

# DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

## Chapter 1 : Catalog Record: The portion of the soul, or, Thoughts on its | Hathi Trust Digital Library

*The Philosophy Of Unbelief In Morals And Religion, As Discoverable In The Faith And Character Of Men [Herman Hooker] on theinnatdunvilla.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. This scarce antiquarian book is a facsimile reprint of the original.*

The fact that twentieth-century philosophical critique of religion focused on questions of meaning rather than on questions of truth the usual preoccupation in the nineteenth century, when T. Huxley coined the term agnostic does not at all diminish the importance of doubt as part of the intellectual process of religious belief. All authentic religious faith, indeed, may be viewed as a descant on doubt. The Meaning of Doubt The word doubt, although often regarded as the opposite of belief, signifies primarily vacillation, perplexity, irresolution. These primary meanings are discoverable in the Latin word from which doubt is derived: To doubt means, therefore, to be of two minds, to stand at the crossroads of the mind. The regular German word for doubt Zweifel, from zwei, "two" brings out the vacillating connotation more obviously than does the English word. In German, Zweifelgeist means "skepticism, the spirit of doubt," and Er zweifelte was er tun sollte means "He was in doubt what he should do" that is, he was of two minds about it. Doubt, therefore, is not to be equated with unbelief or disbelief but rather with a vacillation between the two opposites: In doubt there are always two propositions or theses between which the mind oscillates without resting completely in either. To the extent that religious people deprecate doubt, what they are deprecating must be indecision rather than unbelief, and what skeptics find praiseworthy in it must be not unbelief but a willingness to recognize two sides to a question. Doubt is the attitude of mind proper to the skeptic, who is by no means necessarily an unbeliever any more than a believer. The only serious reproach that either believer or unbeliever may justly direct to the skeptic is that of declining to make up his mind in one direction or the other that is, a moral rather than an intellectual reproach. Modes of Doubt Doubt may be considered in three modes: The characteristic attitude both of the ancient Greek thinkers and of the Renaissance men who admired and followed them has doubt as one of its fundamental inspirations. By attitude is meant here an inclination of the will. That is, rather than conceiving philosophy as a way of showing this or that proposition or thesis to be such as to lead logically to a settled conviction, thinkers in this tradition insist upon an openness of mind sustained by an ongoing attitude of questioning. Even when inclining to one view or another, such thinkers will always not only pay homage to doubt as a methodological principle but will endeavor in practice to keep their minds constantly alert to the claims of both sides of every question: Such an attitude, to the extent that it is successful in terms of its own aims, is creative, engendering openness of the will as well as of the mind. Like all attitudes it is, of course, susceptible to deformity. It may be feigned, for instance, to disguise a moral unwillingness to reach a decision because of the implications of making such a commitment. That the attitude of doubt can lead to such a moral deformity or perversity is of itself, however, no argument against its salutariness or its integrity. It is an attitude that has sustained the greatest minds of all ages in human history; a notable exemplar is Socrates. Doubt as a philosophical method is exhibited in the thought of many important thinkers. Celebrated instances include Augustine and Descartes. Doubt, then, is a methodological point of departure as well as an implicate of all thought. Thinking, in the sense in which it is understood in this intellectual tradition, which goes far beyond any computerlike function of the human brain, entails doubting. While both of the foregoing modes of doubt are relevant to questions of religious belief, that which most sharply illuminates an understanding of the nature of religious belief is the notion that doubt is an implicate of religious faith and therefore of the religious belief that formulates that faith. By taking the view that authentic religious faith does not entail blind, thoughtless belief but must always be accompanied by an element of doubt, we recognize that such faith and the belief that formulates it are in some way sustained by doubt, making doubt and belief as inseparable from each other as are, in the human body, the arteries and the veins. Authentic religious faith, whatever it is, can never be as the schoolboy is said to have defined it: Some religious philosophers in the modern existentialist

## DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

tradition, such as Kierkegaard, Unamuno, and Marcel, have emphasized that a faith unshaken by doubt cannot be authentic faith at all but is a mere blind nodding without either intellectual content or moral decision. I have called faith a descant on doubt, by which I mean, of course, that it rises beyond the doubt that is at the same time its necessary presupposition: Contemporary religious thinkers in the tradition of Kierkegaard talk of the "leap of faith," a phrase that sometimes exasperates their hearers. How does one jump from doubt to belief without injuring, not to say destroying, the integrity of the belief? Before dealing with this vital question, we must first clarify the relation between faith and belief, more particularly as these terms arise in religious contexts. Faith and Belief In religious literature faith and belief often have been identified with each other. In medieval usage the Latin *fides* "faith" generally means both. The thirteenth-century Thomas Aquinas, who became a quasi-official spokesman of the Roman Catholic church, and even Martin Luther, leader of the sixteenth-century Reformation, when they wrote of *fides*, often meant intellectual assent as much as an act of the will. The classic Lutheran dogmatic treatises usually distinguished three elements in *fides*: By this they implied that both intellect and will are involved in *fides*; nevertheless, following Luther himself, they recognized *fiducia* as the principal element and the others as subordinate to it. In much Christian literature, however, not least among heirs of the Reformation, the term faith is invested with a volitional connotation and belief with an intellectual one. The distinction is useful, for faith has an ethical content, with implicates of courage and perseverance that are irrelevant to intellectual assent to any proposition or thesis, religious or otherwise. Nevertheless, faith also entails a metaphysical stance. The object of faith is an "is," not merely an "ought to be. Since, as we have seen, thought itself implies doubt, every assertion of belief that is not to be dubbed mere credulity presupposes an intellectual choice between two alternative possibilities. And since, as we have seen, doubt is an implicate of belief and all authentic faith has in it an intellectual element of belief, then doubt must be called an implicate of faith, no matter how much the volitional element in faith be emphasized. Beliefs, moreover, cannot be held in isolation: As soon, therefore, as we start developing either faith or reason, the question of accepting this belief and rejecting that one inevitably arises. Without the coherence that is thereby achieved, one would seem to be in a position like that parodied in apothegms such as "I believe there is no God and Our Lady is his mother. That attitude, however, arises from an emphasis on the inadequacy of all formulations of truth dharma. The West, except in the more philosophical types of religious literature and in the more mystical varieties of religious experience, has been less skeptical about the capacity of religious symbols to portray the realities of the spiritual dimension of being. Faith, although it entails an intellectual element of belief, plays a special and often misunderstood role in the Bible and therefore in all biblically oriented Jewish and Christian thought. A classic series of illustrations of the fundamental religious significance of faith is provided by the author of the Letter to the Hebrews Heb. It is closely akin to trust. He was not totally uninformed. Yet, considerable as his knowledge presumably was, his act entailed both great personal courage and a firm personal conviction that he could rely on the guidance and guardianship of God, in whom he reposed his trust and to whom he dedicated both his courage and his intelligence, using all the willpower and the knowledge at his disposal. The "knight of faith," whom Kierkegaard depicts in *Fear and Trembling*, engages in a paradoxical movement that presupposes and transcends the "purely human" courage that mere renunciation of the world demands. His is a uniquely humble courage that makes him perfectly obedient to God. Faith is "the greatest and hardest" enterprise in which one can engage, entailing as it does a leap beyond even the highest ethical decisions of which anyone is capable. From all rational standpoints the leap is absurd, running counter to everything to which human wisdom directs our attention as reliable guideposts to right decision and noble action: Kierkegaard was by no means an enemy of either the aesthetic or the intellectual or of the ethical life of man; his concern was to show the uniqueness of faith as a category transcending all other modes of human consciousness. This distinctiveness that Kierkegaard saw in faith has warrant in the New Testament, from which he drew his principal inspiration. Through such faith the Christian is saved Eph. Inseparable though faith is from belief, it is not to be equated with it. It has a quality that distinguishes it from every other activity of mind and will. Nevertheless, having recognized that

## DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

distinctiveness, we must now explore further the relation of faith to whatever cognitive status can be assigned to belief. Prevalent but erroneous is the notion that faith, especially in the tradition of the Protestant reformers, excludes claim to knowledge of God. Hence faith is often contrasted with sight. In the teaching of the Christian school at Alexandria, faith tended to be treated as a vestibule to knowledge, a prolegomenon to a Christian gnosis. By contrast, the reformers glorified living by faith. Yet the French reformer Calvin expressly states: He is not claiming knowledge of God as God is in himself *apud se* ; he does mean that we know him as he is in his dealings with us *erga nos*. Faith, then, ever for so doughty a champion of its volitional character, has a cognitive element in it. Indeed, as good theologians no less than great mystics have always seen, faith yields a kind of knowledge, a gradual unfolding of awareness of God in human experience, apart from which awareness faith could not be indefinitely sustained. This awareness of that to which the name God is given is formulated in a set of beliefs that express in one way or another the stance to which faith leads the person who exercises it. Faith, practical and volitional as it is, is the means by which the knight of faith actually arrives at what he comes to call communion with that is, entailing knowledge of God. Just as we learn to drive or skate or play the piano less from books than by doing the thing, so through faith we arrive at the cognitive element to which it leads and is expressed in a set of beliefs. Human knowledge is always limited and subject to revision, except in the case of mathematics, which is a closed system, a vast tautology that is indispensable as an instrument in scientific inquiry yet incapable by itself of yielding new information. Knowledge of the empirical world, based on observation and experiment, can never yield certainty. As Kant showed, we cannot know the "thing-in-itself. Yet through advancement in the sciences we do have a better grasp of the world around us than did our primitive ancestors. When the knight of faith, whose adventures take him to a dimension beyond the empirical world as commonly understood, expresses his faith in a creedal statement, he can claim only a kind of knowledge. Many philosophical objections attend his claim. For instance, has he merely experienced a psychological state within himself, or has he in any sense encountered the ground of existence, the ultimate reality? Or, again, might he have encountered God through the superego of his own psyche? He can never be consistently and constantly sure; yet his faith, ever challenged by such questions, survives the challenges. When the authentic believer goes on to proclaim his belief "in" God, he is speaking from experience, as is the swimmer who says he believes "in" swimming and knows that he knows what he is talking about. Since the knight of faith is engaged in a practical, not a theoretical, inquiry, his method, like the method of the sciences, is inductive. The inductive method used so habitually and extensively in modern science entails making hypotheses and subjecting them to tests that result in their verification or falsification. While the knight of faith cannot verify or falsify the beliefs that express his faith in the same way that the scientist tests his hypotheses, his procedure is in some important respects analogous. As the creative scientist invests his time and may stake his reputation on the eventual verification of his hypothesis, so the knight of faith stakes his life and his final destiny on his. Although he cannot hope to provide a definitive, assent-compelling verification of his faith here and now, the claim implicit in his faith is verifiable or falsifiable in the long run. Such faith entails risk. We have seen that in the thought of the Middle Ages faith *fides* was generally equated with belief. The great thinkers of the thirteenth century were much more familiar with deductive methods of reasoning than with inductive ones. Despite the foundations for inductive methods that were laid by original medieval minds such as Robert Grosseteste , Roger Bacon , and Johannes Duns Scotus, medieval science did not advance as physics, chemistry, and biology have advanced in recent times. The medieval men certainly did not lack powers of observation. They made astonishingly perceptive discoveries and invented many ingenious technological tools. They were hampered, however, by not taking seriously enough those inductive methods by which modern science has made its advances.

# DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

## Chapter 2 : Ralph Waldo Emerson Quotes About Morality | A-Z Quotes

*The Philosophy of Unbelief in Morals and Religion: As Discoverable in the Faith and Character of Men Item Preview.*

