



Willamette Freethinker



Volume 10, Number 11 — November 2003

A publication of Corvallis Secular Society

<http://css.peak.org>

Corvallis Secular Society (CSS) is a Humanist and Freethought society for all nontheists of good will.

CSS is affiliated with the American Humanist Association (AHA) and the Council for Secular Humanism (CSH).

From the Editor:

It's frequently hard to imagine that religious folks actually believe what they're saying. Even their own language and expressions give them away.

For instance, one commonly-used expression I've heard from Christians is, "God helps those who help themselves". Oh, how wise and profound that sounds.

But think about it! If it turns out that you could help yourself, then what did you need God for in the first place? All in the world this expression says is, God won't do a damned thing to help you when you're down. But once you recover (by your own effort or by the effort of other HUMANS), then everyone will be awfully quick to give God the credit!

Wouldn't an ACTUAL God be more useful if he concentrated on helping those who COULDN'T already help themselves?

Wait a minute. Only helps those who could already help themselves... who don't actually NEED any help... Hmmm...

I guess God really *IS* a Republican!

For those who didn't get to attend Molly Ivins' speech in Eugene last month, it was great! It's nice to hear someone who knows the ins and outs of modern politics, and is willing to tell it like it is.

Afterwards, Angela and I went to her reception and got some books signed (see photo on page 4). She was obviously exhausted from her book tour, but she was still as intelligent and witty as ever.

I tried to thank her properly for her continuing work in the ever-shrinking world of liberal columnists. I hope she understood how much I meant it...

Last but not least, belated congrats to CSS President John Dearing for winning the Salem Humanist of the Year award! Sorry we overlooked this last issue!

Reed Byers

Editor, *Willamette Freethinker*

CSS Meetings and Events

Calendar:

Saturday, Nov 15th 2:00-4:00 CSS regular meeting
Saturday, Dec 20th 1:00-4:00 CSS potluck
Saturday, Jan 17th 2:00-4:00 CSS regular meeting

Regular meeting time:

Third Saturday of each month, from 2:00-4:00 pm.

Regular meeting location:

Corl House (3975 NW Witham Hill Dr, Corvallis).

Reminder:

**Time to renew subscriptions
and CSS membership for 2004!**

See enclosed payment slip and/or
back page for details.



Support CSS: Buy from AMAZON.COM!

If you're planning to shop online at Amazon.com anyway, why not give CSS a share of the profits? It costs you nothing extra, but gives us a helping hand!

Visit our web page at <http://css.peak.org> and click on the Amazon.com button at the bottom of the button bar (left edge of the screen). Then, just shop as usual. Thank you for supporting Freethought in Oregon!

In this issue:

- From the President of CSS p.2
- Voice of an Angel p.4
- The American's Creed p.5
- Wingnut Debate Dictionary p.6
- Can Our Deity Beat Their Deity? p.7
- John Dearing — Salem Humanist of Year p.8

From the President:

My Last Letter to the Corvallis Gazette-Times

Over the years, I've written many letters to newspapers, in support of Humanist ideals. Since I live in Corvallis, Oregon, the paper I've written to most often is "the local rag": the *Corvallis Gazette-Times* (G-T). It appears that this era is over, at least as far as the G-T is concerned. My last letter to them was my last letter; that is, my most recent letter was my final such letter. How did this come about?

Although they've printed most of my letters over the past twenty plus years, it's clear to me that they have disliked those letters of mine that have been critical of religion. For as long as I've read the G-T, it has had a strong, although unpublished, policy of supporting and promoting religion. Every week sees two religion pages, and almost every day has news, "human interest," and even sports articles and photographs favoring religion. No coverage of nontheistic organizations, activities, or individuals ever appears.

