

# **Humanism and the New Age: Lessons for Humanists to Learn**

**Beverley M. Earles**

SHERWIN WINE has explained the origin and character of the New Age in his preceding essay, and consequently it is my task to address the following issues: firstly, what we Humanists can learn, and secondly, what we should be wary of in the New Age movement. The first of these issues will be my emphasis, and I shall conclude my remarks with some comments about the current state of the New Age in order to bring a sense of proportion to some prevalent Humanist feelings about the movement.

To begin with, let us ask what we can learn from the New Age. First, I believe we can learn the importance of being positive and of having pleasure. I say this because Humanists noticeably spend a lot of time talking about how dreadful things are; at our Unitarian Universalist Fellowship for example, we are always having speeches on poverty, population crises, government corruption, illiteracy, difficult relationships and so forth. It is like going through a washing machine cycle every Sunday, and I know the experience is not atypical in Unitarian Universalist fellowships and churches, in chapters of the American Humanists Association (AHA) and in other Humanists groups around the world.

Because I am one of the worst culprits as far as dwelling upon the problematic and the serious, my attendance at a typically joyful and optimistic New Age institution over the

Beverley Earles teaches in the English Language Program at Kansas State University; serves on the Board of Directors of both the American Humanists Association and International Association of Humanist Educators, Counselors and Leaders (IAHECL).

past few months gave me quite a jolt. The institution that I personally experienced is Unity Christian church - now one of the three largest New Age institutions in the United States. Unity was in existence prior to the modern New Age movement, but it has been rapidly absorbing New Age ideas and people who were not content with the usual, highly individualised, rather anti-institutional New Age life style,<sup>1</sup>

When I went to Unity, I might just as well have been on Mars; I thought to myself: "What is this? here we have all these joyous people being positive about the world, positive about themselves and their relationships. Here we have people who really believe that no matter who you are or where you are, thinking prosperously will bring prosperity. Here we have people exclaiming about how fortunate we are to have so many master teachers to show us the happy way. All we have to do is what the master teachers did. All we need to do is follow our bliss for, as Jesus said, 'All will be well. Just go out and go with the flow,'" (I am not sure which version of the Bible this rendition of Jesus' words comes from!),

"God," I thought, "this is no place for any self respecting Humanist. All this optimism - 111break out in a rash!" However, I persevered and eventually I began to emerge from these Unity services feeling more positive about life, Furthermore, I came to believe that it is the optimistic outlook that appeals to so many people flocking to this church. Unity's optimism gives people hope, especially those people who have suffered emotional knocks, but also those who are simply people trying to make it through life with some modicum of optimism and pleasure. I would add that like much of New Age, Unity is equally good at reinforcing the aspirations of the upwardly mobile. (Yes they do still exist!). It keeps the upwardly mobile optimistic even in the current economic situation.

Now we Humanists might think that Unity's New Age optimism is based on wishful thinking and that therefore it is ultimately useless, but I believe that it is instructive. Unity's optimistic attitude and the attraction that it has for people instructs us to stop and wonder about the fun and positive aspects of being Humanists. I disagree with Humanists, for after all, we have our lives to create and surely this is as exciting as most things we might ever imagine and wish to do! So

<sup>1</sup> While it is true that Unity has taken on a lot of New Ageism. it has recently been "cracking down" on three things - channeling, the use of crystals and miracle making.

although it is sometimes difficult to find happy Humanists, I believe that we need to reassert the joy that Humanism brings to the human condition. We need to evaluate our tendency to take too much responsibility for the world's problems that we forget our need for happiness both as individuals and as a movement. This need is both for ourselves and for furthering our purposes; it is time we realised that most people "out there" do not want to adopt a life style that spends most of its time mourning the woes of the world. If we Humanists do not show and speak of the happiness and optimism we are committed to we will never grow.

This is the first major point to learn from New Ager - to remember our optimism and cultivate it, for after all, Humanism is about hope!

