



# The Enlightenment



## The Newsletter of the Humanist Association of London and Area

An Affiliate of the Humanist Association of Canada (HAC)

Volume 3

Number 2

May 2007

### Epicurus – Philosopher and Scientist

The Greek philosopher Epicurus (341-270 BCE) was the consummate scientist of his time. From observations of the world around him, he reasoned that all the matter in the universe was composed of indestructible atoms and that space was a vacuum devoid of atoms. He believed the universe was not created by divine power because it is full of imperfections. His declared purpose was to free humankind from religious fears by proving that the soul is material, not spiritual, and is born and dies with the body. He also believed that if gods exist, they cannot intervene on earth to help or harm humans. He points out the absurdity of a spiritual soul entering the body at birth when he states, "It is surely ridiculous to suppose that spirits are standing by at the mating and birth of animals – a numberless number of immortals on the look-out for mortal frames, jostling and squabbling to get in first and establish themselves most firmly. Or is there an established compact that first come shall be first served, without any trial of strength between spirits."



Epicurus placed great importance on the necessity of living a moral, ethical and balanced life. Unfortunately he is often depicted as living a life of gluttony and debauchery, totally given over to the pleasures of the flesh without any scruples when it came to responsibility; but this is far from being the case. He asserts that the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain are the driving forces behind our volitional and appetitive behavior. Basic instinctive pleasure is essentially the removal of the pain of need. For instance, if a person through his or her own efforts, attains the basic necessities of food clothing and shelter, this can result in a feeling of satisfaction providing it does not lead to excesses such as gluttony or greed. Moderation is the key word. He then says there is a higher pleasure, which is the pleasure of contentment and serenity, the absence of both need and desire, resulting in a feeling of tranquility.

*And then there is Epicurus' famous paradox...an argument against the existence of an all-powerful providential God. – "God either wants to eliminate bad things and cannot, or can but does not want to, or neither wishes nor can, or both wants to and can. If he wants to and cannot he is weak – and this does not apply to God. If he can but does not want to, he is spiteful – which is equally foreign to God's nature. If he neither wants to nor can, he is both weak and spiteful and so not a god. If he wants to and can, which is the only fitting thing for a god, where do bad things come from? Or why does he not eliminate them?"*

## President's Remarks

We have all enjoying the meetings arranged so far this year by our Program Committee of Goldie Emerson and Bill Chefurka. Lorne Falkenstein's talk on David Hume's thoughts on religion, and Peter Ossenkopp's talk on Evolutionary Psychology, were both interesting and stimulating. More quality meeting are coming up. Details of these are shown on page 9.

Many humanists go out of their way to emphasize that Humanism should in no way be considered a religion. This position is challenged in an article by your editor starting on page 3 in this issue of The Enlightenment. The intent is to stimulate comment and discussion both pro and con, so please do not hesitate to let your views be known. Comments will be published in the next Enlightenment.

On another topic, Richard Dawkins states in his book, *The God Delusion*, "I have yet to see any good reason to suppose that theology (as opposed to biblical history, literature, etc.) is a subject at all." This statement made me wonder. Since theology is defined as the study of the nature of God, if God does not exist, can theology be in reality the study of nothing? If so, then the study of theology by all the rabbis, priests, ministers and imams over the centuries has been in vain, because they have really been studying nothing. What irony!

Best Regards, Don.

