

Ethical Record

The Proceedings of the Conway Hall Ethical Society

Vol. 119 No. 5

£1.50

May 2014

THE CREATIONIST ASSAULT ON SCIENCE

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN APES AND MAN

Humans have flat heads and a wide field of view. The forehead is positioned at the head. Ape head vision is more up than flat.

Humans have large semi-circular canals in the inner ear for balance in vertical planes. Ape ear is on all sides.

Humans heads are supported by the spinal fluid below. Ape heads are supported from the back.

Humans backs are upright, flat & strengthened later. Use for carrying objects. Ape backs are like a letter C with their torso in front of their hip. All normally walk & crouched on their knuckles.

Humans have upright hip joints and fully water-tight for walking & standing. Ape hip joints do not fully extend, so always have bent legs, even if standing.

Humans knee joints can extend fully and even lock straight, making standing easy. Ape knee joints do not fully extend, so they must always have bent legs.

Humans have long legs, about that their total body length. Used for walking or running long distances. Ape arms are longer than their legs to allow a hanging movement. If their legs were longer this quadrupedal movement would be hard.

Humans have long arms, about that their total body length. Used for walking or running long distances. Ape arms are longer than their legs to allow a hanging movement. If their legs were longer this quadrupedal movement would be hard.

The human foot is a masterpiece of design with 26 high arches and 26 bones, and tendons and muscles, used for weight bearing and walking and running & balancing on different parts of the foot. Ape, by contrast, have flexible flat-like hands, for grasping branches.

Humans have a uniquely strong big toe, close to the other toes for gripping on foot to the foot in walking and running. Ape has no such strong big toe, there is more a thumb for gripping branches.

Unique human abilities with legs, hands and brains

1. Developed standing for many hours at a time. Ape can only manage a few minutes.
2. Tool making capabilities. (Ape: humans use tools to dig and build, open to their own use and invention)
3. Mobile hand-eye coordination. For accuracy in throwing and catching.
4. Advanced performance ability combined with the use of new tools with. (Use of tools. Man is the most capable of creating and using an ever changing tool)
5. (Use of tools. Man is the most capable of creating and using an ever changing tool)
6. (Use of tools. Man is the most capable of creating and using an ever changing tool)
7. (Use of tools. Man is the most capable of creating and using an ever changing tool)
8. (Use of tools. Man is the most capable of creating and using an ever changing tool)
9. (Use of tools. Man is the most capable of creating and using an ever changing tool)
10. (Use of tools. Man is the most capable of creating and using an ever changing tool)

Unique design features of humans

1. **Facial expressions.** Ape has 40 functional face muscles. Humans have 50 and can make 10,000 facial expressions.
2. **Humans speak 5,000 languages** around the world, with unique larynx, vocal cords, lips and tongue and large brain centre for speech.
3. **Childhood is uniquely long** in humans, allowing huge brain development (4,000 cells per second for first 2 years) with slow body growth.
4. **Unique human sexuality**, provides fertile times throughout the year, and unique breasts for beauty, highly sensitive clitoris (women), and 2x length penis of an ape (men), a unique hymen, hidden ovulation, and ability to mate with total intimacy and remain monogamous for life.
5. **Unique genome.** 23 pairs of chromosomes (humans) 24 pairs (apes). (horses have 32 pairs) Humans have 3 billion nucleotides, apes are 5-10% different, ie 150 million differences.
6. **Humans have a uniquely huge brain.** It is not only more than double the volume (apes have 300cc, humans have 700-2100cc), but the outside (cerebral cortex) is uniquely folded, giving a hugely larger surface area. Human brains have uniquely immense processing speed and can make 1 million million calculations per second. This gives uniquely enormous potential for creativity.
7. **Humans have uniquely varied beauty**, of face and body. The face has rounded features, even teeth and beautiful eyes. The body has wonderful proportions, uniquely placed body hair, fine skin and curved parts.
8. **Humans have a uniquely beautiful voice** with amazing range and control of sounds in speech and singing.
9. **Humans have a uniquely beautiful potential of inner character**, capable of love, kindness, humour, but also capable of terrible anger and hatred.
10. **Humans have a unique capacity to worship God**, or many gods, and to make moral choices of right and wrong, to have great emotional feelings, with the unique ability to cry as well as laugh. Man has been uniquely made in the image of God to rule well over God's world.

Man of the Month is adapted from the book "Origin of Man" by Professor Stuart Newman. Published by Dorling Kindersley. Available on Amazon UK.

Poster displayed at Noah's Ark Zoo Farm, (see page 3)
Image by Pip through Wikipedia Commons

INTELLIGENTLY DESIGNED: THE CREATIONIST ASSAULT ON SCIENCE

Paul S. Braterman

3

THE ETHICS OF NEUROMARKETING ON TERRORISM

David Lewis

10

VIEWPOINTS

Ben Dupré

13

ESSAY - EXISTENCE

Nigel Sinnott, Angela Pinter

16

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

Barbara Smoker

19

20

CONWAY HALL ETHICAL SOCIETY
Conway Hall Humanist Centre
25 Red Lion Square, London WC1R 4RL.
www.conwayhall.org.uk

Chairman: Liz Lutgendorff; **Vice-Chair:** Giles Enders
Treasurer: Carl Harrison; **Editor:** Norman Bacrac

Please email texts and viewpoints for the Editor to: bacrac@fsmail.net

Staff

Chief Executive Officer:	Jim Walsh	Tel: 020 7061 6745	Jim@ethicalsoc.org.uk
Administrator:	Martha Lee	Tel: 020 7061 6741	admin@ethicalsoc.org.uk
Finance Officer:	Linda Lamnica	Tel: 020 7061 6740	finance@ethicalsoc.org.uk
Librarian:	Catherine Broad	Tel: 020 7061 6747	library@ethicalsoc.org.uk
Hon. Archivist:	Carl Harrison		carl@ethicalsoc.org.uk
Programme:	Sid Rodrigues	Tel: 020 7061 6744	sid@ethicalsoc.org.uk
Lettings Officer:	Carina Dvorak	Tel: 020 7061 6750	lettings@ethicalsoc.org.uk
Caretakers:	Eva Aubrechtova (i/c)	Tel: 020 7061 6743	Eva@ethicalsoc.org.uk
<i>together with:</i>	Brian Biagioni, Sean Foley, Tony Fraser, Rogerio Retuerma		
Maintenance:	Zia Hameed / Chey Green	Tel: 020 7061 6742	Zia@ethicalsoc.org.uk

THE HUMANIST LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES

The Library has an extensive collection of new and historic freethought material.

