

PIQUE

Newsletter of the Secular Humanist Society of New York

October 20, 2020

Fourteen days and counting: will this “election season” ever end, or will it continue in OpEds and the courts until January 20 or, Freya forbid, beyond? Will Europe come to our rescue? Will we survive religion’s own new round of Covid? Can we count the stars in the sky? Splice genes wisely? Does an Orange Alien live among us? Do our laws pass the Atheist Test, and how many Presidents do you think/guess/wish were atheists? Browse for answers herein. But first, your Angry Old Man Editor gets to grouse and to fulminate like a fed-up and Angry Old Liberal. — JR

ENOUGH ALREADY: PACK THE COURT

John Rafferty

“When we take back the Senate we will have a lot to do.”
— Kamala Harris

Mitch McConnell is about to cap his six-year campaign as Senate majority leader to use the courts to wipe out every progressive accomplishment since the New Deal by ramming through the appointment to the Supreme Court of a woman so far to the right politically that the appellation “conservative” doesn’t apply. Try “reactionary” ... no, try “neanderthal”.

Never mind that elevating anyone to the court in a presidential election year — hell, in the middle of a presidential election — directly contradicts the pious preachings of Republicans in 2016 to “give the voters a choice”. Never mind that the jurist whose seat is about to be filled — one of the most respected in the history of the court — specifically hoped that her successor would be nominated by the winner of the election. No, let us remember that McConnell has — with the connivance of the legal dimwit in the Oval Office — not only packed the federal courts at every level with right wingers regardless of their experience — or often even their intelligence — during the past four years, but also deliberately withheld confirmation of literally hundreds of appointments during the last two years of the Obama administration — the administration of justice and the rule of law be damned.

In other words, the Republicans packed the courts for six years, and are now horrified by the possibility that the Democrats might, just might, play tit-for-tat.

Well, to hell with “possibility”. This lifelong Democrat demands that a Biden administration and a Democratic-controlled Senate pack the SOCUS.

I’m tired of playing reasonable nice-guy liberal. Notice how all the Can’t-we-get-along pleas in the press, online and on NPR assume we’ll be the guys who will “reach across the aisle” and “dialogue”, while being respectful of the right wing’s batshit beliefs and 19th century ideas. We keep trying to reason with them, offering them concessions if they’ll only play nice, while they snatch all the marbles and then demand more. As recently as a week ago I would have said, No, don’t pack the Supreme Court, respect the tradition and the unwritten rules. But after watching just enough of the farce in the Senate this week I’m done with those schoolyard bullies.

Let’s win the White House and the Senate, and pack three or even four liberals onto the Court, starting with Merrick Garland and, if she wants it, Hilary Clinton. First order of business on January 20.

Next, make the District of Columbia a state — it’ll be a blue state, with two Democratic senators and two votes in the electoral college. The District meets all the requirements, and it takes just a simple majority vote of both houses of Congress. So, done — on January 21.

(Puerto Ricans said they want statehood in the last referendum, so let’s put that on the fast track.)

Third, propose a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and to elect the President and Vice President by the winner of the greatest number of popular votes. We won’t have the two-thirds majority in each house needed, but we can make the mealy-mouthed bastards vote against what will be an overwhelmingly popular amendment at the opening of every session of Congress until we finally get it done.

Enough “nice guy”. Let’s win, *big!* And start acting like winners ... kicking the bastards while they’re down.

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).

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST PACKING THE COURT George F. Will

(Excerpted from “Hypocrisy and constitutional etiquette”,
washingtonpost.com, 9/21/2020)

Suppose Biden wins and Democrats have a net gain of at least three Senate seats. And suppose that either before the election, or before the new Senate is sworn in on Jan. 3, Republicans confirm a new justice. And suppose Senate Democrats, spurred by their party’s enraged base and enabled by their quick abolition of the filibuster, enlarge the Supreme Court by at least four members (two fewer than Franklin Roosevelt envisioned).

This would erase the principal achievement – three Trump nominees – for which Senate Republicans, during four years of canine obedience to the nominator, have rationalized shedding their dignity and shredding their reputations. This institutional vandalism by Democrats would be a grievous injury to the court, which has, so far, largely escaped being drenched by the Niagara of public contempt for the great institutions of national governance, not least Congress. Public confidence in the court’s disinterestedness is the source of its power to defend the Constitution from willful and imprudent majorities, including Senate majorities.