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

President – Don Hatch – 472-6167 – e-mail – [dahatch@rogers.com](mailto:dahatch@rogers.com)

Past President – Derek Kaill – 434-4096 – e-mail, [derekkail@canada.com](mailto:derekkail@canada.com)

Secretary – Harold Koehler – 453-5452 – e-mail, [harold.peter@gmail.com](mailto:harold.peter@gmail.com)

Treasurer – Claire Van Daele-Boseret – 451-5962 - e-mail, [c.v.d.b@rogers.com](mailto:c.v.d.b@rogers.com)

Membership Chairperson – John Pope – 488-1562 – e-mail, [jpope@wwdc.com](mailto:jpope@wwdc.com)

Membership Assistant – Ed Ashman – 457- 9982 – e-mail, [edward017@sympatico.ca](mailto:edward017@sympatico.ca)

Member at Large –Jim Cranwell – 275-2055 – e-mail, [jcranwell@rogers.com](mailto:jcranwell@rogers.com)

Member at Large - Kate Balogh – 433-8486 – e-mail, [kbalogh@sympatico.ca](mailto:kbalogh@sympatico.ca)

The Humanist Association of London and Area meets at Cross Cultural Learner Centre, 505 Dundas Street in London, on the second Thursday of the months September to July inclusive at 7:30 PM. Please use the rear door off the parking lot. The Enlightenment is published quarterly in February, May, August and November.

Visit our web site at [www.humanists-london.org](http://www.humanists-london.org) Our Web Master is John Pope, [jpope@wwdc.com](mailto:jpope@wwdc.com)

**New members are welcome.** Contact Membership Chairperson John Pope at (519) 488-1562 [jpope@wwdc.com](mailto:jpope@wwdc.com) or Ed Ashman at (519) 457-9982 [edward017@sympatico.ca](mailto:edward017@sympatico.ca) . Membership fees are listed below.

	<u>HAC</u> <u>Basic</u>	<u>HAC Limited</u> <u>Resources</u>	<u>Humanist</u> <u>Perspectives</u>	<u>HALA</u> <u>Basic</u>	<u>HALA Limited</u> <u>Resources</u>
Single	\$30	\$15	\$22	\$20	\$10
Family	\$35	\$20	\$22	\$25	\$15
Life	\$500				

## **Should Humanism be Considered a Religion**

In the January 2007 issue of *Canadian Humanist News* there is a “Special Insert” which among other things, outlines the “Principles of Humanism” on the last page of the insert. The following statements are shown under the heading, “The Humanist Life Stance.”

“The Association considers Humanism to be fully secular and non-religious, and Humanism is, therefore, not to be considered a religion.”

“Although the Association endeavours to provide certain rites of passage and other services traditionally provided by religious institutions, this fact does not in any way imply that Humanism is a religion. The Association defines Humanism as being inherently and intrinsically secular, non-religious, non-theistic, and non-spiritual.”

I sincerely wonder if this approach is too dogmatic and short sighted. I also wonder if it is one of the reasons why Humanism is not more widely recognized as a force for good on our troubled planet. Right away the use of the word non-spiritual presents a problem. Although it is obviously intended to refer to traditional religious spirituality, it may imply to some people that humanists are cold, unemotional beings, with no non-religious spiritual feelings of awe and wonder and lacking in feelings of love and compassion; a far cry from reality.

I realize that many of my humanist friends must be getting tired of hearing my ongoing rant that there must be something wrong with Humanism in its present form because membership is so low. I contend, however, that if all humans lived according to the logical, common sense principles of Humanism, the end result should be a more peaceful and more egalitarian world, so I feel justified in looking for improvements. Why is Humanism not more widely know, and why are humanists sometimes labeled as agents of the devil by some evangelicals, when they are in fact just the opposite? Why did the early humanist movement started by Epicurus in the third and fourth century BCE die out, while the Roman church began to flourish? Perhaps it was partly because the Roman church was a religion offering salvation to the uneducated masses while Epicurean Humanism was an academic school of thought available mostly to intellectuals.