An example of this bias: Shortly after moving to Corvallis from Portland, in about 1982, I submitted an "As I See It" column (guest editorial), critical of religion. They refused to print it. I pointed out that their published standards for such columns stated that they favored essays that brought a fresh viewpoint to the pages of the G-T. In the light of their considerable coverage of religion (and complete absence of coverage of nontheistic worldviews or activities), I could imagine no topic that could better meet this ideal. Eventually, after this message was shared with a regional official of the newspaper chain that owns the G-T, they printed the essay.

Another example: After the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the G-T printed articles and letters saying that Islam, like Christianity, is a peace-loving, tolerant religion. I submitted a letter simply quoting the Koran, listing a few of its countless passages that indicate otherwise. Even after I revised the letter to their specifications, they refused to publish it.

A final example: The G-T publishes a weekly Religion page, exclusively filled with fawning articles about religion. A few years ago, I wrote to the editor of that page, and to the general editor, suggesting that they escape this provincialism by expanding the page to include the varieties of nontheistic worldviews. I noted that nonreligious people are a part of this community, and deserve coverage as well. Hence an occasional article about the nonreligious community would be appropriate, adding balance and fairness to their reporting. I suggested they change the name of the page accordingly, to something like "Worldviews," "Lifestances," or at least "Religion and Ethics." I am still waiting for their reply.

On July 28, 2003, I submitted the following letter to the G-T. It was condensed from my August 2003 President's Column, "The Imperial Presidency," which, as I noted

therein, was itself "Condensed and paraphrased from 'A Nation of Victims,' by Renana Brooks (The Nation, June 12, 2003)."

SUBJECT: RESTORE OPTIMISM; RETIRE BUSH

President Bush is a master of negative emotional language as a political tool. He uses dependency-creating language to dominate others, shaming them into submission with the language of contempt and intimidation.

One of his dominating linguistic techniques is empty language: broad statements with so little meaning they are difficult to oppose. His plan to attack Iraq was reduced to: "We will answer every danger and every enemy that threatens the American people."

Another is personalization: focusing the listener's attention on the speaker's personality. He implies that only he is capable of producing results. After 9/11, he said, "I will not yield; I will not rest; I will not relent in waging this struggle.." He substitutes his determination for the nation's. "You" rarely appears in Bush's speeches. "I made up my mind that Saddam needs to go." Such statements were given in lieu of actually presenting a case.

His most frequent linguistic technique is negative framework: instilling the image of a dark, evil and hopeless world. This imparts learned helplessness: the electorate's conviction that it is powerless and that only Bush has the strength to deal with our problems. Hence we must transfer power to him, thus crushing the power of the citizen, Congress, and the Judiciary.

To restore democracy in America (constitutional separation of powers, civil liberties, etc.), we must revitalize the optimism of the electorate. Those opposing Bush in the next presidential election should heed the example of Franklin Roosevelt: against Hoover and the pessimism of the Depression, he said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." This is the key to retiring Bush in 2004.

Unfortunately, in my letter, I failed to credit Ms. Brooks and The Nation as my source. Before noticing this omission, the Opinion Page Editor printed my letter. When this omission was called to her attention by a reader, she called me, and we agreed upon a correction to be printed to credit the source. The matter seemed to be settled.

On August 16, 2003, I submitted the following letter on another subject. I was careful to note the source of my information!

SUBJECT: VATICAN TO BISHOPS: HIDE SEX ABUSE

Roman Catholic bishops are under order to cover up cases of sexual abuse, or risk being excommunicated.

This was reported on the website of The Guardian (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/>). The article is from The Observer (Sunday, Aug. 17), entitled "Vatican told bishops to cover up sex abuse." It reports that "The Observer has obtained a 40-year-old confidential document from the secret Vatican archive which lawyers are calling a 'blueprint for deception and concealment'." It was sent by Pope John XXIII to every Roman Catholic bishop in the world.

The Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales has confirmed the authenticity of the document.

Bishops are to pursue clerical sexual abuse of children "in the most secretive way, restrained by a perpetual silence, and everyone is to observe the strictest secret which is commonly regarded as a secret of the Holy Office, under the penalty of excommunication."

