

PIQUE

Newsletter of the Secular Humanist Society of New York

July 28, 2020

Hot, sticky, and we're still stuck (mostly) indoors, but a sort of baseball is back, so ... summer. Herein we continue our debate about whether we (that is, other people, not us) still need religion, and ask if any among us are stupid enough to go unmasked. We mourn the First Amendment, note a senator's moral bankruptcy, deny naming an army base for Al Sharpton, and glean wisdom from a Supreme Court Justice, a stand-up comedian, and a comic-strip bartender. But first, although Francois Villon never did ask where the heroes (like the snows) of yesteryear have gone, we do. —JR

LIBERALS: WE HAVE A PROBLEM

Conor Friedersdorf

(Excerpted from and based on "The Chilling Effect of an Attack on a Scholar" at theatlantic.com, 7/20/2020)

(Editor's Note: The article excerpted here was forwarded by Gretchen Robinson, my former Humanist Institute Leadership mentor, who wrote: "I disagree with the conclusions here." I disagree with Gretchen. Read the article – and its links to source materials – via the link at the end of this excerpt, and make up your own mind. —JR)

Hundreds of academics in the linguistics community signed an open letter earlier this month attacking Steven Pinker, one of their field's most prominent scholars, for six tweets and a passage from one of his best-selling books. Whatever their intentions, they were never going to succeed in intimidating the famous, tenured Harvard professor. But they did send a message to less powerful scholars that certain opinions, publicly stated, could result in professional sanction.

The chilling effect that creates, especially among linguists without tenure, wouldn't be cause for alarm if the speech in question were obviously and egregiously improper; if it consisted, for example, of racial slurs or open bigotry. But the hundreds of academics who targeted Pinker were not merely reaffirming sensible, widely agreed upon taboos. They were trying to radically narrow the bounds of acceptable speech and inquiry. A closer look at the letter lays bare the specific ideological orthodoxies and political tests that at least hundreds of linguists now feel comfortable openly imposing on their colleagues.

So what do they have against Pinker?

- "Dr. Pinker's tendency to move in the proximity of what *The Guardian* called a revival of 'scientific racism', his public support for David Brooks (who has been argued to be

a proponent of 'gender essentialism'), his expert testimonial in favor of Jeffrey Epstein (which Dr. Pinker now regrets), or his dubious past stances on rape and feminism."

- "Dr. Pinker as a public figure has a pattern of drowning out the voices of people suffering from racist and sexist violence, in particular in the immediate aftermath of violent acts and/or protests against the systems that created them."
- "Dr. Pinker chose to publicly co-opt the academic work of a Black social scientist to further his deflationary agenda."
- "Dr. Pinker uses the dogwhistle 'urban crime/violence'."

Why did hundreds of academics sign the letter and endeavor to have Pinker removed from the Linguistic Society of America's list of "distinguished academic fellows and media experts"? The explanation they offered is hard to accept. "Often, fellows are seen as the first line of academic linguistic authority, and trustworthy sources of linguistic knowledge," they wrote. "Lay people and members of the press reach out to fellows and media experts for official statements. We feel that fellows therefore have a responsibility that comes with the honor, credibility, and visibility allotted them by their distinguished appointment." But Pinker's prestige doesn't come from the list. And his visibility to members of the press and the public far exceeds that of the list.

Shaun Cammack, a graduate student at the University of Chicago, argued that, despite their stated aims, the signatories were sending a message to less powerful scholars:

*This letter wasn't really about Pinker at all. In fact, it has a very specific function – to dissuade lesser-known academics and students from questioning the ideological consensus. The letter says, in not so few words: "It doesn't matter if you're Steven f***ing Pinker. If you don't agree with our ideological prescriptions, you don't*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

Jonathan Engel, Pres.; John Wagner, V.P.; Claire Miller, V.P.; Brian Lemaire, Secty/Treas.; John Rafferty, Editor/Pres. Emeritus
Nancy Adelman, Kiwi Callahan, Dorothy Kahn, Carl Marxer, David Orenstein
SHSNY, P.O. Box 7661, F.D.R. Station, New York, NY 10150-7661 / www.shsny.org

Individual membership \$40 per year; Family membership \$65; Subscription only: \$30; Student: \$20.