Members are able to borrow books from the Library. Readers will be asked to complete a Reader Registration Form, and must provide photographic ID, proof of address and proof of membership. They will be issued with a Reader's card, which will enable them to borrow three books at a time. The loan period is one month. Journals, archive material, artworks and other non-book material cannot be borrowed. Full details of the lending service are available from the Librarian

The Library is open to the public Sunday to Thursday, 1000 - 1700. When evening courses are running, the Library will remain open in the evenings until the start of the classes. The Library will be closed on Fridays. Check the website for details or contact the Librarian.

Cathy Broad, Librarian

Tel: 020 7061 6747. Email: library@ethicalsoc.org.uk

If you have any suggestions for speakers (their contact details are required) or event ideas, or would like to convene a Sunday afternoon informal, get in touch with Sid Rodrigues at programme@ethicalsoc.org.uk or 020 7061 6744.

CONWAY HALL ETHICAL SOCIETY

Reg. Charity No. 251396

Founded in 1793, the Society is a progressive movement whose aims are:

the study and dissemination of ethical principles based on humanism and freethought
the cultivation of a rational and humane way of life, and
the advancement of research and education in relevant fields.

We invite to membership those who reject supernatural creeds and are in sympathy with our aims. At Conway Hall the programme includes Sunday lectures, discussions, evening courses and the Conway Hall Sunday Concerts of chamber music. The Society maintains a Humanist Library and Archives. The Society's journal, *Ethical Record*, is issued monthly. Memorial meetings may be arranged.

The annual subscription is £35 (£25 if a full-time student, unwaged or over 65)

INTELLIGENTLY DESIGNED: THE CREATIONIST ASSAULT ON SCIENCE

Paul S. Braterman

Professor Emeritus, University of North Texas

Lecture to the Ethical Society, 16 March 2014

Before anything else, a plea for action. Please write to your MP in support of the BHA campaign to combat Creationism, including Creationism in publicly funded schools; details at <http://campaign.publicaffairsbriefing.co.uk> In a sense, the rest of this article, like the talk it is based on, is an explanation of why, shockingly, such action is necessary.

Next, let me describe some recent events. Noah's Ark Zoo Farm, near Bristol, which claims to be visited by 15,000 schoolchildren annually, displays posters arguing that apes and humans are too distinct to share a common ancestor, and suggesting how the different kinds of animal could have been housed in the Ark, which it regards as historical. The giraffes, for instance, would have been housed in the highest part of the vessel, next to the T. Rex.

This Zoo Farm recently received an award from the Council for Learning Outside the Curriculum, which justified itself by saying "CLOtC believes that an important aim of learning outside the classroom is allowing children and young people access to education that challenges assumptions and allows them to experience a range of viewpoints; giving them the tools needed to be proactive in their own learning and develop skills to enable them to make well informed decisions." Connoisseurs of creationism will recognise this as a variant of the 'teach the controversy' argument, which advocates presenting creationism and real science as alternatives both worthy of consideration, and inviting uninformed schoolchildren to choose between them.

Copies of a book called *Truth be Told; Exposing the Myths of Evolution* were given out last September in a school assembly at a non-denominational primary school in East Kilbride, near Glasgow. This book not only claims that Noah's Ark is historically correct, but has pictures of people using dinosaurs as beasts of burden, and suggests that their extinction may have been the work of Nimrod, the mighty hunter. Subsequent investigation showed that the school chaplain handing out this book was connected to an extreme sect, Churches of Christ, based in Alabama, and that he had been active in the school for eight years, during which he had advised, not only on Religious Observance, but on Religious Education, which according to Scottish educational policy should be informative and non-confessional.

Yesodey Hatorah (Haredi Jewish) Senior Girls School blacked out questions about evolution on pupils' science exams in 2013. One wonders how this was even possible, given that exam papers are supposed to be sealed until opened at the specified time in the presence of the pupils. However, when the relevant Examination Board, OCR, investigated, they were satisfied that no students had received an unfair advantage*, and took no action.

The Board now tells Ofqual, the government agency responsible for the integrity

of examinations, that it intends “to come to an agreement with the centres concerned which will protect the future integrity of our examinations – by stipulating how, when and where the redactions take place – but at the same time respect their need to do this in view of their religious beliefs.” And OCR’s chief executive says the case has “significantly wider implications and could apply to other faith schools”.

Yesodey Hatorah is a Voluntary Aided school and as such will have to teach evolution when it becomes part of the National Curriculum in 2014. However, it would not have to if it were to change its status to Academy or Free School. The Government assures us that this freedom from the Curriculum is not a problem, because all schools need to prepare for external exams, and these exams, of course, include evolution - exams which the schools have now been invited to censor.

In all these cases, the actual offence is compounded by official complacency or collusion. I can only guess at why is this allowed to happen, but among relevant factors may be official concern with procedures rather than outcomes, scientific illiteracy among decision-makers, free market forces (the exam boards, after all, are competing for the schools’ business), misplaced respect for differences, the fact that religious zealots form an organised political pressure group, and the reluctance of their reality-orientated co-religionists to condemn them. Ironically, these co-religionists have even more to lose than the rest of us here, as their schools are subverted from inside, and their faith brought into disrepute.

Creationism is Part of the Higher Lunacy

Nonetheless we need to study it. Knowing your enemy is sound tactics, and we can actually learn from examining both their strategies and their arguments. A commentator on *The Art of War* enjoins us to build our enemy a golden bridge to retreat across, and I will return to how we can possibly do this for creationists. The obvious response to creationism is to dismiss it as the product of ignorance. This, however, merely restates the problem: why do people choose to be ignorant about evolution? And how should we respond?

* Redactions have now been disallowed. {Ed.}

Creationist motivation is almost invariably religious. On the surface, it is driven by respect for the holy text seen as God’s word, but it goes deeper than that. To quote Jason Rosenhouse, mathematician and philosopher, who has attended creationist conferences, “[I]t is a mistake in my view to think that anti-evolutionism is primarily about an idiosyncratic interpretation the Bible clung to by a handful of extremists. Of far greater concern are the implications of evolution for human significance, the cruelty of the evolutionary process, and the demise of the traditional design argument.” In other words, creationism is not a matter of stupidity, or even of biblical literalism, but a failure of nerve.

There are many varieties of creationism. The most virulent is Young Earth creationism, which bases itself on biblical literalism. Closely related is Old Earth creationism, which attempts to reconcile the biblical account with reality by treating the ‘days’ of creation as indefinite periods of time, while retaining the crucial concept of separate creation. We also have Intelligent Design (more

on this below); Epistemological Creationism, which maintains that our minds are so wonderful and rational that they could not be the mere result of natural selection; God of the Whole Creationism, the mostly harmless doctrine that God is responsible for the existence of the universe and its laws; Deconstructionist Creationism, which is part of the Higher Lunacy that regards scientific knowledge as no more than a sociological construct, and various other weird outliers. Individual creationists often move between these, making rational discussion difficult.

