines as propounded by proponents on how to actualize this culture which is amenable to change.

Karl Marx gave his own humanist orientation a sociological and economic direction. Like Feuerbach, he argues that religion is man's own consciousness and feeling that he has not yet found or has lost again and as such makes religion and not the other way. For him, religion is an avenue for both the expression of and protest against misery, a mindlessness of an era and an opium of the people. He is of the view that both social and spiritual alienation should be attacked and overthrown since they are two sides of the same coin. His opinion centres on the enthronement of communism—highest stage of classless society (Lubac,1998). The principle of communism, which is 'to whom according to his needs and from whom according to his ability,' is not different from the early Christians' life. He only socialized the culture. Whatever man practices he makes; so, the criticism should not be restricted to religion. The fact that religion has been more theorized than practised makes it more vulnerable; but the irony is that the establishment of a classless society can easily be aided through a true practical Christian religion.

For Nietzsche, religion is an effect of psychological duplication, a debasement of man and an adulteration of the personality. It simply means that man divides his two aspects, attributing the stronger to God and leaving himself with the weaker. This entails that God inhabits in the human mind. He is of the opinion that theism is about taming man to an expected standard. Since this is the case, the death of God should be boldly proclaimed (Lubac,1998). It can be inferred from the argument that Godness is the stronger part of man projected outside of the man, but if religion is to raise man, does it mean, then, that man is raised above himself? How can something duplicated be adulterated or is it the adulterated personality that is duplicated? Is it really an adulteration or division of personality, if at all there is anything like that? His humanist dimension is that man must live and appraise, which implies invention and creation. These are what he regards as the

genuine philosophy (Lubac,1998). This underscores the manness and godness in man which is humanistic per se, but religion especially the Christian Religion does neither abhor creation for man nor invention from man.

Auguste Comte gave his humanist interest an organic, systematic and sociological turn. He replaced theism with humanism in order to destroy theism which he claims has limited man's achievement. For him, the only true great being is humanity which we are members of. This implies that humanism, which is constantly positive, should take the place of God/theism which tenets are negative (Lubac,1998). It seems like replacing God with humanity is not different from what religion teaches. For instance, the Bible emphasizes 'man as the image of God' which simply means that man is like God and that God is indwelling in man and, as such, man is God incarnate - a reflection of God. Comte only tries to make man a pure positive entity; but the idea of substitution for God is like saying that one substitutes oneself. Man is an indirect God.

For Corliss Lamont, humanism has a scientific, secular, naturalistic and democratic undertone according as one desires to view it. For Lamont, humanism is not restricted to Professors but it is a credo for laymen and women seeking to lead happy and useful lives. Despite its insistence on reason as the final arbiter, it makes room for various aspects of human nature, including emotion which Corliss believes is to be set free from cramping and irrational restrictions (Lamont, 1997). Corliss argues that modern humanism stands for the understanding that people have one life to lead, and should make best out of it as regards happiness and creativity as well as that human happiness should be its own justification and not by any support or sanction from any supernatural conceived as either heavenly gods or immortal heavens.

For modern humanism, these beings do not exist and as such human beings should use their intelligence and liberal cooperation in togetherness to build an enduring citadel of peace and beauty upon this earth (Lamont, 1997). It entails man taking responsibility of his state in life and not placing it on an extended being. From the foregoing, humanism is disinterested in theism. To state clearly, the following, according to Lamont are the propositions of humanism:

- Naturalistic metaphysics where all forms of supernatural is a myth.
- That man is an evolutionary product of nature and that mind is co-efficient with the brain and, as such, renders man non-existent or unconscious immediately after death.
- The potential of man to solve his problem through reason and science complemented with courage and vision.
- That the theories of fatalism, determinism and predestination underrate man who has the ability to shape his own destiny.
- Believes in earthly ethics or morality with emphasis on worldly freedom, happiness and progress, irrespective of origin.

- That the combination of personal satisfaction, continuous self-development, significant work, and the sort, will promote community welfare and the attainment of the good life.
- Establishment of far-reaching social programs for a high standard of living, peace, democracy and flourishing economic order at both national and international level.
- Full implementation of reason and science as well as full freedom of expression in all spheres of life.
- Questioning and questioning of assumptions, conviction of itself and others (Lamont, 1997).