Articles published in PIQUE are archived at www.shsny.org. Original-to-PIQUE articles may be reprinted, in full or in part.

SHSNY is a Charter Chapter of the American Humanist Association (AHA), an Affiliate Member of Atheist Alliance International (AAI), an Affiliated Local Group of the Council for Secular Humanism (CSH) program of the Center for Inquiry (CFI), and an Endorsing Group in the Secular Coalition for New York (SCNY).

belong here.”

The letter is really directed towards you – the unknown academic, the young linguist, the graduate student. And in this particular goal of dissuading dissent, it will undoubtedly be successful ... You are not Steven Pinker, and Noam Chomsky and others probably aren't going to come to your defence when you get sanctioned for expressing the wrong opinion. Not because they don't believe in free speech, but because they won't even be aware of your case. There will be no articles lambasting and criticising the cancellers. Your cancellation will be a blip on the radar and the academic world will chug along without you.

To me, the motivations behind the letter, however well-intentioned or malign, altruistic or power-seeking, quasi-religious or rational, matter less than what the attack reveals about the academy. The desire to significantly narrow the bounds of acceptable speech is not a fringe proposition; it is a project that hundreds of people in a single academic field are willing to pursue openly.

Comment: “Narrowing the bounds of acceptable speech” from a left point of view is not just a problem in the academy. It is becoming a fact of everyday life all across the media and even in private conversation (tell me that you don't take into account the race, gender and politics of everyone in any conversation before you open your mouth), and is just as egregious and inimical to American ideals as were the Red-scare constrictions of the right wing in the McCarthy era. We have a problem. – JR

Read it all here:

https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/07/steven-pinker-will-be-just-fine/614323/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=atlantic-daily-newsletter&utm_content=20200720&silverid-ref=NTI1NTUwMzY1NDI550

PLANNED PARENTHOOD ABORTS MARGARET SANGER Dennis Middlebrooks

“Planned Parenthood of Greater New York is removing the name of Margaret Sanger, the founder of the nation's largest abortion provider, from its New York City clinic due to her ‘harmful connection to the eugenics movement’, the group said Tuesday [July 21].

“The announcement comes after more than 350 current and former staffers at the Manhattan clinic, as well as 800 donors, supporters and volunteers, called Sanger ‘a racist white woman’. An open letter on June 18 to Planned Parenthood of Greater New York, criticized the organization as ‘steeped in white supremacy’, the Washington Times reports.”

Some leading suffragettes made racist statements in their time, along with a number of leading abolitionists, both male and female. Watch as they are retroactively purged from history and their movements labeled as “racist”. I am sure that the ACLU will be found to be “steeped in white supremacy” based on statements and associations of

some of its founders and leaders over the years. Ditto for NOW, NARAL, and People for the American Way.

If the entire lives of such prominent freethinkers as Thomas Paine and Robert Ingersoll are pored over thoroughly, some ill-advised quotes and associations might be found that could label both as “racist white men” or “anti-woman's rights” and result in the tearing down of their statues. The “Woke” cancel culture is in full swing and is probably unstoppable at this point.

Planned Parenthood's decision to throw Margaret Sanger under the bus is an ominous portent for what is to come. It will do no good. Already several “pro-life” Blacks appeared on Fox News (one was a minister) and accused Sanger and Planned Parenthood of advocating genocide against Blacks via abortion, which Sanger strongly opposed. They demanded that Hillary Clinton and Nancy Pelosi return their Margaret Sanger Awards and express contrition for accepting the awards in the first place.

I suspect they will.

THE “WILDERNESS PROPHET” IS SENT TO THE WILDERNESS

(Ed: Sorry, I've lost the identity of the source for this.)

