

PIQUE

Newsletter of the Secular Humanist Society of New York

April 27, 2021

Woke up! Our favorite science-teller has lodged his foot in his mouth once again, and the guardians of lofty leftist PC are imitating Inquisitors (*Banish him!*), while two Humanists of the Year invoke humanism in his defense, and we take the long (and transatlantic) view of wokeism. Herein, too, Jon Engel despairs of little murders everywhere in America, Jane Mayer remembers the truth-telling of Walter Mondale, a dozen of you offer early-season mayoral options and opinions, and your friendly neighborhood Editor relaxes on a park bench with a fellow codger. — JR

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION BOARD STATEMENT WITHDRAWING HONOR FROM RICHARD DAWKINS

Established in 1953, the Humanist of the Year Award is conferred annually by the American Humanist Association (AHA), recognizing the awardee as an exemplar of humanist values. Communication of scientific concepts to the public is an important aspect of advancing the cause of humanism. Richard Dawkins was honored in 1996 by the AHA as Humanist of the Year for his significant contributions in this area.



Regrettably, Richard Dawkins has over the past several years accumulated a history of making statements that use the guise of scientific discourse to demean marginalized groups, an approach antithetical to humanist values. His latest statement implies that the identities of transgender individuals are fraudulent, while also simultaneously attacking Black identity as one that can be assumed when convenient. His subsequent attempts at clarification are inadequate and convey neither sensitivity nor sincerity.

Consequently, the AHA Board has concluded that Richard Dawkins is no longer deserving of being honored by the AHA, and has voted to withdraw, effective immediately, the 1996 Humanist of the Year award. — April 19, 2021

Bold move for a struggling organization: When everyone has forgotten you exist, why not remind them by committing suicide? — Sam Harris @SamHarrisOrg

RICHARD DAWKINS STRIPPED OF “HUMANIST OF THE YEAR” HONOR AFTER ANTI-TRANS TWEETS Hemant Mehta

(Excerpted from friendlyatheist.patheos.com/, 4/19/2021)

In 1996, Richard Dawkins was awarded the American Humanist Association’s highest honor: Humanist of the Year.

Tonight, the AHA took it back.

The group just announced that it would retroactively withdraw its award due in large part to his recent statements questioning the humanity of transgender people. They’re referring to a recent tweet in which Dawkins compared trans people to Rachel Dolezal – implying that trans people choose their identities – and complained about how critics were vilified for questioning those identities.

Richard Dawkins @RichardDawkins

In 2015, Rachel Dolezal, a white chapter president of NAACP, was vilified for identifying as Black. Some men choose to identify as women, and some women choose to identify as men. You will be vilified if you deny that they literally are what they identify as.

Discuss.

That last word didn’t help his case, either, suggesting that all of this was merely academic for him, all while Republicans across the country are pushing or passing laws designed to hurt trans people.

Dawkins added days later:

Richard Dawkins @RichardDawkins

I do not intend to disparage trans people. I see that my academic “Discuss” question has been misconstrued as such and I deplore this. It was also not my intent to ally in any way with Republican bigots in US now exploiting this issue.

SHSNY 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).

HUMANISTS OF THE YEAR STEVEN PINKER & REBECCA GOLDSTEIN PROTEST

April 21, 2021
Sunil Panikkath

President, American Humanist Association
Roy Speckhardt

Executive Director, American Humanist Association

Dear Sunil, Roy, members of the AHA Board of Directors,

As former Humanists of the Year, donors to the organization, and prominent public supporters of humanism, we write to protest the decision to revoke Richard Dawkins's Humanist of the Year award because of tweets which raised questions about racial and transgender identity.

Dawkins did not call for discrimination against or marginalization of any individual or group. And he explicitly denied any intention to disparage anyone or to lend support to transphobic or racist political movements. Now, it would still be completely appropriate for those of you who objected to the substance of his tweets to criticize them in *The Humanist* or other forums, explaining the nature of their objections. But to seek to punish, dishonor, or humiliate a writer rather than engage with his words is a betrayal of humanism.

The Humanist Manifesto III declares that "the life-stance of humanism [is] guided by reason". Since no one is infallible, reason requires that a diverse range of ideas be expressed and debated openly, including ones that some people find unfamiliar or uncomfortable. To demonize a writer rather than address the writer's arguments is a confession that one has no rational response to them.

This illiberal response is all the more damaging to an organization that claims to repudiate the repressive practices of religion. It has not been lost on commentators that an association of "freethinkers" has deemed certain thoughts unthinkable, nor that it is enforcing dogmas and catechisms by excommunicating a heretic. The AHA is turning itself into a laughingstock.