A Mid-20th-century Heresy

Creationism in its current form is a mid-20th-century heresy, although it has much deeper roots. *The Genesis Flood*, 1961, is its foundation document. This book builds on 7th Day Adventist precursors, and one of the authors was himself an Adventist minister. The name of the publisher, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., looks back to 17th-century Calvinist fundamentalism, while the book itself anticipates many current creationist and ID arguments.

Creation Science invites you into an alternative Universe, where the biblical ‘waters above the firmament’ and ‘fountains of the great deep’ supplied the waters for the Flood, geological sediments and the deep ocean basins, are results of the Flood. So is the fossil record – spare a thought for the poor drowned dinosaurs! The sediments of the Grand Canyon were deposited in the Flood, while the Canyon itself was carved by its receding waters. Radiometric dating of these sediments is not to be trusted, because different methods give different results. Plate tectonics was not widely known in 1961, but more recent creationist works explain that this, also, was a result of the Flood. This answers a question that has troubled many people; how did the kangaroos get from Mount Ararat to Australia? My own contribution to creation science is to suggest that they just hopped onto a passing plate.

Biological structures, in Creation Science land, are so intricately improbable that they could not be the products of evolution. Intelligent Design (ID) is an attempt to make creationism intellectually respectable. It hinges on the claim that biological complexity could not have arisen without a designer, and is also now extended to the laws of nature (fine tuning argument) and the facts of astronomy (the increasingly implausible claim that we live on a privileged planet). Its adherents almost invariably believe in Old Earth or Young Earth creationism, but do not advertise the fact, and I recommend that they should always be asked whether they accept the fact of common descent, and what age they assign to the Earth. I classify ID as a variety of Creationism, because it rejects evolution as source of novelty, is almost always linked to denial of common descent, and argues from the appearance of design to the existence of a designer. Furthermore, its advocates give no explanation of how design becomes embodied, and show no awareness that such explanation is needed; this betrays their unconscious assumption that the designer has supernatural powers. Historically, ID is simply a relabelling of Creation Science, a fact established in court in the US (*Kitzmiller vs Dover School Board*), in a judgement so persuasive that it is unlikely to be challenged, unless and until the US Supreme Court has a majority sympathetic to creationism.

Creationists are of course aware that the scientific establishment accepts evolution, and infer that the scientific establishment is either misguided or perverted. To quote a school textbook from the creationist Bob Jones University, “Satan wants people to believe in evolution.... He keeps a belief in evolution popular because they can use it to [lure] the people away from God.”

There are a handful of standard Creationist arguments. Evolution can't explain, for example, the origins of life or indeed the origins of the universe (this is like arguing against accepting chemistry because, prior to the 1950s at any rate, we could not explain the origin of atoms). There are alleged gaps in fossil record, and new discoveries are ignored because either (a) they are so close to what is already known that they can be neglected, or (b) they are different from what is already known, leaving us with even more unexplained gaps, or (c) both. Much play is made on the complexity and *a priori* improbability of biological structures, some of which are alleged, in the face of the evidence, to be irreducibly complex. Informative anomalies are paraded as fatal objections (as in the case of radiometric dating; see above), and the laws of thermodynamics are misconstrued, misused, and misapplied to bolster the claim that evolution cannot be the source of novel function.

One Argument Worthy of Discussion

There is one creationist argument that is, I think, worthy of discussion; where does the information come from? Creationists are at great pains to point out that random change cannot generate meaning, and that selection cannot generate novelty. For me, this actually highlights the mechanism of evolution. Randomness (as in mutation) is the source of novelty, but it is the subsequent operation of natural selection that selects for meaning. The information comes, ultimately, from the fitness landscape.

Creationist tactics include infiltration of schools and Churches, quote mining and quote mangling, other forms of misrepresentation, concealing their own identity and agenda, extreme cherry picking (they talk about Piltdown man, not Ardipithecus), fake philosophy about the nature of science (discounting the history of life because it cannot be replicated in laboratory), absurd straw man versions of standard biology, and, most recently, mimicry. Thus the Seattle-based Discovery Institute (DI), dedicated to Intelligent Design, calls its anti-evolution website *Evolution News and Views*. Stephen Meyer, senior DI Fellow, is the author of *Signature in the Cell* and *Darwin's Doubt*, weighty tomes with an appearance of erudition that succeed in impressing those with no knowledge of the relevant science, and of an imitation textbook *Explore Evolution*, which misrepresents the very interconnectedness of life as evidence for separate creation.

Truth in Science, a UK group responsible for distributing *Explore Evolution* to every secondary school library in the UK, claims to be an educational group, although in their foundation document they describe themselves as a Creation group, working for God's glory. The Discovery Institute, who claim that their concern is purely with science, are pursuing what they themselves call a wedge strategy, whose aim is “to replace naturalistic explanation with the theistic understanding that nature and human beings are created by God.” The DI forms

'broad tent' alliances including Old Earth, Young Earth creationists and design theorists. These are behind the largely successful 'teach the controversy' campaign in the US, have a reactionary political as well as theological agenda, and are funded by evangelical Christian donors.

No Cause for Complacency

The situation in United Kingdom is no cause for complacency. When asked in October 2009, 54% agreed that 'Evolutionary theories should be taught in science lessons in schools together with other possible perspectives, such as intelligent design and creationism.' This is probably less worrying than it sounds, since the question will suggest to an uninformed person that these other perspectives merit consideration, but nonetheless the response shows ignorance and vulnerability.

There is supposedly clear guidance for state-funded schools in England. Michael Gove, Education Secretary, declared himself (see *Guardian* 21 March, 2011) "Crystal clear that teaching creationism is at odds with scientific fact", and official guidance to Free School applicants states "We would expect to see evolution and its foundation topics fully included in any science curriculum. We do not expect creationism, intelligent design and similar ideas to be taught as valid scientific theories in any state funded school." The reality however is that what are clearly creationist establishments do get government funding. Creationist preschools, to which the guidance does not apply, openly teach rigid biblical creationism along with even more rigid gender roles (see <http://leavingfundamentalism.wordpress.com/2014/03/24/tax-funded-sexism/>). In addition, a number of Academies and Free Schools have been licensed despite clear warning signals. Grindon Hall Christian School, formerly private, was licensed to receive public funding in 2012, despite a record of teaching creationism, and a website Creation Policy, hastily deleted after it received public attention, which stated "We will teach creation as a scientific theory".