Humanism has varied meanings. As a positive life stance centred on people based on our shared humanity guided by reason, evidence and science and no reliance on the supernatural force or entity, it entrusts the right and responsibility of giving meaning and shape to human lives through human capabilities to humans (Lewis, 2016). It is clear that there is no recognition of the extraordinary entity and this version is called secular humanism. Furthermore, Ojedokun explains humanism as a creative work and happiness which is justified by itself without any support or sanction from the supernatural thereby denying the existence of immortalities and their role in making a better world. He insists that humans can build a citadel of peace and beauty upon this earth with their own intelligence cooperating liberally with one another (Ojedokun A. , 2014). In line with humanness of humanism, Sartre expressly presents it as an orientation which makes human life possible as well as that which emphasizes that every truth and action implies an environment and a human subjectivity (Sartre, 2007).

According to its name, humanism is human-centred and Lamont, elucidating on this, proposes that for a belief or action to be humanistic, it has to be a human-centred theory of life characterized by enjoyment, developing and making available to everyone, the abundant material, cultural and spiritual goods of this natural world. It is a philosophy of joyous service for the greater good of all humanity in this natural world with advocacy for the method of reason, science and democracy. The human person is both the center and the sanction (Lamont, 1997). It should be stated here that it is ambiguous as to the kind of spirituality Lamont is emphasizing here. It is undeniable that humanism, human welfare, dignity and optimism about the powers of unaided human understanding (Blackburn, Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy, 1996) form the nucleus of what is referred to as humanism.

In a nutshell, humanism considers common good, compassion, creativity, empiricism, free thought, human agency and dignity, personal liberty, human rights, rationality and social responsibility, etc. It should be noted that humanism is not identical with humanity, inasmuch as they may appear and sound synonymous. In the words of Robin, humnaity means human beings collectively and, at the same time, connoting philanthropy and altruism which implies a moral force (Coupland, 2001). In affirmation of this, Dina

Shelton describes humanity as a multitude of individuals whose concerns are on issues (Shelton, 2009). A closer connect of humanity to humanism is identified in the words of Xlick, where humanity is connected to human condition and the need for its sustenance (Bostrom, 2009). Humanity connotes kindness, understanding and the like (Guillaume, 2013). These two nomenclature have these elements in common and this invokes their moral dimension. In the terrain of morality and in a loose sense, one can infer that humanism is geared towards the recognition and sustenance of humanity.

On Moral Relativism

Moral relativism expresses belief in relation to negation and acceptance of a belief system, and in the words of Runciman, it can be cultural or otherwise (Runciman, 1974). He opines that relativism stems from linguistic creation because different linguistic creations determine, to a good extent, the belief system, of which morality is no exception. It is not clear as to the limit of linguistic operation because, if not for Kant's maxim of not using man as a means to an end, the linguistic-cultural disposition about slavery will not be frowned at. In affirming this, Steven Lukes presents it as a thesis of no superiority of moral values, beliefs, principles, codes and systems over another and, as such, no objective ways of resolving their conflicts. He further states that the idea of moral objectivism is undeniable but problematic due to lack of an appropriate way to present it (Lukes, 1974). Gilbert continues on moral relativism as opposed to moral absolutism and moral nihilism. Moral nihilism claims only one standard of morality while moral nihilism claims no morality or moral values at all (Harman, *The Nature of Morality: An Introduction to Ethics*, 1977).

Reiterating the thesis, Gilbert is of the opinion that moral relativism has come to stay. For him, that which is morally good, right and just is always relative to a moral framework, and the objective moral reasons which an agent has depends upon the agent's desires, goals, aims, intentions and values. In that regard, the agent may have no compelling objective reasons to act according to the critic's endorsement. This question is: in the judgment of a moral agent, whose criterion will be used, is it that of the agent or the critic? He insists that whatever way, moral judgment tends to be objectively arrived at and must involve either critic's relativity or agent's relativity (Harman, *Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity*, 1996).

Simon kicked against this argument saying that the several notions about moral relativism hold no water in that it gives individuals reasons for mischief. He holds that there are rights, values and duties, and as long as an action has consequences, especially negative, it should neither be ignored nor be given a relative attachment (Blackburn, *A Review of Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity* by Gilbert Harman and Judith Jarvis Thomson, 1998). In the words of James, relativism is interested in actions and virtues, be it soft, hard, cultural or individual relativism. He further asserts that moral relativism has a severe

part which is that every belief is as good as the other. Yet, whether moral relativism is context-dependent or individually considered, it is either about the individual or the society.

