

PIQUE

Newsletter of the Secular Humanist Society of New York

April 20, 2021

Yes, there is an Earth outside our cloistered lives, and it needs our attention – see below. Attention must be paid as well, as it is herein, to creeping (and creepy) Christian Nationalism on the pages of the good gray *Times* and as it morphs into fascism on Fox. We question our addiction to the “luxury” of the internet and the value of scientists’ values, re-imagine “Imagine”, rescue the epithet “Liberal” from right-wing corruption, and question even the name “Manhattan”. But first, and also below, please tell us who your choice is to be the 110th mayor of our very own Fun City. – JR

CELEBRATE EARTH DAY, APRIL 22

John Rafferty

No, during a pandemic crisis we can’t bunch together for the plantings and gatherings that have inspired us ever since the first Earth Day in 1970. But after four years (seems like centuries) of climate change denial, “clean coal” idiocy, and flat-out lies about wind and solar power, President Biden is convening a Restore Our Earth global climate summit on Earth Day, April 22, 2021. Best of all, we—the USA—are back on board the Paris Agreement.

So let’s do what we each individually can, even if still in lockdown. To find an event in which you can participate, or at which you can learn something, go to <https://www.earthday.org/earth-day-2021/#map>



*To see a World in a Grain of Sand
And a Heaven in a Wild Flower
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand
And Eternity in an hour.
– William Blake, Auguries of Innocence*

Our loyalties are to the species and the planet. We speak for Earth. Our obligation to survive is owed not just to ourselves but also to that Cosmos, ancient and vast, from which we spring. – Carl Sagan

MAYOR WHO? YOU DECIDE

John Rafferty

Surprise! – there’s a New York City mayoral election on your iCloud Calendar, and you’re expected to vote in the Democratic primary in just two months and 22 days. (You vote *Republican* in NYC? – that’s cute.)

So, for whom will you vote on June 22, in the only election that matters? Which will also be our first-ever ranked-choice, instant runoff election, and that’ll be fun.

Who? There’s Scott Stringer, the guy who has actually earned the big job by doing so many NYC jobs competently; raise your hand if you know what it is that Scott Stringer currently does. I thought so. There’s also Eric Adams, who is Brooklyn’s Borough President (bet you didn’t know that, either) ... Maya Wiley, of the toothsome smile and thoughtful brow we’ve seen so often on MSNBC ... plus a former NYC Sanitation Commissioner ... a guy who worked in the Obama administration ... a financial executive, ... a non-profit CEO ... the long-past-his-sell-date founder of the Guardian Angels ... and several more hopeless hopefuls, thankfully not including the Current Occupant, who is barred by term limits from another dreary term ... *aaand* the current and default leader in the polls, failed presidential candidate Andrew Yang, who has never held a government job and never won an election to anything, but who is, as *The New Republic* announces, *The Celebrity Candidate* ... famous for being famous.

So, what do you think we can we expect from Andrew Yang, or from any of the above-mentioned hopefuls? Who will *you* put your tax-dollar money on this go-around? Who do *you* want to be the next mayor of New York. This is your forum. Send your choice (write-ins and out-of-towners allowed) and your argument to editor@shsny.org.

SHSNY BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

Jonathan Engel, *Pres.*; John Wagner, *V.P.*; Claire Miller, *V.P.*; Brian Lemaire, *Secy/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).

NO, ROSS DOUTHAT, I AM NOT YOUR "BROTHER IN CHRIST"

Jonathan Engel

The *New York Times* editorial page has, in my opinion, a bias in favor of religion and against secularism. Regular columnists Nicholas Kristof, Ross Douthat, and David Brooks go to great lengths to extol the virtues of the pious and the allegedly positive effect religious beliefs have on society, as do numerous guest columnists. On the other hand, the *Times* editorial page rarely if ever presents opinions from the secular community.

On Sunday, April 11, Ross Douthat's column, "Can the Meritocracy Find God?", was so over the top in its religious favoritism that I felt compelled to respond. The thrust of the column (<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/10/opinion/sunday/religion-meritocracy-god.html>) was how terrible it is that the U.S. is becoming more secular and how it would be so great if we could all conduct our arguments as "brothers and sisters in Christ". Not surprisingly, the *Times* declined to print my letter, so I'm sharing it with you here.