Newark School of Enterprise, licensed and expected to open in 2014, is a thinly disguised relabelling of Everyday Champions Church School, which was originally denied licensing because of its obvious links to a creationist church. Ibrahim Hewitt, of the Association of Muslim Schools, has said that his members' schools, including six state-funded ones, taught children about Darwin, because they had to, but they also taught a different, Koranic view, and the ill-fated al-Madinah School originally specified 'Darwinism' as un-Koranic on its website.

In the private sector, we have Christian Schools Trust (CST), with 42 schools. Some of these are applying for Free Schools status, so far unsuccessfully, but Tyndale Community School, which has been approved, is run by Oxfordshire Community Churches which also runs the CST Kings School in Whitney. CST schools teach Genesis as historical fact, with the Fall as the source of all evil, and discuss evolution in such a way as to make it seem incredible. According to the Ph.D. thesis of Sylvia Baker, founder of CST, 75% of students end up believing in Noah's ark. Dr Baker is also directly linked to Genesis Agendum, a Creation Science website, and language in her style appears in the WorldAroundUs 'virtual museum', which claims to show that evolution and old

Earth geology are outdated scientific paradigms in the process of crumbling. Since 2008, CST and the Association of Muslim Schools have shared their own special inspectorate, of which Sylvia Baker is a board member. The fox not only runs the hen house, but is called on to evaluate it.

In an even grosser scandal, NARIC, the National Academic Recognition Information Centre, which is responsible for providing information on qualifications on behalf of the UK Government, has approved the ICCE advanced certificate, based on Accelerated Creation Education (ACE), as equivalent to A-level. ACE has claimed, and in the US still does claim, that Nessie is evidence for a persistence of dinosaurs, and teaches that evolution has been proven false, and that those who accept its “impossible claims” do so in order to reject God. This in a text that prepares students for a certificate that NARIC would have us accept as preparation for the study of biology at university.

How Should we Respond?

The British Centre for Science Education (website at <http://www.bcseweb.org.uk/>) has prepared critiques of specific creationist literature, such as *Explore Evolution*, and the World AboutUs website. Specific instances in schools should be discussed with the Head Teacher, and if necessary with the regional science adviser (please also inform BCSE and BHA). There is need for coordinated public pressure, through teachers’ organisations, other educational bodies and learned societies, publicity and protests after specific cases revealed, and campaigns such as the BHA letter-writing campaign that I commended in the opening paragraph.

In the broader arena, sneering is deservedly futile, while simply ignoring is to play the ostrich. I do not favour debating young earth creationists, since it merely increases their visibility and resolution, although there may be some limited value in debating Intelligent Design creationists, in order to show to show that ID is scientifically empty. Creationism is yet another reason to oppose the setting up of denominational schools.

I am convinced that we should for both tactical and logical reasons keep the science separate from issues of religious identity. Committed believers, such as Ken Miller and the late Stephen Jay Gould in the US, have proved valuable allies, and we should welcome support from religious bodies. After all, the Vatican has accepted the material fact of evolution, while the Church of England has gone so far as to issue a formal apology for having been beastly to Darwin. There is an entire school of theology known as Evolution Theology, and an international movement to celebrate Evolution Weekend at the time closest to Darwin’s birthday. To me, and I imagine most readers, believers face enormous problems, whether or not they except evolution, but they are *their* problems, not ours, and it is not our place to tell them how to deal with them.

Darwin’s View

Let me cite Charles Darwin’s letter to Edward Aveling in support: “[I]t appears to me ... that direct arguments against Christianity and theism produce hardly any effect on the public; and freedom of thought is best promoted by the gradual illumination of men’s minds, which follow[s] from the advance of Science.”

The other thing we should do is write. Write to newspapers, use social media, and write about evolution and creationism in our blogs and in more formal ways (my current writing project is directed at helping schoolteachers deal with creationism). When the occasion arises, we should seize the opportunity to write to schools and local education authorities, and to use Freedom of Information requests when appropriate.

We must become recognised as a constituency, not necessarily in any formal sense, but in the sense that politicians are aware of the depth of our concerns. Numbers are increasingly on our side, since young people are more sceptical than their elders, and Humanists, secularists, sceptics, and even geeks are our natural allies. And so, on this issue, are liberal-minded believers from all faiths.

In conclusion, I would say that creationism is driven by the search for personal identity, which goes even deeper than belief. So this debate will not end any time soon, and we will need to keep up the pressure. On this issue at any rate, we should embrace as allies all who accept the central scientific facts, including (to return to an earlier metaphor) those who retain a bridge to faith, and use reality itself as our wedge.

EXAM BOARDS TO DISALLOW CREATIONIST TAMPERING WITH GCSEs

Oxford-Cambridge-RSA Examination Board has reversed its earlier policy of allowing schools to censor its questions because of their religious beliefs, a policy which was condemned in the March 2014 Ethical Record Editorial. The Board said: “ We have now been able to consider our position and have concluded that as a matter of policy, schools should not be permitted to tamper with question papers prior to a student sitting an exam .”

For more on the issues discussed here, see my website, <http://www.paulbraterman.wordpress.com> If you have information about specific incidents, please contact me at psbraterman@yahoo.com, and the BHA through their website, or at richy@humanism.org.uk.

The Philosophical Society of England
<http://www.philsoc.co.uk>
Registered Charity Number: 1140044

NARNIAN EDUCATION: WHAT WOULD C.S. LEWIS THINK OF 21ST CENTURY SCHOOLING?

Dr. Mark Pike

Mark Pike, Associate Professor in the School of Education, is author of *Mere Education: C.S. Lewis as Teacher for our Time*. He will talk about C.S. Lewis and his views on Education. Lewis was the author of the Narnia books, of which the best known is *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*.

2.30pm Saturday 17 May 2014 Admission free, All welcome
At Conway Hall, 25 Red Lion Square, Holborn WC1R 4RL

THE ETHICS OF NEUROMARKETING

David Lewis

Author of *The Brain Sell: When Science Meets Shopping* (Nicholas Brealey)
Lecture to the Ethical Society, 6 April 2014

Over a six week period in the summer of 1957, some fifty thousand Americans apparently fell victims to mind control. When news broke, the public was outraged and the media hysterical. Yet the ‘experiment’ at the heart of this controversy never took place. During the summer of 1957, a cinema in Fort Lee, New Jersey, was showing *Picnic* starring William Holden and Kim Novak. What audiences, who packed the theatre’s 2,500 seat auditorium, did not know was that James McDonald Vicary, a 42-year-old market researcher was, or so he would subsequently claim, using them as unwitting lab rats.

A Buy-Button in Your Brain?