Now admittedly, humanists have done some great and remarkable things. In Canada, Dr, Henry Morgentaler, at considerable personal hardship, performed a most beneficial service in bringing about legalized abortion, and Evelyn Martens risked imprisonment by being present at a pre-planned suicide. Fortunately she was acquitted, due in no small part to the backing and support of other humanists. And there are many other causes that have been supported by humanists, but there is the potential to do so much more if humanists can get their act together and do more than preaching to the converted. This point was forcefully brought up by author Sam Harris and journalist Susan Jacoby, at the New Enlightenment conference held at Amherst New York in the fall of 2005

About 250 years ago the French philosopher Diderot stated: “Men will never be free until the last king is strangled by the entrails of the last priest.” This can be interpreted to imply that there will never be world peace and prosperity until all the nations ruled by kings and dictators become democracies, and existing religions eventually disappear. Most humanists will likely agree that existing religions should eventually disappear, because it can easily be argued that they are now by and large causing more harm than good, - witness all the religious wars and dissent now occurring. But what should replace them? (continued on page 4)

(Humanism as a religion continued)

Recently I read an article suggesting the need for the promotion and establishment of a new non-theistic universal religion, based on an ideology acceptable to everyone, believe it or not, in the form of humanism, replacing existing religions. What!!! Humanism as a religion? Do most humanists not go out of their way, as indicated above, to emphatically state that humanism is a philosophy and definitely not a religion? I wonder, however, if this dogmatic approach is in fact preventing humanism from expanding and being recognized and accepted by the general public.

Although most dictionary definitions of religions emphasize worship, devotion and obedience to a supreme being, with obligatory rites and ceremonies, there are other definitions emphasizing the practising of honesty, integrity and compassion by all people. In the eighteenth century the French political philosopher Montesquieu (1689-1755 CE) very sensibly recognized that the doctrines, rituals, dogmas, and irrational superstitions of organized religions were less important than trying to live one's life with love and compassion toward others. In his words, "the essence of religion is to live one's life according to the highest moral and ethical standards." Do these criteria not dovetail beautifully with the stated humanist principles? Are the humanist principles not a perfect alternative to religious creeds?

These questions prompt me to ask whether or not we humanists are sitting on a concept that has the potential to help bring about world peace in the future? Are we fooling ourselves when we classify humanism as a philosophy rather than also as a religion? Is it not possible that it could be both? Surely humanism must be more than adhering to a set of stated principles while promoting non-theism and being critical of faithful believers. Julius Huxley has stated in his book, *The Humanist Frame*, that humans are religious animals hard wired to look for some form of spiritual anchor to hang onto. Recent brain imaging and genetic research has confirmed that many humans do have what is sometimes called a "God" gene, - there must be a better word - substantiating Huxley's theory. This gene may activate the brain so it can produce a feeling of wellbeing in people who pray to a supposed "God," or alternatively, by meditation. Humanists need to recognize this innate human trait and decide how to use it to advantage. Huxley suggests that humanists should be guided by the traditional humanist principles, should have a knowledge and appreciation of the arts and sciences, and exhibit an emotional appreciation of the awe and wonder of life on our amazing planet. Does Huxley's definition of humanism not qualify as a possible future religion/philosophy, a substitute for the religions of today?

We need to reexamine just what it is that attracts people to a religion such as Christianity. In many cases people simply carry on with the religion of their parents and believe in the comforting phenomenon of an afterlife. Another factor is the social aspect of meeting together with like-minded people in a place of worship, and in many cases meeting for recreation as well. Some believe that their children will receive moral and ethical guidance that they will not receive elsewhere. So what should a humanist religion look like? First there should be a physical building where members meet on a regular basis to celebrate the joys of living and to engage in philosophical discussions and attend social events. The patron philosophers (not saints) could be Socrates and Epicurus. Sermons or lectures would center on the works of philosophers, scientists and scholars with a humanist bent. The organization could be called a Celebration Fellowship with a leader qualified to formulate and deliver interesting and meaningful messages. After the message, discussion would be essential. Guest speakers would of course be included. Inspiring non-theistic music would be a definite asset. Rites of passage services would of course be available. There must be non-theistic moral and ethical teaching for children based on the agreed humanist principles. (Continued on page 5)

### Humanism as a religion continued)

Children must be encouraged to obtain an education fitted to their aptitudes and abilities so they may earn a living and not be a burden on society. This education must include training in critical thinking. Sport facilities and computer labs would be desirable. Summer camps could be an added feature. An emphasis should be placed on family orientation in the manner employed by the modern community churches.

