

# Humanism is a Satanic Call to Abolish Religions

(Translated)

<https://www.al-waie.org/archives/article/19803>

Al-Waie Magazine Issue 466

39th Year, Dhul-Qi'dah 1446 AH / May 2025 CE

Ayman Salah – Palestine

The United States is not satisfied with its colonialist capitalist policies in its relations with the world alone. America also seeks to spread cultural agendas, and leads satanic campaigns that collectively represent a new religion. Its main tools in promoting these agendas are the United Nations and the international organizations and institutions affiliated with it. It uses international agreements related to political, economic, and social life, as well as civil society organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as means to embed its cultural ideas deep within societies.

In a previous article published in Issues 438–440 of Al-Waie Magazine entitled “The United Nations Calls for a New Global Religion That Unites All Faiths,” I outlined the main features of the new global religion that America and the United Nations want to impose on the world. It is based on the creed of pantheism (the unity of existence), adopts the idea of religious pantheism as a mode of worship, and seeks to replace the social system, or personal status laws, with sexual libertinism and chaos.

In this article, we address the concept of humanism, considering it the bond that America and the United Nations want to establish among people in place of the bond of faith in religion. They seek to make this idea shape how people view one another, regulate relationships between individuals in public life and between individuals and the state, and determine each country’s perspective and stance toward other nations and peoples.

It is important to first clarify that the term “humanism” (الإنسانية) is different from the term “humanity” (الإنسانية), even though some advocates of humanism use the term “humanity” or “humanist doctrine.” Humanitarianism is a value that holds significance in Islam, and Islam commands its realization. However, the value of humanitarianism is not a religion that defines what is good or evil, nor is it a foundation upon which thoughts are built. Humanism, on the other hand, is a concept that contradicts religion. In fact, humanism is intended to replace religion. Therefore, it is essential to be cautious and not to confuse these terms.

Humanism is an ancient concept, and the meanings associated with it have evolved over time. For this reason, it is difficult to provide a single, precise, and comprehensive definition of the term. Humanism goes beyond merely addressing the humanitarian aspect. It adopts its own worldview, based on the centrality of the human being in existence. It emphasizes the value of the human as the center of the universe, and from this centrality, all thoughts must be derived to serve the human being and liberate him from any constraints that limit his freedom, including religious teachings and laws. This has sparked numerous and intense objections against it.

Arab humanist scholars attempt to trace the roots of humanism within Islamic heritage, claiming that this tendency existed in early Islamic tradition, and was not solely a product of the Western Renaissance. They argue that it is a shared aspect of human thought throughout history, even if expressed in different forms. They cite certain texts, correspondences, and treaties written by some Muslim Khulafaa’ (Caliphs) as evidence among them, the famous letter of Imam Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra) to his governor Malik al-Ashtar, whom he appointed over Egypt. They cling to a particular phrase from that letter, الرعية صنفان؛

إِمَّا أَحُّ لَكَ فِي الدِّينِ وَإِمَّا نَظِيرُكَ فِي الْخَلْقِ “Citizens are of two types: either your brother in the Deen or your equal in creation.”

The frequent references by humanist thinkers to the stances and statements of prominent historical Islamic figures reflect their emphasis on the human value that Islam commands to uphold. However, this does not indicate the presence of modern humanist thought among Muslims. Although Islam affirms the humanitarian value, it did not instruct that this value be made a foundational concept for defining relationships between people or for determining societal systems and legislation. There is no evidence that any Khalifah (Caliph), alim, thinker, or philosopher in Islamic history treated the value of humanity as a Deen, or as a foundation for thoughts, or as the basis for human relations, as is established in contemporary humanist thought.

Researchers of humanism, whether advocating for it or critiquing it, often seek to trace its historical origins and determine where and how the idea first emerged. However, I do not see much benefit in delving into the historical origins of this concept. What truly matters today is understanding what modern humanist thought has settled upon, so that we may grasp the dangers of this ideology and how to guard against it. What concerns us is the set of ideas being promoted by humanists today around the world, including in the Islamic world.

