

VOICE OF REASON MORAL DEMOCRACY

BULLETIN FOR MORAL DEMOCRACY, RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE SECULAR STATE.
PUBLISHED BY CENTER FOR MORAL DEMOCRACY ON BEHALF OF VOICE OF REASON/MORAL DEMOCRACY,
2 WEST 64TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10023 BETTY LEA BROUT, EDITOR

SPRING 1982

NUMBER 4

Florence Flast Speaks on Prayer in Schools

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

In the case of the new banner our readers see above, what's in a name is considerable, at least insofar as appearances are concerned. The merger now in process between the Center for Moral Democracy and the Voice of Reason (see editorial, p.2, and interviews, p.3) makes this our "transition" issue. When arrangements for the merger are complete, we will become *Voice of Reason*, with the same subheading that now appears.

It is true that change takes some getting used to. But be assured that the new name will not affect the substance, spirit or message of the *Bulletin*.

What we do expect is that the voice of the *Bulletin* will reach more people in more places. To that end, we will continue to publish the facts regarding the multiple attempts to subvert constitutional freedoms. We will try to keep our readers informed of the activities of the Religious Right—activities that often hide behind diversionary camouflage.

Chaucer said (in "The Pardoner's Tale," from *Canterbury Tales*), "Tak nat my name in ydel or amis." We will do our best neither to take the names *Moral Democracy* and *Voice of Reason* idly, nor to be amiss in their use.

The Editor

Over the years numerous judicial decisions have reaffirmed the unconstitutionality of prayer in public schools—whether silent or vocal, whether voluntary, mandated or in the form of "meditation." Nevertheless, there is a strong possibility of legislation permitting prayer in the classroom.

One of the most effective organizations to combat the "pro-prayer" lobby and protect religious liberty is PEARL—the Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty.

Florence Flast chairs New York PEARL and is Vice President of the National Coalition for PEARL. In addition, she is a member of the Executive Committee of Citizens Against Tuition Tax Credits, and was Vice-Chair of the Education Committee of the American Jewish Congress.

Following is an interview with Mrs. Flast conducted by the *Bulletin's* editor, Betty Lea Brout, which explores the current "state of the art" with regard to prayer in public schools.

Q. What is PEARL's official position on prayer in public schools?

Mrs. Flast: We believe, with Madison and Jefferson, that religious freedom requires the maintenance of the "wall of separation" between church and state.



We hold with John F. Kennedy's statement that America is a land "where the separation of church and state is absolute...where no church...is granted any public funds or political preference."

Preserving Pluralism

We believe in a public school system in which children of all races, religions, ethnic backgrounds and economic levels have the opportunity to learn together and to develop respect for each other's values and contributions to the common good.

(Continued on p.5)

Pro-Choice: A Catholic View

by Lisa Desposito

Last spring, in a country that is 95% Catholic, Italian voters overwhelmingly affirmed the right to legal abortion. Do American Catholics share that view?

Contrary to popular belief that there is unanimity among Catholics in opposition to legal abortion, every poll has indicated a divided church, with the hierarchy and the laity holding opposite beliefs. Under all or certain circumstances, the majority of Roman Catholics believe in the option of legal abortion, although many would not personally choose to have one.

The issue, however, is not what an individual Catholic might choose to do. Rather, the issue is the legal and religious right, based on one's conscience, to choose abortion or childbirth. 77% of American Catholics believe that the decision is a personal one between a woman and her doctor, that it is not the business of government.

Although for many reasons lay Catholic support for legal abortion remains quiet, the issues of conscience and choice are
(Continued on p.5)

EDITORIAL: Voice of Reason/Moral Democracy Approaching Merger

Shortly after the Moral Democracy Center was organized, we discovered that an almost identical grassroots movement was taking form in the midwest. Its organizer is Rabbi Sherwin Wine, founder of the Society for Humanistic Judaism, a friend and co-worker in various endeavors for many years. Wherever I went this past year representing the Moral Democracy Movement, I found myself bumping into Rabbi Wine or his associates, competing to enlist the same people to accomplish the same end.