Confidence in the court is as perishable as the reputations of the senators of both parties who in the next few years might cause the court to be seen as just another scuffed and soiled plaything in the nation’s increasingly tawdry political game. If so, the Republicans among those senators will be able to see the monument to their careers when they look east from the Capitol’s Senate wing, across First Street NE, to the court’s glistening white building, where a liberal majority will be presiding on a lengthened bench for a long time.

EUROPE TO THE RESCUE?

Markus Becker, Christiane Hoffmann, Peter Muller
(Excerpted from “Europe Preparing for the Worst in Washington”, on *Spiegel.de*, 10/16/2020)

A horror scenario is making the rounds these days in both Berlin and Brussels: Should the outcome of the U.S. presidential election on Nov. 3 be close, incumbent Donald Trump could declare himself the winner when polls close, even if he is behind in the vote count. He could prematurely and unlawfully claim the presidency.

What would happen then?

One could imagine a scenario in which Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro rushes to congratulate the “re-elected” U.S. president on election night, followed by Saudi crown prince Mohammed bin Salman, North Korean dictator Kim Jong Un and maybe even Russian President Vladimir Putin. Soon, though, the first congratulations from Europe might find their way to the White House, from Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, for example, or his Polish counterpart Mateusz Morawiecki.

Should a constitutional crisis in fact develop in the

United States following the election, there are widespread concerns in Europe that the EU could once again be deeply divided.

Presidential elections in the U.S. are always tense times for foreign policy experts in European capitals. Foreign Ministry staffers run through various scenarios for what the election result might mean for their country and for the European Union as a whole. The platforms of the two candidates are examined for commonalities and potential pitfalls, for areas of convergence and places where discussion might be fruitful. It is all quite routine.

Usually. This time, it’s different.

It is about more than just the normal shift in U.S. foreign policy that happens when somebody new moves into the White House. It’s also about more than the risk that four more years of Trump could fatally damage the trans-Atlantic relationship.

The upcoming U.S. election is unique because in addition to the two possible outcomes, a third has also crept into the discussion: What happens if Donald Trump simply refuses to leave the White House even if he loses the election? Should that happen, the stability of democracy in the United States would be put to the test. It could even call into question the future of democracy as a form of government.

How can Europe prepare itself for such a scenario? Officials in Berlin and Brussels are wary of speculating publicly. They don’t, after all, want to give Trump even more ammunition should he emerge victorious on Nov. 3.

But in background discussions, politicians and diplomats have made it clear that they see such a third scenario as a very real possibility. ...

In Brussels, a senior EU diplomat recently sent a confidential report— which *DER SPIEGEL* has seen — from Washington, in which he warned that such a scenario cannot be discounted. The report notes that the U.S. is at risk of stumbling into such a crisis, which could last for several months and have significant negative consequences for the rest of the world. ...

Some diplomats are concerned that if a constitutional crisis does develop in the U.S., the EU wouldn’t even be able to agree on a common position. “If the result of the U.S. election isn’t completely clear, European admirers of Donald Trump could rush to his side and drive the EU apart,” warns Franziska Brantner, the German Green Party’s leading parliamentarian on European affairs. “That is a real danger.” ...

The majority of the bloc’s 27 member states is hoping for a victory for Democrat Joe Biden, who they hope will steer the U.S. back to its traditional multilateral approach as a reliable alliance partner. But countries like Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic prefer a Trump victory. ...

It seems likely that the EU heavyweights will initially remain silent, should the results in the U.S. be unclear. But that would become more difficult if Trump were to ignore a clear Biden victory. Would the EU then dare to declare Trump’s presence in the White House illegitimate, as it did

most recently following Alexander Lukashenko's claim to power in Belarus? "If it is blatant, the EU would have to quickly take a position," says Elmar Brok, a former long-time European Parliament member with the CDU. "It couldn't act differently than it does in other instances."

It is seen as a virtual certainty that the European Parliament would pass a sharply worded resolution should Trump attempt to illegally cling to power. But that's not enough for Martin Schirdewan, floor leader for the Left Party parliamentary group. If the EU wants to be a leading defender of democracy, that ambition has to apply to the U.S. just as it does to places like Belarus, he says.

As such, Schirdewan is calling for the EU to send election observers to the U.S., just as the bloc most recently did for the vote in Nigeria. "The EU must push the U.S. government and also state governments to allow neutral EU election observers," Schirdewan wrote in a letter sent to European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen and European Parliament President David Sassoli.