At a press conference he had called, Vicary described how he had installed a device in the projection booth which, every five seconds, flashed two advertising messages onto the screen. One read ‘THIRSTY DRINK COCA-COLA’ and the other ‘HUNGRY? EAT POPCORN’. Because each appeared for only 3 milliseconds no one in the audience was consciously aware of them. Despite this, Vicary claimed, sales of Coca-Cola had increased by 18.1 % and popcorn by 58%.

“This innocent little technique,” he boasted “is going to sell a hell of a lot of goods.” Perhaps fearful of missing out on the next ‘big thing’, advertising agencies besieged his offices, offering contracts and retainers which, according to some reports, amounted to \$4.5 million, or around \$22.5 million at today’s value. But even as the ink was drying on the contracts, hostility to subliminal advertising was mounting.

One journalist described subliminal advertising as “...the most alarming and outrageous discovery since Mr. Gatling invented his gun” (1) while *Saturday Review* editor Norman Cousins ended an article, entitled *Smudging the Subconscious*, by urging the authorities “to take this invention and everything connected to it and attach it to the centre of the next nuclear explosive scheduled for testing.” (2)

In less than twelve months subliminal advertising was transformed from a technique for selling products to one with the potential to manipulate minds and undermine democracies. Contracts were torn up, the process made illegal and James Vicary disappeared from New York without leaving a forwarding address. In 1963 he resurfaced to admit to an advertising magazine that the ‘experiment’ had never taken place. It was all a PR stunt aimed at saving his near bankrupt business!

I have described this ‘experiment’ and the reactions it provoked in some detail, because the evidence suggests that Vicary’s fantasy of covertly influencing public minds might very soon become a reality. Indeed that reality could even already be here. By using brain imaging techniques to explore the consumers’ subconscious thoughts and emotions, neuromarketing companies are seeking to

develop commercial messages fine-tuned to be maximally persuasive. The unanswered question is whether they are also developing ways of influencing the buying decisions of shoppers without their ever being aware of the fact.

The Birth of Neuromarketing

The term Neuromarketing was coined by Professor Al Schmidt of Rotterdam University, in 2002. Shortly after, commercial interest in this new type of market research exploded. Millions of dollars were invested in setting up ‘neuromarketing’ laboratories around the world, major multi-national organisations fell over each other to get involved and new companies sprang up offering ‘brain-based’ insights about consumer preferences.

These were, they claimed, far superior to all other market research techniques because, by directly peering into a consumer’s brain they could far more precisely predict buying behaviour. Neuromarketing, therefore, purports to provide ostensibly superior information to that obtained by traditional means, such as surveys and focus groups, about consumer preferences.

Initially such claims were treated with scepticism by neuroscientists who alleged that much of what was being claimed was mere hype. A 2004 editorial in *Nature Neuroscience*, for example, described neuromarketing as ‘little more than a new fad, exploited by scientists and marketing consultants to blind corporate clients with science.’ (3) It was alleged those companies were offering little more than snake oil to clients who didn’t properly understand what they were buying. “They operate on the greater fool principle”, a neuroscience colleague told me in 2003. “They assume their customers to be greater fools than they are.” If this were still the case there would be no grounds for concern. However, recent advances in our understanding of brain function and the ways in which it can be imaged now cause many in the neuroscience community to revise their opinion.

The Technology of Neuromarketing

Although other techniques for exploring the unconscious mind have been developed and while, in my view, the mining of Big Data poses a greater threat to personal privacy and freedom of choice, it is the two most frequently used forms of technology EEG and fMRI which still arouse the greatest concerns.

EEG involves attaching electrodes to the scalp of volunteers and recording changes in the brain’s electrical activity while that person is, for example, watching TV advertisements, studying packaging designs or shopping in supermarkets. By analysing the patterns it is possible to learn a great deal about the attention paid to each scene, how memorable they are and whether they generated positive or negative emotional valance.

During an fMRI scan the blood flow in the brain is detected. Since regions working the hardest require additional supplies of oxygen and therefore an increase in blood supply, this provides insights into cerebral function. If, for example, more blood is sent to the region responsible for consolidating short-term memory (the hippocampus) it suggests the product or commercial being viewed is likely to stick in the mind.

The Ethics of Brain Imaging

Both EEG and fMRI raise ethical issues which fall into two main categories:

- (1) The protection of those who may be harmed or exploited by the research, marketing, and deployment of neuromarketing.
- (2) The protection of consumer autonomy.

When it comes to protecting those involved in neuromarketing studies, one cause for concern are so-called ‘incidental’ findings, which can affect up to 6% of participants. Suppose, for example, that while scanning the brain of a subject taking part in market research the operator notices an anomaly. Could it be a tumour? Unless he or she is a medical doctor or a qualified radiologist – which in my experience they seldom are – what should the company do? Does it have a responsibility to inform the subject, possibly scaring the life out of him or her for what may well be a false positive (i.e. no pathology exists), or to remain silent?

Stealth Neuromarketing

Because neuromarketing companies and their clients, perhaps unsurprisingly, shroud their findings in commercial confidentiality it is impossible to know whether or not brain imaging has resulted in any new and uniquely powerful methods for influencing the buying public. Have they, in short, discovered what might be called a ‘buy button’ in the brain? My guess is that, at least at the time of writing, they have not. It would, however, be overly complacent to believe this situation will continue. Especially since recent studies have demonstrated Vicary’s dream of subliminally influencing choices was no fantasy.

In a study (4) conducted by Johan C. Karremans and his colleagues at the Department of Social Psychology at Radboud University, Nijmegen, participants watched a string of capital letters moving rapidly across a computer screen. Occasionally a lower-case letter appeared and their task was to notice this change. The task finished, they were asked to suck a salty sweet called a *dropje*. Finally, each was offered a choice of Lipton Ice tea or a mineral water to quench their thirst. Unbeknown to them, while watching the strings of letters, the words Lipton Ice had been flashed onto the screen for 23 milliseconds. Too rapid to be consciously perceived, this brief exposure proved sufficient to cause a majority of those exposed to the message to choose the tea over the water.

Will Voluntary Regulation be Effective?

In the past few years many neuromarketing companies, recognising these concerns, have formed an association and established regulations to address such ethical worries. While welcome, only time will tell whether a voluntary code will prove any more effective in controlling neuromarketing than it did with newspapers.