Though he is of the position that moral relativism is about context-dependency of actual/primary moral values, James used Einstein's understanding of relativity to morality (Kellenberger J. , 2001), ignoring that morality unlike motion is a value-laden concept and should be treated as such.

Paul Carson projects a supportive argument that moral relativism provides support for toleration and compatibility about moral judgements of different frameworks (Carson, 2001). Njoku explains further that moral relativism extends to judging an action as right or wrong in relation to personal feelings and not from any acclaimed universal moral standard. It is a personalized kind of morality that places the rightness or wrongness of an action from a personal judgement (Njoku, 2006). Steven Hales proposed that moral relativism is hated, accepted or instrumental for moderation; and this, for him, is the background behind every other form of relativism (Hales, 2006).

David accepts, in a hostile manner, Michael in sympathetic rejection and Daniel cautiously accepts that moral relativism is centred on moral disagreement (David Capps, Micheal P. Lynch and Daniel Massey, 2007) as it is about letting oneself be swept along by every wind of moral teaching (Kellenberger J. , 2008). Lastly, Christian Miller identified three versions of moral relativism as descriptive, normative and meta-ethical. Descriptive expressed in fundamental difference in moral framework, normative for tolerance and meta-ethical depends on contextual parameters by individual groups (Miller, 2011).

The above ideas of authors on humanism and moral relativism show a close link between them, in that both are homocentric as well as have great influence on social structure, action, orientation and the maintenance of general orderliness of doing things. This nexus will be the concern of the next section, tracing it historically.

Humanism in History

The word humanism was coined by a German educator, F. J. Niethammer in 1808. Then, it meant Greek and Latin classics education. Between 13th and 15th centuries, it became 'humanities' or studies of 'humanities' (studiahumanitatis). During the period of renaissance, these studies were only handled by humanist experts. This is because they were the resuscitators and successors of the classical and medieval rhetorical traditions. Humanism as 'humanitas' is the development of human virtues in all its forms to its fullest extent. Renaissance humanism became a point of departure and evolution of other versions of humanism existing today. Its name is attributed to its time of development, which is the enlightenment/renaissance era succeeding the dark ages.

Renaissance humanism is about a comprehensive reform of culture and the recreation of passive and ignorant society of the dark ages into a new order that encourages and reflects the grandest human potentialities. By deduction, it can be said that while the renaissance humanism is the foundational version of humanism, the strictest and seemingly most trending version is the secular humanism. Secular humanism does not promote religion and its involvements like the idea of a Supreme God. It grew out of the enlightenment rationalism and free thought of the 18th and 19th centuries, respectively (Ojedokun A. , 2014).

Other versions are cultural humanism, which grew from Greek and Rome, diffused throughout European history and formed one of their basic approaches to science, political theory, ethics and law. Philosophical and religious humanism have their antecedents from ethical culture, universalism, etc. and any outlook centred on human needs and interests, respectively. Another name for scientific humanism is modern, democratic or ethical humanism. It is a natural philosophy which rejects supernaturalism and depends heavily on reason, science, democracy and human compassion, though it grew out from religion and secular humanism. This indicates that some versions of humanism are religious and /or philosophical while some others are not (Ojedokun A. O., 2014). The development of humanism in history can best be captured as the efforts made by man to understand man through the things that are physically available from which more potentialities of man can best be actualized.

Overview of Morality

The fact that morality is part/an aspect of ethics makes it more interesting. Yes, the narrower aspect of ethics. It is believed that morality is less-universal as it specifies the norms of a particular group; yet each group draws its norms and rules from a prototype. In this paper, we shall demonstrate that there can be a universal morality. Simply, it means that since morality applies to rational persons which is universal, morality is also universal and as such what seems to be different moral systems are specifications of a moral system. According to Bernard Gert, morality is an informal public system that has no authoritative judges and no decision procedure that provides unique answers to all moral questions. Public system can be either formal or informal and morality stems from the informal because it involves overwhelming agreement about their interpretation. It becomes non-functional unless disagreements are relatively rare (Gert, 2005). It means that there must be a high level of agreement informally and voluntarily and can only be formal through political and legal systems when it becomes vital that disagreements be settled. Bernard further states that morality as an informal public system applies to all rational persons, governing behaviour that affect others as well as includes what are commonly known as

the moral rules, ideals and virtues with its goal as lessening of evil or harm.