We immediately recognized that Moral Democracy, drawing its largest constituency from the Atlantic seaboard, and Voice of Reason, centered in the Detroit-Chicago area, provided complementary regional bases for a unified national movement. We agreed to explore the possibility of merger to avoid wasteful duplication. As a result of a meeting this winter of representatives of both organizations, **we are sponsoring a joint public rally at the New York Society for Ethical Culture on Sunday, March 28 at 4:00 P.M., with prominent speakers, including Isaac Asimov.**

If arrangements work out as we hope, we should be one organization by the March rally. Since Moral Democracy has operated as an unincorporated committee, we agreed that the simplest, most expeditious plan would be for Moral Democracy to merge into the Voice of Reason, which recently completed the legal process of incorporating as a not-for-profit educational organization. We would accept their corporate name while preserving the identity of the Center, which would become the Moral Democracy Center of the Voice of Reason. The terms of the proposed merger will continue the Center as the publication arm and eastern coordinating body of a unified and expanded Voice of Reason organization.

Under Betty Lea Brout's editorship the *Moral Democracy Bulletin* has expanded in format and coverage to become one of the best publications of its kind anywhere. As the journal of the Center, the *Bulletin* now reaches recipients in 42 states, providing information for a growing national network of citizens alarmed by the New Right assault on individual rights, academic freedom, and the democratic secular state.

Under the plan, Ms. Brout will continue as editor of the *Bulletin*, renamed to reflect the merger. Arnold Sylvester and Stanley Marder, whose generous professional contribution has made possible the attractive printing and graphics, will supervise production and printing as at present. As Director of the Center, I congratulate and thank these and many other diligent volunteers and financial contributors who have made possible a burgeoning grassroots movement for the defense of pluralistic moral democracy in a constitutional secular state. □

Edward L. Ericson

CALENDAR OF COMING EVENTS

Sunday
March 28
11 A.M.
Rabbi Sherwin Wine and Edward L. Ericson "The Voice of Reason—A Defense of Moral Democracy," speaking from the Platform of the New York Society for Ethical Culture, 2 West 64th Street, New York City

Sunday
March 28
4 P.M.
RALLY for Religious Freedom and the Secular State, sponsored by Voice of Reason/Moral Democracy at the New York Society (see address, above) Among the featured speakers: Isaac Asimov; Dorothy Samuels, Exec. Director, NYCLU.

Thursday
April 22
All day
from 9 A.M.
National PEARL Annual Conference, The New Assault On Public Education and Religious Liberty. Warwick Hotel, 65 West 54th Street, N.Y.C. Featured Speaker: Archibald Cox. \$35 Registration includes workshops and lunch. To register, write: B. Lewis, 18 Wimbledon Lane, Great Neck, N.Y. 11203

WHOSE TYRANNY?

According to the Moral Majority, the president of the National Council of Churches is a "socialist" and "anti-Christ." Reverend Greg Dixon, Moral Majority executive secretary, said that the Council, headed by Bishop James Armstrong, "has goals parallel to that of the Communist Party—to subject the entire world to slavery and tyranny."

New York Times,
Jan. 22, 1982

From Our Network

To the Editor:

I fear that by the end of the decade, we may no longer be a free country, but a contrived tyranny that retains all the forms of Democracy but none of the substance. There is no end to the atrocities these fanatics are capable of committing, once all power is concentrated in their hands.

Stephen VanEck
Exton, Penn.

To the Editor:

One of my bright fifth graders asked this question: "If God created the earth and it all began with Adam and Eve, how did we get dinosaurs millions of years earlier?" If a ten-year-old can think of such a question, it makes one wonder about exactly who is being attracted to the so-called "moral majority."

Eleanor Carlson Castro

Morality from the New Right

An abstract from a letter soliciting funds for the National Conservative Political Action Committee (NCPAC), written by U.S. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC):

"Your tax dollars are being used to pay [for] grade school classes that teach our children that cannibalism, wife-swapping and the murder of infants and the elderly are acceptable behavior."

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: Betty Lea Brout, Joel Chernoff, Edward L. Ericson, Saul M. Farbman, Valerie D. Farbman
Contributing Correspondent: Edward Baum

A Catholic View

(Continued from p.1)

taken very seriously indeed. This, of course, is at the same time that the Roman Catholic hierarchy is actively politicizing the abortion issue. It is also a time during which the New Right has seized upon the abortion debate to further its own separate political agenda.

Uneasy Alliance

As a result, the Catholic bishops have found themselves in an uneasy alliance with the New Right on this issue. It seems as if the Catholic hierarchy is willing to sacrifice all other social justice issues for the anti-abortion crusade. The church now faces losing the Catholic laity, either to the hysterical, reactionary politics of the Right or to a silent but strong disaffection on the part of liberal-moderate or traditional conservative Catholics who cannot bear this unholy alliance. Until recently most Catholics have considered the abortion issue an internal disagreement and have remained silent about the church's position. Many Catholics are now beginning to see that the church is being used by anti-choice politicians, and are speaking out.