Perhaps the most concise summary of humanist thought can be found in the work of the British humanist scholar Stephen Law, in his book “Humanism: A Very Short Introduction” published in 2011 and translated into Arabic in 2016. In it, Stephen Law outlines the key ideas upon which humanists generally agree. In his essay, “What is Humanism?” published on 7 January, 2014, stated that “most of those who organize under the banner of Humanism would accept the following minimal seven-point characterization of their world-view,” and continued to state as follows:

“1. Humanists place particular emphasise on the role of science and reason. They believe that, if we want to know what is true, reason and science are invaluable tools – tools we should apply without limit. No beliefs should be placed beyond rational, critical scrutiny.

2. Humanists are atheists. That is not to say that they must be atheists in the positive sense, however. Humanists need not deny there is a god or gods. But they do not sign up to belief in a god or gods. Humanists tend to be similarly sceptical about the existence of other supernatural agents of the sort that many religions suppose exist, such as angels and demons.

3. Humanists suppose that this is very probably the only life we have. There is no heaven or hell awaiting us. Nor are we reincarnated.

4. Humanists usually believe in the existence and importance of moral value. Humanists tend to have a particular interest and concern with moral and ethical issues. Most Humanists believe that actions can be objectively morally right or wrong. They therefore deny that the existence of objective moral values entails the existence of God. So far as knowledge of right and wrong is concerned, Humanists place strong emphasis on the role of science and/or reason...

5. Humanists emphasize our individual moral autonomy and responsibility. They insist each individual must ultimately take responsibility for making moral judgements, even if that judgement is that that individual ought to stick with the moral framework handed to them by a tradition or community. They suppose that, convenient though it might be if we could each could hand over responsibility for making tough moral decisions to some external religious, political or other leader or authority, that cannot be done (except perhaps in some very special cases)...

6. Humanists are secularists in the sense that they favour an open, democratic society and believe the State should take neutral stance on religion. The State should not privilege

religious over atheist views, but neither should it privilege atheist views of those of the religious. Humanists believe the State should protect equally the freedom of individuals to hold and promote both religious and atheist points of view...

7. Humanists believe that we can enjoy significant, meaningful lives even if there is no God, and whether or not we happen to be religious..."

Stephen Law mentions that there are other views commonly associated with humanism, but not necessarily embraced by all humanists. Instead, they may critique or reject them. These include, in his words:

"Speciesism. Humanists, as defined above, are not obliged to believe that only human beings matter, morally speaking....

Utilitarianism. Many Humanists are drawn to some form of consequentialism, and some would probably describe themselves as utilitarians. True, almost all Humanists believe that happiness and suffering matter, morally speaking, and should certainly be taken into account when weighing up ethical questions...

Scientism. Some Humanists embrace scientism – the view that every meaningful question can in principle be answered by application of the scientific method...

Naturalism. Humanists are not obliged to embrace naturalism, the view that the natural/physical reality is the only reality there is, and/or that the natural/physical facts are the only facts that there are..."

Stephen Law affirms the conflict between humanism and religion, and highlights the eagerness of humanists to build relationships with religious individuals and institutions in order to facilitate the achievement of secular humanist goals. He asserted,

"Many Humanists would go further and insist that, in some respects, our lives may become rather more meaningful in the absence of gods and/or religion. Some argue that religions can sometimes act as an impediment to our leading meaningful lives by, for example, leading us not to think hard about the Big Questions; forcing us to live a certain way out of fear cosmic punishment; and/or wasting our lives promoting false beliefs because of a mistaken expectation of a life to come... The thought that religion is a necessary underpinning for morality is also contradicted by history... Moreover, while religious belief may be a powerful social adhesive, it comes with risks attached... While there can be benefits to religious belief, and there are plenty of anecdotes about people whose lives have been dramatically "turned around" by religion, there would also appear to be benefits to a more Humanist approach to moral education and raising moral citizens."

These are the prevailing humanist thoughts among Western humanists, and they are the very same ideas being promoted in the Islamic World under various other campaigns that oppose Islam. These thoughts have preachers and advocates within the Muslim world. Many openly promote them under the banner of the humanist doctrine, while others do not explicitly declare their adherence to humanism, but knowingly or unknowingly promote humanist thoughts as part of other movements that aim to undermine Islam, such as the call to reform religion, or reinterpret religious texts through a modernist lens.