The second point that we learn is the importance of providing tools for people; that is, to provide concrete ways for people to more readily do the work of being Humanist. Spouting what Humanists believe is just not enough.

Now the New Age movement is *centered* on tools - it has a long list of methods to use for better living - more successfully, more meaningfully and more happily. The tools are for doing what Joseph Campbell calls "following your bliss," that is, obeying the call of some particular lifestyle. Marilyn Ferguson (New Age leader and author of the key work *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, 1980) refers to these tools as psychotechnologies, and they include biofeedback, meditation, psychodrama, dreamjournals, sensitivity groups, primal therapy and body disciplines such as rolfing and Tai Chi. So the point is if you are a New Ager, there is endless help for you to *be* a New Ager.

Then what do we do to help Humanists be Humanists? You may well answer this question by saying that we do little to help Humanists because many Humanists simply do not want to be helped. Having hung around the Humanist movement for a while I am inclined to agree - at least to some extent.

I think that we mainly have a "catch as catch can" approach to this matter of tools and methods. If people ask "how can we learn to live a Humanist life?" or "how can we learn *more* about living a Humanist life?" what do we do? Well, we send them to a library with a "Go forth and read!" Now it is true that we do offer some practical self help; for example, Rational Recovery does an excellent job of helping people overcome most

kinds of drug and emotional dependencies. Indeed I think that Rational Recovery is one of the most positive developments in Humanism to-date. What else do we offer? Well, we offer support to people wanting to commit suicide. (We can recommend an excellent book for that too.). The point here is that while it is a positive act to support euthanasia, it is at least as important to support those who want to live and who ask for help in doing so more Humanistically,

It is way past time to recognize that apart from the activities of some of our congregation ally styled institutions, we Humanists largely expect people to learn inductively about how to live a Humanist life. It is also way past time to recognize that by no means are all Humanists happy with this state of affairs; some Humanists want more direct methods of help. And I would repeat furthermore, that people *outside* of the movement also seem to want clear methods; they want a Way with a capital "W" and we do not provide it. By way of contrast, the New Age not only provides it, but does so in innumerable ways and without stifling individuality. It says, as it were, "Go ahead and create your own reality-here are several hundred methods that might help you. "

So I would invite you all to consider *how* Humanism has helped you live your life. *Identify* the things that you do to help yourself live Humanistically. Being able to express this is as important as being able to say what Humanism is, particularly when it comes to advocacy.

I would invite you to seek information from those Humanist groups who have in fact developed specific techniques for living humanistically. By way of example, I offer the following experience which I had with one such group.

I participated in a one and a half day Humanist workshop conducted by a Humanist institution here in the States. This workshop was right out of the Esalen Institute at Big Sur, California. (Esalen is one of the best known personality development centers in the USA and two Humanists have had a great influence there - namely Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers). Like so much that had come out of Esalen, the assumption at the workshop I attended was that having predominantly *rational* control over our lives is not good. It was assumed that words are a barrier to self-knowledge and that the worst thing one could be told was "You're up in your head. " In the light of this assumption, we engaged in all kinds of nonverbal encounter and intimacy in order to better know our

---

nonrational selves and through such knowledge to better know and appreciate others.

Well, these activities were not "my cup of tea," and I am not sure that it is even Humanistic to put down the rational aspect of being human to the degree that was suggested. At the same time however, I recognize that this particular mode of "doing/learning" Humanism denotes the overlap that exists between Humanism and the New Age movement. (The overlap occurs at the intersection of the Human Potential Movement and the New Age. Thus Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers are so readily referred to in both places). And I am therefore not unduly surprised to find Humanists involved in it.

In reality the psychotherapeutic efforts of the Human Potential movement do work for people, both Humanists and non Humanists. People find the techniques not only deliver them from alienation but also empower them. A further instance of this is the use of Human Potential tapes. There are Humanists for example, who listen to Tony Robbins self-empowerment tapes over and over again and have found them to be of enormous help in their lives. There is in fact an AHA chapter that has listening to Robbins tapes as a regular activity.