"There are many indications that Trump will try to manipulate the election results or won't recognize a loss," the Left Party politician continues. "If the EU is serious about its appeals for democracy and multilateralism, then the only choice it has is to send election observers." Such a thing, though, would only be possible if they were invited by the U.S., which is extremely unlikely.

Comment: "Extremely unlikely" that Trump would invite election observers? How about snowball-in-hell likely? - JR

AMERICAN LAWS MUST PASS THE ATHEIST TEST

George Pyle

(Reproduced from sltrib.com, 10/8/2020)

A lucky circuit breaker built into the American system of government is the fact that, even if the courts fail to stand up for the rights of individuals, you may be all right anyway, depending on where you live.

Our courts set a floor for human rights, not a ceiling. If the U.S. Supreme Court tomorrow ended its insistence that states permit same-sex marriage, protect abortion rights, integrate their schools or, as has already been demonstrated, heed the Voting Rights Act, that would be dreadful, but life would change only in states where legislatures or judges wanted it to. States that wanted to maintain proper levels of equal rights could do so.

There may be some serious deciding required pretty soon. Well before the U.S. Supreme Court declared that it was unconstitutional to deny same-sex couples the right to marry, the trend among states was heading toward marriage equality. Legislation passed and court rulings made at the state level not only preceded the 2015 *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision, they also laid the moral and legal groundwork for it. Those of us who saw the simple justice of that ruling might have hoped the matter was settled nationwide.

Silly liberals.

An alarm that the marriage equality battle might not

be over was sounded Monday, when the Supreme Court rejected an appeal from Kim Davis, that county clerk in Kentucky who got into a peck o' trouble for refusing to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples even after the court had said she had to.

The bad news was that two of the justices, Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito, spelled out how they agreed to toss the case only because Davis asked the wrong way. They said that, instead of pleading "qualified immunity", that tool used by some police officers who really shouldn't have shot that person, Davis should have sought exemption from the law on religious freedom grounds.

That's two votes to overturn marriage equality as a constitutional right, to backtrack on what Thomas called the court's "cavalier treatment of religion". Add high court nominee Amy Coney Barrett to the other *Obergefell* dissenters and you have a pretty solid 6-3 majority in favor of a return to law based on unreasonable fear of gay people.

Of course, Thomas and Alito are wrong about religious freedom. A judicial ruling — or a statute passed through the democratic process — in favor of same-sex marriage rights in no way violates the religious freedom of a single human being. To claim otherwise is not to seek religious freedom, but to back theocracy, the rule of civil society by religious dogma.

If a law or ruling only makes sense to the religious, or to followers of a certain faith, it is something a constitutional democracy cannot tolerate. It has to be a policy that could be supported by members of any religion, or of none.

In short, it has to pass the atheist test.

It's not hard. As energized as the American civil rights movement was by one strain of religious tradition (and opposed by another), even Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech was 95 percent secular, a sermon that explicitly took as its text, not the Bible, but the Declaration of Independence.

Most opposition to abortion rights also fails to muster any reasoning that isn't based on religious teachings. Which makes it an argument without merit in a free society.

It is telling that the argument raised by, among others, Sen. Mike Lee of Utah, is that the Equal Rights Amendment is a bad idea because if women have equal rights before the law, it will be impossible to prohibit abortion. It is fair to ask if opposition to abortion leads to opposition to legal equality for women, or follows from it.

If a far-right Supreme Court takes back the constitutional guarantees of marriage equality and abortion rights, that will change things only in states that choose to end those rights. We can guess what might happen in Utah — unless our market-oriented Republican leaders realize how unpopular it will be for the rest of the modern world to do business in such a backward state.

(Note: Mr. Pyle is Editorial Page Editor of the Salt Lake Tribune)

The four characteristics of humanism are curiosity, a free mind, belief in good taste, and belief in the human race.

— E.M. Forster

RELIGION AND COVID

Jonathan Engel

As New Yorkers all know, our city and state have been on a Covid-19 roller coaster since the pandemic hit the United States earlier this year. At first we were the hottest of hotspots, with New York City bearing the brunt of the pain. This was not surprising, as: 1) In normal times NYC is inundated with tourists and businesspeople coming in from all over the world every day, and, 2) This is a very dense city; let's face it, we live on top of each other. But then New Yorkers for the most part followed the health rules set out by the City and the State, and we were able to "flatten the curve" as they say. But now hotspots are starting to flare up again, leading to heightened fears of a second wave of infections in the coming winter months.