Humanists understand that priests are only human, just like the rest of us, and can make mistakes — even the ghastly act of sexually abusing a child. The crimes of a few priests and bishops, if isolated incidents, do not call for the wholesale condemnation of a church.

But the widespread hiding of the problem of the sexual abuse of children by Roman Catholic clergy does call for such condemnation. The pathological obsession with secrecy in this church needs to end; it has led to the systematic concealment of criminal conduct of the most horrendous kind.

No one — and no organization — should be above the law.

John S. Dearing, President

CORVALLIS SECULAR SOCIETY

Reference: <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,6903,1020400,00.html>

The Salem Statesman-Journal readily published a shorter version of this letter, but the G-T instead replied:

Dear John Dearing,

Because of your recent plagiarism — not mitigated by your disingenuous [*sic*] reaction of "Oh, should I have attributed the letter?" I

regret to tell you that the Gazette-Times will no longer publish letters from you.

Theresa Novak

Gazette-Times opinion page editor

I responded to Ms. Novak <Theresa.Novak@lee.net>, and also to Rob Priewe, Editor <Rob.Priewe@lee.net>, and to Brenda Speth, Publisher <Brenda.Speth@lee.net> as follows:

CENSORSHIP AT THE CORVALLIS GAZETTE-TIMES

You previously published a letter from me that was condensed from a magazine article. My intention was to publicize the viewpoint expressed in the article, while necessarily achieving the brevity required of a letter. Like so many letter writers, I did not claim to have originated the ideas it contained. Unfortunately, I failed to acknowledge in the letter the origin of the material. I later confirmed the source, and expressed regret at my error, suggesting that I will endeavor to not make this mistake again. This should have ended the matter, not started a self-righteous crusade by you to silence me forever.

Like most writers of letters, I am not a professional writer. (I'm a carpenter.) I do not write for pay, for the hope of winning awards, or for college credit. I write to publicize a point of view on issues that matter to me.

Your hysterical response is analogous to executing someone for a misdemeanor. Your excessive "punishment" (banning me for life from the editorial page of the Gazette-Times) is censorship. This is most unprofessional conduct by a self-proclaimed "professional" writer. It appears to me that you have an agenda here: to silence the expression of a general philosophical and political viewpoint which you find odious.

The letter below ["Vatican to Bishops: Hide Sex Abuse," above] meets your guidelines: I expect you to publish it. And I expect you to fairly consider future letters that meet the same standards to which you hold other letter writers.

Ms. Novak's response was:

This is not a decision subject to argument, nor was it made arbitrarily or without discussion.

Clearly, you think taking someone's words as your own is not a big deal.

In the newspaper business, it is a firing offense.

(continued on page 5)

Voice of an Angel

Election season is now upon us! The debates are well under way, and with a little luck we will have a new president next year! As many of you know, I am a Political Science graduate and a political junkie. I'd like to use this column to talk about a subject I have heard brought up a few times, including at the CSS meetings. That is the Electoral College.

Here's a basic idea behind the Electoral College. Each state has a certain number of Electors which is determined by the number of members it has in the House, plus the number of members it has in the Senate, so in Oregon we have seven Electoral votes. With the Electoral College you must get enough support in enough states before you can be elected president. In nearly all states, it's a "winner takes all" system. If you win the popular vote within a state you win that state's electoral votes. The one with the most electoral votes wins the election.

The main question I hear is "I don't even know why we have the Electoral College in the first place" or "Majority rules, why bother with the Electoral College?" To be honest, I am not sure whether the Electoral College is still a good idea or not, but I think we should take a look at why it was created in the first place.

When this country was first formed, the founding fathers set about the arduous task of deciding how to elect a president. Many ideas were tossed about, including election by direct popular vote.

"Direct election was rejected not because the Framers of the Constitution doubted public intelligence but rather because they feared that without sufficient information about candidates from outside their State, people would naturally vote for a "favorite son" from their own State or region. At worst, no president would emerge with a popular majority sufficient to govern the whole country. At best, the choice of president would always be decided by the largest, most populous States with little regard for the smaller ones."