No one is more important to the history of environmental conservation than John Muir – the “wilderness prophet”, “patron saint of the American wilderness” and “father of the national parks” who founded the nation's oldest conservation organization, the Sierra Club. But on Wednesday, citing the current racial reckoning, the group announced it will end its blind reverence to a figure who was also racist.

As Confederate statues fall across the country, Sierra Club Executive Director Michael Brune said in an early morning post on the group's website, “It's time to take down some of our own monuments, starting with some truth-telling about the Sierra Club's early history.” Muir, who fought to preserve Yosemite Valley and Sequoia National Forest, once referred to African Americans as lazy “Sambos”, a racist pejorative that many black people consider to be even more offensive than the n-word.

While recounting a legendary walk from the Midwest to the Gulf of Mexico, Muir described Native Americans he encountered as “dirty”.

Muir's friendships in the early 1900s were equally troubling, the Sierra Club said. Henry Fairfield Osborn, a close associate, led the New York Zoological Society and the board of trustees of the American Museum of Natural History and, following Muir's death, helped establish the American Eugenics Society, which labeled nonwhite people, including Jews at the time, as inferior.

If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein.

– Robert H. Jackson, US Supreme Court justice

FORT SHARPTON?

John Rafferty

"We're going to name it [Fort Bragg] after the Reverend Al Sharpton?" Trump said. "What are you going to name it, Chris [Wallace], tell me what you're going to name it? So there's a whole thing here. We won two World Wars, two World Wars, beautiful World Wars that were vicious and horrible, and we won them out of Fort Bragg, we won out of all of these forts that now they want to throw those names away."

I know that the Current Occupant of the Oval Office struggles with American English vocabulary, but while inveighing clumsily against the proposed and long overdue renaming of military posts that now honor traitorous Confederates—*who killed American soldiers!*—he described the 20th century's world wars as "beautiful", which is more than a little *de trop*, even for him.

(BTW, SHSNY Past President Dennis Middlebrooks, who forwarded the above quote, distinguishes between the two global conflagrations by pronouncing WWI "more beautiful" than WWII by virtue of "better songs!" I'm not so sure ... I think "Boogie-Woogie Bugle Boy of Company C" stacks up pretty well against "Over There".)

But to return to Mr. Trump's idiocy, No, no one is talking about naming anything for the Reverend Al (with whom I agree about most things political, but will never forget or forgive for Tawana Brawley and the sliming of New York AG Bob Abrams), and Orange Julius knows it. That's just another of his don't-look-there deceits: throw red meat to the racists in his cult (honor the Confederates) while accusing the Left of proposing something no one has ever proposed (Fort Sharpton).

May I suggest some real renamings? Of genuine American patriots who led American troops in battle, or who were distinguished troops themselves?

Let's start with the American general who beat the bejeezus out of all those "War Between the States" traitors. How about Fort Ulysses S. Grant? Or William Tecumseh ("War is Hell") Sherman.

Jumping to the 20th century, let's honor the WWI's American Expeditionary Force leader General John J. ("Lafayette, we are here") Pershing. And/or America's first flying Ace, Eddie Rickenbacker (26 kills). Or sharpshooting legend Infantry Sgt. Alvin York. Moving on, WWII's most-decorated soldier, Audie Murphy, comes to mind. And so do victorious generals Marshall, Eisenhower, Patton, and MacArthur. Yeah, even insubordinate, brilliant, darling-of-the-Right MacArthur, what the hell.

And, of course, with the perfect trifecta of qualifications, i.e., valorous, up-from-the-bottom, and Black (while ignoring that "WMD" speech to the United Nations) ... Colin Powell.

Just my suggestions.

My demand? Erase the traitors' names. Now!

The question is whether or not you choose to disturb the world around you, or if you choose to let it go on as if you had never arrived. — Ann Patchett

Take the test ...

