**THE WILD WORLD OF WINSTON WU**

**(MY REPLIES TO HIS CLAIMS ARE IN ‘CAPS’)**

**I’ve noticed some common flawed tactics that skeptics use. These include:**

1. **Ignoring facts and evidence that don’t fit into their preconceived world view, rather than updating their beliefs to conform to the facts, which is more logical. (e.g. "It can’t be, therefore it isn’t!")**

**IT IS BELIEVERS, NOT SKEPTICS, WHO TEND TO IGNORE EVIDENCE AND FACTS. IN FACT, THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT DIFFERENTIATES SKEPTICS FROM BELIEVERS: BELIEVERS WILL NEVER ADMIT EVIDENCE OR FACTS THAT CONTRADICT THEIR BELIEF. SCIENTISTS AND SKEPTICS ARE THE ONLY ONES WHO DO. THEY ARE THE ONLY ONES CAPABLE OF ADMITTING THEY WERE WRONG AND THEN CHANGING THEIR BELIEFS TO CONFORM TO THE NEW EVIDENCE.**

**BY THE WAY, “IT CAN’T BE, THEREFORE IT ISN’T!” IS TRUE;**

**BECAUSE IF IT CAN BE, THEN YOU CAN’T SAY “IT ISN’T.”**

1. **Trying to force false explanations to explain a paranormal event regardless of whether they fit the facts. In essence, cynical skeptics tend to prefer inventing false explanations rather than accepting any paranormal ones. For example, using "cold reading" to explain the amazing accuracy of a psychic reading when no known cold reading technique could account for the facts and circumstances.**

**MORE BAD NEWS … FOR YOU … THERE ARE NO KNOWN “AMAZINGLY” ACCURATE PSYCHIC READINGS TO EXPLAIN. THE ONES THAT HAVE BEEN DONE, CAN ALL EASILY BE EXPLAINED BY COMMON COLD READING TECHNIQUES THAT ANYONE CAN DO - EVEN WU.**

**30 YEARS AGO MOST PEOPLE BELIEVED URI GELLER WAS BENDING SPOONS WITH HIS MIND. NOW MILLIONS OF PEOPLE ARE DOING IT. THERE ARE SEVERAL TECHNIQUES, ALL OF WHICH ARE EASILY LEARNABLE. ANY SECOND-RATE MAGICIAN CAN DO IT.**

1. **Moving the goal posts or raising the bar whenever their criteria for evidence is met. For example, a skeptic wants evidence for psi in the form of controlled experiments rather than anecdotal evidence. When this evidence is presented, he will then raise the bar and demand that the experiments be repeatable by other researchers. When this is done, then he will either attack the researchers integrity and character, attack their methods, or demand a report of every detail and minute of the experiment or else he will contend that some unmentioned lack of controls must have been the culprit to explain the positive psi results, etc. He will always find some excuse due to his already made-up mindset.**

**I SEE THE PATTERN: EVERY TACTIC THAT BELIEVERS ARE GUILTY OF, WINSTON WU SIMPLY ATTRIBUTES TO SKEPTICS.**

**THE REQUIREMENT THAT EXPERIMENTS BE REPRODUCIBLE IS NOT ‘RAISING THE BAR.’ IT HAS BEEN A PART OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD SINCE THE BEGINNING. HE MUST DENY ALL ASPECTS OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD BECAUSE TO ACCEPT IT WOULD REQUIRE THAT HE GIVE UP ALL HIS UNSUPPORTABLE BELIEFS AND THAT IS SOMETHING HE WILL NEVER DO.**