— *The Electoral College*, William C. Kimberling, Deputy Director FEC Office of Election Administration, <http://www.fec.gov/pdf/eleccoll.pdf>

The idea behind the Electoral College is to force a candidate to appeal to the broad based general population. If you want to be President, you have to appeal to votes not only in the big cities, but in the rural areas as well. This forces campaigning all across the country. It would be easy for a popular candidate from New York to spend all their time building up support in the northeast where they are popular. They would eventually win the popular vote and get elected President, but it was feared that the other states would resent this and create problems for the new union.

The original idea behind the Electoral College was to force a candidate to campaign and appeal to the less populated states. As well as force them to get their message out to ALL states and prove they truly appeal and can represent all of them. The problem we face is that as this country aged, technology developed. With the advent of national news organizations, newspapers, television and the Internet, we now have a glut of information. It is now very easy for a candidate to get their message out to everyone, and with the help of the press it's spread to all corners of the country.

So in this modern world, does the Electoral College really do any good? I honestly don't know. I still am a little undecided on the entire issue. I don't believe that most Americans understand the Electoral College, let alone why it was created, and I do think that before we quickly condemn the system we should all understand why it was created in the first place. In the end, I tend to lean towards abolishing the system. It was a good idea in the beginning, but modern technology really makes the Electoral College rather moot.

Angela Byers

CSS Treasurer & Webmaster

Your Humble Editor With His New Best Friend and Personal Confidante, Molly Ivins



The American's Creed

Another Godless Document

by Wayne Everett Orgar, CSS Member

During a recent visit to the Ft. Stevens Military Museum on the Northwestern Oregon coast, I noticed a copy of The American's Creed posted in a display case next to a WWI military uniform. Given the continued attempts by those who distort early American history with the false claim that our country is a nation under God, I thought it would be good to point out yet another significant godless document from American history.

Read the American's Creed and consider the background that follows.

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the People, by the People, for the People; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; A democracy in a republic, a sovereign Nation of many Sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of Freedom, Equality, Justice, and Humanity for which American Patriots sacrificed their Lives and Fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to Love it; to Support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to Respect its Flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

William Tyler Page wrote the Creed in 1917. He did it as an entry in a nationwide contest along with 3,000 other participants. The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York accepted the Creed for the United States and the proceedings were recorded in the Congressional Record, No, 102, April 13, 1918 ⁽¹⁾. The Creed drew from documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Gettysburg Address. The Independence Hall Association, established in 1942 to create the Independence National Historical Park, lists it among the Documents of Freedom ⁽²⁾.

William Page, like many Americans, was undoubtedly a religious man and purportedly wrote the Creed after church one Sunday night ⁽³⁾. He was known to regard the U.S. Flag as a religious symbol as well as a patriotic one. This makes it even more remarkable to note that out of 3,000 entries, the winning entry and the one accepted by the House of Representatives was a statement totally void of the concept of a god.

A creed is a set of beliefs or principles. If William Page, the contestant judges, and the House of Representatives thought that belief in a god was a necessary part of early American political principles, they had a perfect opportunity to assert this in 1918, a time of great domestic and global turmoil. They didn't. As most of you know, it

wasn't until the 1950's that insecure and dogmatic American politicians attached the word "God" to our money, the national motto, and the Pledge of Allegiance as a reaction to communistic statism. Even so, nothing about those politically abusive mistakes allows an unconstitutional support by a government official of any particular god or religious text.

The next time some one tells you that our country is a nation under God, ask them this question. What is there about the phrase, "**Government of the People, by the People, for the People; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed,**" that you don't understand?

References

1. The American's Creed. <http://www.usflag.org/american.creed.html>. Accessed 8/31/2003.
2. Documents of Freedom. The American's Creed. <http://www.ushistory.org/documents/creed.htm>. Accessed 8/31/2003.
3. Fairfax County Chapter NSDAR. History of the American's Creed. <http://www.rootsweb.com/~vafccdar/darcreed.html>. Accessed 8/31/2003.

