

View Single Post

Thread: The Girl with "X-ray" vision

25th January 2006, 07:57 AM

#1202

Julio Siqueira

Banned

Join Date: Jan 2006

Posts: 95

Full House this time...

-

-

-

Hi Once More...

Skolnick

Don't you think that the above is the epitome of hypocrisy? I certainly do.

I don't think so. Actually, I am, as I have always been, very sincere in this.

Steenkh, I believe Siqueira has made it clear that he doesn't care the least about Natasha Demkina. His only interest in the test is to use it anyway he can to attack Richard Wiseman and me, and the skeptical community in general. He calls himself an "antiskeptic activist." He's not pro-Natasha in the least. He's vehemently anti-us.

Yes, Steenkh, I have made it clear. It is clear that I care enormously for Natasha as a human being. I don't care much to her powers. Further, my interest is, as I have made clear to Skolnick from the first moment I contacted him, to attack him. Or better: to attack the wrong points in his research, and to attack the wrong points in Wiseman's research, and to have, as I call it, **antipseudoskeptic** activity. So, this "**US**" that Skolnick mentions above clearly leaves out Carl Sagan, Marcelo Truzzi, Keith Augustine, Robert Todd Carroll, etc, etc, etc. Weirdly enough, what Skolnick complains so much against is the very thing that drives on the scientific enterprise: **Criticism**. There is even a seminal text in philosophy and methodology of science called: "Criticism and The Growth of Knowledge." Almost all scientists are thankful when they receive criticism. Some, like Benvenist (and Skolnick...), are not...

He still claims Natasha was "spot on" in her readings. But in the program, you can hear Natasha telling the M.D. that his liver, kidneys, gall bladder, and pancreas all have problems. For example, she said she saw "sand" in his kidneys.

Skolnick, it would be nice if you could provide us the transcript **plus the video and audio**. You keep not providing us this kind of material. It strains your credibility to act like this.

The Russian journalist for the British tabloid Sun, Igor Monichev (the one who , posing as an objective journalist, defended Natasha and criticized the CSMMH-CSICOP investigators in the Discovery Channel program)

Monichev seems very honest.

And this, fellow forum members, is the kind of evidence the anti-skeptics accuse us of ignoring.

Anti-skeptics maybe; anti-pseudoskeptics surely not.

As soon as I get a chance, I'll watch the broadcasts again and post here partial transcripts of the programs. They are as informative as they are amusing and trust me, they are quite amusing

Judging from what we have had to wait regarding your previous allegations, Doomsday will most likely come and you will still have only your word (and your memory...) to back you up on that...

So, **I highly recommend that you do what I have done:** provide video + audio files, with transcript, so that we can analyze things in a truly scientific fashion. Anecdotes and hearsay should be left for the credulous. Also, why don't you provide us **your copy** of the documentary? I can provide mine to you, or to any forum members, if you wish. Larsen can compare these with the version that he has recorded. That would be truly skeptical work. Also, you (CSICOP/CSMMH) had guys filming the test with Natasha for you. Natasha signed giving you permission to use it. Why don't you use this material to back up your points of view? It looks as though, by keeping secret this material, you from CSICOP/CSMMH fear that this material can only be used against you...

Time to put the cards on the table, my dear friend 😊

Julio



Close this window