ARE YOU STUPID ENOUGH TO BE AN ANTI-MASK PROTESTOR?

(Shamelessly cribbed from thedailymash.co.uk, 7/22/2020)

Idiots are protesting against the outrageous idea of wearing a face mask during a pandemic. Are you enough of a cretin to join their ranks?

Do you think masks go against your human rights?

A) Of course not. They're designed to keep people safe, like seat belts and bicycle helmets.

B) They're the first step on the road to establishing a fascist police state. That's why I won't wear one when I go to my militia meeting.

You see someone wearing a face mask, how do you feel?

A) Relieved because they're taking actual precautions rather than relying on "common sense", which the American public has proved they don't have.

B) Outraged at their stupidity. If this virus isn't a hoax, which I suspect it is, the best solution is to rip down 5G towers because they're designed by illegals and lizard people to beam stuff that turns real men into libtard fags.

What do you think of the phrase "nanny state"?

A) It's a condescending buzz word used by tabloids to provoke outrage, and it hurts my feelings.

B) It's the best way to describe our loony left, safety-gone-crazy culture. If I want to have beers with some of my maybe infected buddies and catch a lethal virus, that's my FREEDOM!

What protests have you been to?

A) I watched Black Lives Matter protests online and shared them on Facebook, does that count?

B) I screamed at commie protestors who were saying white lives don't matter. Okay, they didn't actually say that, but you can tell it's what they really meant.

Mostly As: Sorry, you're too much of a limp liberal to be an anti-mask protestor. Spend some hours scrolling through furiously angry Facebook groups, then try this quiz again.

Mostly Bs: For once you've passed a test by being stupid. However, your insane indignation burns so fiercely that you don't care.

IT'S OKAY, FREEDUMB LOVERS, DEAR LEADER SAYS O.K. TO MASKS!

We are United in our effort to defeat the Invisible China Virus, and many people say that it is Patriotic to wear a face mask when you can't socially distance. There is nobody more Patriotic than me, your favorite President!"

— Donald J. Trump, tweeting @realDonaldTrump after wearing a mask at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center

WAIT A SECOND, WAITWAITWAIT ...

What does Q say? Is that okay with Q?

Trumpster: If you're wearing a mask, why would you care if I'm not? Your mask works, right?

Brian Rafferty: If you're sober, why would you care if I'm driving drunk? Your seatbelt and airbags work, right?

MITCH McCONNELL DECLARES MORAL BANKRUPTCY

Peter Flom

Louisville, KY — In a surprise move, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) has declared moral bankruptcy. In his remarks he said:

"Just as a person with no money may declare financial bankruptcy, so, a person with no morals ought to be able to declare moral bankruptcy. Well, I have looked into my soul and, after much contemplation I have decided that I have no course but to declare moral bankruptcy."

Reaction by his colleagues was swift. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) was supportive:

"I have nothing but deep admiration for Senator McConnell and his decision. This will make it easier for all Republicans to continue to support our great president, Donald Trump."

When reminded that he had said Trump was unfit to be president. Sen. Graham replied:

"That is exactly my point. I do wish I had known about this several years ago. I went through considerable pain having my testicles and spine removed; I know many of my colleagues have had similar qualms about our president. But all we have to do is declare moral bankruptcy."

Susan Collins promised to study the matter thoroughly and issue a long statement justifying her decision not to do anything because "moral bankruptcy should not disqualify someone from being the Majority Leader" and because she thinks McConnell has "learned a lesson from this".

Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) said she was struggling with how to respond. ...

Across the aisle, Minority Leader Charles Schumer (D-NY) was conciliatory: "I wish Senator McConnell well as he tries to recover his morality." When he was informed that McConnell had no intention of trying to recover his morality, Sen. Schumer was virtually speechless. "Oh. I see," he said.

Sen Bernie Sanders (I-VT) was visibly angry:

"This is not just an indictment of Mitch McConnell; it is an indictment of our entire system of elections and the huge problems of unregulated capitalism. The system must be changed. It's not me, it's us."