Any conceptualization of morality that excludes harm reduction to either oneself or others cannot suffice or be justified as one harbouring the whole content of what makes morality what it is. To this extent, morality becomes a guide for action as well as reaction. From the definition, it shows that virtues, ideals and rules are parts of morality which is only examined by moral theory. Invariably, morality, with its aspects of virtues, rules and ideals, prohibits, requires, discourages, encourages and allows (Gert, 2005). If it allows, it promotes.

Summmarily, morality does not end at specific rules for a people but extends to the fact that it is binding on rational persons and as such ignorance of morality is not an excuse (Gert, 2005). For a moral judgment to be binding, the individual on whom the judgment is passed is always aware of the conditions. On the ground of rationality upon which morality is established, it is universal and as such impartial. This implies equitable moral judgment (treating similar conditions similarly and vice versa). This brings us to the question of moral relativism and how satisfying are the grounds for its justification, how far it has solved the problem of man in relation to coordination and guide for action.

The Relativism of Secular Humanism

As much as possible, this paper has tried to conceptualize humanism and moral relativism. One cannot ignore the place of the human person in both humanism and moral relativism. Man at the centre does not make humanism relative, but it is the starting point that opens up the platform for the development of relativism in humanism. At the natural level lies the egoistic inclinations in man which when allowed interferes in decision-making by man inclusive of moral issues. From the natural level to civil level where consensus and moral agreements are reached, moral agreements are usually human-centred to reduce harm for man. The reduction of harm ushers in humanism. Humanism is relative to the extent that man is not restricted neither by religion nor the supernatural. This is because moral relativism is ignorant of religion. It does not mean then that any concept ignorant of religion will be relative, but humanism ignores both religion and the supernatural which serve as the threshold of moral objectivism.

It is verifiable that not all the tenets of humanism are morally relative but to the extent that they promote personal satisfaction and continuous self-development. Personal satisfaction is mostly in conflict with general and objective satisfaction, likewise development once it is out of control. The understanding of man's independency to shape and determine his future invites variations in approaches which will in turn evoke moral issues and questions.

Furthermore, it is within the ambience of religion that the 'golden rule' is recognized. The Decalogue noted and practised, the law of love given to be obeyed, etc., are within the

terrain of religion. Humanism also borrowed these from religion. It simply means that dissociating humanism from religion makes the former incomplete and unsatisfying because it is like a dissociation from the origin (self-denial). Some argue that tracing the historical development, religion is nothing but a human creation, yet it is more objective in its morality. For instance, the golden rule (Do unto others what you would like them to do unto you) as mentioned above which as applicable universally is found in all forms of world religions. Though interpretations, derivations and extensions may harbour variations, it does not undermine the fact that certain level of objectivity is accorded religious morality. Even a religion that metamorphosed from culture will assume a considerable level of objectivity in its moral establishment. Having explained the morally relativistic nature of humanism, what then is the problematic associated with such a situation is the next intention of this paper.

The Problematic of Secular Humanism as Morally Relativistic

The understanding and knowledge of morality as relative has remained a problem to man. Moral relativism claims that there is no absolute morality. It is an event that began on earth and on time (Kreeft, 1999). It started from human nature manifesting in tradition and continued evolving till today. Despite this, moral relativism is a problem to the standard because it confronts and counters the opportunity of objective moral norms/legal rules and a complete implementation of the universal standard of morality. For instance, it is within the terrain of humanism that it became paramount that people with different sexual orientations be given equal right of expression. No need of going further on the problematic associated with sexual orientations because it is not the thrust of this paper. As such, homosexuality and sodomy which was unacceptable at a time became acceptable and legalized in some countries of the world. Such applies to the random and incessant divorce around the world as well as the indiscriminate sexual manifestations and perversions.

The aspect of humanism which is the full expression of freedom contradicts another one of its aspects which is the collaboration and togetherness to achieve a paradise on earth according to Corliss. Of course, when there is full expression of freedom by all and sundry, invariably, man will be taken back to a pseudo state of nature unless with the aid of genuine and functional political and legal systems. Humanism claims that man can shape his destiny unaided by God or religion, particularly because this doctrine feels that the idea of God and religion restricts man while a disbelief in it allows for greater achievements.