As states go, New York is not particularly religious. It's certainly not located in what is known as the "Bible Belt". But certain areas of the State and the City have high concentrations of ultra-orthodox Jews. These are primarily the areas that have experienced new outbreaks of Covid-19. In response, Governor Cuomo reimposed enhanced restrictions for public gatherings, including religious gatherings, in hotspot areas. Outraged, an Orthodox Jewish organization sued the state for infringing on their religious beliefs. Not to be outdone, the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn filed a similar suit. The State argued in court that "The First Amendment's protections (for freedom of religion) do not require that the government ignore reality and common sense." Fortunately the Federal Court Judge hearing the case agreed, and let the reimposed restrictions stand.

Ultra-religious beliefs in this country are anti-science and have contributed to tens of thousands of infections and deaths. Ultra-orthodox communities in New York continue to fight against and flout the rules imposed on everyone for the safety of everyone. And fundamentalist Christian churches all over the country have defied local ordinances by continuing to hold super-spreader events, also known as Sunday services. Most mainstream congregations of all religions have gone online and followed the rules to keep their congregants safe, but the more fundamentalist a religious group is, the more likely they are to believe that their particular deity will save them from Covid-19; no earthly rules and regulations needed.

Trump and his followers simply do not want to do the hard work (social distancing, wearing a mask) that is required to fight Covid-19. They want the virus to disappear as if by magic. Which of course is part of the religious mindset: just ask the local deity to fix things, and then all is right with the world. But religious dogma is so embedded in this country that very few are willing to say out loud that our outré religious beliefs are hampering our Covid-19 response. In the October 7 *New York Times*, columnist Thomas Friedman wrote: "Is your adaptation response [to Covid-19] grounded in chemistry, biology, and physics? ... If it is grounded instead in politics, ideology, markets and an election calendar, you will fail and your community

will pay." And what if our response is grounded in ancient religious beliefs? The belief that their sky-god will protect them from disease (or reward them in heaven for being such selfish, science-denying jerks) is rampant in this country among fundamentalist Jews, Catholics and Protestants. And such beliefs contribute mightily to our pandemic response failure. The *New York Times* knows it. Thomas Friedman knows it. But religion in this country is such a sacred cow (so to speak) they're afraid to say it out loud.

SURELY WE MUST BE WISE ...

Lawrence Shaw

CRISPR, the new gene splicing technology for which its developers, Jennifer Doudna and Emmanuelle Charpentier, won the Nobel Prize, makes it possible to alter genes, allowing us to change people. While we agree that eliminating defective genes is a good idea (sickle cell for instance), other possibilities are controversial, specifically, designer babies. Could only rich parents be able to design stronger, smarter or better-looking children? And when it comes to smart, we do not even know what that means, so how could we use gene splicing for it? CRISPR could make for more problems than positives. Surely we must be wise in using this technology.

Comment: And when have we ever been wise in using new technology? – JR

READERS RESPOND

To the Editor: In October 13 PIQUE, Rosa Heyman ("Will We Ever Have an Atheist President?") stated: "I don't believe in God. And I don't mind, really, that all the Presidents in our country's history, and certainly in my lifetime, have been openly religious (and entirely Christian) ..."

This is highly inaccurate. Four presidents, i.e., John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Millard Fillmore and William Howard Taft were Unitarians. Taft openly stated that he did not believe in the Trinity or the divinity of Jesus. Lincoln and Grant were unchurched and expressed skepticism towards the tenets of Christianity. Grant declined to join a Protestant church in his final days while suffering from terminal throat cancer. And while Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe were nominal members of the Anglican church (renamed the Episcopal church after the Revolution) there is compelling evidence that they were not Trinitarian in their beliefs, but were Deists or Unitarians. When referring to a deity, Washington routinely used Deistic terms such as Divine Providence, Heavenly Father, Grand Designer, and Supreme Architect of the Universe. Jefferson in particular was a harsh critic of Christianity and was labeled an atheist by the Christian clergy of his day. In the Declaration of Independence he referred to "Nature's God", another Deist term, and not to Jesus. Late in life he wrote that he hoped to see Unitarian beliefs become dominant among university students, the future leaders of the nation. His cut-and-paste *Jefferson Bible* left out the entire Old Testament and deleted all references to Jesus' virgin birth, miracles and resurrection

in the New Testament. The focus was entirely on the ethical teachings of Jesus, which Jefferson greatly admired.