THE FIRST AMENDMENT: IT HAD A GOOD 231-YEAR RUN

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...

First Amendment to the Constitution, 1789

Properly understood, the Establishment Clause does not prohibit States from favoring religion. ... Under the modern, but erroneous, view of the Establishment Clause, the government must treat all religions equally and treat religion equally to nonreligion."

— Justice Clarence Thomas, in support of the *SOCUS 5-4* ruling in *Espinoza v. Montana Department of Revenue*, allowing states to fund religion, June 30, 2020. Justice Neil Gorsuch concurred.

DO WE STILL NEED RELIGION? Part 2

(Transcribed from "Has Science Made Religion Useless?", at bigthink.com, 7/15/2020.)

(Ed: Religious scholars, a primatologist, a neuroendocrinologist, a comedian, and other brilliant minds consider the evolutionary function that religion serves. Part 1 ran last week.)

BOB BELL (Spiritual Teacher, Author, *What is the Bible?*): This idea somehow that faith and science are in opposition I've always found to be complete insanity. Both are searching for the truth. Both have a sense of wonder and an expectation and exploration. They're each simply naming different aspects of the human experience. One thrives in naming exteriors – height, weight, gravitational pull, electromagnetic force. The other is about naming interiors – compassion, kindness, suffering, loss, heartache. They're both simply different ways of exploring different dimensions of the human experience.

FRANCIS COLLINS (Physician Geneticist; Director, National Institutes of Health): Science is about trying to get rigorous answers to questions about how nature works and it's a very important process that's actually quite reliable if carried out correctly, with generation of hypotheses and testing of those by accumulation of data and then drawing conclusions that are continually revisited to be sure they're right. So if you want to answer questions about how nature works, how biology works, for instance, science is the way to get there.

But faith in its proper perspective is really asking a different set of questions and that's why I don't think there needs to be a conflict here. The kinds of questions that faith can help one address are more in the philosophical realm. Why are we all here? Why is there something instead of nothing? Is there a God? Isn't it clear that those aren't scientific questions and that science doesn't have much to say about them.

BILL NYE (The Science Guy; CEO, The Planetary Society): So the question is if you have a religious tenet, if you hold a point of view that excludes something about modern science, I don't think the burden is on scientists or engineers to provide you a comfortable link. The link is for you. You have to reckon the facts as we call them with some belief system that is incompatible with it.

An example that I think everybody would eventually find ourselves discussing would be geology, the age of the Earth. A couple of years ago I debated a guy who insists that the Earth is 6,000 years old. That's completely wrong. It's obviously wrong. And the way we know it is wrong was a result of centuries of study. People found layers of rocks, figured out where the layers came from. People found radioactive elements which chemically substitute into certain crystals in exchange like rubidium and strontium, substitute for potassium and calcium and argon and so on. This led us to an understanding of the age of the Earth. So if you have a belief system that is incompatible with modern geology, really the problem is for the person trying to argue the Earth is extraordinarily young. Not for the people who

have studied the world around us and understand it.

There's nothing there that I've seen in the Bible that informs modern science with one possible exception. There's in some translations that I've read there's reference to 22/7 for being the distance around a circle, the value of pi. And that's pretty close. That's pretty close. It doesn't go past three digits but it's pretty close. Okay, so the people who wrote the Bible were literate but they were not literate in the modern scientific sense. So you have to reckon that, man. I can't get in there. The earth is not 6,000 years old. Never going to be.

COLLINS: My study of genetics certainly tells me incontrovertibly that Darwin was right about the nature of how living things have arrived on the scene by descent from a common ancestor under the influence of natural selection over very long periods of time. Darwin was amazingly insightful given how limited the molecular information he had was. Essentially it didn't exist. Now with the digital code of DNA we have the best possible proof of Darwin's theory that he could have imagined. So that certainly tells me something about the nature of living things. But it actually adds to my sense that this is an answer to a how question and it leaves the why question still hanging in the air.