This will only intensify when critics discover that past Humanists of the Year, whose awards have not been withdrawn, include Margaret Sanger, a proponent of eugenics, and Alice Walker, who advances lunatic anti-Semitic conspiracy theories. Many other awardees have aroused controversy in their day or ours, sometimes endorsing positions we now recognize as pseudoscientific.

If every Humanist of the Year could be canceled by someone who took exception to a sentence in their work, we would have a new Inquisition that would earn the mockery of every defender of traditional religion.

Richard Dawkins is one of our greatest living scientists, writers, and humanists. We call on the American Humanist Association to reverse this regressive decision and undo the damage it has brought upon itself and the humanist movement.

Sincerely,
Steven Pinker and Rebecca Goldstein

Too little, too late. It was a weak attempt at walking back what he said and didn't even address the main issues.

As I wrote last week, and as the AHA alluded to, Dawkins has done this sort of thing before, creating ammo for conservatives to use in their attacks on transgender individuals by questioning the legitimacy of who they are. He even appeared to pat himself on the back for using trans people's preferred pronouns. ...

While the AHA's revocation of his honor is mostly symbolic, it follows a separate denunciation from American Atheists' Alison Gill, a trans woman and the group's Vice President for Legal and Policy.

"We need science communicators like Richard Dawkins to put in the time to learn this information and then communicate it clearly and accurately to the public, not reinforce dangerous and harmful narratives put forward by the opponents of equality."

SUPPORT DAWKINS AND THE AHA David Orenstein

Richard Dawkins is still a pillar, even if some have moved him to the basement. What I mean is his lifetime of work in science, biological research, writings and education, as well as his support of the freethought community and fighting religious violence should be admired. I certainly admire it.

I don't think Dawkins is a bigot. I do think he stepped in it and frankly I am uncomfortable with the original Twitter post. For a man who fights against ignorance, the Tweet seemed confusing and ignorant.

I consider myself somewhat of a Charles Darwin scholar. And while that great biologist was an incredible scientist and was against slavery, he did not support the women's suffrage movement, nor did he think that all cultures were equal, holding British culture above all others.

I'm still working through my thoughts and emotions on Dawkins/AHA, but as I search my own feelings I know that all humans make errors in judgment. Certainly, the AHA is accountable for its actions and Dawkins is accountable for his writings, and has even apologized.

The AHA, as the premier humanist organization in the US, has a right under its own governance, guidance and leadership to freely take actions as they see fit. This organization has fought for atheist and humanist civil and human rights and should equally be admired and respected.

Those on the Left, Libertarians and the Right are all pouncing on this as the effects of "Woke culture", the new shorthand and fault line in the culture wars, for their own personal justifications and political needs. I can't really comment on this since I don't want to deal with these types of politics that separate us rather than bring us together.

In the end, if you choose to not support Dawkins or the AHA in the future, short or long-term, that is your business. I will certainly support both the man's work (maybe not the man?) and the organization's work (those on the front lines) because they're each still on the same side of right in my own mind. End of the controversy for me.

THE MARCH OF WOKEISM IS AN ALL-PERVASIVE NEW OPPRESSION

Trevor Phillips

(Excerpted from *The Times (London)*, 11/6/2020)

I was taking part in an online seminar with several hundred public servants recently when one of them started his question to me with an earnest apology: "I am a man of white privilege . . ." I found it hard not to laugh out loud. Things have come to a pretty pass when people prostrate themselves in public for having a prostate gland, not to mention dumping on their parents for being the wrong colour. ...

Personally I find the appeal of this brand of ethno-masochism hard to fathom, but then I'm not white. Yet increasingly, such "woke" thinking is flooding our workplaces, schools and universities. It is two centuries since this country [the U.K.] abolished the Test Acts under which people were required to make a pledge of religious observance to qualify for public office or the civil service. But once again employees are being required to sign up to statements of belief or face denunciation, demotion and dismissal. Arcane arguments about white privilege and Pythonesque disputes about whether men can be women are no longer confined to warring left-wing sects or social media; they are eating away at the heart of leading institutions, corporations and government itself. ...

The intolerant aspect of wokeism has become plainer than ever. Its strictures against "offensive" language brought some of its adherents close to apologising for the massacre at *Charlie Hebdo* magazine in Paris, suggesting that the journalists bore some responsibility for the Islamist attack by declining to censor themselves. The beheading last month of Samuel Paty, a French teacher who had shown *Charlie Hebdo's* cartoons of Muhammad to his class, left woke activists awkwardly trying to distance themselves from the killer while implying that Paty should have placed the right to free speech second to the sensitivities of some Muslim parents. ...

