

Luciferian Ideology Alive Today

1. The first category is not questions but cultural observations. I'm not sure how successful a discussion group might be about phenomena that are not widely known, but if an option were available, it might be very attractive to some of the conferees.

All atheistic philosophy and "theology" is Luciferian. Much of the trendy "deconstructionist" school is explicitly based on Nietzsche's word, "God is dead." (E.g., Mark C. Taylor's acclaimed mixture of negativistic brutality and sophisticated historical knowledge, Erring: A Postmodern A/theology, University of Chicago Press, 1984) The trap is for sincere believers to get into the endless labyrinth of untangling spiritual insight and legitimate points from trash.

There are hot, antitheistic and cold, secularistic versions of this, both of which are widespread in Marxist literature. Marxism of late, has begun to speak of "spiritual" values, meaning cultural values, in order to further its project of co-opting the Islamic and Catholic revolutionary forces in the Middle East and Latin America.

The effort to find a secularistic consensus for a pluralistic society is, arguably, a further variant of this trend. Public education is swamped by this reductionistic ideology. The litigants who argued against secularist humanism as a religious bias in school text-books are widely regarded as extremists, but their point is worth very serious consideration.

2. The main thrust of Lucifer's ideology alive today is the denial of divine standards for values. The main alternative to the divine standard view is relativism, the view that value judgments depend essentially on individuals or cultures. Relativism may be found in the areas of truth (epistemology), beauty (aesthetics), and goodness (ethics). Most philosophers who want to avoid relativism do not understand (what The URANTIA Book teaches on p. 192) that it is not irrational to assert some primal insights as assumptions to serve as a bulwark against relativism.

We commonly talk about "values clarification" and about "his or her values," meaning those things which he or she happens to prefer. Valuation is thus often portrayed as a subjective process with no objective norms. However benign the intentions of such talk, its philosophic essence must warm the deceiver's heart.

"Beauty is in the eye of the beholder." (Mussolini's son found the orange flares of bombs he dropped on Ethiopia to be beautiful.) Aesthetics is the region where value judgments are the hardest to support; this realm provides a field-day for relativism. Rebellion is often expressed by defiance of general social norms in music, film, dress, etc. Plato, Confucius, and the Soviets take the character-consequences of the arts seriously; our society, on the whole, does not.

Relativism is most obvious in the slogan, "It's all relative."

A much more important and difficult example is, "Different strokes for different folks." The problem here, as with many of the following examples, is the indulgent and "good-humored" confusion between legitimate difference and moral anarchy. For most people it's well-nigh socially impossible to object to such a glib saying.

"It's a free country."

"Who's to judge?" I.e. (1) no one is competent to judge and (2) any judgment made with authority would be unfairly imposed upon others.

At times religionists appeal to "mercy" and condemn "judgment" in ways that tend towards support for moral anarchy. Many students of The URANTIA Book, at the gut level, regard the justice of God which annihilates hardened iniquiters as somehow injustice—as if justice is injustice, and as if only mercy can be just. This sentiment, if brought to consciousness and fully authorized, would be Luciferian sentiment. Along the same line, complaints arise about the "hardness" of Jesus'

last temple discourse. The divine intolerance is not a welcome theme: (1676d, 1653c, 1766, 1839d, 1843d, 1890, 1911)

Some religions teach that everybody survives and attains eternal life (while others fear that such a presumption is contained in the concept of the "universal Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man").

"Everybody has his/her own opinion." i.e., there is no insight, only mere opinion; there is no rational basis for criticising another person. Much of the time this kind of talk is a mask for the stout--and absolutistic--defense of individual rights (which is not a relativistic position at all).

Anyone with a strong conviction needs to take care lest others feel that he is trying to "cram something down their throats." This very common expression is often a way of pressuring people to regard their convictions as private opinions, which they should be timid about expressing. The success of this ideology is one reason why students of The URANTIA Book do so little evangelism. Many Marxists, on the other hand, have earned a certain kind of respect for their outspoken, aggressive rhetorical behavior. The advocates of pluralism, however, typically do not see how their rules for discourse may be just as tyrannical as those of their more obviously dogmatic opponents.

The absolute right of individual nations to determine their own destiny is another variation on our theme. Hitler was permitted to build up a military force that posed a tremendous threat to his neighbors. Other countries are being permitted to do so today. Nationalism is not only the glorification and aggrandizement of one's own nation but also the irrational tolerance for the exaggerated autonomy claims of other nations.

Lucifer denied the validity of structures of authority. Resistance to authority figures in the classroom, politics, etc. can exemplify a rebellious attitude; but these matters are slippery, since often tyrants and oppressors who want to violate individual freedom seek and gain positions of authority.

A seminar leader could explain relativism and elicit examples from the group, as well as provide examples. Then the group could analyze the confusion of legitimate and mistaken claims being made in a single slogan. A further question is why the smuggling operation is done? Why is this kind of non-thinking so widespread? This is a difficult seminar to teach. The 2094 quote that we do not create values is a starting point.

3. Another manifestation today of Luciferian ideology is the complaint that we are being overtrained, i.e., that many portions of The URANTIA Book are superfluous.

I look forward to our phone call in November. Thank you for wading through these dissertations.

Love,



Jeff Wattles