Indeed, I recall reading years ago that the first U.S. president who can be properly viewed as a true believer in Christianity, and not as an open or closeted Deist or Unitarian, was Martin Van Buren, our eighth president.

As for more recent presidents, it is well established that JFK, despite identifying as a Catholic, was secular in his views, much to the dismay of his devout wife, Jackie. I have strong doubts that Bill Clinton and especially Barack Obama were sincere in their stated religious views. As for Trump, he is a polytheist, worshiping Mammon and the person he sees in the mirror. – *Dennis Middlebrooks*

To the Editor: Beautiful issue, thank you. – *Brian Lemaire*

AT LEAST THIS WOULD EXPLAIN HIS HAIR

M J Banias

(Excerpted from Motherboard on vice.com, 10/5/2020)

QAnon is not the only movement getting worked up over Trump's coronavirus diagnosis. The extreme fringe also suspect that Trump—who they believe might be an immortal alien—might have contracted coronavirus in an attempt to shed his mortal flesh and shapeshift into something else.

Conspiracy theorist Richard van Steenberg started an online petition three years ago called “Disclose: Humanoid Extra Terrestrials Live Among Us.” ... Steenberg asserts that there are countless alien-human hybrids who coexist with humans on Earth, and that many hold established positions of power, such as being celebrities or corporate CEOs. He believes that these extraterrestrials are engaged in a plan to subvert humanity and take control via psychological manipulation. Trump, according to Steenberg, is most likely in on the plan.

“The plan has been in action since they put us on the planet as cavemen,” he said. “I would say Trump is either a HET [human alien hybrid] or CEA [a human complicit in the alien plot] in that he has known what is going on certainly for the better part of his public life on Earth and would have known early on he would be President,” Steenberg explained. “If he's an HET [human alien hybrid], it's very probable he existed before Earth and took part in the design of the ETA [the plot to invade].”

Comment: Lunatic, right? Think about this the next time you hear some pundit blather that he “has faith in the good sense of the American people”: Steenberg has 30,000 Twitter followers, and 10,000 signatures on his farkakte petition. – JR

HOW DID THEY KNOW?

trumpery n. deceit, fraud, imposture, trickery (first used in 1456) – *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Thanks to Craig Brashear on Facebook for this – JR)

trump•er•y n. pl. *-ies* 1. Showy but worthless finery, bric-a-brac. 2. Nonsense; rubbish. 3. Deception; trickery; fraud. – *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, 2000*

HOW MANY STARS ARE IN THE UNIVERSE?

Rebecca Smethurst

(From Space at the Speed of Light, by Dr. Smethurst, excerpted on Delanceyplace.com, 10/14/2020)

It is nigh on physically impossible to count the number of galaxies in the universe because a) there are so many and b) how can we be sure we've found them all?

But, to put some sort of lower limit on this, we can use an image that the famous Hubble Space Telescope (HST) took about a decade ago. Astronomers decided to use HST to stare at the darkest patch of sky that we know, in the constellation Fornax, in the Southern Hemisphere night sky, to see what they could find. They took an image that was a 2 x 2 arcminute square patch of the sky. An arcminute is a funny unit – it is a sixtieth (1/60) of a degree, and an arcsecond is a sixtieth (1/60) of an arcminute. Given that the whole sky is 360 degrees around, it's a very small patch. It's an image that is 5 percent of the size of the Full Moon in the sky. Astronomers didn't really know what to expect to find in this tiny dark patch of sky, but the latest count on the number of stars found in the image of that patch is four. And the latest count of the number of galaxies is about five thousand—everything from beautiful nearby spiral galaxies to distant galaxies that we detect as just a single pixel.

If we take that number and apply it to the rest of the area of the sky, we can estimate that there are at least 100 billion galaxies in the universe. Remember, this image was taken of the darkest patch of the sky, so in other regions we should see even more galaxies (plus all the galaxies that are still too faint for us to see). It's more likely that there are another couple of zeros on the end of that number. So, let's make our estimate a round trillion galaxies. Not only that, let's say that each galaxy contains, roughly, 100 billion stars. So, perhaps, we can estimate that there are at least 100 sextillion stars. That's 100,000,000,000,000,000,000 stars in the universe. So, if one in a quintillion stars might develop life, and there are at least a hundred sextillion stars in the universe, then perhaps there are a hundred thousand planets out there in the vastness of space that might have the right conditions to develop intelligent life!