**HE THEN STATES THAT THE SKEPTIC WILL ATTACK THE REPORT, THE RESEARCHERS, ETC. THIS IS NOT WHAT HAPPENED IN THE GANZFELD EXPERIMENTS. A SKEPTIC AND A BELIEVER COOPERATED IN THE DESIGNING AND TESTING OF PSI. THEY DID NOT ATTACK EACH OTHER’S CHARACTER. THEY WORKED TOGETHER TO ENSURE AGREEMENT ON TESTING CRITERIA. THE RESULTS BROUGHT THE ORIGINAL GANZFELD SCORES DOWN FROM ALMOST 60% TO JUST OVER 25% (WHICH IS THE PERCENTAGE THAT WOULD BE EXPECTED BY CHANCE = NO PSI FACTOR). SINCE THE RESULT WAS SLIGHTLY OVER 25% THE BELIEVER IN CHARGE HELD TO HER BELIEF THAT THERE WAS A PSI FACTOR IN ACTION. THE SKEPTIC STATED THAT ANY FACTOR, IF IT DID EXIST, WAS VIRTUALLY IRRELEVANT. THOUGH THEY DISAGREED, THEY DISPROVED JUST ABOUT EVERYTHING CLAIMED IN THE STATEMENT ABOVE.**

1. **Using double standards in what they will accept as evidence. For example, when a psi experiment shows well above chance results, they will not accept it as evidence against psi. But when a psi experiment only shows chance results, they will accept that as evidence against psi. In the same fashion, they will not accept anecdotal evidence for the paranormal because they consider it to be unreliable, but not surprisingly they will accept anecdotal evidence when it supports their position (e.g. "Others never reported any paranormal activity in the area").**

**FIRST, THERE ARE NO RELIABLE EXPERIMENTS THAT HAVE SHOWN “WELL ABOVE” CHANCE RESULTS.**

**SECOND, ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE IS NOT EVIDENCE, IT IS HEARSAY.**

**THIRD, THE FACT THAT OTHERS NEVER REPORTED PARANORMAL ACTIVITY IS NOT EVIDENCE, ANECDOTAL OR OTHERWISE. IT DOESN’T EVEN MAKE SENSE TO SAY THAT NOT REPORTING ACTIVITY IS EVIDENCE.**

1. **Attacking the character of witnesses and undermining their credibility their evidence or testimonies can’t be explained away. As we all know, when politicians can’t win on the issues, they resort to character assassinations. Unfortunately, this is also what skeptics and debunkers tend to do as well. When evidence or testimony from key people can’t be explained away or are irrefutable, skeptics will find ways to discredit them such as character assassinations or grossly exaggerating and distorting trivial mistakes. This has especially been done with the direct eyewitnesses of the 1947 Roswell Incident, as Roswell author Stanton Friedman often points out.**

**AS ALWAYS, HE USES THE BREAD-AND-BUTTER TACTICS OF THE TRUE BELIEVERS AND TRIES TO CLAIM THAT THIS IS A SKEPTICAL TECHNIQUE. SKEPTICS TRAIN IN LOGIC AND CRITICAL THINKING. SKEPTICS KNOW THE LOGICAL FALLACIES FORWARDS AND BACKWARDS. “PERSONAL ATTACK” IS ONE OF THE LOGICAL FALLACIES THAT NO SKEPTIC WOULD BE CAUGHT TRYING TO PULL. BUT BELIEVERS LIVE BY THAT TACTIC.**

1. **Dismissing all evidence for the paranormal by classifying it either as anecdotal, untestable, unreplicable, or uncontrolled. Skeptics who wish to close their minds to any evidence, even after asking for it ironically, tend to do so by classifying it into one of the categories above. If the evidence is anecdotal, they will say that anecdotal evidence is worthless scientifically and untestable. If the evidence is in the form of scientific experiments, they will then say that it is unreplicable or uncontrolled.**

**THOSE ARE EXCELLENT REASONS FOR REJECTING A CLAIM. WHAT YOU HAVE JUST SAID IS THAT YOU WILL ACCEPT CLAIMS THAT ARE ANECDOTAL, UNTESTABLE, UNREPLICABLE, AND UNCONTROLED. I’M SURE YOU DON’T FOLLOW YOUR OWN ADVICE IN YOUR ELECTRIAL ENGINEERING CLASSES; AT LEAST, NOT IF YOU HOPE TO GRADUATE.**