To the Editor, The New York Times:

Ross Douthat's primer on Christian nationalism ("Can the Meritocracy Find God?") should horrify any person who believes in reason, rationality, and the use of the scientific method. Supernatural beliefs have no place in science, period. I fully respect the right of a scientist to pray to whatever god they choose in their house of worship, but if they bring supernatural beliefs into their lab they are no longer scientists, and without scientists how can we expect to address challenges such as Covid-19 and climate change? "Praying away" the Covid virus did not work (and boy did we try); only science has moved us closer to a solution to this plague which has already killed over 550,000 Americans.

But what I find most alarming in Mr. Douthat's column is his sense of Christian superiority. He states his preference that, "In future clashes between East Coast progressives and West Coast techno-libertarians, let them clash as brothers and sisters in Christ." How is it possible that in the year 2021 he could be ignorant of the fact that not every American is a Christian, or wants to be one, and that we all have the constitutional right not to be? Is he really suggesting that a West Coast Buddhist and an East Coast Hindu should frame their discussion as brothers/sisters in Christ? How patronizing and disrespectful.

Christian nationalism like that suggested by Mr. Douthat is antithetical to a pluralist, rational society, and should be soundly rejected.

— Jonathan Engel
President, Secular Humanist Society of New York

When I hear from people that religion doesn't hurt anything, I say, really? Well besides wars, the Crusades, the Inquisitions, 9-11, ethnic cleansing, the suppression of women, the suppression of homosexuals, fatwas, honor killings, suicide bombings, arranged marriages to minors, human sacrifice, burning witches, and systematic sex with children, I have a few little quibbles. And I forgot blowing up girl schools in Afghanistan. — *Bill Maher*

THE CHRISTIAN RIGHT: SUSPEND DEMOCRACY

Eric Levitz

(Excerpted from "The GOP (Rightly) Fears America's Churchless Majority"; nymag.com/intelligencer/, 4/1/2021)

Whatever its impact on the GOP, the implications of creeping secularism are more dire for social conservatives. The Republican Party can ultimately retain political power by bringing its policy commitments into slightly closer alignment with public opinion. That is not an option for the Christian right's true believers. As a result, the movement is becoming forthrightly anti-democratic. On the one hand, the moral minority hopes to impose its will on the nation by judicial fiat. On the other, it aims to disenfranchise the heathen majority.

Liberal analyses of the GOP's war on voting rights tend to characterize it as a reaction against the nation's burgeoning racial diversity. And this is surely one driver of the phenomenon. But it's worth noting that the eclipse of conservative Christian America is real, while that of majority-white America is a paranoid delusion. According to Census Bureau projections, white Americans will still comprise over 68 percent of the U.S. population in 2060, so long as one includes Hispanic Americans who identify as white in that category. The complexion of America's white majority may shift, as it has many times before. But it's not actually disappearing. White conservative Christians, by contrast, are already a minority of the U.S. electorate.

It's not surprising then that many of the right's most unabashed advocates for authoritarianism hail from its religious wing. And while no respectable conservatives will publicly argue that nonwhite Americans are unfit for self-government, many are quite comfortable saying as much about the nation's socially liberal majority. Glenn Elmers, at the Claremont Institute and a research scholar at Hillsdale College, made the case vividly this week:

[M]ost people living in the United States today – certainly more than half – are not Americans in any meaningful sense of the term ... They do not believe in, live by, or even like the principles, traditions, and ideals that until recently defined America as a nation and as a people. It is not obvious what we should call these citizen-alien, these non-American Americans ...

Authentic Americans still want to have decent lives. They want to work, worship, raise a family, and participate in public affairs without being treated as insolent upstarts in their own country. Therefore, we need a conception of a stable political regime that allows for the good life. The U.S. Constitution no longer works.

The Republican Party can still compete for political supremacy within America's existing institutions. But its moral traditionalists cannot regain cultural hegemony absent some kind of a counterrevolution. If such a project is practically implausible, it is increasingly ideologically permissible on the right side of the aisle.

Thus, the coming decade of U.S. politics may be defined, in part, by the struggle to prevent conservative Christianity from taking democracy down with it.

DEMOCRACY: FEAR IT, DEFEAT IT

Timothy Snyder

(From *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century*, the *April 1 Humanist Book Club* selection.)