Those who call for humanism from within the Muslim community often recycle the language and concepts that define humanism, but they try to appear as though they are not opposing Islam or rejecting its rulings. Some may believe in Allah and identify as Muslims, yet they avoid discussing matters of creed in terms of Iman and evidence, or rejection and denial. They call for abolishing the Islamic bond of Aqeedah (doctrine) and establishing instead a bond based purely on humanism. They strongly criticize anyone who insists that religious creed is the correct basis for human relations, and see no problem in confining Iman merely to the heart.

They advocate for excluding the divine Deen from consideration in any aspect of human relations. In their view, humanism is the new “religion” that will put an end to wars. Through this “religion,” peace will prevail among nations, the wounds caused by wars and religious conflicts will be healed, and societies will be driven toward material progress.

Among the contemporary figures who promote and theorize humanism is Mohammed Arkoun (from Algeria), who writes his ideas in French, as he is part of the Western intellectual framework. Another is Abdel Rahman Badawi (from Egypt), the author of “A History of Atheism in Islam.” Also among them are Rasoul Mohammed Rasoul and Mohammed Habash, the latter being a student of his uncle, his wife's father, Sheikh Ahmad Kaftaro, who served as the Mufti of Syria under the Ba'athist regime for four decades.

There are other humanist advocates as well, but Mohammed Habash is perhaps the most vocal proponent of humanism in the Islamic World. He persistently promotes humanist ideas that are in clear conflict with Islam. A review of his views reveals just how dangerous and deviant humanist ideology can be.

Humanists who affiliate themselves with Islam adopt the seven core humanist principles summarized by Stephen Law, along with several other ideas commonly associated with humanism. However, they face a challenge when it comes to atheism and agnosticism, which are central to Western humanist thought. To reconcile this, they classify belief in God, atheism, and agnosticism all as forms of subjective, faith-based acceptance. As a result, believing humanists do not rely on conclusive rational evidence to affirm their faith. They are content with emotional or instinctive belief without examining evidences, arguing that since atheists and agnostics exist, they too must have some form of justification for their stances, and that all such stances in faith must be respected.

These believing humanists selectively adopt from religion only what aligns with humanist ideals and reject what contradicts them without applying any scholarly or methodological standards in accepting or rejecting religious texts. For instance, Mohammed Habash claims to believe in Allah and in Islam. He reads the Qur'an and cites verses that suit his narrative, interpreting them according to his own perspective. He accepts certain hadiths and rejects others not based on Shariah juristic principles such as the strength of the chain of transmission or linguistic interpretation, but solely based on whether they conform to humanist thinking. For him, the only criterion is compatibility with humanist ideology.

He has no problem with atheism and sees no issue in criticizing religions, including Islam, considering this part of the freedom of expression that he champions. He views “human brotherhood” and “national unity” as bonds that connect him with polytheists and atheists alike.

In Mohammed Habash's book “Neighbors on One Planet”, under the chapter titled “Neighbors: Muslims and Communists”, he writes, “Workers of the world, send blessings upon the Prophet...” It is a deliberately provocative title to discuss common ground between Islam and communism. He then describes his participation in an event hosted by the leadership of the Communist Party in Syria, where he gave a speech including the statement, “I am not here to preach a red Islam, nor do I claim that our communist comrades have become devout and started organizing pilgrimage groups. But I insist that what unites us is far greater than what our enemies believe. And without hesitation, I say: prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, and zakat are conditions for entering Paradise. However, they are not conditions for entering the homeland. The homeland belongs to all its children. Let us work together to build the earth and leave the matter of judgment to Allah.”

Mohammed Habash [1] has written several books promoting humanist thought, which he refers to as “the humanist doctrine.” He has also published many of these ideas in articles in Arab newspapers, on numerous programs aired on Arab satellite channels and radio

stations, as well as on his Facebook page. Among his books are: “The Humanist Doctrine in Islam,” “Islam Without Violence,” “The Democratic Prophet,” “A Prophet for Humanity,” “We Share More Than We Think,” “Islam Without Wars,” “Corporal Punishments and Human Dignity,” “Neighbors on One Planet,” and many others. In nearly all of these works, he repeats the same humanist ideas.