So say all the prophets, Apostles, martyrs and our Lord Himself. Machiavelli Yet, we try to avoid talking about enemies. Partly because of our fear of confusing spiritual with material enemies; of hating the sinner along with the sin; of forgetting that "our struggle is not with flesh and blood but with the principalities, with the powers, with the world rulers of this present darkness, with the evil spirits in the heavens" Eph. But that fear is more unfounded today than ever in the past. No age has been more suspicious of militarism, more terrified of the horrors of physical war, than ours. And no age has been more prone to confuse the sin with the sinner, not by hating the sinner along with the sin but by loving the sin along with the sinner. We often use "compassion" as an equivalent for moral relativism. Perhaps we lack courage because we lack a reason for courage. This is how we think as moderns, but not as Catholics. As Catholics we know life is spiritual warfare and that there are spiritual enemies. Once we admit that, the next step follows inevitably. It is essential in warfare to know your enemy. Otherwise, his spies pass by undetected. So this series is devoted to knowing our spiritual enemies in the struggle for the modern heart. They have also done great harm to the Christian mind. Machiavelli, the inventor of "the new morality"; Kant, the subjectivizer of Truth; Nietzsche, the self-proclaimed "Anti-Christ"; Freud, the founder of the "sexual revolution"; Marx, the false Moses for the masses; and Sartre, the apostle of absurdity. Niccolo Machiavelli was the founder of modern political and social philosophy, and seldom in the history of thought has there been a more total revolution. Machiavelli knew how radical he was. For all previous social thinkers, the goal of political life was virtue. A good society was conceived as one in which people are good. There was no "double standard" between individual and social goodness "€" until Machiavelli. With him, politics became no longer the art of the good but the art of the possible. His influence on this point was enormous. All major social and political philosophers Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Mill, Kant, Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche, Dewey subsequently rejected the goal of virtue, just as Machiavelli lowered the standard and nearly everyone began to salute the newly masted flag. We need instead man-made lanterns; in other words, attainable goals. We must take our bearings from the earth, not from the heavens; from what men and societies actually do, not from what they ought to do. An ideal is good for him, only if it is practical; thus, Machiavelli is the father of pragmatism. Not only does "the end justify the means" "€" any means that work "€" but the means even justify the end, in the sense that an end is worth pursuing only if there are practical means to attain it. In other words, the new summum bonum, or greatest good is success. Machiavelli sounds like not only the first pragmatist but the first American pragmatist! More than a pragmatist, he was an anti-moralist. The only relevance he saw morality having to success was to stand in its way. He taught that it was necessary for a successful prince "to learn how not to be good "The Prince, ch. But modern scholars usually see it as drawn from science. They defend Machiavelli by claiming that he did not deny morality, but simply wrote a book about another subject, about what is rather than about what ought to be. They even praise him for his lack of hypocrisy, implying that moralism equals hypocrisy. This is the common, modern misunderstanding of hypocrisy as not practicing what you preach. In that sense all men are hypocrites unless they stop preaching. Matthew Arnold defined hypocrisy as "the tribute vice pays to virtue. He overcame hypocrisy not by raising practice to the level of preaching but of lowering preaching to the level of practice, by conforming the ideal to the real rather than the real to the ideal. In fact, he really preaches: Or Mary to the angel? Or Christ in Gethsemane, instead of "Father, not my will but thine be done"? If you can, you are imagining hell, because our hope of heaven depends on those people having said to God, "Poppa, do preach! By this definition Machiavelli was almost the inventor of hypocrisy, for he was almost the inventor of propaganda. He was the first philosopher who hoped to convert the whole world through propaganda. He saw his life as a spiritual warfare against the Church and its propaganda. He believed that every religion was a piece of propaganda whose influence lasted between 1, and 3, years. And he thought Christianity would end

## DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

long before the world did, probably around the year , destroyed either by barbarian invasions from the East what is now Russia or by a softening and weakening of the Christian West from within, or both. His allies were all lukewarm Christians who loved their earthly fatherland more than heaven, Caesar more than Christ, social success more than virtue. To them he addressed his propaganda. Total candor about his ends would have been unworkable, and confessed atheism fatal, so he was careful to avoid explicit heresy. But his was the destruction of "the Catholic fake" and his means was aggressive secularist propaganda. One might argue, perhaps peevishly, that he was the father of the modern media establishment. Thus both minds and bodies could be dominated, and domination was his goal. He saw all of human life and history as determined by only two forces: The simple formula for success was the maximization of virtue and the minimization of fortuna. He ends "The Prince" with this shocking image: In other words, the secret of success is a kind of rape. For the goal of control, arms are needed as well as propaganda, and Machiavelli is a hawk. He believed that "you cannot have good laws without good arms, and where there are good arms, good laws inevitably follow" ch. Machiavelli believed that "all armed prophets have conquered and unarmed prophets have come to grief" ch. Moses, then, must have used arms which, the Bible failed to report; Jesus, the supreme unarmed prophet, came to grief; He was crucified and not resurrected. But His message conquered the world through propaganda, through intellectual arms. This was the war Machiavelli set out to fight. He recognized no laws above those of different societies and since these laws and societies originated in force rather than morality, the consequence is that morality is based on immorality. The argument went like this: Morality can only come from society, since there is no God and no God-given universal natural moral law. But every society originated in some revolution or violence. Therefore, the foundation of law is lawlessness. The foundation of morality is immorality. The argument is only as strong as its first premise, which "like all sociological relativism, including that which dominates the minds of writers and readers of nearly all sociology textbooks today" is really implicit atheism. Machiavelli criticized Christian and classical ideals of charity by a similar argument. How do you get the goods you give away? Thus unselfishness depends on selfishness. The argument presupposes materialism, for spiritual goods do not diminish when shared or given away, and do not deprive another when I acquire them. The more money I get, the less you have and the more I give away, the less I have. But love, truth, friendship and wisdom increase rather than decrease when shared. The materialist simply does not see this, or care about it. Machiavelli believed we are all inherently selfish. There was for him no such thing as an innate conscience or moral instinct. So the only way to make men behave morally was by force, in fact totalitarian force, to compel them to act contrary to their nature. The origins of modern totalitarianism also go back to Machiavelli. If a man is inherently selfish, then only fear and not love can effectively move him. Thus Machiavelli wrote, "It is far better to be feared than loved The bond of love is one which men, wretched creatures that they are, break when it is to their advantage to do so, but fear is strengthened by a dread of punishment which is always effective" ch. The most amazing thing about this brutal philosophy is that it won the modern mind, though only by watering down or covering up its darker aspects. He simply lopped off the top story of the building of life; no God, only man; no soul, only body; no spirit, only matter; no ought, only is. Yet this squashed building appeared through propaganda as a Tower of Babel, this confinement appeared as a liberation from the "confinements" of traditional morality, like taking your belt out a notch. Satan is not fairy tale; he is a brilliant strategist and psychologist and he is utterly real. Whenever we are tempted, he is using this lie to make evil appear as good and desirable; to make his slavery appear as freedom and "the glorious freedom of the sons of God" appear as slavery. To subscribe to The National Catholic Register call

# DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

## Chapter 3 : Religion in the Light of Philosophy

*The Philosophy of Unbelief in Morals and Religion, as Discoverable in the Faith and Character of Men [Hooker Herman ] on theinnatdunvilla.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers.*

Andrus And Son, Hartford. Corner tips are rubbed and there is a 2" crack in the top of the front joint. Covers are firmly attached. There is an ornately written ownership claim on the ffep, as well as owner name written on title page. Pages are supple and generally clean, and tightly bound. Overall condition is Good All my books are as described. A happy customer comes back! For all buyers - I can ship the way which best fits your needs, so contact me if you would prefer a different method. Check out my ebay store - buythebookhere for all manner of scarce and interesting books and collectibles! Shipping and handling This item will ship to Germany, but the seller has not specified shipping options. Contact the seller- opens in a new window or tab and request a shipping method to your location. Shipping cost cannot be calculated. Please enter a valid ZIP Code. Worldwide No additional import charges at delivery! This item will be shipped through the Global Shipping Program and includes international tracking. Learn more- opens in a new window or tab Change country: There are 1 items available. Please enter a number less than or equal to 1. Select a valid country. Please enter 5 or 9 numbers for the ZIP Code.

# DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

## Chapter 4 : (1) The Pillars of Unbelief - Machiavelli

*The Philosophy of Unbelief in Morals and Religion, as Discoverable in the Faith and Character of Men by Herman Hooker Volume 5.*