Does the history of tyranny apply to the United States? Certainly the early Americans who spoke of “eternal vigilance” would have thought so. The logic of the system they devised was to mitigate the consequences of our real imperfections, not to celebrate our imaginary perfection. We certainly face, as did the ancient Greeks, the problem of oligarchy – ever more threatening as globalization increases differences in wealth. The odd American idea that giving money to political campaigns is free speech means that the very rich have far more speech, and so in effect far more voting power than other citizens. We believe that we have checks and balances, but have rarely faced a situation like the present: when the less popular of the two parties controls every level of power at the federal level*, as well as the majority of statehouses. The party that exercises such control proposes few policies that are popular with the society at large, and several that are generally unpopular – and thus must either fear democracy or weaken it.

**This was written before the 2020 election. – JR*

FASCISM? “RIGHT,” SAYS TUCKER, “THAT’S RIGHT.”

On Fox News March 26, Tucker Carlson and his guest, right-wing talk radio host Jesse Kelly, openly speculated that Republicans may soon get tired of “following the rules” and “pick a fascist” to lead the party.

“I think you make a really solid point about the sadness and powerlessness that people feel in the face of this,” said Carlson. “And some people are just going to say, why should I follow the rules? Why should I be a good citizen if *they* don’t have to follow the rules? I mean things kind of break down at some point, don’t they?”

“They will break down, they are breaking down, Tucker,” said Kelly. “I’ve said this before, and I’m telling you, I worry that I’m right, the right is going to pick a fascist within 10 to 20 years, because they’re not going to be the only ones on the outs. There’s 60, 70 million of us, we’re not a tiny minority. And if we’re all going to be treated like criminals, and all subject to every single law while antifa, Black Lives Matter guys go free and Hunter Biden goes free, the right’s going to take drastic measures.”

“Right,” Tucker agreed, “that’s right.”

LIBERALS

David Rafferty

(Reprinted from *Greenwich Time*, 10/11/2020)

(Editor: This was received too late for inclusion in our Nov 2020 pre-election issue, but the argument holds up. – JR)

Columnist Mike Royko of the *Chicago Tribune* once put it best: “It’s much harder to be a liberal than a conservative because it’s easier to give someone the finger than a helping hand.”

It certainly seems that way, especially since for the last 50 years or so, one major political party has pretty much given up on truth-based, positive messaging and plans for America, preferring instead to rely on negative appeals to fear and resentment. They decided that governing was for suckers, secondary to maintaining power, and enriching themselves and their already wealthy patrons. “Going negative” metastasized into demonizing their opponents, regardless of the content of their character. And one of the greatest unfortunate successes of this conservative political war on America has been the rebranding of the great American Liberal.

From Nixon to Reagan, both Bushes and now Trump, “liberal” has been corrupted for generations of Americans as something wimpy and weak. Except liberalism in this country actually represents the best of America, and it’s time for good people to fight back and reclaim our proud Liberal Democracy.

In 1963, economist John Kenneth Galbraith stung the modern conservative movement as “... the search for a truly superior moral justification for selfishness”. To selfishness, conservatives piled on inflammatory accelerants like race baiting, class warfare and evangelical pandering, morphing the movement from its small government, fiscal responsibility roots into the golem of greed and faux social righteousness that exists today. Yet Liberal Democracy, with its foundational approach of wanting to make America better for everyone, was originally politically agnostic. For example, both Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson saw social justice and a pro-active government as necessary to keep greed in check and provide equal opportunity for all.

In World War II, it was liberals of all political persuasions in this country who fought fascists in Spain and joined the Royal Air Force in 1940, while conservatives were finding ways to work with Hitler. Liberals wanted to fight the growing fascist threat to America and it wasn’t until Germany started striking at our economic interests by sinking ships that we finally rallied to the cause.

Liberal programs like the New Deal, Great Society, and the Marshall Plan, supported on both sides of the political aisle, aspired to lift millions out of poverty and despair. Conservatives? They rallied around Joe McCarthy, and have forever tried to tear down anything resembling a “social safety net”.

Liberals were the driving force towards ending legal sexism and legal segregation. Conservative dogma requires that liberals be painted as weak, but does anybody consider Martin Luther King, Jr., weak? Or Bobby Kennedy, Gloria Steinem or John Lewis? No they don’t, because liberals represent the best and most noble aspects of what this country should stand for. Liberals believe that all men and women are created equal and should be entitled to equitable government services. That everyone should have access to quality health care, education, and a retirement with dignity. That the rule of law should be applied fairly and, if necessary, punishments should be humane and fit the crime. That the national defense should be strong, and that our

soldiers are treated well and not used for preemptive, unnecessary entanglements.