In this vein, any version of humanism that does deny categorically the existence of God dissociates itself from religion. As such, even the Christian version of humanism is not by declaration or development but by extraction, especially from the various areas of the Bible where human-centredness is promoted. However, it can be seen that Christian

principles are more socially-inclined before it allows for a leap to the world beyond. These principles are humanistic in themselves. On a strict sense, it can be inferred that many principles of humanism were established due to the prior knowledge of the Christian principles. Then, it can be concluded that humanistic principles are religious principles and particularly Christian principles secularized, exaggerated and overemphasized. Humanism in its quest to prioritize human needs and interests stirred so many pervasive inclinations in man as mentioned above which questions humanity's moral stand. In addition, it allows for activities and inventions that became life-threatening and existentially incompatible with the natural way of doing things.

In summary, humanism in the promotion of independency, superiority and unlimited capabilities of the human agency endangered man by indirectly establishing platforms for the promotion of the latent pervasive inclinations in man which raises moral questions. Humanism in promoting human agency evoked some implications for moral relativism which will be explained below.

Implications of Secular Humanism in Promoting Moral Relativism

- **Perpetuation of moral conflict:** The relativistic nature of humanism perpetuates moral conflict due to moral disagreement. The broad concept called morality in the words of John, recommends specific virtues, proposes methods of evaluating moralities and recommends ideals for moral progress around the world. It is substantiated in moral codes but not itself a code (Shook, 2015); and it is at the level of codes that this challenge arises. Like Nietzsche who wanted to destroy metaphysics and ended up in it, humanism perpetuates moral relativism due to its core tenets.
- **Promotion of logic and science:** For humanists, these are instrumental for world progress which is accompanied with less interest in religion. Secular humanism is a rejection of religious belief (Norman, 2004) and as such humanism and religion are not two sides of the same coin on the one hand. On the other hand, if religion, which holds a considerable objective view of morality is inversely related to humanism, how then can excesses be checked in the expeditions and explorations of the human agency. It can be inferred then, that humanism embraces a diminished conception of what it means to be human (Norman, 2004) as it presents humans as devoid of soul and spirit and leads to a one-dimensional view of life–nature.
- **Extreme Liberalism:** When godliness becomes a threat, its elimination becomes needful and extreme liberalism will gradually creep in. The rate of homosexuality, transgender, drug addiction and divorce as they are today cannot be unconnected to this. We may argue that they have medical undertone yet their gradual acceptance led to its current level. In the course of extreme liberalism, a lot of harm has been done to the fundamental human

values. This is plausible where morality is drawn from the state instead of from religion. It can be argued that these feelings have been there but they became a set of belief in the 21st century due to the search for human welfare unaided by an external agent (Copson, 2015).

- **Polar Concepts:** In line with the idea of polar concepts, nature should have its polar concept but with humanism, there is a denial of such. It is undeniable that for now, there are truths and possibilities that cannot be explained naturally and even logically. Do we now discard or disregard them? For instance, there are human beings with super powers with or without religious attachment, should they cease to exist or may be ignored as though they do not exist.
- **Disequilibrium among vital forces:** In the African belief system, there is an interaction of vital forces in their hierarchy which includes God to spirits/ancestors to humans and then animals and objects. This interaction helps to balance nature but removing God from humanism makes this flow incomplete. Africa is humanistic in nature (Egbunu, 2014) yet promotes religion. This simply means that humanism can still be effective without the denial of religion, God and the supernatural. By extension, world traditions and religions such as Confucianism, Platonism, Hinduism, Taoism, Judaism, Aristotelianism and even Christianity reject moral relativism, at least, in the absolute sense. It may not be possible to eliminate moral relativism since it upholds some core values across stable cultures, but the common foundations of these core values which is human nature and problems should be tackled objectively for communities to survive (Grcic, 2016).