Why is it, for instance, that the constants that determine the behavior of matter and energy, like the gravitational constant, for instance, have precisely the value that they have to in order for there to be any complexity at all in the universe. That is fairly breathtaking in its lack of probability of ever having happened and it does make you think that a mind might have been involved in setting the stage. At the same time that does not imply necessarily that that mind is controlling the specific manipulations of things that are going on in the natural world. In fact, I would very much resist that idea.

I think the laws of nature potentially could be the product of a mind. I think that's a defensible perspective, but once those laws are in place then I think nature goes on and science has the chance to be able to perceive how that works and what its consequences are.

BELL: Everything is driven by the desire to know the truth. There's an exploration. There's a wide-eyed sense of wonder. If you talk to the best scientists they have this sort of gleam in their eye like, "This is what we're learning. And we don't know what's actually around the corner." And if you talk to the best theologians and poets and scholars they—ideally—have the same gleam in their eye which is "Look what we're learning. Look what we're exploring." And so to me they're not enemies. They're long lost dance partners.

COLLINS: Part of the problem is I think the extremists have occupied the stage. Those voices are the ones we hear. I think most people are actually kind of comfortable with the idea that science is a reliable way to learn about nature, but it's not the whole story and there's a place also for religion, for faith, for theology, for philosophy. But that harmony perspective doesn't get as much attention. Nobody

is as interested in harmony as they are in conflict I'm afraid. **NYE:** As you may know I'm not a believer. I'm a nonbeliever. I spent a lot of time trying to understand my place in the cosmos and I've reached my own conclusions but I'm the first to say that ultimately we are all agnostic. This is to say you can't know whether or not there is a giant entity running the show or choosing to not run the show. You can't know. So we all are I believe best served by just living good lives. Trying to leave the world better than we found it.

REZA ASLAN (Religious scholar, Author, *God, A Human History*): The truth of the matter is we just don't know. But what is a fact is that there is something in the way that our brains work that compel us to believe that we are more than just the sum of our material parts. That thing is either an echo or an accident or it's deliberate and purposeful. And which you decide is surely a matter of choice because there is no proof either way.

BELIEFS: JESUS, MO, AND THE BARMAID

(The boys are once again at their favorite pub.)

Jesus: Barmaid, why aren't you a believer? Is it because you are wedded to a life of sin?

Barmaid: No.

Mohammed: Too proud to submit to the will of Allah?

Barmaid: No.

Mo: Then explain yourself! Why are you not religious?

Barmaid: Basically, I have strong philosophical reservations about believing in things that aren't true.

Jesus: Pity.

Mo: I can see why that would be a problem.

There are people who believe that dinosaurs and men lived together, that they roamed the Earth at the same time. There are museums that children go to, in which those people build dioramas to show the children this. They are crazy; they are stone cold f**knuts. I can't be kind about this, because these people are watching "The Flintstones" as if it were a documentary. — *Lewis Black*

BASEBALL AND DEMOCRACY

George F. Will

Baseball suits the character of this democratic nation. Democracy is government by persuasion. That means it requires patience. That means it involves a lot of compromise. Democracy is the slow politics of the half-loaf. Baseball is the game of the long season, where small incremental differences decide who wins and who loses particular games, series, seasons.

In baseball, you know going to the ball park that the chances are you may win, but there's no certainty given. You know when a season starts that the best team is going to get beaten a third of the time, the worst team will win a third of the time. The argument, over 162 games, that middle third.

So it's a game that you can't like if winning is everything, and democracy's that way, too.

SHSNY CALENDAR: JULY – OCTOBER 2020

FICTION BOOK CLUB ONLINE

The SHSNY Fiction Book Club meets online via Zoom, and will continue so for the duration of our enforced isolation.