Meanwhile, today's "conservatives" are willing to fight to crush the majority of Americans on behalf of a select few. They don't care about your civil rights or your personal freedoms. They deny science because it affects profits, and to hell with your right to clean water and air. They move your job offshore and blame someone else. They offer nothing but thoughts and prayers if you get shot or sick. They'll embrace a Christian theocracy that has nothing to do with love, forgiveness or tolerance. They have some nerve calling themselves the "real Americans".

Modern conservatives have contributed nothing to what made America the shining city on a hill the rest of the world until recently respected and wanted to emulate. Liberals built that America, and now are going to have to fight to do it all over again. A fight that begins Election Day with national and local conservatives being kicked to the curb, starting America back on a road to salvation. One helping hand at a time.

A WARNING FROM THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Jonny Thomson

(From Big Think Weekly, 4/15/2021)

Are we enslaved by the finer things in life? Luxury, technology, and easy living can ensnare us or box us in. In many ways, it's a modern and relatable phenomenon, but it goes back at least to the Roman writer, Tacitus.

The Roman army was one of the most militarily effective and successful forces the world has ever known. On open land, their legions were pretty much unbeatable. But the Roman Empire was not built on the back of military genius and short, stabbing swords alone. The legions might have beaten a people, but they did not subdue them. It was the love of luxury and easy living that did that. The Britons, Tacitus noted, were enslaved, not by chains, but by their desire for good wine and elegant dinner parties. In fact, the governor of Britain, Agricola, deliberately sought to pacify this tribal warrior society by the "delightful distractions" of warm baths, togas, and education. As Tacitus wrote, "The naïve Britons described these things as 'civilization', when in fact they were simply part of their enslavement."

The use of luxury to win over a people is a tactic mirrored across time. Faced with a trade deficit with China, the British Empire flooded their country with cheap opium they had shipped over from India. A luxury drug became an addiction, and the British traded their opium for porcelain, tea, and silk. The Cold War was also won on the back of luxury. But the most relatable example for most of us today is our relationship with Big Tech. Companies like Facebook, Apple, and Google slowly and surely wire our lives into their algorithms and platforms. Social media are designed and calibrated to be deliberately addictive. Time- or money-saving services, like cloud-based storage, have become so universal that going back is becoming impossible. It's increasingly the case that we don't even know our

passwords for things—we let our phones or apps invent and store them for us.

So is it possible to leave "the machine"? Though we view technology as liberating, it also boxes us in. If we believe Tacitus, we are now enslaved by the things we once saw as luxury. It's the job of philosophy to see these chains for what they are. And, as we examine our lives, we can then choose to wear them happily or start the long hard journey of throwing them off.

THE PAST LIVES ON IN GOOGLE

(and that's okay)

Garrison Keillor

(Excerpted from his blog, "A walk around the Central Park Reservoir", 4/4/2021)

With the birth rate falling and America getting old and cranky, it's wonderful to walk in Central Park on a sunny day and see all the little families rollicking around, all the little kiddos.

It's brave to raise boisterous kids in a small apartment in a bumpy economy and good for Joe Biden that he put some child support in his Recovery Act. We need more of these kids, otherwise we'll become a national historical reenactment.

I don't want that. I want the past to fade into the sunset, except for the classics, like Central Park. I walk in the park as April comes in and it's a genteel world like what Renoir painted in Paris with the ladies carrying parasols and Dvorák walked in Prague whistling a tune that became the Humoresque that generations of kids would learn for spring recitals and Shakespeare sat in and scribbled notes for "A Midsummer Night's Dream" — it is a permanent pleasure, to be cherished for all time, but I want life to move on so the kids grow up and think of Vietnam as a cuisine and trump as part of card games and "pandemic" will come to mean a college prof who gets negative reviews.

The past lives on with Google and that's okay. In every phone and laptop is a trove of trivia and the answers to all questions — where did Allen Ginsberg write "Howl" (an apartment on Montgomery Street in San Francisco), or what president hit a hole-in-one during his presidency (Jerry Ford), or the name of George Custer's horse at the Little Big Horn (Comanche, and he outlived Custer by fifteen years) — are easily available. Back in the day, you'd've spent months in the library paging through dusty tomes in the reference room to get this information and now it's literally at your fingertips. Good enough.