But what about other Humanists? Many of the Humanists whom I know are suspicious of tools provided by the Human Potential movement. These Humanists find such methods intrusive on their personal space, and they find them flaky and contrived. These Humanists want to reserve hugging for those of whom they are fond and they don't appreciate what they see as a swing too far in a non verbal or non rational direction in Humanist behaviour. So we must develop ways suitable for these Humanists too. Perhaps one would be to encourage greater emphasis on practical articles in our magazines. Perhaps exposure to personal stories would be another way; personal testimony seems to be a rare item in Humanist meetings. Yet it can be very educational *because* it is personal. People reach people in a way that abstraction never can. Moreover, personal testimonies can be given in a non threatening manner by making it clear that highly intimate ventilation is not what people want to hear.

In making all of these comments about tools, I am not suggesting that we deliberately invent a catalogue of Humanist techniques. This would be crass and probably unsuccessful - but I am suggesting that we have to get more practically

minded. We must find practical ways to help people *become* Humanists and we must find practical ways to help *Humanists* be Humanists.

The third lesson to learn from the New Age is really a corollary to the second lesson on providing tools. Simply expressed, providing tools for people is a direct concern for individual persons and their needs; and such concern is clearly something that many people are looking for. (Women's magazines, churches, and New Agers have long known this.). I think that Humanists, particularly in the least communal and most secular wings of the movement, have tended to overlook the significance of the personal; but I think that concern and interest in the person are something to which the movement as a whole needs to become aware of.

Sherwin Wine pointed out that a very successful individual claimed by the New Age movement is Joseph Campbell- I say claimed, because I do not think Campbell actually referred to himself as a New Ager. There is much one could say about this man, but for the moment I simply must emphasize his genius at engaging the person, particularly those persons who have rejected tradition. I want to emphasize this in support of my belief that this is what *we too* must learn to do. We need to become adept at engaging the person.

Unlike 99% of academics, Campbell writes in a way that any normal human being can read. And while some academics readily dismiss him as lightweight, Campbell nevertheless has the distinction of having educated an enormous number of people in the myths of the planet. Furthermore, he has done it in such a way that many readers become personally engaged in those myths and thereby experience something universally human yet at the same time intensely personal. Indeed Campbell believes that the discovery of human universals *is* the discovery of the deeply personal, and the *means* of discovery is the understanding and experience of myth. He argues for example, that one of the important universals that one can experience in myth is the person of the hero. No matter who the hero is, (Jesus, Buddha, the Humanists Prometheus, or whoever) the basic experience is the same says Campbell; an engaged reader identifies with the hero's experiences so that while the hero is coming to the realization of her own identity, so too is the reader. "Not only are all (the) stories one story, but the one story is one's own....<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Forence Sandler and Darrell Reeck. "The Masks of Joseph Campbell" *Religion* 11(1981). P.6.

Depending upon which books one reads and how many, one may be tempted to think that Campbell is a Humanist. Indeed I have heard a number of Humanists say this. For my part, I do not for one moment think that Campbell is a Humanist (as I shall in due course explain) although I do believe that he is a teacher whom Humanism *needs*. We need Campbell because he demonstrates how to reach people both personally and universally at the same time, and we need him because the tale of the hero is so often the tale of a *Humanist*, I repeat, Campbell is often writing for those who have rejected traditional religion and who want to find new ways to move meaningfully forward. He was a great critic of traditional and institutionalised religion, and he said that the heralds of the future are Leonardo and Copernicus,<sup>3</sup> We need to understand that Campbell appeals to New Agers and to a good number of Humanists, because heroes take responsibility for their lives; heroes do not leave things up to God or to the laws of the universe, and it is precisely this attitude in living that is fundamental to New Age and Humanist commitment.

