Reader David Glück referred me to this site , which prompted me to respond. Perhaps you'll go there, read the essay, and return to see my response, below…

I read this unsigned essay with great interest. Therein, I found a few canards of which I'd not previously heard. For example, I assure the author that I, as a devoted skeptic but not a cynic, personally have no fear nor worry whatsoever that claimed psi phenomena might turn out to be real, as he thought might be the case with some. In fact, upon being presented with firm evidence establishing this wonderful circumstance, I would delight in trying to solve the *modi operandi*
that might bring about telepathy, precognition, or other such phenomena.

The author writes: "Sceptics – identified as such from prior personality profiling – have been found unconsciously to influence the results of psi experiments by consistently producing results lower than would be expected by chance." Using that same standard, substitute "believers" for "sceptics," and "higher" for "lower." I believe this is properly described by an old saying involving interchangeable sauce for geese and ganders…?

The "It's the kind of thing I would not believe in even if it were true" statement is, to me, unforgiveable, and I cannot embrace that thought. I am a rationalist, and proper evidence will establish, for me, any claim. For the last decade, through the James Randi Educational Foundation, I have offered a one-million-dollar prize to any person who can establish that any paranormal, supernatural, or occult claim is true. The fact that no one has won this prize, nor even passed the preliminary stage of testing, either indicates that no one can do so, or that a suitable applicant has yet to apply. I prefer the latter possibility, though I admittedly have no belief in these wonders, because all that I've seen in my 80-plus years, have been the results of trickery or self-delusion.

The author also writes: "A great deal of what debunkers write in their books is not really researched at all closely, but simply lifted from earlier books." In respect to this comment, I refer you to the geese-and-ganders sauce application mentioned above… I note, too, that the author quotes extensively from staunch believers, and expresses little – if any – doubt that they speak sooth.

True skeptics are always willing to be shown, as I am. And it may happen, though I note that

none of the prominent figures of today such as Uri Geller have expressed any interest in accepting my challenge. That, in itself, speaks loudly to the skeptic. But then, Geller appears to be making a bid to tell all, since he now only accepts the designation “entertainer” or “showman,” not wanting to be described as “psychic.” What will the next phase of his newly-adopted stance involve, I wonder?