I am one of those. I am Catholic, and I am pro-choice. My decision to support freedom of conscience on abortion and contraception did not happen overnight; as with most Catholics, it evolved over a period of years. Even then, I remained silent within the church family and in public: Catholics just do not speak out in opposition to the official church, and those who want to don't know where or how.

Making a Choice

How can I be Catholic and pro-choice? This is the question most frequently asked of me. For pro-choice Catholics the answer is: the primacy of conscience. We believe that the First Amendment of the Constitution, which guarantees religious liberty, provides a legal right to abortion as an option. We support that guarantee and view attempts to outlaw abortion as a violation of religious freedom. CFFC does not promote abortion. We have joined together to support the view that the decision to choose abortion is fundamentally one of conscience, not legislation, whether the law be secular or church.

Catholics for a Free Choice does not intend to ridicule the church: *we are the church*. Nor do we seek to undermine the

Flast Speaks for PEARL

(Continued from p.1)

Q. What have you found to be the most workable means to effect these principles?

Mrs. Flast: We use a number of approaches. PEARL tries to encourage public discussion and debate. That, in turn, entails the dissemination of current information to a concerned public, including public officials. And, finally, legal challenge. For example, New York PEARL has challenged every New York State law which has in any way violated separation of church and state as it affects education, whether with regard to funding of "secular" teaching and materials, record keeping, maintenance and repair of parochial school buildings, or tax tuition credits. In all, we've lost only one such case, as the result of which some mandated services are now reimbursed with taxpayer dollars.

church's teaching authority. We have spoken out because the hierarchy has embraced a system of sexual morality which differs from the beliefs and actions of the Catholic laity. In areas of reproductive choice, the hierarchy no longer represent the Catholic people. We have not fallen away from the church; rather, the hierarchy has fallen away from its people.

Pro-Choice Catholics: Good Catholics

Pro-choice Catholics have grounds to dissent from the present position of the church, whose anti-choice teaching is not infallible. The right to dissent from authoritative non-infallible teachings is part of Catholic tradition, as is the primacy of conscience. Officially, the church teaches that "the inner dictates of a private conscience do count against the authority of the church." Many theologians believe that this is not only the role of conscience, but the *duty* of it as well. Previously the church relied on biblical injunctions, legalisms and church codes as the only proper guides for decisions about sexual morality.

The Second Vatican Council, however, called for Catholics to adhere to a morality of *conviction*, not *imposition*. The emphasis, therefore, is now on individual responsibility for the making of moral decisions which in turn requires acting in accord with an informed conscience.

The Catholic church itself has not always agreed on what has now become an immovable position on the part of the hierarchy. While human life has always been held sacred, how many informed Catholics know that, for most of church

Q. What about other states? Is there a national pattern of any kind? And what action has PEARL taken?

Mrs. Flast: There are now nine states where prayer in some form is actively an issue, but there isn't a geographic pattern. The states are as far apart as Massachusetts and Florida, New York and Missouri. Sometimes it's not the legislature which has acted, but a citizen group which has brought suit to force the state to allow prayer.

Fortunately the courts, so far at least, have been consistent in their position that the state cannot constitutionally involve itself in the conduct of prayer.

Q. What is PEARL's position regarding
(Continued on p.6)

history, there has been divided opinion on the exact moment of ensoulment of the fetus, hence personhood? Traditional church position, based on Aquinas, supported the theory of delayed ensoulment, holding that it occurs later in the course of fetal development. The church has always opposed abortion, not because the fetus is a person, but as part of a code of sexual ethics which views abortion as a sin of sex.

Certainly the Catholic bishops have the right, indeed the obligation, to address moral issues—just as all religious leaders do. But given the lack of religious, scientific, legal and medical consensus with regard to abortion and the point at which a fetus becomes a person, no single view should be written into law. To do so negates the meaning of a pluralistic society.

Speaking Out

Pro-choice Catholics can no longer be silent. Our road may not be an easy one, but we must travel it together. Our voices must be heard, in our living rooms, in our parishes, and in the halls of Congress. Catholics for a Free Choice provides an effective vehicle for those voices. We plan to use it well. □

Lisa M. Desposito is co-founder of the N. Y. State affiliate of Catholics for a Free Choice and serves on its Board. CFFC is national, includes both men and women, lay and religious, and has affiliates in 18 states. Ms. Desposito is also a member of the Policy Council for the NY/Metro Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights. She was recently named by Ms. Magazine as "One of the 80 Women to Watch during the 1980's."