My main point in drawing attention to Campbell, and in particular to the hero stories, is that we Humanists should be telling the stories of our own heroes; we should be doing this more often, and we should be doing it in a way that speaks to people personally - people should be engaged in the telling, and they should emerge the better for the experience. Reading or listening to a story is an entirely different experience from being lectured on the tenets of Humanism, yet it is lecturing, whether by spoken or written word, that we spend so much of our time doing.

Now a word of warning - and I'm issuing this warning now because it doesn't readily come later. We ought not assume that Joseph Campbell has found the ultimate universal of the human condition. You see, he is not by any means academically invincible. Critics point out for example, that Campbell has examined very few complete myths, and even worse, he has used and promoted his particular formula of the human condition on its own account. We should further note, that Campbell is a universalist, and like most universalists, can be

<sup>3</sup> Pointed out by Sandler and Reeck. *ibid* p. 16. Also note that Campbell said the heralds of the future are the Americans - for it is true indeed, or at least true enough, that the world in which we are now living was not only created in 1492 but redeemed in 1776," - "The Symbol Without Meaning" referred to by Sandler and Reeck *ibid*. p, 16.

criticised for not allowing room for the particular. Campbell is in fact a mystic of the Vedantin Hindu variety, and Vedantins ultimately believe that reality is one and indivisible and therefore is ultimately non individuality.<sup>4</sup> Now when we take this mysticism and add considerable influence from Jung, we end up with a reasonably clear notion of the assumptions that have governed Campbell's research. And what it all comes down to is this: when Campbell speaks, a Vedantin mystic speaks; when he talks about all basic human stories being one story, he is assuming a Vedantin mysticism with Jungian overtones. This does not invalidate his research, but it does put it into a specific context of which we ought to be aware.

Despite the reservations that we ought to have when we attempt to understand Campbell, we should note that he has accomplished enough to convince a large number of people that he is "on to something," and I would certainly agree. Campbell gives us an overview of what he thinks has been going on in this incredible, mysterious human history of ours, and it is a view that cannot be summarily dismissed as "wacko." Many of us appreciate the importance of seeking out any universals that may exist in the human condition and of understanding how these have been expressed. We can see, for example, that it is unlikely to be either accidental or insignificant that so many of our myths have had common themes. So the point is that even if we do not accept *Campbell's* explanations for common mythological themes, we can nevertheless learn about those themes from the masses of readable material he offers, and then we can attempt to give *our own, naturalistically based explanations*. In short, we Humanists do have something important to learn from Campbell, be he a New Age guru or not.<sup>5</sup>

Fourth and last, we can learn from the non sectarian character of the New Age. Universalist positions such as those presented by Campbell, the Eastern philosophies and the new physics, all provide a foundation for a New Age vision that includes the entire world in its sights. And while we Humanists may reject the basis of the vision, I believe we must nevertheless

<sup>4</sup> I have been a student of Vedanta for many years, and I wish to point out that the description I have given of this school is grossly oversimplified. It is however a description that serves the present purpose.

<sup>5</sup> Please note that Joseph Campbell strongly disapproved of gurus because he believed that they stand in the way of healthy individual independence. On this point both Humanists and he are in absolute agreement.

reflect upon the commitment to universalism that underlies it. The commitment signifies the growing reality that we live in a global village, and that we must find some universals to unite us. The desire to seek and experience such universals has given the New Age its special nonsectarian appeal.

Where does their Humanism stand in this matter of global vision? Despite the growth in cooperation of Humanists globally, Humanism continues to have a culturally parochial tone. There is the tendency to assume that the real history of human endeavor began with the enlightenment, and that the West has nothing to learn from other traditions. This tendency manifests itself when Humanism assumes a mantle of rational, scientific superiority and ignores all else. Thus Humanism becomes dangerous and ignorant. It betrays the commitment to openmindedness and limits the Humanist vision for those who would embrace our version of recent Western thought.