**WINSTON WU’S CONCLUSION**

**As we have seen, these common skeptical arguments are not as rational or sensible as they seem.**

**MAYBE THEY SEEM RATIONAL AND SENSIBLE BECAUSE THEY ARE.**

 **There are many critical flaws and limitations in them. They also show a closed system of thinking as well, which reality does not always agree with. Although some of these arguments serve as good guidelines, they are by no means the dogma of reality. They are not all encompassing, nor do they account for every fact and anomaly.**

**I’M NOT SURE WHAT ANY OF THAT MEANS, BUT THE ONLY THING THAT REALLY MATTERS, IS THAT IT MADE SENSE TO HIM.**

**In fact, they can be rigid enough to close one’s mind to new things.**

**EVEN IF IT DID IT WOULDN’T MATTER BECAUSE SCIENCE COULD CARE LESS ABOUT WHETHER PEOPLE OPEN OR CLOSE THEIR MINDS.**

**99.9% OF ALL PEOPLE ON EARTH BELIEVED THE SUN ORBITED THE EARTH. NO MATTER HOW MANY PEOPLE BELIEVED IT, IT DIDN’T CHANGE A THING. THE EARTH ALWAYS HAS, AND STILL DOES, ORBIT THE SUN.**

**The true skeptic should be skeptical of his own beliefs as well as of others. NDE/Consciousness expert Greg Stone, a member of my discussion lists, sums up the skeptics’ mentality quite well in terms I never would have thought of:**

**HE IS AMAZED THAT THERE IS ANYONE OUT THERE WHO COULD ACTUALLY COME UP WITH AN IDEA THAT HE WOULD NOT HAVE THOUGHT OF.**

**You see the subjective evaluation of a skeptic holds less weight than the subjective direct observation of the experiencer. What is needed, and sorely missing, is a real understanding of the nature and factors of subjective knowledge. Without this all such discussions will be foolhardy. The skeptic continually fails to understand and admit that he works on a subjective basis. And seems mystified when someone accepts someone's direct observation over the skeptics subjective evaluation.**

**AFTER READING THAT, I’M AFRAID THAT MR. WU DID NOT GIVE HIMSELF CREDIT. I’M SURE HE COULD HAVE COME UP WITH THAT HIMSELF.**

**Former Naval Scientist Eldon Byrd also wittily comments:**

**What major contribution has any skeptic made to the betterment of humankind? How many Mother Teresa’s have they produced?**

**THANKFULLY NONE.**

**How many great scientific discoveries have they made?**

**ALMOST ALL OF THEM.**

**Many of them are like movie critics--useless and usually wrong.**

**REMEMBER, HOW WINSTON WU RAILED AGAINST PERSONAL ATTACKS JUST A FEW PARAGRAPHS AGO. NOW HE IS AN EXPERT IN USING THEM. CAN YOU SPELL THE WORD H-Y-P-O-C-R-I-T-E?**

**Regardless of what belief you take toward the paranormal, the important thing is to keep an open mind and not rush to judgments based on our personal world views.**

**I DON’T THINK YOU HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT “RUSHING” TO JUDGEMENT. PARANORMAL CLAIMS HAVE BEEN INVESTIGATED FOR CENTURIES. EVIDENCE SCORE IS STILL AT 0.**

**A quote by Hendri Poincare makes this point well:**

**"Doubt everything or believe everything: these are two equally convenient strategies. With either we dispense with the need for reflection." - Henri Poincare**

**THAT WAS NON-SENSICAL: TO DOUBT DOES NOT DISPENSE WITH THE NEED FOR REFLECTION. IN FACT, DOUBTING IS WHAT OFTEN LEADS TO EXPERIMENTATION AND PROVING / DISPROVING AN HYPOTHESIS.**

**Do we have all the answers to the mysteries of the paranormal and of existence? Of course not.**

**I WOULD AMEND THAT QUESTION TO “DO WE HAVE ANY ANSWERS TO THE MYSTERIES OF THE PARANORMAL?” I WOULD LEAVE THE ANSWER AS IS.**

**Neither the most rational skeptics nor the most evolved spiritualists do. But what I can tell you is this. Based on my research and direct personal experience, I know that psychokinesis, telepathy, prayer and spells are real and they work.**