Darwin 1, Creationists 0 — But Stay Tuned

Darwin may not be put on the shelf after all. In January, a federal court judge dealt a serious blow to efforts by the Religious Right to require the teaching of the creationist doctrine of the universe's origin. In a major victory for those who support separation of church and state, the judge declared unconstitutional an Arkansas law requiring balanced treatment in public schools' curricula of evolutionary theory and "scientific creationism."

The full impact of that ruling is becoming apparent. In Arkansas, the state attorney general has declined to appeal the decision, putting the creationists back at square one. In Mississippi, where the state Senate passed a similar creation science bill, it appears that the bill won't make it through the other chamber.

In Louisiana, where a creation science bill had already passed into law, its implementation will be held up until its constitutionality is resolved in court. As in Arkansas, the American Civil Liberties Union will argue the case.

Furthermore, while similar bills are pending in 15 to 20 other states, none of the affected state legislatures shows signs of moving on them. But the battle against the creationists is far from over. Many more clashes at the judicial and school district level are expected in the future.

Creation Science is Not Science

In ruling that the Arkansas law violated the First Amendment's "establishment clause," Judge William Overton found that the bill "was simply and purely an effort to introduce the Biblical version of creation into the public school curricula."

The definition was nothing less than the first 11 chapters of the Book of Genesis, he held. "Creation out of nothing" clearly involves a supernatural deity even though the law studiously avoided mention of any god.

Unfortunately, the ruling doesn't mean that the creationism battle is finished. While there will be more fights at the court level, the heavy contests will occur in local school districts. At least nine states permit classroom use of materials espousing scientific creationism. (U.S.

News & World Report, Jan. 18.) Even though the ACLU insists that use of such material is illegal—since the situation parallels debate over voluntary school prayer—that won't stop local communities from vigorously pursuing "voluntary" approaches. Moreover, local school boards will continue to push for textbooks that at best minimize evolutionary theory and at worst emphasize creation science.

Still, the future is not dim if people organize to monitor their local school boards and build broad-based coalitions. As Gara LaMarche, Assistant Director of the New York Civil Liberties Union, points out, "If we can do it in Arkansas, we can do it anywhere." □

SCHOOL DAZE: *The "Right" Connections*

The New Right assault on public education is unabated and unabashed. The unceasing attacks attempt to focus attention on "states' rights" and "community control." Regrettably, at least insofar as public education is concerned, both of these phrases have become New Right code words for something far more sinister.

Certainly local community and parent participation in schools is desirable. But what the Religious Right is doing relates, not to the integrity and even-handedness of public education, but to the use of public schools for narrow religious purposes.

The Aims Are Clear

Whether with regard to prayer, or creationism, or censorship, or busing, or other complex issues, the pattern is unmistakable. The aim is first to rid American public school systems of government supervision and guidance, and then to center full educational control in the hands of local groups. Those pushing hardest for this, of course, speak with the voice of the Religious Right.

Today, that voice is being heard, and heard where it counts most. When the President announced the dismantling of the federal Department of Education—or at least the sharp diminution of its mandate—he was echoing its call. At first

Paying for Praying

There is a price to be paid for violating the First Amendment's ban on commingling church with state, an Iowa high school official recently discovered. In a hard-learned lesson, the principal was ordered to pay \$300 to a teacher who suffered "emotional distress" when the principal led prayers in school assembly programs celebrating Easter and Christmas.

Small though this award may be, it reinforces the right to sue an individual who abuses church/state separation. It is also the first time money damages have been awarded in a case of this nature.

National Law Journal, Feb. 8, 1982

glance the connection between the death of a federal agency in favor of so-called states' rights and the goals of the Religious Right may seem tenuous. It is not.

Whose First Amendment?

The April 4, 1979 issue of *The Right Woman*, in an article entitled "Education as a State Responsibility," carried the following statement:

"There is an underlying assumption... that the care and education of children is the primary responsibility of the State. ... This view is contrary to the Judeo-Christian tradition which has always maintained that the education and care of children is the primary responsibility of parents. God has not only blessed parents with children. He has given the responsibility for nurturing children to parents. To interfere, or to attempt to interfere, with a parent's right is a violation of First Amendment Rights."