For me personally, the universalist message is demonstrated loud and clear - in my work. I work mainly, with international students, most of whom are Buddhist, Hindu or Muslim, and the most important aspect of my work is that it keeps me in touch with a part of the world that most people do not have the privilege of experiencing. Every day, I actively step into the worlds of these people. It reminds me both of my shared humanity with the rest of the planet and that as Humanists we must use this connectedness. Humanism has the power to win conviction for me on a practical, moral and psychological level, and so I am committed to it. However, on a metaphysical level I have to say there are many questions yet to be answered, and I must therefore remain open to the input of others. I believe that this should also be the actual (as opposed to the occasional) position of the Humanist movement that the New Age reminds us of it.

In sum, I think that the serious New Agers have it on us in the area of sympathetic global awareness. In comparison, we appear narrow minded, and we certainly appear less attractive.

And, there endeth the lesson on what we can learn from the New Age. We can learn about: the importance of an optimistic attitude, providing tools for Humanists living, shifting our focus to a more personal humanism, and working on an open-ended global humanism.

Now let me issue some warnings about the New Age. Such warnings come under two basic headings, educational and holistic health,

On the subject of education, we must be aware that there are a number of institutions that present courses and degrees for academic credit in New Age subjects. These subjects range from transpersonal psychology, to the occult, to all kinds of holistic health practices. *The New Age Encyclopedia* lists several hundred institutions teaching the New Age in one way or another, and we must note that by no means do all of these come under the alternative education category; for example, they include the Universities of Iowa and Minnesota and the University of London in England.

*The New Age Encyclopedia* makes a case that American higher education has been accommodating itself to New Age beliefs since the sixties, and while I cannot explore this now, I can point out that one of the many outcomes of the situation has been the acceptance of New Age ideas by some *main stream* academics and the bringing of these ideas into *traditional* courses. Take for example a case at the university where I teach - Kansas State University. Here, a professor of architecture assigned his students a number of books to read and comment on. One of these books was the New Age "Bible," *The Aquarian Conspiracy*. At least one of the students did not know what to make of this book and could not see its relevance to architecture. Nor can I.

As Humanists, we ought to be aware of such incidents and understand the consequences, one of which is that in our education system, various approaches to knowledge are being increasingly combined. The sociologist Hans Sebald forcefully discusses this in his article "New-Age Romanticism" (1984) and I am in agreement with his point that while there are different kinds of inquiry we should nevertheless be vigilant in keeping a division of labor. Sebald argues that a division of labor between kinds of inquiry is particularly important in the universities where "impressionable minds... are just learning the difference between the speculative and the empirical, between wishful thinking and reality."<sup>6</sup> He refers to sociology teaching assistants who have taught "consciousness of reincarnation" implying that this has been scientifically established, and he refers to an incident at the University of Arizona where an anthropology course on "Witchcraft and the Occult" was in fact a "jam session" of the committed sharing esoteric convictions.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Hans Sebald "New-Age Romanticism: the Quest for an Alternative Lifestyle as a Force of Social Change" *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* vol 11 no. 2 (spring/summer 1984). p. 121.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.* p. 121.

This matter of mixing types of inquiry, leads me to my next warning, and it concerns the assault on the left brain. For those who may be unaware of just what this assault amounts to, let me simply say that with the emergence of the New Age, holistic health and womens' movements, there has also been increasing criticism of the role that the left brain has played in our consciousness, It is widely argued that the left, rational hemisphere has long oppressed the right, creative hemisphere, and this being the case, we must unleash our creativity by limiting our rationality. When we do so, we will be healthy,

This left brain/right brain concern has been an important part of the New Age movement, and we see it in basic New Age terminology. For example, New Agers commonly define the word 'analytic' as 'narrow minded,' 'empirical' as 'superficial,' 'objective' as 'petty,' and 'rational' as 'arrogant.' On the other hand, they define 'esoteric' as 'truthful,' 'inarticulate' as 'profound' and 'irrational' as 'sensitive.,<sup>8</sup>

