

George W. Bush – Secular Hero

Christopher Hitchens **writes**:

George Bush may subjectively be a Christian, but he—and the U.S. armed forces—have objectively done more for secularism than the whole of the American agnostic community combined and doubled.

We agree. This is one way of stating, in short, why we, as atheists, supported this deeply religious man for the Presidency.

The demolition of the Taliban, the huge damage inflicted on the al-Qaida network, and the confrontation with theocratic saboteurs in Iraq represent huge advances for the non-fundamentalist forces in many countries.

Indeed. And Hitchens uncharacteristically omits to mention that Bush and the US armed forces have done all this in the teeth of the uncompromising opposition of the Vatican and most other Christian churches, not to mention certain other faiths, in unholy alliance with most atheists – but with the support of American Christians of all denominations in whom (contrary to what most of them claim) the secular values of the West are alive and on the ascendant.

The "antiwar" faction even recognizes this achievement, if only indirectly, by complaining about the way in which it has infuriated the Islamic religious extremists around the world. But does it accept the apparent corollary—that we should have been pursuing a policy to which the fanatics had no objection?

Again, we agree. And here comes the reason:

Secularism is not just a smug attitude. It is a possible way of democratic and pluralistic life that only became thinkable after several wars and revolutions had ruthlessly smashed the hold of the clergy on the state. We are now in the middle of another such war and revolution, and the liberals have gone AWOL.

He means 'liberals' in the American sense of the word, namely leftists. One has to wonder whether the left was ever truly onside

with the project of liberalism: to liberate human beings, in body and

mind, from tyranny and slavery.

Tue, 11/09/2004 - 22:00 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Horse \$h!t

This post reminds me of the of the joke about the boy who is exited about being put in a stable full of manure - there has to be a pony in here somewhere!

I think this administration is similar to the Johnson administration in that it is fighting a movement that is a radicalised reflection of itself. To say that this administration is advancing secularism is like saying that LBJ is was a friend of free markets.

by a reader on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 01:13 | [reply](#)

Another religion

Another religion that Bush rides roughshod over is environmentalism.

by a reader on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 02:11 | [reply](#)

Re: Horse

To say that this administration is advancing secularism is like saying that LBJ is was a friend of free markets.

Fair comment. But did Hitchens or **The World** claim that Bush is a *friend* of secularism? If not, why didn't you write: "to say that this administration is advancing secularism is like saying that LBJ is was *advancing* free markets when he tried to halt the spread of communism"?

by [David Deutsch](#) on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 02:36 | [reply](#)

Re: Re: Horse

Look at the historical record of LBJ's domestic policies and the actual results of his foreign policy = hardly a bulwark of capitalism.

by a reader on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 02:58 | [reply](#)

Horsefeathers

GWB now talks about freedom like he used to talk about Jesus. He believes in the power of freedom to change lives. Like LBJ and Communism, GWB has the right idea. Like LBJ, he may still fail.

By the way, was FDR a de facto Fascist because of his corporatist policies? Or was he an enemy of Fascism because he fought it world-wide? Did he do more to promote it, or to destroy it?

legenda.blogspot.com

by Nick on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 04:20 | [reply](#)

Big Improvement over Dad

I think it's clear that Hitchens and **The World** are right about Bush and secularism.

What I think everyone should agree with, is that George W. Bush has a much better attitude towards atheists than his father did:

See **this**.

On the contrary, George W. Bush has made repeated comments expressing respect for those of us who don't worship any God.

He's not perfect, but his generation is better than the last one. Hopefully the next one will be even better.

Gil

by **Gil** on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 17:13 | [reply](#)

RE: horsefeathers

LBJ failed because his beliefs (and many of his constituents) were really not that different from the Viet Cong. e.g.:The Viet Cong wanted "just" redistribution of wealth - so did LBJ. LBJ's fallback position was that South Vietnam should be "democratic" i.e. majority rule. So (in theory) thousands of Americans needed to die so that South Vietnam could hold elections- and then vote for communist rulers! Similarly, Bush can't announce a war against mystic, Biblically inspired dogma (Islam) because he (and many of his constituents) are adherents to a similar kind of dogma.

by a reader on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 19:29 | [reply](#)

vietnam

Are you familiar with the Domino theory? i assume you disagree with it. But it's clearly false to give a supposedly complete description of the *reasons* we went to war in Vietnam, while leaving it out. Even if we were wrong about that, it was still a reason we went.