Conclusion

It has been established that humanism and morality involve human agency. It has also been demonstrated that humanism in its modern and mostly secular sense denies the existence and potency of God in relation to man and his destiny. Religion upholds God as the supernatural which is deniable by humanism. It has been demonstrated that humanism has a moral undertone because it involves human agency who engages in rational actions that are always under evaluation morally. It has also been articulated that the moral environment of humanism is relative in nature due to some of its core tenets. Moral relativism has been reaffirmed as a problem to man and humanism throws man back into it. Among the harms of moral relativism, through humanism, is the derivation of morality from the state which has created platforms for latent pervasive inclinations to manifest. Readers' emotions might have been evoked wrongly due to this write-up but to establish an envisioned united world matters, though it may not be possible with moral relativism.

Finally, it is not the case that religion, God and the supernatural restrict man's capability as proposed by humanism. It is just that people have theorized and interpreted religions

and their principles more than they have practised them. Unless the distinction is given between the point of intersection of religion, God and the supernatural, with the activities of man, a wrong notion will always be the case in relation to their influence on man. Until there is a revisitation to the understanding and principles of humanism, it will always create more problems than it solves. With moderation in all, better, positive and lasting achievements will be made in improving the universe for man.

References

- Blackburn, S. *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford: University Press, 1996.
- Blackburn, S. A Review of Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity by Gilbert Harman and Judith Jarvis Thomson. *International Phenomenological Society*, 195-198, 1998.
- Bostrom, N. The Future of Humanity in new waves. *Philosophy of Technology*, 1-29, 2009.
- Carson, P. K. *Moral Relativism: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Copson, A. *What is Humanism*. John Wiley and Sons, 2005.
- Coupland, R. *Humanity: What is it and how does it influence International Law*. Retrieved from <http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/irrc-844-coupland.pdf>, 2001, December.
- David Capps, Micheal P. Lynch and Daniel Massey. *A Coherent Moral Relativism*. Springer, 2007.
- Egbunu, F. E. Africnsa and Africna Humanism: What Prospects. *International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4, 297-308. Retrieved from <http://www.aijcrnet.com/journalsvol.4-no-1-January-2004/30.pdf>, 2014.
- Gert, B. *Morality: Its Nature and Justification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Grcic, J. Limits of Moral Relativism. *Electronic Journal for Philosophy*, 23, 4-9, 2016.
- Guillaume, A. Humanity and Animality: A Transdisciplinary Approach. *Versita*, 13-32, 2013.
- Hales, S. D. *Relativism and the Foundations of Philosophy*. England: MIT Press, 2006.
- Harman, G. *The Nature of Morality: An Introduction to Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Harman, G. *Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1996.
- Kellenberger, J. *Moral Relativism, Morral Diversity & Human Relationships*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.
- Kellenberger, J. *Moral Relativism: A Dialogue*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2008.
- Kreeft, P. *A Refutation of Moral Relativism: Interviews with An Absolutist*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999.
- Lamont, C. *The Philosophy of Humanism*. Amherst, New York: Humanist Press, 1997.
- Lewis, A. Thought for the Week. *Letters*, p. 6., (2016, Nov., 25).
- Lubac, H. D. *The Drama of Atheist Humanism*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1998.
- Lukes, S. Relativism: Cognitive and Moral I. *Proceedings of Aristotelian Society*, 48, 165-189, 1974.

- Miller, C. *Moral Relativism and Moral Psychology*. (S. D. Hales, Ed.) Oxford Blackwell Publishing, 2011.
- Njoku, F. *Studies in Ethics*. Lagos: Claretian Publications (Clacom), 2006.
- Norman, R. *On Humanism*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2004.
- Ojedokun, A. Between Humanism and Humanitarianism: A Need for Clarification. *Humanism, Existential Predicaments & Africa*, 121-123, 2014.
- Ojedokun, A. O. Between Humanism and Humanitarianism: A Need for Clarification. *Humanism, Existential Predicaments and Africa: Essays in Honour of Olusegun Oladipo*, 124, 2014.
- Rational Debate. *The Express*, p. 14, 2014, December.
- Runciman, W. G. Relativism, Cognitive and Moral II. *Proceedings of Aristotelian Society*, 48, 191-208, 1974.
- Sartre, J. P. *Existentialism is a Humanism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Shelton, D. Common Concerns of Humanity. *Lustum Aequum Salutare*, 33-40, 2009.
- Shook, J. R. *Moral Realism and Ethical Objectivity*. (A. C. Grayling, Ed.) John Wiley and Sons Ltd, 2015.