Looking over the above criteria for a humanist philosophy/religion, one might tend to equate it with Unitarianism because Unitarian and humanist principles are similar. There is, however, one major difference. Unitarians try to be all things to all people welcoming those of all the world's religions as well as agnostics and non-theists. On the other hand, most humanists tend to discard any consideration of the supernatural, and are usually non-theists or agnostics. When I was first exposed to Unitarianism I thought this must come close to the ideal religion. And when I was first exposed to humanism I was impressed by the logic of the humanist principles and decided that further exploration was warranted. After investigation I was most disappointed to learn that there were so very few Unitarians or humanists. There are fewer than five thousand registered Unitarians in Canada and hardly more than six or seven hundred card-carrying humanists, and sometimes they are one and the same. They both must be thinking about what they can do to improve. This situation causes me to wonder if the two groups should unite and do something daring by forming a philosophical religion - a universal non-theistic ideology for the future. Participants would have concern for the underprivileged and the environment and celebrate the joys of being alive on our wondrous planet, expounding a humanist philosophy of loving and revering life in the same manner as believers love and revere God. Richard Dawkins, one of the world's most famous non-theists, states in his book, *The Ancestors Tale*: "Humans must endorse the true reverence with which we are moved to celebrate the universe, once we understand it properly...My objection to supernatural beliefs is precisely that they fail to do justice to the sublime grandeur of the real world. They represent a narrowing-down from reality, an impoverishment of what the world has to offer." Until humanists put as much emphasis on "celebrating the sublime grandeur of the real world," as they do on non-theism, they are not likely to win many converts and earn the privilege of eventually becoming a universal world philosophy/religion.

Obviously progress toward a world philosophical religion will be very slow because of the entrenchment of religious fundamentalism in today's world. Our best hope is that children in the future will seriously question the logic of all existing religions and gravitate toward something like that suggested above. This will take as much as a century providing in the meantime the world is not destroyed by nuclear war, excessive pollution or the exhaustion of natural resources. In the meantime it could be exciting if, in one of the larger Canadian cities, there could be a critical mass of people who would obtain the finances necessary to take over an unused church or other suitable building and start a humanist philosophy/religion with a qualified energetic leader and plenty of eager volunteers. There are up to six million Canadians who mark the "no religious affiliation" box on the census form. Very few of these are now attracted to humanism or even Unitarianism. Perhaps, however, one percent or say fifty to sixty thousand could be attracted to a non-theistic, non-supernatural Celebration Fellowship, if an interesting, family oriented, somewhat intellectual approach were followed - something that would attract the young people who now feel they are being asked to park their brains at the door when they enter a church.

The preceding commentary will hopefully generate some thoughtful discussion and perhaps some considerable opposition. If this happens it is all to the good. All aspects need to be aired. Comments are welcome. (DAH)

## **To the Editor of The Enlightenment:**

The February issue of The Enlightenment included a transcript of the debate between Dr. Bruce Tallman and Dr. Goldwin Emerson on the existence of a “Loving Creator God.” I know it is not necessary to point out to our HALA members the faulty logic of Dr. Tallman’s argument for the existence of God, but I can’t resist commenting on two glaring examples.

His evidence for God’s existence based on nature, flowers, mountains etc. is the equivalent of saying, “the evidence that God exists is that God exists.” You can leave out the nature bits.

”Evidence” means you have proof or knowledge, and if you have knowledge there is no requirement for faith. By definition faith is belief without knowledge, the whole basis of the Christian religion. I’m sure no Christian leaders, especially the Pope, would be happy to hear that Dr. Tallman had evidence of the existence of God; they would all be out of work.