To be included and notified of each meeting's link and password, email your address to Sharon Krutzel at sharonkrutzel@rcn.com

TUES, AUGUST 11, 7:00 pm **DOUBLE WHAMMY** Carl Hiaasen

Just for fun, follow the adventures of a news-photographer-turned-private-eye as he seeks truth, justice, and an affair with his ex-wife. A hilarious caper with unforgettable characters, including the lunatic ex-governor of Florida whose diet is roadkill.

TUESDAY, SEPT 8, 7:00 pm **ALOYSIUS THE GREAT** John Maxwell O'Brien

By Joyce scholar, author of *Alexander the Great: The Invisible Enemy*, and PIQUE subscriber O'Brien, *Aloysius* is now available in paper and e-formats at Amazon.

Mr. O'Brien advises that to purchase *Aloysius* in paperback most economically go to <http://bit.ly/AloysiusTheGreat>. \$22.99 there, with free shipping.

TUESDAY, OCT 13, 7:00 pm **AMERICAN DIRT** Jeanine Cummins

Stephen King calls it "extraordinary," and this *NYTimes* best-selling story of a comfortable, middle-class Mexican family caught up in the flight to *el Norte* and away from drug violence has been called "the international story of our times". Hardcover, Kindle.

HUMANIST BOOK CLUB ONLINE

We continue online for the duration of our social distancing. Harry French will send the linking codes for the Zoom meetings. Send your address to:

htfrench46@gmail.com
Meanwhile, do the reading ...

THURS, AUGUST 6, 7:00 pm **UNORTHODOX:** *The Scandalous Rejection of My Hasidic Roots* Deborah Feldman

Deborah Feldman grew up under a Satmar code of relentlessly enforced customs governing every aspect of her life. At nineteen, with a baby, she realized that she would have to forge her own path to happiness and freedom.

Now a very good Netflix series.

THURS, SEPT 3, 7:00 pm **SURVIVING AUTOCRACY** Masha Gessen

As seen on MSNBC Morning Joe and heard on NPR All Things Considered: the bestselling, National Book Award-winning journalist offers an essential guide to understanding, resisting, and recovering from Trump and the ravages of our tumultuous times.

"When Gessen speaks about autocracy, you listen."
— *The New York Times*

THIRD THURSDAY GROUP THURS, AUGUST 20, 7:00 pm

Regulars of the Humanist Book Club have formed a Zoom-in "non-book" club to enjoy each other's company and more conversation. To join, send an email with your address to:

htfrench46@gmail.com

HUMANIST HAPPY HOUR ONLINE

SUNDAY, JULY 26, 5:00 pm

Let's get together even when we can't get together, via Zoom. Get comfortable at your computer with your beverage and/or snack of choice – and join 15, 20, or more of your fellow humanists in our Humanist Happy Hour!

Zoom in at

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/9806344432?pwd=c0NrNUoweDVGWHo2ditvYmJlVjVGdz09>

Meeting ID: 980 634 4432

Passcode: SHSny

Join by Skype for Business

<https://us02web.zoom.us/skype/9806344432>

MONDAY MOVIES

MONDAY, JULY 27, 8:00 pm

We'll discuss Billy Wilder's

SOME LIKE IT HOT

Movie buffs meet every other Monday eve to discuss interesting and socially relevant films.

1. Together we choose a film.
2. You have 2 weeks to watch it at home, free or cheap rental.
3. We meet via Zoom to discuss it (probably over wine).

Let's watch "Some Like It Hot" (\$3.99 on Amazon Prime), then discuss societal attitudes re gender-bending, homophobia (*i.e.*, actual fear of) then (1959) and now. Meanwhile, Marilyn Monroe, Jack Lemmon, Joe E. Brown – how can it not be fun?

To be included, email your address to sharonkrutzel@rcn.com

LIKE SHSNY ON FACEBOOK

<https://www.facebook.com/SHSofNY>

MEET US ON MEETUP

www.meetup.com/shsnny-org/

TEXT US ON TWITTER

@SHS_NewYork