**ALL YOU NEED IS PROOF.**

**YOU CANNOT STATE THE HYPOTHESIS AS THE CONCLUSION: YOU HAVE TO PROVE THE HYPOTHESIS. (LOGICAL FALLACY OF “BEGGING THE QUESTION” OR “UNSTATED MAJOR PREMISE”).**

**The question is how and why.**

**ACTUALLY, THE ONLY QUESTION IS WHY. WHY DOEST THOU PERSIST?**

**The problem is that although these things are real,**

**ONCE AGAIN (“UNSTATED MAJOR PREMISE”), HE TRIES TO SLIP BY THE READER THE FACT THAT HE HAS NOW ASSUMED THE CONCLUSION TO BE TRUE.**

**they don’t fit into conventional paradigms of reality.**

**“CONVENTIONAL PARADIGMS OF REALITY” - THAT WOULD BE THE REAL WORLD.**

**Therefore, we definitely need to update our beliefs and world views to account for these facts and find new paradigms that account for them.**

**WHY?**

**JUST BECAUSE YOU ASSUMED THEY WERE TRUE?**

**In the meantime, we should keep in mind that the beauty of mysteries and paranormal phenomena lies not in finding the answers to every question, but in the awe and appreciation we have for them.**

**JUST FIND AN ANSWER TO ANY OF THEM AND WE (SKEPTICS) WOULD BE ECSTATIC.**

**Therein lies the great lesson that there is always "more to learn" and "something better out there".**

**THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE “MADE-UP STUFF.”**

**Let me close on this with three profound quotes which state this in a poetic way.**

**HE IS VERY FOND OF ‘APPEALS TO AUTHORITY’ AS EVIDENCED BY THE MANY PEOPLE HE QUOTES.**

**"The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all true art and science." - Albert Einstein**

**EINSTEIN WAS A SKEPTIC.**

**"Truth is stranger than fiction, but it is because Fiction is obliged to stick to possibilities; Truth isn't." - Mark Twain**

**TWAIN WAS AN ATHEIST.**

**"Let the mind be enlarged... to the grandeur of the mysteries, and not the mysteries contracted to the narrowness of the mind" - Francis Bacon**

**I’M PRETTY SURE NONE OF THESE THREE GUYS BELIEVED IN PSI.**

**Sincerely,**

**Winston Wu**

**MY CONCLUSION**

**I HAVE READ MUCH OF THE WRITINGS OF WINSTON WU. IN FACT, IN THE NEXT SHOW I INTEND TO DISCUSS HIS “30 ARGUMENTS AGAINST SKEPTICISM.”**

**THOUGH HE COMMITS EVERY LOGICAL FALLACY LISTED IN THE CRITICAL THINKING LITERATURE, THERE IS ONE OVERRIDING THEME TO HIS ENTIRE DEFENSE: IT IS THE DISTRACTION TECHNIQUE KNOWN AS “THROWING IT BACK.”**

**THIS TECHNIQUE IS FIRST ACQUIRED IN SCHOOLYARDS AT AROUND AGE 8 (3RD GRADE). MOST PEOPLE THEN USE IT THE REST OF THEIR LIVES TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AGAINST OTHERS.**

**IT IS VERY SIMPLE: WHATEVER CLAIM OR ACCUSATION IS THROWN AT THEM, THEY SIMPLY TURN IT AROUND AND THROW IT BACK. ONE OF THE FIRST VERSIONS THEY LEARN IS “I KNOW YOU ARE, BUT WHAT AM I?”**

**THE PURPOSE OF THIS TECHNIQUE, LIKE MOST DISTRACTION TECHNIQUES, IS TO TRICK THE OTHER PERSON INTO DEFENDING THEMSELVES. IF THE PERSON FALLS FOR THIS TRICK, THEY WILL BE SO DISTRACTED BY DEFENDING THEMSELVES THAT THEY WILL NOT EVEN REALIZE THAT THE OTHER PERSON HAS EVADED RESPONDING TO THE CLAIM OR ACCUSATION. IT WORKS VERY WELL AGAINST CHILDREN WHO ARE NOT SOPHISTICATED ENOUGH TO REALIZE WHAT IS HAPPENING. WHAT IS AMAZING TO ME, IS HOW SUCCESSFUL THIS TECHNIQUE IS ON ADULTS. NO MATTER HOW MUCH OLDER AND MORE EDUCATED A PERSON BECOMES, IT SEEMS THEY ARE ALWAYS VULNERABLE TO THIS SIMPLE, CHILDISH PLOY.**