From the titles of his books and a close examination of his statements, it becomes evident that Mohammed Habash’s works are saturated with Western humanist ideas, as summarized by Stephen Law. He claims that the commonalities between religions are greater than their differences and rejects the concept of the “Saved Sect”—the belief that after the mission of Muhammad (saw), no one enters Paradise except those who believe in and follow him. According to Habash, all good people regardless of which religion they follow, even if they are atheists are among the people of Paradise.

In his book “The Humanist Doctrine in Islam” (2021), he writes, “I am convinced that Allah does not wrong even by the weight of a mustard seed, whether it is a Muslim or a non-Muslim, and if it is a good deed, He multiplies it and grants a great reward from His bounty.”

He strongly criticizes what he calls the “culture of hatred widespread among Muslims.” In his view, a Muslim should not hate or dislike a disbeliever merely for their disbelief. He rejects the concepts of loving and hating for the sake of Allah, insisting that love and hatred should not, from a humanist standpoint, be based on one’s belief or creed. Rather, disapproval or dislike should be due to one’s actions and behaviors.

He also opposes the Islamic concept of al-wala’ wa-l-bara’ (loyalty to believers and disavowal of disbelievers). He harshly condemns preachers who focus on this concept or include the idea of disavowing disbelievers and showing loyalty to believers in their sermons, lectures, or writings.

In “The Humanist Doctrine in Islam”, he states, “The idea of the human family and the brotherhood of the children of Adam must be manifested by promoting human fraternity, reducing wars, and spreading peace.”

He expresses this idea through various phrases, such as, “All of humanity are the dependents of God and one family under Him.”

In his framework, human brotherhood takes precedence over the brotherhood of faith, and over the principle of al-wala’ wa-l-bara’.

Like Western humanists, Mohammed Habash places strong emphasis on elevating the value of the human being to a central, even supreme position in existence to the extent that prophethood itself, in his view, exists for the sake of the human being. He frequently states that “the human is God’s main project on this planet.”

In his book “The Humanist Doctrine in Islam,” he writes, “There has never been a religious or political movement in history that did not speak of the human being as the essence and ultimate goal. Thus, the humanist doctrine is an intellectual and social trend that can be traced across all human societies, and it can clearly be found in all sacred texts. It is a perspective that views the human being as both the center and the goal, and considers the achievement of human happiness as the measure of true religiosity and political direction. Therefore, speaking of the human being as the center and goal is a given.”

He also says, “I used to call for faith... but today I call for the human being.” “The goal is not religion, but the human being.”

In his book “Neighbors on One Planet,” he asks, “When will we be able to decode the dialogue between those who believe in God in the heavens and those who believe in the human on earth?”

He frequently uses expressions such as “faith in God and in the human being” or “we believe in the human.”

For humanists, the human being is the essence of existence and more important than religion or Shariah. In fact, according to this view, Shariah can be altered to conform to the human being’s happiness and well-being, as defined by Western notions of happiness and welfare.

In his book “Women Between Shariah and Life,” Mohammed Habash argues that Islamic Shariah rulings contain clear and harsh discrimination against women, such as those concerning guardianship, testimony, and the prohibition of travel without a mahram (male guardian). He believes such rulings place women under oppressive male guardianship. He also claims that the current marriage and divorce system, as prescribed by personal status laws, shows a blatant imbalance in gender equality and women’s rights, and calls for bold *ijtihad* (independent reasoning) to restore women’s rights and human dignity.

He criticizes the imposition of the hijab on women. Notably, when discussing hijab, he does not distinguish between hijab, jilbab, and niqab. He writes, “The jurists unanimously agreed that the hijab is a noble Islamic etiquette.”

He then poses the question, “Is the command to wear the hijab an obligation or a recommendation?”

And he answers, “We choose to consider it a recommendation!”

He concludes, “In summary: we should leave the matter of hijab to the woman. It is her choice, her freedom, and her responsibility. We should explain to her the religious facts and let her know that religion is ease, not hardship; mercy, not punishment. My message is that we should respect both the veiled and the unveiled, and we should call respectfully for modesty and chastity without extravagance, and we must make religion more accommodating for people.”