“We have lots of choices or do we?” asks Erika Rosenberg, in *Mindfulness and Consumerism*. “What and how much we consume stems more from unconscious choices than from mindful deliberation. Advertising capitalises on this automaticity to exploit the insatiable need for fulfilment that burdens many modern humans in industrialised countries.” (5)

But, as I explain in my book, perhaps the most effective form of defence for consumers is to follow the ancient maxim *Caveat emptor*. Not so much as ‘let the buyer beware’ as ‘let the buyer *be* aware.’ For it is only through a recognition of the power and reach of the persuasion industry that customers will be able to recognise and resist the myriad neuroscience techniques that now confront them in the brave new world of the ultimate brain sell.

References

- (1) *Nation* (1957), p.206.
- (2) Cousins, N. (1957) *Smudging the Subconscious*, Saturday Review, p20 – 40.
- (3) Brain scam? (2004) *Nature Neuroscience* 7 (7) p 683.
- (4) Karremans, J. C., Stroebe, W. & Claus, J. (2006) Beyond Vicary’s fantasies: The impact of subliminal priming and brand choice, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 42, pp 792–798.
- (5) Rosenberg, E. L. (2004) Mindfulness and consumerism. In Kasser, Tim (Ed); Kanner, Allen D. (Ed), *Psychology and consumer culture: The struggle for a good life in a materialistic world*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 107-125.

ON TERRORISM

An extract from the book 50 Ethics Ideas by Ben Dupré (Quercus 2013)

‘One man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.’ It may be something of a cliché, but there is an important grain of truth in this saying. Today, the word ‘terrorism’ always has a strongly negative meaning: nobody uses the word of themselves or their own actions. A state tends to see any violence directed against itself, except violence that comes from another state, as terroristic, while it portrays its own actions as legitimate acts of war or defence against its enemies. These enemies, on the other hand, see themselves as warriors, sometimes even martyrs, fighting in a just cause, struggling for liberation against the oppression of what they regard as an illegitimate government.

When the term is loaded in this way, debate over the ethics of terrorism is fruitless. A terrorist action is wrong by definition, merely by virtue of being described as such. This is not to say that it is a purely semantic issue and therefore doesn’t matter: sometimes it is vital to win the war of words – to win over the ‘hearts and minds’ of participants and observers alike. Yet we need to get beyond the semantic impasse if we are to say anything interesting, ethically, about the concept of terrorism.

The state calls a given act an illicit act of terrorism; the perpetrators of the act call it a legitimate act of political violence. The state’s understanding of itself implicit here is in accord with the influential view of the German sociologist Max Weber, who suggested that the defining characteristic of the state was its claimed ‘monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force’: the exclusive right, in other words, to make laws within its territory and to use violence, actual or threatened, to force compliance with those laws. The perpetrators of violence against a particular state might, indeed, accept this definition; they contend, however, that the state which they oppose has, for some reason, forfeited its rights as a state and is therefore a legitimate target of violence.

On both sides, then, there is agreement that terrorism involves violence. And there is more common ground: this violence is carried out with the specific intention of creating terror – using intimidation to achieve some further political goal. Broadly, the two parties agree on what is done (violence) and why it is done (to intimidate). The chief point of difference is the legitimacy of the goal, and it is this that determines whether a particular act of violence is labelled as terrorism or political violence.

Targeting the Innocent

Acts that are commonly called acts of terrorism can take many different forms. Consider the following two scenarios:

1 Clandestine organization A, fighting for liberation from a colonial power, plants a bomb in the governor's residence; it explodes and kills the governor and a number of government officials.

2 Clandestine organization B, also fighting for liberation, plants a bomb in a popular tourist hotel, killing a random selection of foreign visitors, indigenous hotel workers and others.

Would we describe both of these scenarios as terrorist attacks? Perhaps, but they clearly have a very different complexion.

Targeting members of the government, as in the first scenario, might have some intimidatory value, but it could perhaps be better described as a focused attempt to weaken the government by eliminating key personnel. The colonial power would doubtless present the attack as terroristic, but the perpetrators themselves would regard their victims as legitimate targets – as official representatives of what they see as an illegitimate regime – and would probably describe their operation as an assassination rather than an act of terrorism.

In the second scenario the situation is very different. Crucially, the victims are selected or targeted only in the vaguest sense: an impartial view would be that they are innocent bystanders or non-combatants, with no (clear or direct) responsibility for the grievances that motivate the bombers. And the objective of the attack is very diffuse. The aims probably include demonstrating the organization's power to inflict harm and the government's inability to prevent it; undermining the country's economy by deterring tourists, foreign investors, etc; intimidating and destabilizing, in a completely unfocused manner, the ruling regime. Nobody, except presumably the perpetrators themselves, would describe the operation as anything other than an act of terrorism.

Is Terrorism ever Justified?

From an ethical standpoint, it makes a great deal of difference if both the scenarios sketched above are seen as terrorist attacks, or just the second. It is commonly claimed by perpetrators of such attacks that their victims are in some way complicit in causing the grievances that provide the broad justification for their actions. Such a claim is highly plausible in the first scenario, the bombing of the governor's residence, but much less so in the second, the attack on the hotel. Following the 9/11 attacks on the United States, the al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden claimed that all Americans were responsible for atrocities

committed against Muslims, on the grounds that they were collectively responsible for electing the government, paying taxes, etc. The idea that paying money (often grudgingly) to the Internal Revenue Service is sufficient grounds for being incinerated in aviation fuel is grotesque in itself – to say nothing of the many people (including babies) who do not vote or pay taxes.

Complicity, then, looks like a plausible justification for attacks that target those who are genuinely complicit – though there are doubts whether such attacks are best described as terroristic. But it takes a very far-fetched view of collective responsibility for complicity to justify the kind of random attacks that generally result in the death and maiming of those who would normally be considered innocent non-combatants. Are there any better justifications?

An ethical consequentialist – one who judges the rightness and wrongness of actions purely on the basis of their consequences – would regard a terrorist attack on non-combatants as justified if it resulted in a sufficiently large benefit, all things considered. This qualification is important, for among the things considered should be whether this benefit could be achieved in a less morally repugnant manner (for instance, by targeting those who *are* complicit in some way). Many would say that there must *always* be a better way than taking the lives of innocents, and that weighing up the pros and cons, in the consequentialist manner, is not the right way to reach a verdict in such cases. Thus the issue of terrorism resolves itself, once again, into the intractable conflict in ethics between ends and means.

Sacrifice on the altar of extremism

Terrorists tend to be driven by extreme views, perhaps because it is only such people who can contemplate ‘sacrificing’ innocent lives in pursuit of a greater goal. At the turn of the twentieth century an extreme doctrine known as revolutionary anarchism spread bloody mayhem across Europe and North America. Its adherents held that the impact of the state on its citizens was so dire that it warranted forcible removal, by any means including violence. The underlying idea was that new life emerged from annihilation, or, as the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin portentously put it, ‘the urge for destruction is also a creative urge’.