When I think of these terms, I do not only think of the New Age Movement. As mentioned before, I think of the increasing emphasis on right brainism in education and in some aspects of the feminist movement. When I do think about it furthermore, I always start to feel anxious about keeping a modicum of moderation, I respect and agree with the New Age and the feminist critiques of over rationality, particularly in the use of which that rationality has been put by patriarchy with the resulting poverty in living for both men and women. But I feel anxious when I hear *rationality* devalued to the extent that *non* rationality had been in the past. For after all, the reliability of reason has been and is a key factor in our very survival!

My third warning has to do with the holistic health movement, easily the area where the New Age has made its greatest impact. My point is not to denigrate the entire holistic health movement. For instance, I am not questioning that health is much more than the absence of disease. I do however wish to indicate awareness in the interests of sheer safety, And for my warning I have but to use the words of a New Ager - a committed individual from within the holistic health movement itself  
- Dana Ullman.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> This is an abbreviated list from the glossary Sebald provides. *ibid.* p. 119.

<sup>9</sup> "Holistic Health: Friend and Foe of Progressive Health Care" *International Journal of Holistic Health and Medicine* vol 2 (Winter. 1984), pp. 20-23.

Ullman points to a dangerous tendency within the movement. It assumes not only that individuals are "responsible for their health," but that they are also to "blame for their disease."<sup>10</sup> I have found this to be true in Unity and generally throughout the New Age movement. If something is wrong then one's consciousness is out of alignment with ultimate consciousness and it is one's personal responsibility to realign it. Indian philosophy has made quite a contribution to this idea by suggesting that individuals choose their illnesses including genetic and environmentally related diseases - this is karma - this is fate. I call it blame the victim, and find it unacceptable and dangerous.

Ullman also points to a tendency toward overconfidence in feelings and to an insufficiency of attention paid to intellectual analysis. Both can produce potentially life-threatening situations.

So there are areas in the holistic health movement that we ought to treat carefully. However, the movement does have beneficial aspects; for example, yoga has been a successful method for stress relief for about four decades, and creative visualisation has been found to be a useful component of disease treatment. There are of course other examples.

Having issued warnings, let us move now to the state of New Age today.

Some people think that the New Age has peaked, others that it is becoming absorbed into the wider culture. To find answers to some of these questions I called J. Gordon Melton of the University of California at Santa Barbara. Melton is Director of the Institute of the Study of Religion, and he is the editor of *The New Age Encyclopedia*. He has this to say:

Firstly, the term 'New Age' is on the way out because New Agers feel it has been abused and distorted by the media. New Agers feel that the media has given the movement a frivolous reputation by hyping up the extravagances of some people and some New Age activities. Consequently, organizers of New Age congresses are now switching to the name "whole life."

Secondly, Marilyn Ferguson is not very vocal these days, but she is still committed.

Thirdly, key individuals in the movement *no longer believe* that the New Age of peace and transformation of consciousness is emerging. However they do think it is a goal worthy of working toward.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.* p. 22

Fourthly, the New Age is here to stay though not necessarily in the forms with which we have been familiar. It is becoming absorbed in the culture and it is becoming institutionalized, In terms of numbers of *centers* being founded, Unity is the fastest growing of all the New Age institutions. (It is virtually impossible to obtain data on actual numbers of Unity members.).

To these points, I must personally add two others. I recently read that Unity had a 2.5 million dollar drop in donations in 1990, so clearly it is not all "plain sailing" for them. Perhaps their growth rate is in fact declining. Then, survey results released recently in April showed that the number of Americans claiming to be New Agers is 20,000.<sup>11</sup> Given this figure we must ask just what is it we are dealing with in the New Age movement. Are we in fact really dealing with the large movement that Humanists have thought? I would say that yes, we are dealing with a movement of some size in that New Age ideas have been influential to an extent *way beyond formal numbers*. Earlier I indicated New Age ideas do seem to have become diffused to some significant degree within our society. And there is a direct parallel with Humanism here; we can hardly say that the number of self-professed Humanists defines the extent of humanism today for we know that humanistic ideas have long been, and continue to be influential throughout much of what we refer to as our secular society.