People often ask me, how—as an astrophysicist knowing and thinking about these numbers all the time—I don't get overwhelmed by it all. How do I stare at the sky without being entirely crippled by anxiety at the sheer scale of the whole thing and our own insignificance? Firstly, in day-to-day life there isn't time to stop and think about it. But, when I look at the majesty of the night sky, with the Milky Way stretching out overhead in a huge arc of stars, I don't feel anxious. I feel limitless. Like there are infinite possibilities out there and I could be part of any one of them. The scale doesn't scare me; it thrills me. Like the protagonist at the beginning of a good adventure novel yearning to see the world and get out of their small town.

When I look up at the sky and think about the sheer number of stars out there, I can't help but get excited about drawing the conclusion that we can't be the only planet whose cards came up right in the game of life.

SHSNY CALENDAR: OCTOBER 2020 – JANUARY 2021

FICTION BOOK CLUB ONLINE

The SHSNY Fiction Book Club meets online via Zoom 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

TUESDAY, NOV 10, 7:00 pm
THE THIRST

Jo Nesbo

Harry Hole is one of crime fiction's greatest cops ever, but after promising the woman he loves he's through, something about the killer who targets his victims on Tinder pulls Harry back to the chase in this eleventh novel in the series. *Paperback, Kindle.*

TUESDAY, DEC 8, 7:00 pm
THE VANISHING HALF

Brit Bennett

From the bestselling author of *The Mothers*, a stunning new novel about twin sisters, inseparable as children, who ultimately choose to live in two very different worlds, one black and one white.

TUESDAY, JAN 12, 7:00 pm
THE LYING LIFE OF ADULTS
Elena Ferrante

With this new novel about the transition from childhood to adolescence to adulthood, Ferrante proves once again why she has become one of the world's most read and beloved writers. *Kindle.*

LIKE SHSNY ON FACEBOOK

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

MEET US ON MEETUP

www.meetup.com/shsny-org/

TEXT US ON TWITTER

@SHS_NewYork

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, NOV 5, 7:00 pm
HOW INNOVATION WORKS:

And Why It Flourishes

in Freedom

Matt Ridley

Author of *The Rational Optimist*, Ridley chronicles the history of innovation – the reason we experience both dramatic improvements in our living standards and unsettling changes in our society – and how we need to change our thinking on the subject.

THURS, DEC 3, 7:00 pm
THE HOOLIGAN'S RETURN:

A Memoir

Norman Manea

At the center of this internationally acclaimed memoir/novel is the author himself, always an outcast, on a lifelong journey through Nazism and communism to exile in America.

THURS, JAN 7, 7:00 pm
To Be Announced

MORAL MISFITS IS UP

Check out lively, interesting, one-on-one conversations with Rich Sander, John Rafferty, Jon ("We're Out There") Engel, Tony David, Massimo Pigliucci, and Anne ("It's a Good Life") Klaeyesen.

Browse YouTube and Moral Misfits, and make your pick.

HUMANIST HAPPY HOUR ONLINE

SUNDAY, OCT 18, 5:00 pm

Pour something, grab a snack, and join 15 or more humanists and rationalists for lively conversation in our SHSNY Happy Hour!

Zoom in at

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/9806344432?pwd=c0NrNUoweDVGWHo2ditvYmJlVjVVGdz09>

Meeting ID: 980 634 4432

Passcode: SHSNy

Join by Skype for Business

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

**MONDAY MOVIES:
MUSICALS!**

Let's have some fun, screening, talking about, and simply enjoying the best "all-singing, all-dancing" Hollywood (and other) classics. Rent 'em on Amazon (\$3.99), watch, then Zoom in at 8:00 on the date to discuss ...

MONDAY, OCT 26, 8:00 pm
42ND STREET (1933)

Ruby Keeler, Dick Powell, Ginger Rogers, Busby Berkeley choreography ... *wow!* Zoom in at:

<https://zoom.us/j/93181782927?pwd=Nm54UWpmVDJzb3ZvNjVBblRCZmU2Zz09>

Meeting ID: 931 8178 2927

Passcode: 901490

MONDAY, NOV 9, 8:00 pm
CABARET

Liza Minelli and Joel Grey, Bob Fosse choreography, and *nine* Oscars. Zoom in at:

<https://zoom.us/j/91435952481?pwd=MERFZUIk0RG9keWVHSFIIvFBWwW5TdZ09>

Meeting ID: 914 3595 2481

Passcode: 238073