Everything is on the Internet, the entire subterranean depths of demons and obsessions. You can read a website saying that doctors and nurses who administer COVID vaccine should be tried as war criminals. You can visit the world of men in love with weaponry. A man writes: "The AK-47 has endearing qualities, is easy to manipulate, the sights are rugged, and a reasonably skilled person can get maybe 60 rounds a minute out. And they're fun as hell."

This strikes me as lunatic fringe but it's a fringe that is steering the Republican Party.

RE-IMAGINING JOHN LENNON'S "IMAGINE"

Stefan Pastis

(Transcribed from "Pearls Before Swine", 4/11/2021)

IMAGINE

Imagine there's no Facebook,
It's easy if you try.
No trolls to berate us,
Around us no more lies.
Imagine all the crackpots
Silenced for the daaaayaaaay.
Imagine there's no Twitter,
It isn't hard to do.
Nothing to shill or cry for
And no retweeters, too.
Imagine all the people
Being kind to youuuuuuuuu.
You may say that I hate screamers,
But I'm not the only one
Who hopes one day we'll stop this
And the world will be more fun.

SCIENCE IS VALUE-FREE, SCIENTISTS ARE NOT

Naomi Oreskes

(From "Scientists Should Admit They Bring Personal Values to Their Work" in *Scientific American*, April, 2021.)

As the U.S. recoils from the divisions of recent years and the scientific community tries to rebuild trust in science, scientists may be tempted to reaffirm their neutrality. If people are to trust us again, as I have frequently heard colleagues argue, we have to be scrupulous about not allowing our values to intrude into our science. This presupposes that value neutrality is necessary for public trust and that it is possible. But available evidence suggests that neither presumption is correct.

Recent research in communications has shown that people are most likely to accept a message when it is delivered by trusted messengers—teachers, for example, or religious or business leaders, or local doctors and nurses. One strategy to build trust, therefore, is for scientists to build links from their laboratories, institutes and academic departments into the communities where they live and work. ... It is well known that people are more likely to accept evidence that accords with what they already believe. Psychologists call this "motivated reasoning", and although the term is relatively recent, the insight is not. Four hundred years ago Francis Bacon put it this way:

"Human understanding is not composed of dry light, but is subject to influence from the will and the emotions ... man prefers to believe that he wants to be true."

Scientists may assume this motivated reasoning explains erroneous positions—such as the refusal to wear a mask to limit the spread of COVID-19—but plays little role in science. Alas, there is little evidence to support such confidence. Some research suggests that even with financial incentives, most people are apparently incapable of escaping their biases. Thus, the problem seems to be not a matter of will but of capacity. Great scientists may think because

they are trained to be objective, they can avoid the pitfalls into which ordinary people fall. But that isn't necessarily so.

Does this mean that science cannot be objective? No. What makes it so is not scientists patrolling their own biases but rather the mechanisms used to ensure that bias is minimized. Peer review is the best known of these, though equally if not more important is diversity. As I contend in the new edition of my book *Why Trust Science*, diversity in science is crucial not just to ensure that every person has a chance to develop their talent but to ensure that science is as unbiased as possible. ...

Studies show that U.S. scientists want (among other things) to use their knowledge to improve health, make life easier, strengthen the economy through innovation and discovery, and protect people from losses associated with disruptive climate change. Opinion polls suggest that most Americans want many of these things, too; 73 percent of us believe that science has a mostly positive impact on society.

If scientists decline to discuss their values for fear that they conflict with the values of their audiences, they may miss the opportunity to discover significant points of overlap and agreement. ... Value neutrality is a tinfoil shield. Rather than trying to hide behind it, scientists should admit that they have values and be proud that these values motivate research aiming to make the world a better place for all.

MANAHACHTANIENK

Joshua Jelly-Shapiro

(Excerpted from "How New York Was Named", on *newyorker.com*, 4/13/2021)

In the fall of 1609, some weeks after Henry Hudson angled his ship through an inviting narrows, entered an expansive bay, and began exploring a broad river that would later be named for him, one of Hudson's seamen wrote, in his log, that the river's wooded east bank was known to the area's natives as "Manna-hata". These people, who spoke an Algonquian tongue called Munsee, had beat Hudson there by around a thousand years. ... In ensuing years, these people—along with their southerly cousins, who spoke a related but distinct Algonquian tongue, called Unami—came to be known as Delawares. ...