From the President...

(continued from page 3)

Nobody has sentenced you to death. (Who is being hysterical?) But as a letter writer, you have been fired, which is what would happen to any reporter or editor that stole the words of another and ran them under his or her by-line.

In my, possibly self-serving, view, the G-T took advantage of a mistake I made to ban me from the "public forum" of their letters page. I note that this ban came, not after I submitted a letter without its source specified, but rather after I submitted a well-documented letter that was profoundly and inescapably critical of the Roman Catholic Church.

The reader may disagree with my view, feeling that the ban is appropriate. Regardless, I will continue to write letters to other newspapers. And I hope that members of Corvallis Secular Society, and other fair-minded people, will send more letters to the G-T, to fill in the void and to keep the expression of Humanist ideals appearing on the only page in that newspaper where they are likely to appear.

John Dearing
President of CSS

Wingnut Debate Dictionary

Compiled by “Ethel the Blog” from various contributors

Abridged from full article, located at: <http://www.smirkingchimp.com/article.php?sid=13674&mode=&order=0>

All-or-nothingism: This is when one is mocked because his/her recommended policy does not completely solve some problem.

Audio'reilly: To adjust the sound level relative to the opponent, either electronically or vocally, to make ones argument appear stronger.

Borkellatio: the act of declaring reactionary religious beliefs to be perfectly adequate justification for enacting anti-civil rights laws.

Cableism: An obvious lie repeated so many times it functions as a truth, for the time being.

Cheney's razor (n): a philosophic rule that the most complex explanation of an unknown phenomenon is probably correct.

Clenis Syndrome: An uncontrollable urge to blurt out “Clinton did it!” or “Oh yeah? What about Clinton?” rather than using logic and reason to make one's point.

Coulterintuitive: Making shit up that has nothing to do with the known universe.

Crying Wolfowitz: telling lies to achieve an objective.

DeLaying Tactics: the delaying of bills or issues that will be damaging to the GOP until they can be coopted for political gain or to bash Democrats with when the Republican spin machine gets rolling.

Demagogarrhea: Gut wrenching sickness brought on by hearing RNC talking points spouted by yet another Bush apologist.

Electoralmapism: A curious synaesthetic condition in which the sufferer perceives certain American states as being “red” and others as “blue”, leading to the belief that those living in “red” states are completely virtuous and incapable of sin or misjudgment, while those who live in “blue” states are unspeakably evil.

Elmer Fuddocrats: Candidates, officeholders, and party members who, having the opposition cornered at point-blank range, decide instead to shoot their own party in the face.

Godomy (godomizers, godomizing): Shamelessly and repeatedly invoking God in support of your partisan agenda, and implying that your opponents are less-holy-than-thou.

Limbaughcrisy: loudly denouncing ‘degenerate’ and illegal behavior, which one nevertheless secretly practices.

Newter (var. Newtralize): To restate the position of an opponent, followed immediately by the phrase “The fact of the matter is...” and then your own opinion. Example: “Liberals say they support national security. The fact of the matter is liberals are treasonous scum who should be lined up and slapped.”

O'Reillyus Interruptus (v): being cut off from making a really good point or argument by a radio or cable TV talk show host. Usually involves being loudly shouted down, having one's mic cut (if in a studio), or being “potted down” (if calling in to a radio program). Odds of this happening are greatly increased the closer one gets to the truth.

Powell Movement: When a moderate allows him or herself to be used by conservatives for their own ends. From Colin Powell.

Reagentology: the cult of Ronald Reagan, who was obviously a perfect human being with no character flaws, and the 4th member of the Holy Trinity. Its adherents are known as Reagentologists.