The upshot was a spate of terrorist attacks on high-profile leaders and politicians, including kings, presidents and prime ministers, whose assassinations were intended to highlight the vulnerability of the state and so to inspire the masses to revolution. At the turn of the twenty-first century the 9/11 attacks on the United States were the worst (though not the first) manifestations of a new brand of terrorism marked by religious fanaticism. Accountable only to God, these ‘new’ terrorists, most notably the Islamist group al-Qaeda, were quite willing to sacrifice their own lives in order to maximize the deaths of their enemies, including non-combatants. As such they remained (and remain) incomprehensible to their enemies, presenting a threat that has not yet been fully understood, let alone adequately countered.

The views expressed in this Journal are not necessarily those of the Society.

VIEWPOINTS

The Role of Volunteers in Freethought Organisations

I am uneasy about aspects of Alex Gabriel's *Godless and Broke*. . (ER April: p. 22). I certainly agree with some of it, like "Remember poor people", "Don't charge prohibitive entry fees" and "Don't just hire graduates" but in other respects I feel that the talk, although delivered to a London audience, was really composed with the United States in mind. A lot of it does not seem appropriate for freethought in Britain, and even less so in Australia.

While not paying young 'interns' sounds unethical, I suspect most freethought bodies in Britain, especially local ones, are run entirely by volunteers, usually retired people. As for "Pay your speakers well", well, I find that rather naive. I have almost never been paid for speaking, and have not expected to be. It has been my way of 'putting in' to the movement; though I have been offered travel expenses when appropriate. I have also been happy to write for magazines that do not pay contributors.

As far as I know almost all freethought bodies in Australia are run by volunteers, even the Council of Australian Humanist Societies. The Australian Skeptics have only one employee, the journal editor. The Melbourne Unitarian Church (a near-analogue of C.H.E.S.) has a paid office assistant, pays one of the people running its weekly radio programme, and pays a fee to its two organists, but everything else is run by volunteers. The services are conducted (chaired) by members and Sunday addresses ('sermons') are given either by members or by visiting speakers. (First-time speakers are presented with a pen, but that is all.) Local Humanist and Rationalist bodies are volunteer run, as is the Atheist Foundation of Australia. And this all seems to work well.

Back in the early 1970s I got to know the late Peter Cadogan, then general Secretary of S.P.E.S., and one of the things he was keen about was proclaiming what he called the 'gift economy'. I did not always agree with Peter, but this concept resonated with me, and over the years I have realised how valuable it is. Obtaining blood for medical transfusion is done far better through volunteer blood donors, of whom I was one for decades, than by the ghastly U.S. system of buying and selling human blood. I am sympathetic to the notion of not hiring only graduates. Tertiary education is clearly valuable in some areas, for training medical people, scientific researchers and lawyers, but in other spheres it teaches people to expound gobbledegook masquerading as profundity and can function as a cross between a cargo cult and an extortion racket. Far from opening doors to young people, a lot of tertiary education serves to close doors to people who do not have the 'right' diploma, never mind imagination, enthusiasm, experience and real aptitude.

Nigel Sinnott – Melbourne, Australia

Girl Power at the Law Society

The proposals for guidance notes issued by the Law Society on sharia* are a matter of serious concern and should be opposed. Essentially they appear to legitimise sharia as a separate legal order within Britain and could encourage other demands from a rapidly growing Muslim population. However, the opposition has been badly mishandled. Those who undertook opposition used weak and wrong arguments.

To begin with, Law Society issued guidance notes, not a statement of law. All Wills must conform to the Wills Act 1837 and to subsequent minor legislative changes such as the Inheritance Act of 1975. Where a Will has not been made, the estate has to be distributed according to the intestacy rules without any exceptions. The guidance notes do not alter this. The point of intestacy rules is to make provision according to succession rules within blood related or adopted families. It does not apply to strangers or co-habitees etc for instance. The only way to avoid the intestacy rules is to make a valid Will.

It must be made clear to members of the Lawyers Secular Society (LSS) that Human Rights Act and Equality Act absolutely do NOT apply to any Wills or inheritance matters. This is entirely appropriate as the testator – the person making the Will -- has absolute discretion to make or withhold bequests. The only exception to this are the ability to make a claim on the Will in the case of existing dependants who can expect some ‘reasonable provision’ from the estate by decision of a court after a legal process. The LSS and its staff and members do not seem to understand this but demand that Wills should conform to what is ‘socially acceptable’ as defined by LSS. Secularism requires neutrality, not the enforcement of a politically correct homogeneous society.

The LSS mounts a contradictory argument. It claims to support testamentary freedom then condemns a sharia Will which may make discriminatory bequests based on such freedom. LSS seems to think that a testator with, say, three sons and two daughters should treat them all equally and leave them equal sums. But the testator is entitled to disinherit them or bequeath unequal sums depending on a variety of factors including disapproval of their personal or political choices — or disapproval of particular sexualities, for instance. A Muslim could disinherit a son who had renounced Islam. Equally a secularist or atheist might disinherit a gay daughter who had converted to a religion.

Among LSS claims are support for questionable concepts such as ‘girl power’ or cohesion which have nothing to do with law. This may make an interesting sound-bite but is hardly a legal or sensible argument. It exposes the fact that LSS and perhaps many other secularists are unable to sustain an argument and refuse to debate as ‘they know’ the answers to everything. How utterly arrogant.

In fact the rather long-winded article from Charles Klendjian (Secretary of the Lawyers Secular Society) and others about this issue did not put any legal arguments but plenty of emotive ones. Among its claims are: ‘This undermines the Equality Act’. I am afraid this is nonsense. The Equality Act only applies to the provision of goods and services and to public bodies, not to individuals. It would be a breach of the Equality Act if a solicitor refused to carry out instructions for a particular class of client unless the instructions were plainly illegal. Another claim is that ‘It is not HRA compliant’. The HRA does not apply to private acts of which a Will is surely an exemplar.

The Law Society is the recognised body for regulating the registration of solicitors but not the advice they give. Such advice is covered by indemnity insurance and normal professional expectations to give best advice. They do not imply in any way that the Will should meet some theoretical and

entirely fanciful ‘equality objective’. The whole point of a Will ultimately is to give expression to the wishes of the will-maker: the testator. Therefore it follows that the Will should be discriminatory by definition because it must make bequests to very specific individuals and causes or charities. No reason is required to be given to any person including family members.

It is interesting to note that the petition organised by One Law for All included many who are well-known secularists but no academics or politicians. Nor actually a single lawyer apart from Charlie Klendjian. Notable is that it was not signed by BHA or NSS. This was a very serious error as it exposes the lack of a serious legal argument and the lack of support from other secularists.