**ONLY THROUGH LEARNING CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS CAN YOU LEARN HOW TO PROTECT YOURSELF AGAINST PEOPLE WHO ARE ADEPT AT TRICKING OTHERS. NEXT WEEK, AS I GO THROUGH HIS ARGUMENTS, I WILL NOT ONLY POINT OUT THE VARIOUS LOGICAL FALLACIES IN HIS THINKING, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY, SHOW YOU THE COMMON THREAD OF “THROWING IT BACK” THAT RUNS THROUGHOUT ALL HIS ‘ANSWERS.’**

**AN HONEST PERSON WILL RESPOND TO A CLAIM OR AN ACCUSATION WITH A LOGICAL ANSWER. DISHONEST PEOPLE RESORT TO LOGICAL FALLACIES AND DISTRACTION TECHNIQUES IN ORDER TO AVOID SHOWING THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE THE FACTS OR EVIDENCE ON THEIR SIDE. “THROWING IT BACK” SERVES THE PURPOSE OF “SHIFTING THE BURDEN OF PROOF.”**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

Nepal: The god king's last exit

**Nepal celebrates its transformation from the last Hindu kingdom into a secular democratic republic. The historic step to put an end to 239 years of monarchy and lead the Himalayan country on the “roof of the world” into the 21st century, was taken on May 28, 2008 by the newly elected Maoist-led Constitutional Assembly with 560 votes against 4. Ousted King Gyanendra – till recently officially worshipped as incarnation of the Hindu god Lord Vishnu – has left Narayanhity Palace on 12th June for good. Though his astrologers urged him to wait for an auspicious time, the government did not allow him to extend the deadline. The royal flag at the main palace gate has long been exchanged with the national standard. The pink edifice in the center of Kathmandu will soon become a national museum.**

**Bertrand Russell**

[**18 May**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/May_18)[**1872**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1872)**–**[**2 February**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/February_2)[**1970**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1970) **97 YEARS!**

**He was a** [**philosopher**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosopher)**,** [**historian**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historian)**,** [**logician**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical_logic)**,** [**mathematician**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematician)**, advocate for social reform, and** [**pacifist**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pacifism)**. He was co-author (with** [**Alfred North Whitehead**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred_North_Whitehead)**) of** [**Principia Mathematica**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principia_Mathematica)**, an attempt to ground** [**mathematics**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematics) **on the laws of** [**logic**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logic)**. Both works have had a considerable influence on** [**logic**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logic)**,** [**set theory**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Set_theory)**,** [**linguistics**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistics) **and** [**analytic philosophy**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Analytic_philosophy)**.**

**In 1950, Lord Russell was awarded the** [**Nobel Prize**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nobel_Prize) **in** [**Literature**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nobel_Prize_in_Literature)**, "in recognition of his varied and significant writings in which he champions** [**humanitarian**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humanitarian) **ideals and** [**freedom of thought**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freethought)**".**

**"We may define 'faith' as the firm belief in something for which there is no evidence.**

**Where there is evidence, no one speaks of 'faith.'**

**We do not speak of faith that two and two are four or that the earth is round.**

**We only speak of faith when we wish to substitute emotion for evidence."**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**"Many orthodox people speak as though**

**it were the business of skeptics to disprove received dogmas**

**rather than of dogmatists to prove them."**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**"The immense majority of intellectually eminent men dis-believe in Christian religion,**

**but they conceal the fact in public, because they are afraid of losing their incomes."**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**"Many people would sooner die than think. In fact they do."**

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

**"What is wanted is not the will to believe, but the wish to find out, which is the exact opposite."**