In conclusion I would like to say that, as Humanists, I believe we have a responsibility to learn about the New Age movement for two reasons: first because of its influence on society (both positive and negative) and second because of its ability to attract those who are disaffected from mainstream religion. With respect to the latter, the New Age has much to teach us about our image, particularly the importance of optimism and the dangers of crisis mentality. I think Humanists tend to lack optimism and confidence because we have focused continually on problems and have experienced much trouble in growing. But I agree with Marilyn Ferguson who says that "confidence is likelier than a crisis mentality to produce

<sup>11</sup> National Survey of Religions (CUNY) April, 1991. This survey was conducted by the National Survey of Religious Identification and had a much larger sampling than those usually conducted by Gallup and like organisations - the N.S.R.I. survey sampled 113,000 adult Americans, rather than the usual 1000-3000. This kind of survey provides a greater quantity of raw data and allows for drawing more conclusions about smaller religious groups.

answers,"<sup>12</sup> I also agree with public relations strategy of telling a better story; she suggests that promotional strategies ought to capitalize on the fact that "People are moved by metaphors and drama and symbols. ..."<sup>13</sup> Ferguson is not alone in reasserting this simple truth about story telling; witness the results of this strategy in the success of Joseph Campbell. Humanists can and should "tell a better story," We have wonderful human, personal stories to tell, and I urge Humanists to tell them; instead of reciting only Humanists beliefs.

Finally, I would like to suggest that we are living in a New Age but this New Age has nothing to do with an aquarian conspiracy. Both Humanists and New Agers have recognised that we (in the West at least), are living in an age where the locus of mystery has shifted from the heavens to within the human being. The difference between our movements lies in how we conceive the mystery. For committed New Agers, the mystery signifies the divinity of humans and the ultimate illusion of anything but consciousness. This is why New Agers are happy; New Agers *are* ultimate reality; they *are* God and therefore they have nothing to fear. For Humanists the mystery is otherwise. For Humanists, the mystery is the challenge of living as *finite* beings in an indifferent universe. We have the challenge of living positively and hopefully not only *without* God *but without being god*. And we do this successfully. Humanism works for us, and so it can work for others. To attract people, we must first determine *how* Humanism works for us, and then turn that how into a *tool* other people can use. We can then offer our Humanism with the genuine smile of optimism, happiness and hope.

<sup>12</sup> *The Aquarian Conspiracy - Personal and Social Transformation in Our Time* updated edition. J.P. Tarcher Inc.. 1987. p. 431.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.* p. 431.

Bibliography

- Basil, Robert ed., *Not Necessarily the New Age - Critical Essays*  
Prometheus Books, 1988.
- Campbell, Joseph, *Myths to Live*, New York, Viking Press, 1972.  
*The Hero With a Thousand Faces*, 2nd edition, Princeton  
University Press, 1968, c. 1949.
- Hoyt, Karen & the Spiritual Counterfeits Project, *The New Age  
Rage*, Power Books, c. 1987.
- Flowers, Betty S, ed., *The Power of Myth - Joseph Campbell  
with Bill Moyers*, New York: Doubleday c. 1988.
- Melton, J, Gordon, *The New Age Encyclopedia*, Gale, 1990.
- Segal, Robert A., *Joseph Campbell-an Introduction*, Garland  
Publishing Inc., 1987.  
*Joseph Campbell in Conversation with Michael  
Toms* New Dimensions Foundation, Larson Publications,  
c. 1988.  
*New Age Journal* (bi monthly published by Rising  
Star Associates, Brighton, MA.)