My main point however is with Dr. Tallman’s reference to Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who was a Jesuit and a paleontologist. (whether this is possible is probably the subject for another debate). Fr. Pierre was a fascinating character and led a very interesting and adventurous life. It was rumoured that he was a co-conspirator in the “Piltdown forgery” incident, but as no definite proof was ever established, we should give him the benefit of the doubt.

His famous book “The Phenomenon of Man” was published posthumously in 1959. It was denounced by the Holy See in 1962, and the ban has never been revoked.

In 1967 Nobel Laureate Sir Peter Medawar showed that Teilhard de Chardin’s teleological approach to evolution was mostly nonsense and that he clearly did not understand the process or the implication of natural selection. It is annoying that, forty years later, Teilhard de Chardin’s mysticism should be used in any discussion on evolution.

Thank you Don for your work and effort in producing “The Enlightenment” newsletter, looking forward to the next issue.

Jim Cranwell  
Stratford

Editor’s Note: Thank you Jim for your letter to the editor. I encourage other readers to also send in letters in the future. (DAH)

## **Atheists in the News**

In the past couple of months there have been several references to atheists in the media. In Toronto, Justin Trottier, director of the Centre For Inquiry Ontario, was physically assaulted and injured while he and a friend were posting posters near Ryerson University for an upcoming book signing by physicist Victor Stenger, for his new book, *God: The Failed Hypothesis*. The police are looking for the perpetrators, a black man and one of Middle East descent. In the United States, CNN recently aired a program on “Atheists in America,” and interviewed a man who had been evicted from his home by his landlord solely because he proclaimed he was an atheist. It was also mentioned that atheists were the most disliked and most distrusted minority in America, even ranking lower than homosexuals. (*Continued on page 7*)

(Atheists in the news continued)

On a more positive note, for the first time a US congressman has publicly stated that he is an atheist. Pete Stark, a democratic representative from California since 1973, acknowledged his non-theism in response to an inquiry from the Secular Coalition for America ([www.secular.org](http://www.secular.org)) Herb Silverman, president of Secular Coalition for America states, "The only way to counter the prejudice against non-theists is for more people to publicly identify themselves as non-theists. Representative Stark shows remarkable courage in being the first member of congress to do so."

On another positive note, the Saturday March 10<sup>th</sup> edition of the Globe and Mail carried a full-page article entitled, "When the ain'ts go marching in." Subtitle: "With fundamentalists at war, and Richard Dawkins in the bookstores, atheism is surging. Canadian groups are calling, 'Come all ye faithless'." The article also features a large photograph of Dr. Chris diCarlo, one of Canada's best-known non-theists.

A number of different humanist organizations are mentioned in the Globe article, including the new Centre For Inquiry in Toronto, Skeptics Canada and the Humanist Association of Canada (HAC). There are numerous quotes by HAC president Gary Bauslaugh, HAC vice president Pat O'Brien and HAC past president Dr. Robert Buckman as well as Dr. Chris diCarlo. Gary Bauslaugh states that, "HAC has been well meaning, but not terribly effective in the past," noting it was historically oriented towards debate rather than action. He said, "We want to appeal much more widely to critical-thinking Canadians. There are literally millions of people who think like us, but don't label themselves humanists. We think there is common cause." Canadian humanists say they want to be able to stand up for their beliefs in public and hope to be more included in public debate – for example, to be asked to comment on issues in the media, the way religious figures are. But they have a long way to go. Mr. Bauslaugh says, "If we want to influence Canadian public policy, we need to be bigger than we are now."

Yes indeed! HAC needs to be bigger and better than it is now. How do we do this? As the Globe article points out, over 5 million Canadians stated in the 2001 census that they have "no religious affiliation." Surely HAC should somehow be able to attract 5000 or just 0.1 % of these people, giving a credible base on which to operate and gain influence. This is the challenge we face.