Humanism rejects the punishments prescribed in Islam particularly the hudud (fixed penalties) on the grounds that they are harsh, inhumane, and incompatible with free rational choice, innate human nature, the higher values of religion, and human rights. In his book “The Humanist Doctrine in Islam,” Mohammed Habash writes, “Perhaps the most problematic aspect in presenting the humanist doctrine in Islam is the issue of the harsh hudud punishments, which involve torturing the body, such as execution, crucifixion, stoning, and amputation. These are extremely severe penalties that cannot be understood within a humanist framework because they are not intended to reform the offender, but rather to destroy them entirely or partially. They are typically justified on the basis that the destruction of one individual leads to the reform of society, thus achieving a humanist outcome in the end, even if the immediate result appears to be torture and cruelty.”

Since abolishing the hudud contradicts clear and established Islamic Shariah rulings, Habash attempts to support his call for their abolition by claiming that such a move was made by prominent early figures like Umar ibn al-Khattab (ra) and Umar ibn Abdul Aziz, and that this is the view of some of the greatest ulema in Islamic history.

Habash states, “Many people think that the call to change the hudud—from flogging, stoning, amputation, and crucifixion to rehabilitative punishments—is a concern of Westernized secular movements... and religious leaders still view such a call as disbelief in what Allah has revealed... In my new book ‘Justice, Not Revenge’, I documented fifteen clear positions from eight of the most prominent ulema in Islamic history, who explicitly called for the suspension of corporal hudud punishments and the transition to rehabilitative penalties.”

Humanists adopt secular democracy, and Mohammed Habash proudly identifies as a secularist who advocates for democracy even going so far as to describe the Prophet

Muhammad (saw) as a “democrat.” He calls for freedom of expression, even when it includes rejection or criticism of Islam. According to humanists, democracy arises from the innate virtues and values of human nature. Since they claim that human nature is naturally inclined toward monotheism (tawḥīd), they consider democracy to be part of the true religion.

Habash quotes his teacher, Jawdat Sa‘id, as saying, “Democracy is a form of pure monotheism and an expression of the upright religion.”

Humanists argue that critics of religious belief must be cautious in the tone and manner of their critique, ensuring that it does not come across as mockery, or personal ridicule, of those who hold religious beliefs.

Humanism views individual morality as a purely rational matter that requires no religious justification. Human reason or science can independently determine what is moral, based on human experience across different peoples and cultures. Humanists acknowledge that people vary in their moral insight; some may possess broader moral knowledge, making them more trustworthy judges of right and wrong. Certain individuals might have important moral wisdom, and some of that wisdom may even be found in specific texts.

When Mohammed Habash wrote about morality in his article “On the Theology of Ethics... A New Vision,” his discussion focused entirely on the experiences of philosophers throughout different eras and regions, without citing any religious texts. He went further to claim the right to critique Islam and the Qur’an in the realm of ethics, because Islam treats morality as divine commands and prohibitions, with consequences of reward or punishment in the afterlife.

Habash argues that this focus on reward and punishment represents a regression in the concept of ethics, reducing it to a material transactional exchange. He views religious reward as driven by physical, instinctual desires such as sex, pleasure, wine, and intoxication and sees religious punishment as irrational cruelty. In his article, he writes, “We truly need a tour through moral philosophy as presented by the Enlightenment philosophers, and then we must reflect on the regression we brought upon ourselves when morality became a purely transactional system, conditioned by reward or punishment. Rewards took the form of bodily, instinctual desires sex, pleasure, wine, and drunkenness. As for punishment, it strayed far into a cruel realm, where skins are flayed, only for the angels of torment to replace them with new ones so the condemned can continue to suffer for eternity, forever and ever.”

Humanism rejects Jihad, particularly Jihad al-Talab (offensive Jihad), because humanism is a religion of nonviolence. From the humanist perspective, Jihad constitutes a form of violence especially Jihad al-Talab, which is associated with concepts they deem “inhuman,” such as Jizya (tax for non-Muslims under Muslim rule). They claim it directly contradicts what they describe as the core values of Islam: justice, mercy, and benevolence.