Sex—"the trans debate"—remains a hot issue but race was the principal battleground, even before the Black Lives Matter movement was reinvigorated this year. According to Ibram X Kendi, the author of *How to be an Antiracist*, "the original sin is racism". Bari Weiss, the *New York Times* writer who quit in July over its wokeism, says that "the beating heart of this new ideology is critical race theory". This theory holds that whites are uniquely insulated from poverty and injustice, and that even poor whites would be worse off if they happened to be another ethnicity—confronted constantly by police brutality, discrimination and the legacy of transatlantic slavery. This view ignores the inconvenient truth that people of Indian origin in this country (and in the US) outsmart the white majority educationally, outshine them professionally and outearn them by more than 15 per cent. The notion of white privilege would be baffling to the families of white boys who have fallen to the bottom of education attainment league tables, and who are staring at a lifetime of sweeping the streets occupied by

their affluent Indian-heritage classmates. But critical race theory is the ultimate guilt trip; it works on the liberal elite because it's true of enough people, enough of the time.

The advance of wokedom is made even more unsettling by the fact that the rules are a moving target, driven by a bewildering array of changing sensitivities and shifting language: should we talk about BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic—so yesterday), BIPOC (or Black, Indigenous and People of Colour, as they say in California) or people of colour (so whites are some kind of transparent creatures?). Confusion abounds. But for the past four years wokeists worldwide have at least been able to define themselves by asking a simple question: what would Donald Trump say? And whatever the answer, the reverse would be woke. But with the Great Orange Yardstick on his way out, the movement's gurus are having to come up with new guidelines. ...

I suspect that the man who asked me that question in the seminar had been reading *White Fragility*, the magnum opus of sociologist Robin DiAngelo, darling of the white self-flagellators, whose bleak remedy for being born the wrong colour is to strive to be "less white", which she says means "less racist". She recently told TV viewers that "white privilege is the automatic, taken-for-granted advantage bestowed upon white people . . . it takes us literally seeing a man being murdered in front of our eyes to wake us up". I'm not sure that the family of George Floyd, whose death at the hands of US police in May triggered protests around the world, will appreciate him being spoken of as a kind of moral alarm clock for white people. ...

Serious people on both sides of the Atlantic are drinking deep at the well of racial self-abasement. A much-lauded course at the prestigious Duke University in the US teaches that there are 15 characteristics to white supremacy culture, including perfectionism, a sense of urgency, worship of the written word and, amazingly, objectivity, all of which, it is argued, need to be jettisoned. ...

The one place in which wokedom seems to have made least progress is in non-black minority communities. Mr Trump's strong showing among Hispanics, taking almost a third of their vote in the presidential election, prompted a senior black journalist at *The New York Times* to say: "We are surrounded by racists." Another decreed that Latinos should be stripped of their minority status after Miami's anti-communist Cubans voted heavily for Trump. ...

Some woke taboos are risible. The head of a fee-paying girls' school was forced to apologise for using the word "negro" during an assembly explaining the origins of Black History Month, which lay in Negro History Week a century ago. It seemed to matter little to her protesting students that, back then, the alternative to negro would have been a truly ugly epithet beginning with "n", or that "negro" was the word Martin Luther King would have used. ...

The greatest tragedy in all of this is that the gurus of wokedom have persuaded thousands of idealistic young people who rightly want to change the world into supporting what is actually a deeply reactionary movement. The

trans activists can only realise their aim of being able to enter spaces reserved for women by erasing the female sex. Critical race theory remains credible only so long as black and brown people continue to fail. In the end, the woke movement is turning into an echo of the very oppressors it claims to be combating. After all the statues come down, and women's prisons are opened to all and sundry, the celebrities and social media warriors will move on to the next fashionable cause – and minorities will still be less likely to win the top jobs, and women will still be the victims of violence. The only thing that will have changed is the bitterness of a generation whose idealism was betrayed.

LITTLE MURDERS

Jonathan Engel

Do you remember the 1967 Jules Feiffer play (subsequently turned into a movie), "Little Murders"? It was a satire on the ubiquity of gun deaths and how numb we have all become to everyday violence. I hope I'm wrong, but it seems that there must be some sort of natural law that prescribes that eventually satire must become reality. And so here we are. After Atlanta and Boulder and a few others, we have Indianapolis again. And two days after that we have three shot to death in Kenosha WI, and then three more gunned down in Austin, TX, and we don't even blink. Our numbness is complete. "Little Murders" is here.