Man is something that shall be overcome. What have you done to overcome him? All beings so far have created something beyond themselves; and do you want to be the ebb of this great flood, and even go back to the beasts rather than overcome man? What is the ape to man? A laughingstock or established embarrassment. You have made your way from worm to man, and much in you is still worm. Once you were apes, and even now, too, man is more ape than any ape. Let your will say: Amor fati and the eternal recurrence [edit] Rock on Lake Silvaplana where Nietzsche conceived of the idea of Eternal return. Nietzsche may have encountered the idea of the Eternal Recurrence in the works of Heinrich Heine, who speculated that one day a person would be born with the same thought-processes as himself, and that the same applied to every other individual. Nietzsche expanded on this thought to form his theory, which he put forth in *The Gay Science* and developed in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Schopenhauer directly influenced this theory. This idea of eternal recurrence became a cornerstone of his nihilism, and thus part of the foundation of what became existentialism. He gradually backed-off of this view, and in later works referred to it as a thought-experiment. And there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and every sigh—everything unspeakably small and great in your life—must come again to you, and in the same sequence and series. The eternal hourglass will again and again be turned—and you with it, dust of dust! Or have you once experienced a tremendous moment, in which you would answer him: Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. March This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. In the field of meta-ethics, one can perhaps most accurately classify Nietzsche as a moral skeptic; meaning that he claims that all ethical statements are false, because any kind of correspondence between ethical statements and "moral facts" remains illusory. This forms part of a more general claim that no universally true fact exists, roughly because none of them more than "appear" to correspond to reality. Instead, ethical statements like all statements remain mere "interpretations". Sometimes Nietzsche may seem to have very definite opinions on what he regards as moral or as immoral. On the contrary, he depicts falsehood as essential for "life". He mentions a "dishonest lie", discussing Wagner in *The Case of Wagner* as opposed to an "honest" one, recommending further to consult Plato with regard to the latter, which should give some idea of the layers of paradox in his work. In the juncture between normative ethics and descriptive ethics, Nietzsche distinguishes between "master morality" and "slave morality". Although he recognizes that not everyone holds either scheme in a clearly delineated fashion without some syncretism, he presents them in contrast to one another. Some of the contrasts in master vs. Nietzsche elaborated these ideas in his book *On the Genealogy of Morality*, in which he also introduced the key concept of resentment as the basis for the slave morality. These considerations led Nietzsche to the idea of eternal recurrence. Nietzsche primarily meant that, for all practical purposes, his contemporaries lived as if God were dead, though they had not yet recognized it. Nietzsche believed this "death" had already started to undermine the foundations of morality and would lead to moral relativism and moral nihilism. As a response to the dangers of these trends he believed in re-evaluating the foundations of morality to better understand the origins and motives underlying them, so that individuals might decide for themselves whether to regard a moral value as born of an outdated or misguided cultural imposition or as something they wish to hold true. Social and political views [edit] This section possibly contains original research. Walter Kaufmann put forward the view that the powerful individualism expressed in his writings would be disastrous if introduced to the public realm of politics. Owing largely to the writings of Kaufmann and others, the spectre of Nazism has now been almost entirely exorcised from his writings. Nietzsche and individualism [edit] Nietzsche often

## DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

referred to the common people who participated in mass movements and shared a common mass psychology as "the rabble", or "the herd". He allegedly valued individualism above all else, although this has been considered by many philosophers to be an oversimplification, as Nietzsche criticized the concept of the subject and of atomism that is, the existence of an atomic subject at the foundation of everything, found for example in social contract theories. He considered the individual subject as a complex of instincts and wills-to-power, just as any other organization. The question remained pendant. Recently there was unearthed further, still circumstantial, evidence clarifying the relationship between Friedrich Nietzsche and Max Stirner. He is best characterized as a thinker of "hierarchy", although the precise nature of this hierarchy does not cover the current social order the "establishment" and is related to his thought of the Will to Power. Against the strictly "egoist" perspective adopted by Stirner, Nietzsche concerned himself with the "problem of the civilization" and the necessity to give humanity a goal and a direction to its history, making him, in this sense, a very political thinker. However, he qualified his critique of Christianity as a "particular case" of his criticisms of free will. This theme is common throughout Thus Spoke Zarathustra. In *Ecce Homo*, Nietzsche criticized the "German nation" and its "will to power to Empire, to Reich", thus underscoring an easy misinterpretation of the *Wille zur Macht*, the conception of Germans as a "race", and the "anti-Semitic way of writing history", or of making "history conform to the German Empire", and stigmatized "nationalism, this national neurosis from which Europe is sick", this "small politics". The separation between us is thereby decided in really the most absurd way. Have you grasped nothing of the reason why I am in the world? Now it has gone so far that I have to defend myself hand and foot against people who confuse me with these anti-Semitic canaille; after my own sister, my former sister, and after Widemann more recently have given the impetus to this most dire of all confusions. After I read the name Zarathustra in the anti-Semitic Correspondence my forbearance came to an end. These accursed anti-Semite deformities shall not sully my ideal!! No, we do not love humanity; but on the other hand we are not nearly "German" enough, in the sense in which the word "German" is constantly being used nowadays, to advocate nationalism and race hatred and to be able to take pleasure in the national scabies of the heart and blood poisoning that now leads the nations of Europe to delimit and barricade themselves against each other as if it were a matter of quarantine. For that we are too open-minded, too malicious, too spoiled, also too well-informed, too "traveled": We who are homeless are too manifold and mixed racially and in our descent, being "modern men", and consequently do not feel tempted to participate in the mendacious racial self-admiration and racial indecency that parades in Germany today as a sign of a German way of thinking and that is doubly false and obscene among the people of the "historical sense". We are, in one word "and let this be our word of honor! For every kind of unbelief? No, you know better than that, my friends! The hidden Yes in you is stronger than all Nos and Maybes that afflict you and your age like a disease; and when you have to embark on the sea, you emigrants, you, too, are compelled to this by a faith! He frequently made remarks in his writing that some view as misogynistic. He stated in *Twilight of the Idols* "Women are considered profound. Because we never fathom their depths. These points of difference from Schopenhauer cover the whole philosophy of Nietzsche. Von Hartmann suggested that Schopenhauer was the only philosopher who has been systematically studied by Nietzsche. However, he did never recommend or argue for suicide " this is a common misconception " and aims to motivate those who abhor the world back to an active life with self-chosen goals. It is debatable whether he succeeded in the latter: In one of the passages, Nietzsche wrote: The systematic institutionalisation of criminal delinquency, sexual identity and practice, and the mentally ill to name but a few are examples used to demonstrate how knowledge or truth is inseparable from the institutions that formulate notions of legitimacy from "immoralities" such as homosexuality and the like captured in the famous power-knowledge equation. Nietzschean commentator Keith Ansell Pearson has pointed out the absurd hypocrisy of modern egalitarian liberals, socialists, communists and anarchists claiming Nietzsche as a herald of their own left-wing politics: For Nietzsche, modern politics rests largely on a secular inheritance of Christian values he interprets the socialist doctrine of equality in terms of a secularization of the Christian belief in the equality of all souls before God" On the

**DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN**

Genealogy of Morality, Ansell-Pearson and Diethel, eds.

# DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

## Chapter 5 : Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche - Wikipedia

*The philosophy of unbelief in morals and religion, as discoverable in the faith and character of men., [Herman Hooker] Philosophy of unbelief in morals and religion.*

Pride When the Lord asked in John 5: Man is so busy seeking and reveling in his own glory that he has neither the time nor the desire to offer glory to His Maker. An unhealthy lust for power wrapped in a cloak of pride breeds unbelief. One of the most famous apologists among Christian theists of the past generation was the renowned biblical scholar Wilbur M. In he authored *Therefore Stand*, which was then, and is now, a classic in the fields of Christian apologetics and evidences. When man says he believes in a Supreme Being All this is humiliating; it takes away any cause for pride, for if there is one thing that man has always liked to feel it is that he is sufficient for all things, that he is going to bring about a better world by his own ingenuity, that he is the greatest and highest and most important phenomenon in the world, and that beyond him there is nothing worth considering reprint, p. In the text they co-authored, *A Survey of European Civilization: Their assessment of the effects of this phenomenon was: Forty years later, the accuracy of their assessment became clear when two eminent atheists of our generation, Richard Leakey and Roger Lewin, wrote: Unquestionably mankind is special, and in many ways, too There is now a critical need for a deep awareness that, no matter how special we are as an animal, we are still part of the greater balance of nature During that relatively brief span evolutionary pressures forged a brain capable of profound understanding of matters animate and inanimate: The potential is enormous, almost infinite. We can, if we so choose, do virtually anything Altizer, a professor at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. Almost forty years earlier, Walter Lippmann had addressed this same type of problem in his book, *A Preface to Morals*. This is the first age, I think, in the history of mankind when the circumstances of life have conspired with the intellectual habits of the time to render any fixed and authoritative belief incredible to large masses of men. The irreligion of the modern world is radical to a degree for which there is, I think, no counterpart I do not mean that modern men have ceased to believe in God. I do not mean that they no longer believe in Him simply and literally. I mean they have defined and refined their ideas of Him until they can no longer honestly say He exists Bales authored an important volume, *The God-Killer?* Almost a decade later, Dr. In his book, *How Can Ye Believe?* Some have made a declaration of independence from God. They believe they are self-sufficient in knowledge. Through the unaided human mind they can answer all questions that can be answered, and solve all problems that can be solved For example, in our day Thomas J. Altizer has declared that God is dead. This was decreed by the pride of man. In his pride, Altizer maintained that man must be autonomous. He must be free to create his own nature and to formulate his own moral laws. If God is, and if God created man, man is not autonomous. He is not free to create his own nature, nor can he be left to his own will and whims as to what is right or wrong. He is not free to live his own life without being accountable to God. In his pride, Altizer wanted none of these things, so he decreed that God is dead in order that he might be free to live as it pleases him without being accountable to God. The arrogant heart cannot furnish fertile soil for seeds of truth The apostle John wrote: Somewhere in time, Altizer lost his way. In his pride, finite man sought to rid himself of the infinite God. Henry Morris has observed: The root of all sin Imagine the position in which the devout unbeliever finds himself. He may be thinking: If I alter my views now, I will lose face. My reputation is linked to my views. So is my conduct. Were I to change my mind, I would be condemning my whole past existence and altering my entire future life”in both word and deed. Not only is pride heavily involved, but personal integrity as well. Perhaps this is the very thing that Jesus had in mind when He said: If a person so desires, he or she can replace unbelief with belief. As the apostle John brought the Book of Revelation to a close, he wrote: It is a common occurrence among social human beings that a person who manifests a superior excellence is resented by his contemporaries. The student who consistently breaks the curve of the academic grading system is frequently treated with quiet hostility by his classmates The unusually competent person represents a threat not only to*

## DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

his peers but to his superiors as well, and is frequently treated as persona non grata. Competency at a moral level is perhaps the most unwelcome kind of competency, pp. Who among us has not endured taunts from associates because we refused to participate in something immoral? Those who are willing to participate in immoral acts often react in hostile fashion to those who are not. Consider the case of Jesus Christ. When those sent to spy on Him reported to the chief priests and Pharisees who had commissioned them, they admitted: Christ was morally unique. He was the One Who taught: And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two. I say unto you, love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you. Matthew 5: As Sproul has suggested: The unique moral excellence of Jesus was a massive threat to His contemporaries, particularly to those who were considered to be the moral elite of His day. Though the popular masses hailed the Pharisees for their moral excellence, Jesus exposed them as hypocrites. Jesus disintegrated the firm security of His contemporaries. When the Holy appeared, the pseudo-holy were exposed, pp. One need not look long or hard to find corroborating evidence for such an assessment. For example, Aldous Huxley wrote: I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently, assumed it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics; he is also concerned to prove there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do. For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom, 3: Why did he, and so many of his contemporaries, abandon belief in God? In fact, this is one of the primary planks in the platform of modern-day humanism. In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures, unduly repress sexual conduct. The right to birth control, abortion, and divorce should be recognized. While we do not approve of exploitive, denigrating forms of sexual expression, neither do we wish to prohibit, by law or social sanction, sexual behavior between consenting adults. Some might object on the grounds that not all unbelievers lapse into moral decay. Bales addressed this objection in his book, *How Can Ye Believe?* First, men are sometimes glad to get away from the moral authority of the Christian faith not because they want to do some things that it forbids, but because some of the things which it sanctions and commands they do not want to do. Second, the sinful attitude of heart may not be of the type that we generally associate with immorality, but such as the pride of individuals who do not want to admit that they are a long way from what they ought to be. Such an individual may welcome unbelief because it removes from his sight the accusing high standard of the faith which passes judgment on his life. Third, the collapse in moral conduct may not come immediately because. Fourth, it has not been suggested that this is the only cause of unbelief, pp. As this section on immorality as a cause of unbelief draws to a close, I believe it is appropriate to conclude with the following quotation from Wilbur M. The point I am making is this:

### Chapter 6 : Apologetics Press - Causes of Unbelief [Part II]

*The philosophy of unbelief in morals and religion, as discoverable in the faith and character of men* Item Preview.

### Chapter 7 : Misquoting Our Founding Fathers

*The Philosophy of Unbelief in Morals and Religion, as Discoverable in the Faith and Character of Men* Average rating: 0 out of 5 stars, based on 0 reviews Write a review This button opens a dialog that displays additional images for this product with the option to zoom in or out.

# DOWNLOAD PDF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION, AS DISCOVERABLE IN THE FAITH AND CHARACTER OF MEN

## Chapter 8 : THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNBELIEF IN MORALS AND RELIGION | eBay

*Loading The philosophy of unbelief in morals and religion, as discoverable in the faith and character of men, by the Rev. Herman Hooker.*

## Chapter 9 : Doubt and Belief | theinnatdunvilla.com

*The Philosophy of Unbelief in Morals and Religion, as Discoverable in the Faith and Character of Men by Herman Hooker starting at. The Philosophy of Unbelief in Morals and Religion, as Discoverable in the Faith and Character of Men has 0 available edition to buy at Alibris.*