The lines of battle could not possibly be more clearly drawn. On one side is the New Right, seeking to impose a narrow minority view upon the majority, and to use our public schools for that purpose. On the other side are those who believe in the preservation of pluralism and the secular state. At stake is the educational future of America's children. □

Steering Committee: *Andre Balazs, Betty Lea Brout, Edward L. Ericson, Donald A. Field, Hans Gerngross, Matthews A. Griffith, John Z. Katz, William A. Kulok, Walter Lawton, Stanley Marder, Bruce Southworth, Arnold Sylvester.*

United We Stand

Voice of Reason

SHERWIN T. WINE, *National Spokesperson*

Q. What aspects of your background led to your present involvement in today's social ethics?

Humanistic Judaism is inextricably tied to both social ethics and philosophy. My education, a Master's degree in '51 in philosophy, before entering Hebrew Union College, and my efforts to establish Humanistic Judaism on the local, national and international levels, seem to have led directly to a particular concern with today's political use of fundamental Christianity. I also

founded in 1976 and continue to direct the Center for New Thinking, a forum for new ideas in the arts, sciences and philosophy. I've been Rabbi of the Birmingham (Michigan) Temple, the first congregation for Humanistic Judaism, since founding it in 1963. All of these endeavors reflect a view that, in the context of the present threat to freedoms in a secular state, virtually mandates a strong, organized response.



Photo by Bill Mitchell

Q. How does the Voice of Reason embody and implement that mandate?

Defense of science and freedom in a secular state is *the* important issue in America today. It is the issue which created Voice of Reason, established in January 1981 as a national organization. Our purpose is to protect religious and scientific freedom and resist the New Right attempts to subvert the constitutional framework of our country. Our program is primarily educational, at the grassroots level. We look upon the Jeffersonian advocacy of separation of church and state as basic to a strong and healthy America.

Q. What has Voice of Reason accomplished? And how will the merger with the Center for Moral Democracy affect its future?

I think our grassroots organizational efforts have provided a good start in meeting the challenge of the New Right. We have strong groups in Michigan, Illinois and Alaska and incipient ones in some 7 or 8 other states. We've gathered together persons of all political persuasions who, despite differences in other areas, are committed to the preservation of a secular state. We've concentrated on that issue: clarity is an important key to success.

I look upon the merger with the Moral Democracy Center as a marvellous opportunity to create a truly national organization, from coast to coast, and from north to south. It is a bold approach to the expansion of our efforts at a time when boldness is essential to combat the powers of unreason that, today, too often hold sway. The broader the base of our cooperative efforts, the greater is the likelihood that we will succeed. *Our* voice must, and will, prevail.

Q. What will your own role be in the merged organization?

That of national spokesperson. The principal purpose of our organization is to educate the American public to the importance of religious freedom in a secular state. Perhaps we've taken that freedom for granted for too long. I believe that I can help to make my fellow citizens aware of the role that each of us can play in the preservation of freedom. □

Center for Moral Democracy

EDWARD L. ERICSON, *Director*

Q. What did you do before joining the New York Society? How does it relate to your present involvement in social ethics?

I was Leader of the Washington, D.C. Ethical Society for 12 years before joining the N.Y. Society in 1971. I also was president of the American Ethical Union from '69 to '71. Earlier, I served for 5½ years as a Unitarian minister.

My interest in politics developed in relation to my original professional goal: to be a college history instructor. My Master's degree, in 1951, was in history, with a minor in political science. McCarthyism was then on the rise, and the growing intolerance of diversity in American life affected me deeply. I felt that the free pulpit might well be the last and best defender of a tolerant society. So I entered the ministry with a keen concern for social ethics, a concern that of late has become even more acute.



Photo by Bill Mitchell

Q. How did the Moral Democracy Center evolve from your interest in social and political issues?

In 1980 the New Right attacks on liberal religion and humanism, many directed specifically to Ethical Culture, represented a dangerous return to the McCarthy mentality. It was essential to meet the challenge, and to do so through the building of a coalition of like-minded individuals and organizations. Our first rally drew 2,000 people and led to the founding of the Center for Moral Democracy, in March of last year.

We've endeavored to make the movement broadly inclusive, with those of all religions and political persuasion, and those who are unaffiliated either religiously or politically, working with us. Our focus on First Amendment rights makes this possible.

Q. What has the Center achieved? And how will the merger with the Voice of Reason affect its future?

We've succeeded in providing a base for a coalition. The merger with Voice of Reason is an indication of the growth of that base.