Rush (v): To defend hypocritical right-wingers with logic that appears to be drug-addled

Sacred Cow: Republicans have mastered the art of just designating some subjects as untouchable. Best example in the still (very) recent past... the now cancelled Reagan film. It never mattered whether

anybody saw it. There was never any real discussion about whether it had real objectionable content in it or not. Even discussions about whether it was right for a political party to step in and pressure television producers is off limits. It's wrong to talk about Reagan now (or ever). Whether factual or fictional, unless it is authorized propaganda put out by a trusted GOP functionary. Period. Sacred cow trumps all other arguments.

Scaliosis (n): condition wherein the afflicted develops a preternatural ability to read the minds of Constitutional framers at a remove of over 200 years.

Stepford Democrat (n): Term used for political hack who is Democratic in name, but relentlessly supports the GOP (if a Republican is President) or pushes a corporate and culturally conservative agenda (if a Democrat is President).

Thesaurus Defense: “The president never said it was an imminent threat! He said it was a looming danger!”

Vaccinating: The process of accusing your opponent of doing what you're already doing in an effort to prevent your opponent from being the first to make that accusation.

Godomy (godomizers, godomizing): Shamelessly and repeatedly invoking God in support of your partisan agenda, and implying that your opponents are less holy-than-thou.

Can Our Deity Beat Their Deity?

by Ellen Goodman, Boston Globe, 10/23/2003

http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2003/10/23/can_our_deity_beat_their_deity/

AT FIRST it sounded like satire. My God is bigger than yours? Did General William Boykin actually taunt his Islamic enemy with that muscular divinity?

Not my weapons are bigger than yours. Not my battalions are bigger than yours. My God is bigger. It sounded like some e-mail that got through the morning spam filter: Click here if you want your God to be three inches bigger.

Of course, after the stories he told evangelical churchgoers became public, Boykin apologized in that nonapologetic way to “those who have been offended.” He said, “I am neither a zealot nor an extremist” nor anti-Islam. If he sounded like a religious warrior, it was just a misunderstanding.

But the more you read and heard about the soldier who preached politics in full uniform to religious groups, the less likely you were to misunderstand. This is a man who defined our country as a “Christian nation” fighting “a spiritual enemy that will only be defeated if we come against them in the name of Jesus.” This is the man who said, “The enemy is a guy called Satan.”

The revelation that we had our own holy warrior in the upper reaches of the war on terror was startling enough. The undersecretary in charge of finding Saddam seems to have found . . . Satan. The Pentagon’s man who has yet to locate the caves holding Osama bin Laden nevertheless once identified a dark spot on a Somali map as . . . “the principalities of darkness.” The man in charge of intelligence believes that his commander in chief was “not elected by a majority of the voters . . . he was appointed by God.”

This story broke just days after the Malaysian prime minister, Mahathir Mohamad, offered up some gratuitous anti-Semitism in a speech otherwise chiding his Islamic world. President Bush quickly labeled Mahathir as “wrong and divisive.” But he didn’t utter a harsh word about a wrong and divisive general. Donald Rumsfeld said crisply in the general’s defense, “We’re a free people.” And religious conservatives in Congress began circulating a letter against any action that could “intimidate the free religious exercise of his faith.” They rose to protect Boykin’s religious freedom to denigrate another religion and his First Amendment right to intolerance.

How far we have drifted from the early days after 9/11. In the wake of the terrorist attack by Islamic fanatics, the country was urged to understand that our enemy is fanaticism, not Islam. After a false start, after calling for a

“crusade,” the president made it clear that this is not a religious war. It is, if anything, a struggle between theocrats and democrats, those who believe God is on their side and those who believe God doesn’t take sides.

Of course, there were homegrown zealots even then. Some of our fundamentalists linked arms with Osama’s fundamentalists. Jerry Falwell joined the enemy in blaming Americans — “the pagans and the abortionists and the feminists and the gays and lesbians . . . all of them who have tried to secularize America” — for the fate of the folks buckled into their seats in planes and those who were opening up their coffee cups in the Twin Towers. He said, “I point the finger in their face and say, ‘You helped this happen.’”