## **The Bone Boxes**

Both The Globe and Mail and MACLEAN'S magazine list the book *The Jesus Family Tomb*, on their best-seller list. This recently rediscovered tomb and the ossuaries contained therein were also featured on a two and one half hour documentary on Vision TV. The evidence presented, claiming this tomb to have contained the bones of Jesus and his family, appears fairly convincing, but of course as yet there is no definite proof. Nevertheless, the possibility is intriguing because, if it were ever proven beyond a shadow of doubt, that the physical body of Jesus was not resurrected and ascended into heaven, the very foundation of Christianity would be badly shaken. As expected, many members of the Christian clergy, and some rabbis as well, have taken great pains to point out flaws in the evidence presented by the investigators in order to protect their turf, but some liberal Christians who have already questioned whether or not Jesus was divine, are not so disturbed. They point out that it is not the claimed supernatural qualities of Jesus that are important; what should matter to Christians are the moral and ethical teachings of Jesus. Living by these principles is more important than dogmas and blind faith.

## **The Catholic Hierarchy Just Won't Listen to Reason**

Pope Benedict recently reiterated that divorced Roman Catholics who remarry, are not permitted to partake of the sacrament of holy communion. He also restated that the Vatican's stance on abortion and gay marriage is not negotiable, and all members of the priesthood must be celibate males. (The thought of women priests is an anathema).

To a non-Catholic, none of this makes any sense and defies all logic. And forbidding artificial birth control, which is contributing to the spread of AIDS, is also very hard to fathom. All of this causes one to wonder just what causes apparently intelligent people to bow to the dictates of the domineering male Catholic hierarchy. Most protestants have long since quite sensibly abandoned all of these restrictive practices, and of course most humanists have gone even further and abandoned all religious dogma and all faith in supernatural events. But devout Catholics cannot seem to abandon the articles of faith and the archaic practices they learned in their formative years, attesting to the power the priests have over young minds. As we all know, this power has most regrettably been criminally misused by many priests who have engaged in pedophile activities.

Although it is wishful thinking, if it were ever proved beyond any doubt that the bones of Jesus were actually in the tomb referred to in the previous section, the doubt then cast on the divinity of Jesus might cause Catholics to question and abandon many of the tenets and practices referred to above. Some Catholics, along with many Protestants, might even become humanists.

### **Time For Brunch**

During a recent phone conversation with Pat Duffy Hutcheon, she informed me that on most Sunday mornings she meets with 15-20 Vancouver humanists for brunch at the Rail Spur Alley Café on trendy Granville Island. During a recent trip to Vancouver, my son Graham and I thoroughly enjoyed attending one of these delightful occasions. One of the attendees kindly took the picture shown below on Graham's digital camera.



From left to right are Glenn Hardie, Don Hatch, Frank Norman, Frances Hodgkinson, Graham Hatch and Eric Damer. Eric is the editor of the British Columbia Humanist View and Fran is his assistant. Pat Duffy Hutcheon, Canadian humanist of the year in 2000, was present at the brunch, but was seated outside the picture.

Holding a Sunday brunch is a delightful custom that HALA might want to consider at some time in the future.

## **Making Progress**

HALA member Don Santor recently tuned into CBC radio to an interview with Mohammed Khaleel, and was so impressed he sent Mr. Khaleel an email as outlined below.

Last week CBC Radio aired an interview with Mohammad Khaleel, professor of religion and Islamic Studies at San Diego University. I was so impressed with him, I sent him an email congratulating him on a number of things - content, articulation, perspective, clarity of substance, etc. At the end of my note I said I was a humanist. He sent me a reply which you can see below. Perhaps we are making progress. Don Santor.

Thanks for your kind words. I wish more people would learn what it is to be a humanist...the so-called focus on "god" in religion has relegated humans to nothingness, and it seems that the stated purpose of religion of being good citizens of the cosmos is lost in supposedly appeasing an invisible being at the expense of the very cosmos over which we are supposed to minister. KM. Editors Note: What an encouraging statement. We need many more like this.