Perhaps the Center's strongest thrust has been the dissemination of information to concerned citizens across the country. One of the results of our efforts in this direction, in fact, is the *Bulletin* readers have in their hands now. I think the Center is uniquely qualified to act as the publications arm of the merged organization. [See Editorial, page 2.]

As to the future, I'm excited about our merger. The Voice of Reason has done well in establishing strong grassroots organizations. Sherwin Wine is an extremely effective speaker and a superb organizer. The two groups complement each other, not only geographically, but in terms of combining their many chapters with our publications skills. Together, we can only grow.

Q. What role do you hope to play in the merged organization?

I will continue to speak and write on the issues. A short paperback I've just completed, "American Freedom and the Radical Right," will soon be published by Frederick Ungar, who approached me after hearing a series of radio talks on the dangers of the New Right. So, whether by speaking or writing, there can be no doubt that the word—*our* word—is getting around. □

Florence Flast

(Continued from p.5)

voluntary as opposed to mandatory prayer?

Mrs. Flast: There is no real difference: organized prayer in the classroom remains a formal exercise required of children. There is, therefore, no such thing as voluntary prayer. For the non-theistic child, or the religious child who is rigidly bound by certain forms of prayer, any time set aside is a problem. When that child steps out of the classroom, he or she is automatically "different," often negatively so. Other problems arise. What kind of prayer shall be used? Whose denomination shall prevail?

No Trumpets for "Voluntary"

In fact, no one denies any child the right to pray silently at any time during the school day. It is the organized effort, imposed upon all children, that is unconstitutional and impermissible.

Q. Has the New Right affected federal policy regarding prayer?

Mrs. Flast: Practically speaking, no, not yet. Symbolically, yes. In November 1981 the Senate voted to endorse "programs of voluntary prayer" in public schools by amending an appropriations bill for the State, Justice and Commerce Departments, barring Justice from the use of federal funds to "prevent the implementation of...voluntary prayer and meditation in the public schools." While this has little practical impact, it encourages those who would circumvent the Constitution and Supreme Court deci-

Casting PEARLS...

PEARL was founded in 1967 by Dr. Leo Pfeffer, one of the nation's leading constitutional lawyers (see Winter '82 *Bulletin*), with Florence Flast a co-founder. Its initial, and successful, effort was to prevent New York State from overriding a constitutional provision to bar the use of public school money in aid of any school controlled by a religious denomination or in which religious doctrine is taught.

Over the years PEARL has grown to embody a cross-country network of local

sions affirming the ban on prayer.

Q. What are the prospects for legislation being enacted by Congress?

Mrs. Flast: The prospects are frightening and the threats multiple. They come from so many sources. The Religious Right, for the first time, has sympathetic people in vitally important positions of power, and the pressure will be tremendous.

Never before have the votes been available in the Congress to enact laws to bypass the First Amendment. The threat is now a real one, and given the possibility of an even more conservative Congress after the 1982 elections, the danger may well increase. An increasingly conservative Congress may also result in weighted hearings when proposed legislation is debated.

Another threat relates to the effort to

limit the jurisdiction of the courts, whose position on church-state separation and prayer has been unassailable. We can only hope that the courts will be in a position to continue their present role.

Florence Flast has truly "come up through the ranks" with regard to her involvement in church-state affairs. From 1964, when she was President of United Parents Association, through years of employment in the New York City Board of Education and with Community Service Society, up to and including the present, she has been a knowledgeable, articulate, and effective spokesperson on behalf of religious liberty.

limit the jurisdiction of the courts, whose position on church-state separation and prayer has been unassailable. We can only hope that the courts will be in a position to continue their present role.

Misusing Religious Liberty

Religious liberty is facing an unprecedented onslaught of attack—and the irony is that the attacks themselves are made in the name of religious liberty. The further irony is that all of the major faiths oppose the effort to legislate prayer, their position being that religious practice belongs in the church and home.

We are a pluralistic society, of many faiths and of no faith, and yet, and as never before, we find ourselves increasingly subject to the tyranny of the minority. PEARL will continue to fight that tyranny and will use all of its resources to do so. □

COUNT ME IN!

Enclosed is payment of my membership dues, payable to the Moral Democracy Center:

\$15 Individual, \$20 Household, \$50 Contributing, \$100 Supporting,
 \$500 Sustaining, \$1000 Patron, \$ _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Please make checks payable to the **Moral Democracy Center** and send to
2 West 64th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023.

(The Bulletin will be sent to contributors of \$5.00 or more.)