But by and large, most Americans recognize that our unity and strength depend on accepting our diversity. Our civic religion of tolerance keeps us strong in the face of intolerance.

Yet we seem to be drifting again into civil skirmishes over religion. Last summer the Ten Commandments judge, Roy Moore, became our own theocrat when he refused to remove the Judeo-Christian symbols he had installed in a secular courthouse. This fall the Pledge of Allegiance came to the Supreme Court for a contentious struggle over whether our schoolchildren can pledge to “one nation under God.”

Do such symbolic wranglings divide us when we need to be united? Is my theism bigger than your Hinduism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, or atheism?

And now Boykin, deputy undersecretary of defense for intelligence, joins Al Qaeda in calling his enemies “Satan.”

I have no doubt that Boykin deserves respect for his military record and freedom for his religious beliefs. I will leave it to the Pentagon investigators to determine whether he’s violated any code.

But for all we talk about the clash of civilizations, we know that the most important global struggle is not between one religion and another but between fanaticism and tolerance — the two principles that cut across all borders and run through every religion. In the long struggle between theocracy and democracy, General Boykin has, I am afraid, thrown his lot in with the enemy.

If Americans are to stand for tolerance, it’s more than a strategic error to say that my God is bigger than yours. It’s a sacrilege to our civic religion.

In the long struggle between theocracy and democracy, General Boykin has, I am afraid, thrown his lot in with the enemy.

John Dearing Awarded “Salem Humanist of the Year”

[Editor's Note: *Congratulations to CSS President John Dearing for winning the Salem Humanist of the Year Award. The following were his brief remarks for the occasion.*]

Thank you, fellow Humanist Association of Salem members!

My family attended the 2003 Annual Meeting of the Humanist Association of Salem on August 23. It was graciously hosted by Steve & Kathy Smits at their lovely country home near Monmouth. There I was surprised and

honored by being awarded this year's SALEM HUMANIST OF THE YEAR award. For once, I was speechless! Now that I have found my voice, I wish to express my deep appreciation for this honor.

This award was previously given to Bill Kidder (1997), Millie Beck (1998), Lloyd Kumley (1999), Eunice Overhulser (2000), Frank & Gennie Burleson (2001), and David Pearl (2002): wonderful Humanists, all.

I will proudly display this award in my home until it is time to present it to next year's awardee.



How to Subscribe:

If you enjoy reading this newsletter, and are concerned about the growing threat to the principle of Separation of Church and State in this country, then please consider joining Corvallis Secular Society, subscribing to this newsletter, or making a donation:

Newsletter subscription: \$18/year (\$1.50/month)

Full CSS membership: \$30/year (\$2.50/month)
(includes newsletter)

You can upgrade at any time from subscription to membership, by just sending in the difference in price.

Memberships and newsletter subscriptions are on a calendar-year basis (i.e. they always expire in December), and we prefer they not be renewed for more than one year at a time. People subscribing mid-year only need to pay for the remaining issues for that year. This is to keep our bookkeeping as simple as possible.

Thank you for supporting our efforts to promote atheism, humanism, and freethought in Oregon's Willamette Valley.

Contacting Us:

President

Use this address for comments or questions about CSS.

Please do NOT send payments here.

John S. Dearing
126 NW 21st St.
Corvallis, OR. 97330
(541) 754-2557
president@css.peak.org

Vice President / Editor

Use this address for newsletter submissions.

Reed H. Byers
3035 SE 24th Ave.
Albany, OR. 97322
(541) 924-9128
editor@css.peak.org

Treasurer / Webmaster

Use this address for membership and subscription payments, or for comments about the CSS web page.

Angela C. Byers
3035 SE 24th Ave.
Albany, OR 97322
(541) 924-9128
webmaster@css.peak.org

Disclaimer: This newsletter contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of humanist, environmental, political, human rights, economic, democracy, scientific, and social justice issues, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material in this newsletter is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml> If you wish to use copyrighted material from this newsletter for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.