## **Up-coming Meetings**

### **May 10<sup>th</sup> 2007** – Regular Meeting of the Humanist Association of London and Area

Dr. Arja Vainio-Mattila, Director for the Centre of Global Studies, Huron University College, UWO, will speak on **“What is Africa to us in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century?”** Dr. Vainio-Mattila received her PhD in Development Geography and has worked for two decades in development interventions in most of Sub-Saharan Africa as well as in Asia.

### **June 14<sup>th</sup> 2007** - Regular Meeting of the Humanist Association of London and Area

Our speaker will be HALA member Dr. You-shen Li speaking on **“An Introduction to Taoist Philosophy”** You-shen Li received his Ph.D. in cancer cytogenetics from Cambridge University in England. He was born in China and graduated from a medical school in China. He is author of a book, *A New Interpretation of Chinese Philosophy*.

### **July 12<sup>th</sup> 2007** – Regular Meeting of the Humanist Association of London and Area

Mr. Jim Cranwell, long time member of HAC, the Kitchener/Waterloo/Cambridge/Guelph, Humanists, The Humanist Association of Toronto and the Humanist Association of London and Area will explore the question of **“Should We Mandate Free Speech in Respect for Religion”** in light of the writings of Daniel Dennett, Barbara Smoker, Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris.

Your program committee of Bill Chefurka and Goldie Emerson have been actively lining up interesting speakers for the remainder of the year. There will be no meeting in August, but meetings will resume on September 13<sup>th</sup> when our speaker will be Paul Chefurka talking about the world's dependency on oil. The title of his talk is **“The View From the Peak.”** Our presenter on October 11<sup>th</sup> will be Dr. Amelia Whelau, Professor Emerita from the Astronomy Department at the University of Western Ontario. Her topic will be **“How do Astronomers Determine the Vast Scale of Cosmic Time and Space.”** On November 8<sup>th</sup> HALA member Don Santor, will speak on the ongoing subject of **“Ethics Without God.”**

We are most fortunate to have a very capable Program Committee. Thank you Goldie and Bill. for your efforts in making arrangements for such an interesting slate of speakers.

## What Do Teachers Make?

The dinner guests were sitting around the table discussing life. One man, a CEO, decided to explain the problem with education. He argued, "What's a kid going to learn from someone who decided his best option in life was to become a teacher?" He reminded the other dinner guests what they say about teachers: "Those who can, do. Those who can't, teach."

To stress his point he said to another guest; "You're a teacher, Bonnie. Be honest. What do you make?"

Bonnie, who had a reputation for honesty and frankness replied,

"You want to know what I make? (She paused for a second, then began...)

"Well, I make kids work harder than they ever thought they could.

I make a C+ feel like the Order of Canada.

I make kids sit through 40 minutes of class time when their parents can't make them sit for 5 minutes without an I Pod, Game Cube or movie rental...

You want to know what I make?" (She paused again and looked at each and every person at the table.)

I make kids wonder.

I make them question.

I make them criticize.

I make them apologize and mean it.

I make them have respect and take responsibility for their actions.

I teach them to write and then I make them write.

I make them read, read, read.

I make them show all their work in math.

I make my students from other countries learn everything they need to know in English while preserving their unique cultural identity.

I make my classroom a place where all my students feel safe.

I make my students stand to sing The National Anthem, because we live in Canada.

Finally, I make them understand that if they use the gifts they were given, work hard, and follow their hearts, they can succeed in life.

(Bonnie paused one last time and then continued.)

"Then, when people try to judge me by what I make, I can hold my head up high and pay no attention because they are ignorant...

You want to know what I make?

**I Make a Difference.** What do you make?"

There is much truth in this statement. **"Teachers make every other profession."**

### A Few Quotes

"There is in every village a torch; the teacher: and an extinguisher; the clergyman." Victor Hugo.

A great conductor is credited with saying: "If you have Mozart you don't need God."

"The religion of one age is the literary entertainment of the next." – Ralph Waldo Emerson.