Some secularists in their obsession with equality seem to think that equality trumps an individual’s ability to make a Will. Equality may be a desirable objective but *cannot* apply to Wills or inheritance. It is likely that this particular LSS campaign will be wholly unsuccessful because to allow LSS to influence the Law Society on this issue would mean that equality must apply to Wills and that is wholly unacceptable even to secularists such as me. The demonstration itself is also a mistake because the Law Society cannot base its decision on demonstrations but on legal arguments.

The LSS’s Successes

The LSS worked behind the scenes on the LSE cartoons issue and was successful. It also succeeded in reversing the decision of Universities UK on gender segregation. This was after the intervention of the Equality and Human Rights Commission. But that success may have gone to their heads and they may have made a serious tactical error in picking a struggle which they cannot win. This will embolden sharia supporters to make more demands. So the LSS position has been counterproductive. In the meantime they have not actually advanced a single legal argument.

The next article on the LSS website was on the ‘Spanner’ case concerning extreme spanking. The article had absolutely nothing to do with secular goals and contains silly comments. To publish it at this time when the campaign against Law Society is getting some attention was very foolish and could do lasting damage at a crucial time. I support or would like to support LSS because I am secularist, but I do not support the promotion of homosexuality or sado-masochism. Like religion, it is a purely private matter and LSS should not be involved. The Brown case featured extreme sado-masochism which included lacerating scrotums and inflicting life threatening pain. These are acts with public consequences. It is not a matter of being moralistic. But such practices are considered repugnant by most and have nothing to do with secularism. Extremes should not be supported by a group which seeks mainstream support. It is indicative of this that they chose to publish an article about extreme sado-masochism and not mention a trial in which a tweeter was being prosecuted for making anti-Muslim comments on the ground of ‘racial hatred’. Neither LSS nor NSS said a word for fear of.... well quite.

Angela Pinter - Hackney

* <http://www.lawsociety.org.uk/news/press-releases/law-society-publishes-practice-note-on-sharia-wills-and-inheritance-rules/>

ESSAY - EXISTENCE

Barbara Smoker

*The author's summary of a talk she gave to the Bromley Humanist Group on 10 April 2014. The full text will appear in the issue of the bi-monthly magazine **Philosophy Now** (102)*

“WHY is there something rather than nothing?” This question, framed by the secular mathematician Leibniz three centuries ago, is often pressed by modern Christian theologians, in the mistaken belief that an answer to it must include a purposive creator. I agree with them that unless the incipient universe somehow came into existence from nothing, we are forced to assume the existence of a first cause, independent of the universe – but not that this would have to be a conscious and purposive entity.

While ‘first cause’ is a theological term, the concept is not necessarily theist. Theologians do not allow for the possibility that something else – say, an earlier universe, or the wider cosmos, or incipient energy, or simply time – has always existed. (Although, within the universe, time is inseparable from space, maybe time without space existed before the Big Bang brought the material universe into being.)

Many theists go on to embrace the arrogantly anthropocentric belief that the whole complexity of time and space was specially devised by their god with the sole motive of producing human beings on Earth, as “objects of His love” What sort of love is it, however, that would ordain all the suffering endured by earthlings, including ourselves, whether caused by parasites, predators, diseases, natural disasters, or human inhumanity — not to mention basing evolution on the principle of the weakest going to the wall?

The naive theistic explication for existence not only fails to answer the Leibniz question, why there is something rather than nothing – since a creator god would still be something — it also inculpates the supposed creator, if all-powerful, as immoral.

Admittedly, the only answer we atheists can offer to the question why there is something rather than nothing is that (like many inappropriate ‘Why’ questions put by small children) it is unanswerable. More to the point, though, is why, in the 21st century, children are still taught to believe in an unnecessary and manifestly uncaring creator. And why atheism should still be widely regarded as pernicious.

Atheism is backed by science. Physicists are in the process of discovering how, given certain physical conditions, our universe may have actually created itself. At the same time, microbiologists are on the cusp of fathoming the spontaneous emergence of life through a combination of particular chemicals forming self-replicating matter. For contemporary theologians to ignore all this ongoing scientific research suggests, at least, an element of wishful thinking in their faith and of evasion in its advocacy.

People and animals are entitled to respect, but not ideas. (N. Sinnott)

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

Conway Hall Ethical Society, 25 Red Lion Square, Holborn, WC1R 4RL.

Tel: 020 7405 1818 Registered Charity No. 251396

For programme updates, email: programme@ethicalsoc.org.uk

Website: www.conwayhall.org.uk

Admission to Sunday morning lectures is free for members of CHES and £5 (£2 conc) for non-members. For other events, no charge unless stated.

MAY 2014

Sunday 11 1100 **WAR CRIMINALS, REFUGEES AND THE UK**
Brian Moore

Saturday 17 1430 PSE presents: **NARNIAN EDUCATION: WHAT WOULD C.S. LEWIS THINK OF 21ST CENTURY SCHOOLING?**
Dr. Mark Pike

Sunday 18 1100 **THE ETHICS OF LIBERATION WARS**
Dan Thea, Deputy Chair of the Anti-Apartheid Movement

Sun 25 Lecture to be confirmed

JUNE

Sun 1 Lecture to be confirmed

Sun 8 1100 **CORRUPTION IN FINANCE AND THE LAW**
Nicholas Wilson "Mr Ethical"

Sat 14 1030 Centre for Inquiry UK and Conway Hall Ethical Society present
GOD IN THE LAB: THE SCIENCE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF
Presented by **Stephen Law**
11.00 **Glen Carrigan**, 12.00 **Chris French**, 13.45 **Jon Lanman**
£10 (£5 students, Members of Conway Hall Ethical Society and the British Humanist Association and Friends of CFI UK).

19:00 CHES, New Humanist Magazine & Istros Books present
THE 'YOUNG BOSNIA' GROUP: TERRORISTS OR FREEDOM FIGHTERS?
Alternative perspectives on the Sarajevo assassination that sparked WW I
Bosnian author and journalist, **Muharem Bazdulj** &
Dejan Djokic, Reader in History at Goldsmiths College
Tickets £5.

THE 80th CONWAY MEMORIAL LECTURE

JEREMY BENTHAM: PROPHET OF SECULARISM by **Philip Schofield**

Copies available at £4 inc post from the
Conway Hall Ethical Society



CHES's SUNDAY CONCERTS, SPRING 2014

Artistic Director: **Simon Callaghan**

Doors open at 1730 Concerts start at 1830 Tickets £9; students £4; under 16 free

Full details on: www.conwayhallsundayconcerts.org.uk