Nowadays, descendants of those "Delawares" refer to themselves by their ancestors' shared word for human being, Lenape. ... Within three centuries of Hudson's arrival, most of the Lenape were either dead or dispersed toward reservations in Ontario and Oklahoma, where their descendants remain.

In the Lenape's absence, it was left to non-Native philologists to theorize about the etymology of "Manhattan". For much of the nineteenth century, the most accepted version seemed to be one offered by a scholar named John Gottlieb Ernestus Heckewelder, at the 1822 meeting of the American Philosophical Society. He proposed that Manna-hata was actually a misrendering of Manahachtanienk—"island where we all became intoxicated".

Comment: "Sounds right and makes sense to me. So I'll have a dry Manahachtanienk, bartender, straight up. — JR

SHSNY CALENDAR: APRIL – JULY 2021

FICTION BOOK CLUB ONLINE

The SHSNY Fiction Book Club meets online via Zoom for the duration of our enforced isolation. Join the Zoom Meeting at <https://zoom.us/j/97467470190?pwd=dGdEbTkwV0pSRmZRWHYvbj-FoTXIrZz09>
Meeting ID: 974 6747 0190
Passcode: Read

TUES, MAY 11, 7:30 pm **THE GOOD LORD BIRD** James McBride

The story of a young boy born a slave who joins John Brown's antislavery crusade, right up to the Harper's Ferry Raid – and who must pass as a girl to survive. A rousing adventure and a moving exploration of identity and survival. – *Paperback & Kindle*

TUES, JUNE 8, 7:30 pm **SNAP** Belinda Bauer

Jack is only 15 years old, but he supports his sisters as “the Goldilocks Burglar” and hunts for his mother's killer in this Man-Booker Prize-listed novel by “the true heir to Ruth Rendell”. – *Paperback & Kindle*

TUES, JULY 13, 7:30 pm **THE LEOPARD** Giuseppe Di Lampedusa

Set in the 1860s, the spellbinding story of a decadent, dying Sicilian aristocracy threatened by the approaching forces of democracy and revolution is rich in drama and action, yet imbued with a particular melancholy beauty and power that together make it one of the greatest historical novels of our time. – *Paperback, Kindle*

HUMANIST BOOK CLUB

Harry French invites you to Hour monthly Zoom meeting. Zoom in to the waiting room at: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82413289962>
Meeting ID: 824 1328 9962

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 7:00 pm **THE LONELY CENTURY** Noreena Hertz

A bold, hopeful, and thought-provoking account by “one of the world's leading thinkers” (*The Observer*) of how we built a lonely world, how the pandemic accelerated the problem, and what we must do to come together again
– *Hardcover & Kindle*

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 7:00 pm **HEAVEN AND HELL: A History of the Afterlife** Bart D. Ehrman

Heaven? Hell? Where did these ideas come from? They are nowhere in the Old Testament and are not what Jesus or his disciples taught. A best-selling historian tours the long, fascinating history of the afterlife. – *Paperback & Kindle*

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 7:00 pm **COGNITIVE NEUROSCIENCE: A Very Short Introduction** Richard Passingham

An exciting account of this relatively new field that cuts across psychology and neuroscience, with connections to philosophy of mind. – *Paperback & 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 HAPPY HOUR ONLINE

SUNDAY, APRIL 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=c0NrNUoweDVGWWho2ditvYmJlVjVVGdz09>
Meeting ID: 980 634 4432
Passcode: SHSNy
Join by Skype for Business
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/skype/9806344432>

MONDAY MOVIES

Let's introduce each other to movies we love, screen them ourselves and discuss them together. Rent 'em (many on Amazon @\$3.99), watch, then Zoom in at ... <https://zoom.us/j/92351454127?pwd=OVg5NnBaUFc4NWtLbHJJNW1vZ1Y1Zz09>
Meeting ID: 923 5145 4127
Passcode: watch

**MON, APRIL 26, 8:00 pm
HEARTS OF DARKNESS:
A Filmmaker's Apocalypse**
A 1991 Emmy-winning documentary on the “insane” making of Francis Ford Coppola's brilliant 1979 Vietnam War epic, “Apocalypse Now”, by his filmmaker wife, Eleanor.

Good idea? Watch (or watch again) “Apocalypse Now” first.

MON, MAY 10, 8:00 pm **DUMBO**

The 1941 Disney animated classic is fun to watch, and a look back at societal attitudes about race eighty years ago – let's talk about those crows.