According to their argument, Jihad al-Talab is no longer applicable in the modern world, since freedom of religion exists globally, and Muslims can spread the message of Islam peacefully through wisdom and kind preaching, especially using modern technological tools. They argue that today’s reality renders offensive Jihad obsolete.

In the introduction to his book “Islam Without Violence,” Mohammed Habash writes, “Nonviolence is a magical word, with followers, prophets, and saints in every land. Yet here in the East, it is persecuted, treated as an idea that contradicts hudud (Islamic legal punishments) and Jihad. Islam is seen as following the logic of ‘an eye for an eye,’ and that ‘killing is the best deterrent for killing.’ Verses such as ‘In retribution, there is life, O people of understanding,’ and ‘Fight the disbelievers entirely as they fight you entirely,’ and ‘When you meet those who disbelieve, strike their necks,’ and ‘Fight them until they submit’ these are invoked.”

He concludes from this that Jihad al-Talab is a form of violence that has no justification.

And as you, dear reader, can observe from the quote above, Habash subtly undermines divine Islamic Shariah rulings, Qur'anic verses, and Prophetic hadiths by portraying them as contrary to modern humanist ethics.

It is worth noting that the religion of Humanism contradicts Darwinism. Darwinism is based on the concept of the struggle for survival, which is an inseparable part of its theory, where the fittest or strongest survives. It considers human beings to be just like other living creatures, and assumes that conflict between human groups of different racial origins is inevitable, so that the groups with superior traits can dominate. Therefore, conflict and violence are central components of Darwinism, which stands in direct opposition to the principles of Humanism.

In conclusion, what has been presented outlines the core principles of Humanism. Upon examining them, it becomes clear that Humanism constitutes a religion that seeks to replace all others, particularly Islam. It openly admits to excluding religions, which means it is, by nature, a doctrine of disbelief (kufr). It equates the true religion with abrogated and distorted ones, places belief and atheism on the same level, and rejects divine revelation as a source of authority in life. It denies Islamic laws that are firmly established by conclusive evidence in both transmission and meaning.

The real danger lies in the promotion of partial humanist thoughts that often deceive ordinary Muslims, who may not realize that such thoughts are part of a larger ideological system rooted in Humanism. The way to confront this is by refuting these partial ideas and reaffirming the centrality of Islam which is what Humanism seeks to undermine.

Finally, it must be stated that Humanism can never be practically applied as a cohesive social system, it remains a misguided individual phenomenon, often carrying contradictory ideas even outside the framework of Humanism itself. While humanists preach love, and claim to harbor no malice toward anyone, their slips of the tongue often reveal what lies hidden in their hearts. True love cannot exist without hating its opposite and this becomes clear in the way they speak about Muslims who reject humanist ideology and hold firmly to the Shariah as it was revealed by Allah (swt).

This all shows that Humanism is nothing more than a purely satanic illusion. It can never manifest in collective reality. Instead, it is a gateway to kufr (disbelief), disguised with attractive and embellished rhetoric, deceiving only those who “take the devils as allies instead of Allah and think that they are rightly guided.”

As Allah (swt) says, \* **وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَا لِكُلِّ نَبِيٍّ عَدُوًّا شَيَاطِينَ الْإِنْسِ وَالْجِنِّ يُوحِي بَعْضُهُمْ إِلَى بَعْضٍ زُخْرُفَ الْقَوْلِ \* غُرُورًا وَلَوْ شَاءَ رَبُّكَ مَا فَعَلُوهُ فَذَرْهُمْ وَمَا يَفْتَرُونَ** ﴿١١٢﴾ **“And so We have made for every Prophet enemies, devilish humans and jinn, whispering to one another with elegant words of deception. Had it been your Lord’s Will, they would not have done such a thing. So leave them and their deceit.”** [TMQ Surah Al-An'am 6:112].

#### Footnote:

[1] In 2010, Habash was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Craiova, one of the oldest and most prestigious universities in Romania. This honorary degree is granted only once every two years. The university awarded this honor to Dr. Mohammed Habash in recognition of his research and efforts in interfaith dialogue—particularly his book “The Biography of Prophet Muhammad”. The university translated the book into Romanian and designated it as required reading for students in its theology faculties.