There are simply too many guns in private hands in this country. The sheer number of firearms floating around America guarantees that eventually some will fall into the wrong hands. And the "wrong hands" could be just about anybody when you factor in alcohol, mental illness, anger and hate (thank you President Trump!) and the stress of living through a pandemic. In no way do I want to excuse the rash of police killings that have been plaguing our country, but when everyone and his brother is armed to the teeth, are we really surprised that some cops are trigger happy?

That this is happening in what is probably the most religious of all western industrialized countries comes as no shock. Which is why, although it pains me grievously to say so, I can't see a way out for us. Unfettered access to high-powered firearms has become dogma for a large part of the USA, and so red America is no more likely to get real on guns than it is to get real on the subject of supernatural nonsense. The late Phil Ochs wrote a song about everyday brutality and how we shrug it all off (unless we're the victim) that had the chorus, "And I'm sure it wouldn't interest anybody, outside of a small circle of friends".

But I am a humanist and so "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind" (John Donne). Any killing sends a ripple of pain and grief through the entire community. To a humanist, there are no "little murders". There just aren't enough humanists.

Last week in Houston, a 3-year-old boy shot his 8-month-old baby brother in the family home, killing him.

Last year in America, at least 371 children fired a loaded gun, causing 143 deaths and 243 injuries.

THE LAST TRUTH-TELLER

Jane Mayer

(Excerpted from "Remembering Walter Mondale" at newyorker.com, 4/19/2021)

Two seminal moments capture Walter Mondale's long-shot 1984 Presidential bid The first was his effect on a cavernous campus gym in the Midwest filled with cheering supporters. The place was crammed to the rafters with college students who had been raucously awaiting Mondale's arrival and were primed for excitement. The crowd applauded wildly as the former Vice-President strode onto a stage festooned with festive bunting and balloons. But, when Mondale launched into his stump speech, he told the eager young students that not all of them would go out into the world and succeed. Many of them, he warned, would find that life could be hard, and that they might have setbacks. He predicted that some members of the audience would someday need the help of government services, and that, in the future, many would rely on Social Security. When I looked out across the room, it was as if a field of wildflowers was wilting before my eyes. One could feel the crowd's optimism plummet, as soon-to-be college grads pictured themselves as needy old folks waiting for their government checks. Everything Mondale said was true. But it was not what American voters wanted to hear.

The second instance was more famous. It was a moment during his acceptance speech at the 1984 Democratic Convention when, to the shock of many, Mondale chose to deliver the bad news that, if elected, he would raise taxes. At the time, Ronald Reagan, who was seeking a second Presidential term, was promising "morning again in America", with a series of gauzy television ads featuring white picket fences and golden sunrises. But Mondale refused to peddle the magical thinking of Reaganomics – the phony claim that slashing taxes would produce an economic boom so great that it would make up for the lost tax revenue. To the contrary, Mondale accurately argued, it was instead producing vast federal deficits, degraded social services, and runaway economic inequality. Rather than endorsing the ostensibly pain-free path of "supply-side economics", Mondale declared that something had to be done to reduce the mounting federal deficit. "Let's tell the truth. It must be done. It must be done," Mondale declared, during the most important speech of his life. "Mr. Reagan will raise taxes, and so will I. He won't tell you. I just did."

He lost in a landslide, carrying only his home state, Minnesota, and the District of Columbia.

Looking back, it's hard not to admire how honorable Mondale – who died Monday at the age of ninety-three – was during that campaign. He was the last Presidential nominee of either party to respect the American public enough to tell it the hard truth about economic realities. ...

It remains to be seen whether Americans are more willing today to accept hard truths about the taxes that it takes to sustain such spending. The track record since 1984 isn't reassuring.

WHO SHOULD BE THE 110TH MAYOR OF NEW YORK?

I decided to vote for *Scott Stringer* maybe 4 years ago when after a political event we had a conversation which convinced me of his sincerity and liberal leanings, which agree with mine. I like that he hasn't been charged with corruption or any other crime and his cousin was the liberal dear departed Bella Abzug, formerly a U.S. Congressperson from NYC. I also like receiving his regular reports that he's deposited my monthly NYC pension payments into my account, with his personal message of good will and tasteful portrait photo, and he's doing a good job as the NYC Comptroller. A year ago his office promptly answered my query about suits against the NYC Police being paid out to civilians. Otherwise I always vote left of center unless the candidate creeps me out or is unbelievably PC. – *Joel Galker*

I plan to vote for *Scott Stringer*. I'm not hugely enthusiastic about it, and I think several candidates are good, but Stringer has a combination of experience and liberal values that none of the others have. – *Peter Flom*

It's a very interesting field and I haven't made a decision (yet :) – *Kiwi Callahan*

Maybe it's the residual effect of the pandemic, but I have not yet developed a strong interest in the race for NYC mayor. That said, the next mayor will face enormous problems, not least of which will be the reduction in office real estate values (and the consequent effect on tax revenue) as well as the potentially sluggish return of tourism until Broadway, concerts, lectures and other mass indoor activities resume. At this point, I lean toward *Scott Stringer*, mainly because he has experience in the nuts and bolts of municipal government. Perhaps some other candidate will spark my passion in the weeks ahead, but so far, I am not impressed with most of the field. – *Joe Lisanti*

I'm not sure who I plan to vote for or even if I can vote in NYC. My official address is in Port Jervis even though my family and I live in the City as well. I only try to vote (at least) twice in the presidential election! – *David Orenstein*

I choose not to reveal that information. Too much backlash from anarchists. – *Carl Marxer*

Regarding the upcoming choice of mayor: I'm looking for a mayor who will ... set up housing, and health care for the homeless, and maybe even a few jobs? ... deal with transportation issues: more and better bike lanes, and a few more dedicated bus lanes as on 14th Street, and some places just for pedestrians, like Herald Square ... and stop the cops from parking in bike lanes, and parking anywhere they please, double parking, parking on sidewalks, placard abuse ... and a special gift for cars driving in from Staten Island: Congestion pricing.

And while we're on the subject of the police, reign in

the police union and increase accountability for police abuses. – *Brian Lemaire*

I haven't made up my mind yet. There are so many candidates. But I do think that I want someone who knows their way around NYC politics and government. The city is at a critical juncture and I don't think it's time for amateur hour. On last Sunday's SHSNY Zoom Happy Hour, a number of people spoke positively about Scott Stringer, and he does have the kind of experience I'm looking for. So I'll be taking a close look at Stringer, but I would still put myself in the "*Undecided*" column. – *Jon Engel*

We are doing ranked-choice voting, so here are my top 5: *Ray McGuire* ... Scott Stringer, Shaun Donovan, Eric Adams, Kathryn Garcia. – *John A Wagner*

Tentatively, *Scott Stringer*. The choice of mayor, unlike that of a legislator, is based not just on philosophy, i.e., stands on issues, but on executive ability. As mayor, a conservative with good management skills is preferable to liberal lacking these. Based on experience, Stringer is ahead of the others. Prior to being Comptroller, he was the Manhattan Borough President and a member of the Assembly. Kathryn Garcia, who ran the Dept. of Sanitation, NYC Housing Authority and Dept. of Environmental Protection, is my second choice. By comparison, Andrew Yang and David McGuire lack government experience. Maya Wiley has limited experience. – *Lawrence Shaw*

Scott Stringer – *Dorothy Kahn*

The Big Apple is in such a mess due to the pandemic that I doubt anyone could salvage it for years to come. In addition to the candidates listed in PIQUE, Andrew Giuliani, the son of Rudy, has expressed interest in running, as has Curtis Sliwa, the former head of the Guardian Angels. Both advocate a pro-police and public safety agenda. If the city continues its downward spiral with respect to violent crime, we should not be surprised if one of these two finds a home in Gracie Mansion. My choice of mayor: the reincarnation of *Fiorello LaGuardia!* – *Dennis Middlebrooks*

GARRISON KEILLOR SPEAKS FOR ME

– *John Rafferty*

(Excerpted from his blog, at garrisonkeillor.com, 4/21/2021)

Spring is here, the park is gloriously in bloom, and I sit on a sunny bench watching the young on the running path, working hard out of their fear of mortality, and I feel the great privilege of being in my late seventies eighties, all my ambition gone, enjoying life itself, not aiming for distinction. All those decades I tried to be intelligent, to be in the know and to maintain a cool sense of irony, an elegant detachment from the mundane, and now that rock-climb is over: it takes no effort whatsoever to be an old man. You sit in the park and savor your happiness and let the young do the suffering.

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 25, 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=c0NrNUoweDVGWWho2ditvYmJlEVjVGdz09>
Meeting ID: 980 634 4432
Passcode: SHSNy
Join by Skype for Business <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/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.