And, the Domino theory doesn't seem obviously unreasonable to me. Maybe you know some important detail I don't, but it'd be better to tell me about that detail than imagine I'm actually going to agree to your description of the reasons for the war while you leave out the most famous one.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://www.curi.us/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Wed, 11/10/2004 - 19:36 | [reply](#)

Evangelistic Atheism

Sermon on the mount, or a tale of the horse they rode in on.

If it gets votes and sounds good, preach it. Atheists and evangelists are suitably good in bed together for that very reason, by definition in verbiage and not in sin. For the record atheists are not like those flippy-floppy godly-godless agnostics. Atheists and evangelists both know they are right about one thing. God either exists because He does or because the idea of Him exists. Agnostics doubt the existence of God and know they might be wrong either way. Agnostics therefore are mightily confused. True leaders are believers and certainty triumphs over doubt. In that these horses are about due to sprout wings any day now, we all will have a new way to fly and horsefeathers shall aboundeth. Tie the the reins of these pipe dreams together to make a tall tale and name her Objectivity. Mount up!

It was good, and on the seventh day they rested and we babbled.

Hallelujah! I'll believe it when I see it.

by a reader on Thu, 11/11/2004 - 03:38 | [reply](#)

RE: Evangelistic Atheism

Reader, you're definitions are wrong. Atheism is the lack of theistic belief. "A" means without. "Theism" means, the belief in god or gods. Atheism is not the belief that there is no god of any kind (although people who believe this are atheists, it is merely a subset of atheism, the way believers in Norse mythology are a subset of theists.)

Atheism is not a belief system. It is the absence of belief. It covers a lot of ground. For example, infants are atheists (implicit atheists) not because they are sure that there is no god, but because they simply lack belief.

"Agnostic" was a term coined by Thomas Huxley, referring to the religious sect known as "Gnostics" as an example of men who claim knowledge of the supernatural without justification. By deciding that he was "a-gnostic", Huxley was saying that even if the supernatural does exist, it is unknowable to man. An "Agnostic" has come to be understood as someone who maintains that some aspect of the supernatural is forever closed to human knowledge.

Agnosticism is not a third alternative to theism and atheism. "Theists" and "atheists" covers everyone on the planet. Either you believe that god(s) exists or you are without that belief. Agnostics can be a subset of either of the two. Generally speaking, agnostic theists believe in god but believe that the true nature of god is unknowable. Agnostic atheists maintain that the supernatural is inherently unknowable, so the agnostic can neither affirm nor deny the existence of god. But since this person lacks actual belief in god(s), he is not a theist, and is therefore an atheist.

Agnostics are not necessarily confused or flip-floppy about any of this.

The idea that atheists, by their nature, are evangelical is false.

Although there may very well be evangelical atheists, the vast majority are not. In fact, most atheists probably don't even know that they're atheists.

by **R** on Thu, 11/11/2004 - 16:33 | [reply](#)

Useful Distinction

Theists, Atheists, and Agnostics are all subsets of the same, humans postulating with their different shadings of belief. Satire is useful in dealing with rampant belief systems to which ironically each of all of us subscribe to some degree. Beliefs change. Reality rules.

Your explanation of the differences is useful however. The life cycle of beliefs would seem to indicate that we are born as atheists, wonder a bit about various theisms, and then assume with some certainty that the rest of the gnostics are a bunch of babbling fools - which of course might be wrong - agnostically.

by a reader on Fri, 11/12/2004 - 01:37 | [reply](#)

"If it gets votes and sounds

"If it gets votes and sounds good, preach it. Atheists and evangelists are suitably good in bed together for that very reason, by definition in verbiage and not in sin. For the record atheists are not like those flippy-floppy godly-godless agnostics. Atheists and evangels both know they are right about one thing."

Atheists know they are right that there is no god and theists know they are right that there is a god. I'm an atheist conservative, btw.. great post!

by a reader on Fri, 07/15/2005 - 04:55 | [reply](#)

God bless George W. Bush our hero

Hi,

I am a proud supporter of George W. Bush!
because he:

- protects us - homeland security
- creates jobs
- renewal in iraq
- honoring our veterans
- rebuilding the gulf coast region
- education reform - no child left behind
- protecting our nation's enviroment

That's why I like him. We have one America and President George

W. Bush is defending with all his heart and soul.
It will be sad day for the USA and the world when bush leaves
office. Too bad he can't be president again. He's done more in the
past 2 years than most presidents ever do.

If someone have any questions contact me!
(www.georgewbushthehero.piczo.com)

Faithfully Steven Freeling (George W. Bush the hero)

God bless America

by George W. Bush the hero on Thu, 10/04/2007 - 16:13 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights