



The Enlightenment



A Mini-Journal of the Humanist Association of London and Area
Visit Our Web Site at www.humanists-london.org

Volume 14

Number 2

February 2018

This is the 100th Enlightenment

The first *Enlightenment* was published in April 2005, sixteen months after the Humanist Association of London and Area (HALA) came into being. In the beginning it was published once every quarter, but by 2017, twelve issues a year were published. Originally it was intended to be a newsletter listing events of interest to humanists that were happening currently or in the future. But, before long it evolved into a sort of mini-journal containing articles of academic or philosophical or scientific interest or on other subjects related to humanism, such as human rights and democracy. This is keeping in step with the Purpose of HALA as stated in our Constitution, which reads:

The purpose of The Association shall be to educate and increase the public's understanding of the principles of secular worldviews, including humanism through the provision of seminars, conferences, and newsletters.

Thus, *The Enlightenment* is intended to help fulfill HALA's CRA mandate to educate the public about the advantages of secular societies. Those with a firm separation of church and state.

A Personal Assessment of Humanism

By Donald Hatch, Editor and Publisher of *The Enlightenment*

When I joined the Humanist Association of Canada (HAC) in the early 2000s, I expected to be joining an organization of several thousand people, but as it turned out, there were less than a thousand paid up members. And to boot, there was turmoil at headquarters. A new Board member from BC was causing a disruption by claiming that the Board needed a shaking up because it was not heading in the right direction. In the end this Board member resigned, conditions returned to normality and good things began to happen. Dr. Robert Buckman, a well-known spokesperson for HAC, was President and Bill Broderick published a very credible newsletter on a regular basis. In addition to the national organization, there were a number of active local humanist affiliates, including our London group, operating in many of Canada's larger cities.

In the summer of 2005, HAC organized a great conference in Ottawa at which Dr. Henry Morgentaler, the founder of HAC, was the keynote speaker. Dr. Morgentaler had worked tirelessly to bring about legal abortion in Canada and later was awarded the Order of Canada for his efforts. There was an impressive list of speakers expounding on various topics related to humanism and all was going well until the Annual

General Meeting (AGM) which in my view, turned out to be a disaster. The chairman lost control as two or three radical members from Toronto succeeded in passing a motion to abandon the central nature of HAC and adopt what they called a federation model that would allow the local affiliates to have more say in the operation of HAC. It was downhill from then on, as membership dropped to just a few hundred and the organization has never regained its former size and influence.

These happenings caused me to wonder, just what should a humanist movement be about? Was it just about bashing religions and shouting from the rooftops that a supernatural God does not exist, or was it something more? I concluded it had to be something more because of the twelve HAC humanist principles, only one deals with rejection of the supernatural. Also, definitions of humanism are inclusive in nature as the explanation of humanism on the back of the HALA membership card illustrates:

Humanism is a proactive life stance guided by the principle of rational thought, scientific inquiry, ethics, responsibility, compassion, fairness and equality, without belief in supernatural phenomena.

What could be more inclusive? Surely there should be many who would like to belong to an organization expounding humanist principles and providing an opportunity to associate with like-minded people and further the cause of secularism. But in reality, there are not many “card carrying” humanists in the world. Not many local groups consist of more than a hundred members and most national associations have no more than a few thousand. Admittedly, there is an exception in Norway where the national association boasts over eighty thousand members, but this is because the national group receives a portion of the state church tax.

Fortunately, there is another exception that can help point us in the right direction in determining what humanism really should be all about. This is the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF) in Madison, Wisconsin, whose co-presidents are Annie Laurie Gaylor and her husband Dan Barker, who spoke at the HALA Wolf Hall event in 2014. This organization has over twenty thousand members and has a remit to promote and protect the separation of church and state. They have a team of lawyers whose job it is to assist in fighting court cases where the separation of church and state is threatened. This is particularly important in the United States, where evangelicals have gained influence in governments and are attempting to reverse Roe v Wade and are also pressing for the teaching of creationism in science classes in public schools. Recently FFRF has engaged atheist Ronald Reagan Jr. to appear in TV ads appealing for donations. The logical conclusion surely is that separation of church and state should be one of the major concerns of humanist organizations particularly at the national level.

In addition to separation of church and state, what else should humanist organizations be concerned about? I think a book by Phil Zuckerman, entitled *Society Without God* can provide a clue. Zuckerman spent fourteen months in Denmark and Sweden and his research showed that “society without God is not only possible, but can be quite civil and pleasant. And contrary to the claims of certain outspoken conservative Christians who regularly argue that a society without God would be hell on earth: rampant with immorality, full of evil, and teeming with depravity, in reality Denmark and Sweden are remarkably strong, safe, healthy, moral and prosperous societies.” He goes on to say, “It is crucial for people to know that it is actually quite possible for a society to lose its religious beliefs and still be well-functioning, successful, and fully capable of constructing and obeying sound laws and establishing and following rational systems of morality and ethics. Worship of God can wane, prayer can be given up, and the Bible can go unstudied, yet people can treat one

another decently, schools and hospitals can still run smoothly, crime can remain minimal, babies and old people can receive all the care and attention they need, economies can flourish, pollution can be kept to a minimum, and children can be loved in warm homes – without God being a central component of everyday life.”

An obvious conclusion to be drawn from Zuckerman’s revealing book is that traditional religion and supernatural beliefs fade away in a prosperous secular society, “not as a result of aggressive atheist activity, but as a result of people being provided with a high level of personal security. God and religion just naturally fade away when people live in a society with adequate social safety nets and where minimum inequality exists.” No amount of criticizing religions and putting signs on buses proclaiming there is no God, will achieve these desirable results. It is a prosperous economy with low inequality that fosters secularism and reduces religiosity.

Thus, humanism is all the things in the definition cited above, but it is also a phenomenon wherein people live in a secular society with firm separation of church and state, being centered on the welfare of individual humans, as opposed to theocratic societies that are centered on a supernatural deity.

This has been my conclusion after much reading and studying over the years and I was pleased to discover from reading Yuval Noah Harari’s book *Sapiens: A brief History of Humankind*, that he thinks along these same lines. In the section on religions, Harari includes an interesting conception of humanism which he considers to be “a revolutionary new creed that conquered the world during the last few centuries.” This is not about today’s card-carrying members of Humanist organizations (these organizations are never mentioned in Harari’s book) but instead, humanism is about living in a secular society without God. Prior to 1500 and the Protestant Reformation, religion and God played an important role in the lives of most Westerners. But after 1500, northern Europe began a slow march toward less religion and more secularism with increasing concern about the welfare and actions of individual humans and diminishing concern about God. Harari posits three kinds of humanism in societies embracing increasing secularism and waning religiosity:

- Liberal humanism – Humanity is a conglomeration of individual humans, and the liberty of each individual is sacrosanct. This is the form of humanism in most western secular democracies.
- Socialist humanism – Humanity is collective rather than individualistic. There is a striving for equality. This is the form of humanism in many communist countries.
- Evolutionary humanism – Evolution has made one race superior to all the rest. This was the contention of the Aryan Nazis. For many years after World War II, evolutionary humanism went out of favour, but unfortunately has recently re-emerged among white supremacists in the U.S.

Liberal humanism, wherein humans no longer look to God and holy scripture for guidance, but rely on themselves to look for meaning in this life, fortunately won out over the other two forms of humanism in the last half of the twentieth century in most of the Western world.

So, if humanism is a kind of ideology centered on the well-being of individuals living peacefully and well-off in secular societies, what is the role of national humanist organizations like Humanist Canada (HC, formerly HAC) and local associations like HALA?

In my view, all national humanist organizations should have the objective of promoting the furthering of secular societies with firm separation of church and state and possessing optimum equality for individuals. To accomplish this, it is often necessary to get political in the same way evangelicals have become political in the United States and have successfully influenced governments. This will require an organization with a critical mass of members and a strong well-known and respected leader who can speak out on matters concerning separation of church and state and command the attention of the media.

Local humanist associations like HALA should continue to attract and educate members on topics related to humanism and provide an atmosphere conducive to belonging to a group of like-minded people. All local members should also belong to the national association in order to help finance it, so it can be large enough to influence governments on pertinent issues. Obviously in Canada we are far from this ideal, but I believe this is the direction in which HC should be headed. After all, Dr. Morgentaler, the founder of HAC, was deeply involved in politics with his crusade to allow legal abortions in Canada. It may, however, be necessary to give up charitable status in order to get more political. Ending the public funding of religious schools would be a good issue to champion in the future for both national and local humanist associations.

Before concluding, it deserves mention that in recent years the trend toward more secularism has been heading in a positive direction. The latest statistics reveal there are now 1.2 billion non-believers or “nones” in the world and this number should continue to rise as more and more critical-thinking young people abandon the religion of their parents. These nones constitute 16% of a world population of 7.4 billion, ranking third behind Christians (31.2%) and Muslims (24.1%). Ranking fourth is Hinduism with 15.1%. Fifth is Buddhism with 6.9%. Greg Epstein in his book *Good Without God*, points out that the nones are growing faster than any of the world religions. Hopefully this will continue, but it must be mentioned that Muslims with their current higher birth rate could outnumber Christians within 15 years.

For whatever it is worth, the above discourse outlines my thoughts up to now (they may change) on what humanism should be all about, but the encouraging trend toward more secularism could conceivably slow down in a world with increasing inequality and a concentration of wealth in the one percent. Under conditions of a shrinking middle class, a rise in populism, and lower prosperity for the 99%, religiosity could increase and the march toward more secularism could slow down. It is a known fact that secularism tends to thrive in prosperous economic conditions and the converse could well be true.

In any case, the road ahead is uncertain as the Digital Revolution and artificial intelligence are changing the way we live, with robots replacing people and jobs disappearing. After WW II capitalism and democracy along with rising secularism and a rising middle class brought prosperity to the Western world, but questions are now being asked about the viability of the democratic system as well as the capitalist system that requires continuing growth to sustain itself. Are they the right systems for Western democratic societies in the future? A recent book authored by the well-known humanist philosopher A. C. Grayling tackles the current problems facing democracy by dealing with its history, current position, short-comings and possible solutions. A review of this book follows.

A Review of Democracy and Its Crisis

A book by A. C. Grayling

This book is divided into two sections. In Part I Grayling documents the history and evolution of democracies and in Part II he examines democracy today and why it has gone wrong in the U. K. with Brexit and in the U.S. with the election of Donald Trump as president.

The history of democracy, of course, begins in Athens in the 5th century BCE. In this era Pericles summarized the essence of Greek democracy with these words:

“Our constitution is called a democracy, because power is in the hands not of a few, but of the whole people, everyone is equal before the law. The man who holds himself aloof from public life is useless.”

In Athens, all citizens were members of the assembly and could vote directly on legislation proposed by the council. Similarly, all citizens could be placed on a jury to judge their peers, a majority vote leading to conviction. Further, a significant majority vote could ostracize any citizen for ten years. Most citizens could obtain the higher administrative offices since most of these positions were filled by lot. Power and authority clearly lay with the citizens of Athens.

But to be a citizen, a person had to be male, at least 18 years of age, and born of Athenian parents. This meant that the majority of Athenians, including women, resident aliens and slaves, were barred from participating in the democratic process. Of the 310,000 people living in Athens, only 43,000 participated in government, fewer than one-seventh of the total population. Nevertheless, the Athenians laid a foundation that would eventually be resurrected and developed by others. Citizenship, shared power, equality, and participation, would in time be hallmarks of democracies around the world.

In Part I, Grayling comments on most of the major philosophers who influenced the evolution of democracy from ancient Greece until the nineteenth century. These include Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, Locke, Spinoza, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Madison, Constant, De Tocqueville, and Mill. He also comments on a succession of major events, mostly in England, France and the United States, beginning with the Magna Carta followed by a number of occurrences including the English Civil War, the end of divine right of kings, the ascension of William and Mary, the American Revolution, and the French Revolution.

Grayling states that those readers who might not be interested in the history of democracy, but more interested in contemporary events, are free to skip Part I and begin with Part II, but for those skipping Part I, a few individuals from the past deserve mention. The first is Plato. He was not a fan of Greek democracy, after all it killed his teacher Socrates. And he had concerns that democracy could deteriorate into what he called an *ochlocracy* leading to a hidden oligarchy, possibly followed by a revolution then leading to a restoration of order by a strong man, a tyrant. The French Revolution and the fascism of Nazi Germany and Italy followed parts of Plato's prediction, as did the United States where Congress is now controlled by big money. The U.S. is not now a functioning democracy, but is a hidden oligarchy.

Plato believed that governments should be led by what he called philosopher kings, men who studied philosophy, served an apprenticeship in government and lived almost like monks, not being interested in

any personal gain. Aristotle realized that this utopian arrangement would not be practical, but did state that it was the duty of all politicians to provide good government for the benefit of all citizens.

Another person from the past worth mentioning is John Locke, who is regarded as one of the founders of liberalism. His work had considerable influence on the writing of the United States Constitution with the introduction of the separation of powers between branches of government.

The first chapter of Part II is entitled, "Alternative Democracies and Anti-democracies." Grayling cites the differences between the British Parliamentary system and the system in the U.S. Republic with its separation of powers. The Parliamentary system has evolved over many centuries to its present state and has served the U.K. and Commonwealth countries including Canada, Australia, and New Zealand reasonably well. The Prime Minister is usually the leader of the political party that controls a majority of seats in the House of Commons, rather than being elected in a general election as is the case with the President of the United States. When the ruling party holds a majority in a Parliament, it has a monopoly on power and can pass any legislation put forward by the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. If there happens to be a minority government, then compromises are required, and this is not necessarily a bad thing. In Canada, however, with three major parties and the first-past-the-post system, the party in power often does not represent a majority of the voters. This is considered to be a major shortfall by those who desire a more equal representation system.

After the American Revolution, the founding fathers created a Constitution outlining a new form of democracy based on three branches of government. Namely, the Administrative consisting of the President and cabinet, the Congress, and the Judiciary, each with separate powers. The Congress consists of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Senate is elected, not appointed. The members of the Judiciary, however, are appointed. Under the U.S. system, the President, the Congress and the Senate are not always of the same political party, necessitating compromise to enable the government to create and pass legislation efficiently. Without consultation and compromise between the two political parties, stagnation can occur. In less than two centuries, this newer form of democracy enabled the United States to become the most powerful nation in the world, but today there are serious problems.

Grayling points out, using Brexit and the election of Donald Trump as examples, that democracy in the U.K. and the U.S. is in crisis. In Britain, the first-past-the-post system and low voter turnout caused the nation to begin a process of separation from the European Union with only 26% of eligible voters voting in favour. Grayling describes Brexit as "a politically illegitimate effort by the right wing of a political movement to effect dramatic constitutional changes by referendum which they could not achieve as a self-standing political party in a standard general election." And he goes on to state, "in the United States there is a new President who by a long chalk is one of the worst qualified and worst equipped individuals ever to be voted into the White House, courtesy of the electoral college, with three million votes less than his better qualified opponent."

Grayling further comments that "something has gone seriously wrong in the state of democracy. Democracy must be reclaimed, in the form worked out by some of the best minds in the history of our civilization, before the opportunity to reclaim it passes." He mentions that there are alternative forms of government including communism and benevolent dictatorships, but he, like Winston Churchill, considers democracy the least bad of all other systems and feels strongly that, with modifications, democracy can be salvaged and reformed into an improved system that truly represents the wishes of the majority. Grayling warns that

“although by all measures the citizens of democracies (the Western democracies at least) today are safer, wealthier and freer than humans have ever been anywhere in history, there is no guarantee that social dissatisfactions such as income inequality and unfair distribution of opportunities will not arise and rankle the electorate.” Because of these dangers he argues reforms are required. But, what kinds of reforms does he recommend?

1.The first suggestion is to get rid of the first-past-the-post system. It should be replaced by some system that allows the majority of the voters to have fair representation, but he does not spell out what this alternative might be. We all know that the present Liberal government promised to reform the system, but they were unable to fulfil this promise. They found out it is not an easy problem to solve to everyone’s satisfaction.

2.Another suggestion is to better educate all students in civic and government matters while still in high school, so that when they reach voting age (Grayling suggests it should be 16), they are ready to make wise judgements when deciding on the best qualified candidates to elect.

3.Grayling is unequivocal in his conviction that voting should be made compulsory by all qualified voters, as it is now in Australia.

4.Without question, the financing of political candidates is badly in need of reform because big business, big money, and special interests have undue influence today, particularly in the U.S. This is well documented in Jane Mayer’s recent book entitled *Dark Money* that spells out the reality that “dark money” has turned the United States into a hidden oligarchy, aided by the U.S. Supreme Court ruling that allows billionaires to give unlimited amounts of money to campaigns at all levels. “Political office in the U.S. is bought and sold like a pair of socks,” Grayling says.

5.An additional problem is the practice of gerrymandering, rigging constituencies to give one party an advantage over the opposition. This has been a long-standing problem, and has recently aided Republicans in the United States.

So, will the world’s democracies attempt to carry out the reforms necessary to overcome the current shortfalls and reverse the ongoing trend toward increasing inequality, or will it take something drastic like an uprising to bring about reform? No matter what happens, the road ahead, with the digital revolution and increasing use of Artificial Intelligence, will not be easy, and skillful leaders will be required to navigate successfully into the future. Will these leaders be found, or will democracy be overtaken by another system that is more efficient?

The January *Enlightenment* contained an article entitled “How China Retains Power: The one-party state draws heavily on the tool of democracy.” Communist China has apparently avoided the pitfalls that brought down communism in Russia, so it appears they will continue to grow and prosper. It seems almost certain that China with its more than one billion citizens will outstrip the United States GDP in the not too distant future, and become the world’s most dominate power both militarily and economically. And can they in the process adapt a code of human rights that provides freedom and equality for all citizens? Only time will tell, nothing can be ruled out.

The last paragraph in the above-mentioned article states: “Instead of assuming that one-party systems must fail and become more like ours, perhaps we should be learning from the efforts of China’s one-party system to fix itself. If it can adapt and Western democracies cannot, which system will ultimately prevail?”

So, where are we? There is no doubt we are living in precarious and uncertain times. Conditions are much different than they were in 1945 at the end of World War II, when a spirit of optimism prevailed, and a golden age occurred as families became more prosperous and living standards improved for many. Today we are in a situation somewhat analogous to the darkest days of World War II when two leaders, Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt, came forward to guide us through to victory. Today we have an unstable leader, Donald Trump, who could very well start a nuclear war with North Korea. And there are other problems. Not only is democracy in need of reform, Islam also needs reform to bring Islamic jihad to an end. Yes indeed, intelligent, competent, and brave leaders are urgently needed to bring about some sense of order in the uncertain days ahead, but, where are they?

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that as we begin the year 2018, we are in a similar situation to what prevailed 250 years ago at the start of the Industrial Revolution with the introduction of machinery into the textile industry followed by the perfection of the steam engine. During the following 250 years the lives of humans changed dramatically, as we all know. With the Digital Revolution now underway, dramatic changes will occur again, perhaps beyond anything we can imagine. Hopefully we and our descendants will be up to the challenges that lie ahead.

So, having speculated a bit about the future, let’s change gears and take-a-look at a subject relative to living in the here and now. That subject is Stoicism. (DAH).

What Is Stoicism?

A short while ago HALA President Rod Martin mentioned to me that he was becoming interested in the study of the Roman stoic philosophers, including Epictetus, Seneca, and Marcus Aurelius. Previously I had read Marcus Aurelius’ great dissertation entitled *Meditations*, and had studied a book on the teachings of Epictetus, so I had some idea of what stoicism was about. I did not realize, however, that Stoicism might well be a better guide for living a satisfying life than humanism, until I received an email attaching an article by Massimo Pigliucci entitled, *What the Stoics did for us: Could a 2300-year old philosophy be the key to happy 21st-century life?* I sent this article to Rod and he informed me that he was well aware of Pigliucci because he had read his recent book, *How to be a Stoic: Using Ancient Philosophy to Live a Modern Life*. Rod loaned me his copy of the book and I became hooked on Stoicism, because it seemed to provide for me something that I felt is missing in humanism, not in the sense of humanism as living in a secular society, but in the sense of belonging to a humanist organization.

In his book, Pigliucci describes his journey from being raised a Catholic, to becoming an atheist in his teens, to becoming a secular humanist, and now a Stoic. At an earlier stage he rejected atheism, because he “became downright irritated by the so-called New Atheists represented by Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris and others. Although public criticism of religion is the staple of democratic society, people do not respond very well to being belittled and insulted.” For quite a while Pigliucci embraced secular humanism, but eventually found something lacking. He says, “it is too dependent on science and a modern conception of rationality, with the result that – despite the best efforts of its supporters – it comes across as cold and not

the sort of thing you want to bring your kids to on a Sunday morning. Hence, I think the spectacular lack of success (numerically speaking) of secular humanist organizations.”

I could hardly agree more! Although I have been a “card carrying humanist” for 15 years, and have enjoyed being a member of HALA, serving in all executive positions, I have always been puzzled by the “lack of success of humanist organizations (numerically speaking)” as Pigliucci puts it. I did, however, gain some encouragement about humanism after reading Harari’s book (see above) in which he describes humanism not as belonging to a humanist organization, but as the experience of living in a secular society with firm separation of church and state, centred on the well-being of humans, rather than being subservient to a supernatural being, as is the case in theocratic societies. This was a big step up for me, but now I feel I need to explore Stoicism, in-order-to find out if it will provide for me what seems to be missing in humanism.

The founder of Stoicism was Zeno of Elea (334 BCE-262 BCE). Of the three Greek philosophical disciplines, Epicureanism, Skepticism, and Stoicism, it was mainly Stoicism that was picked up by the Romans, as evidenced by the three philosophers mentioned previously, Epictetus, Seneca and the Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius. But Stoicism was not just an ideology for ancient times – it is equally relevant today.

Stoicism, in its broadest terms, is a philosophy of living. It involves ethics (adopting a moral lifestyle), aesthetics (concern with beauty and art), epistemology (the study of how we know things), logic (dedicated to understanding reason), and physics (to comprehend the nature of the world). Stoics build a very large tent indeed, welcoming everyone from atheists to agnostics, from pantheists and panentheists, to theists including Christians, Muslims and Jews, as long as they do not try to impose their own metaphysical views on others. Stoics do, however, try to distance themselves from the more pernicious fundamentalists that are plaguing our recent history.

To a Stoic, it ultimately does not matter if a person thinks what they call the *Logos* is interpreted as either God or simply what is sometimes termed as “Einstein’s god,” the simple, indubitable fact that Nature is understandable by reason. Stoics realize that what is important in life is to live it well and that such an objective – the eudaimonic existence sought by the ancients – depends very little on whether there is a God or not, and if there is one, on what its specific attributes may or may not be. So, on this matter, why not agree to disagree and get on together with the serious business of living a good life.

An important basic tenet of Stoicism is exemplified by what has become known as the Serenity Prayer.

*God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change,
Courage to change the things I can,
And the wisdom to know the difference.*

This philosophic wisdom is very much a part of Epictetus’ teaching and has been put forward by a number of sages over the centuries. Today it is probably best known for its use in Alcoholics Anonymous meetings.

Another Stoic tenet is Socrates’ dictum that: *The unexamined life is not worth living.* That is, we should learn from our mistakes and continually strive to do and live better.

The foregoing is just a brief introduction to Stoicism. We will be hearing more about Stoicism when Rod Martin presents his talk on this subject at the regular HALA meeting on May 9th, 2018. (DAH).

Looking Back on The Enlightenment

Over the years, various *Enlightenments* have contained a short discourse on philosophers and other personalities of note on the front page. The list in order of appearance is:

Bertrand Russell, John Dewey, Pat Duffy Hutcheon, Thomas Paine, Robert Green Ingersoll, Richard Dawkins, David Hume, John Stuart Mill, Epicurus, Julian Huxley, Benedict Spinoza, Baron d’Holbach, Carl Sagan, Simone de Beauvoir, Percy Bysshe Shelly, Arthur Schopenhauer, Isaac Asimov, Marcus Aurelius, Marie Curie, Abraham Maslow, Confucius, Robert Buckman, Les Philosophes, Jean Meslier, Albert Schweitzer, Paul Kurtz, Christopher Hitchens, Tarek Fatah, Michel de Montaigne, Pope Francis, Immanuel Kant, Mary Wollstoncraft, Jesus of Nazareth, Malala Yousafzai, Plato, Ann Druyan, and Martin Luther. Noticeably, Aristotle, a prominent philosopher certainly worthy of an *Enlightenment* article, is missing.

Periodically various HALA members have given talks at regular meetings on how they became a humanist. These talks have been very popular, and many have been printed in *The Enlightenment*s issued just after the talks were presented. Those telling us how they became a humanist include:

John Hore, Arsenio Giron, Don Hatch, Amelia Wehlau, Goldie Emerson, Rod Martin, Wendy Kennedy, Tom Kennedy, Imram Menon, Peter Evans, Carl Goldberg, Elizabeth Bright-See, George Cherian, Brad Banks, Sherry Keddie, Sara Magee, and Jason Reed.



Articles in many of the *Enlightenments* included pictures, usually in black and white, but occasionally in colour. For the first time, the cover on the September 2010 issue displayed cartoons. These cartoons compared the scientific method with the creationist method. The cartoons succinctly and cleverly get the absurdity of creationism across.

The Board of the Humanist Association of London and Area (HALA)

President – Dr. Rod Martin – 519-673-6635 – email – ramartin@uwo.ca

Vice President – Carl Goldberg – 519-657-1362 – email – carlg1948@gmail.com

Secretary – Dr. Elizabeth Bright-See – 519-471-3963 – email – ebright@uwo.ca

Treasurer – Brian Prachar – 519-668-0237 – email – brianprachar@hotmail.com

Member at Large – Celina Everling – 226-235-2425 - email – celinaeverling@gmail.com - Membership

Member at Large – Brad Banks – 519 902-1213 – email – elbankster@gmail.com - Publicity

Member at Large – Sherry Keddie – 226 926-2426 – email – sherrykeddie@gmail.com – Social

Non-voting – Don Hatch – 519-472-6167 – email – dahatch@rogers.com - Enlightenment