

CSI's Balles Prize Goes to Richard Wiseman for *Paranormality*

BARRY KARR

The Committee for Skeptical Inquiry (CSI) will award its 2011 Robert P. Balles Annual Prize in Critical Thinking to psychologist Richard Wiseman for his book *Paranormality: Why We See What Isn't There*.

Wiseman holds Britain's only Chair in the Public Understanding of Psychology, at the University of Hertfordshire (UK). He has written several best-selling books, including *The Luck Factor*, *Quirkology*, *59 Seconds*, and *Paranormality*. More than two million people have taken part in his mass participation experiments, and his YouTube channel has received more than thirty million views. He is one of the most frequently quoted psychologists in the British media and was recently listed as one of the *Independent on Sunday's* top 100 people who make Britain a better place to live. He is also a Committee for Skeptical Inquiry fellow and a SKEPTICAL INQUIRER consulting editor.

Paranormality is not like a good number of skeptical books looking at paranormal claims. Wiseman is not simply interested in looking at a claim, gathering the evidence, and debunking the claim. He goes a step further. He is interested in showing us how easy it is for us to be deceived and how easily we can be fooled and fool others. He includes do-it-yourself activities that allow you to learn some of the basics and share in the experiences for yourself.

As the book jacket says: "Richard Wiseman is clear about one thing: Paranormal phenomena don't exist. But in the same way space travel yields technology that transforms our everyday lives, so research into telepathy, fortune-telling, and out-of-body experiences produces remarkable insights into our brains, behaviour and beliefs." Exactly.

The Robert P. Balles Annual Prize in Critical Thinking is a \$1,500 award given to the author of the published work that best exemplifies healthy skepticism, logical analysis, or empirical science. Each year, the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry, publisher of the SKEPTICAL INQUIRER, selects the paper, article, book, or

other publication that has the greatest potential to create positive reader awareness of important scientific issues.

The prize will be presented to Wiseman during CSICon Nashville, October 25–28, 2012.

This prize has been established through the generosity of Robert P. Balles, an associate member of CSI, and the Robert P. Balles Endowed Memorial Fund, a permanent endowment fund for the benefit of CSI. CSI's established criteria for the prize include use of the most parsimonious theory to fit

data or to explain apparently preternatural phenomena.

This is the seventh year the Robert P. Balles prize has been presented. Previous winners of this award are:

2010: Steven Novella for his tremendous body of work, including the *Skeptics' Guide to the Universe*, *Science-Based Medicine*, *Neurologica*, SKEPTICAL INQUIRER column "The Science of Medicine," and his tireless travel and lecture schedule on behalf of skepticism

2009: Michael Specter, *New Yorker* staff writer and former foreign correspondent for the *New York Times*, for his book *Denialism: How Irrational Thinking Hinders Scientific Progress, Harms the Planet, and Threatens Our Lives*

2008: Leonard Mlodinow, physicist, author, and professor at Caltech, for his book *The Drunkard's Walk: How Randomness Rules Our Lives*

2007: Natalie Angier, *New York Times* science writer and author of the book *The Canon: A Whirligig Tour of the Beautiful Basics of Science*

2006: Ben Goldacre for his weekly column, "Bad Science," published in the *Guardian* newspaper (U.K.)

2005: Shared by Andrew Skolnick, Ray Hyman, and Joe Nickell for their series of articles in the SKEPTICAL INQUIRER on "Testing 'The Girl with X-Ray Eyes'"

Barry Karr is the executive director of the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry.

Sixth World Skeptics Congress—Berlin 2012

KYLIE STURGESS

It's rare for a gift of homeopathy to be welcomed by skeptics, but at the Sixth World Skeptics Congress every presenter was given a sample of *Murus Berlinensis*, a homeopathic remedy made from the remains of the Berlin Wall. While sugar tablets can't be guaranteed to bring harmony and unity in every pill, they certainly brought an ironic smile to

between politics and creationism in Italy, Serbia, Brazil, Great Britain, and Russia. Scott's message on how "science is not a democracy" was reiterated by Dittmar Graf of the Institute of Biology and Education at the University of Dortmund, who outlined comparative studies on the acceptance of evolution in Germany and Turkey and the difficulties in achieving

duced conflicted responses from students.

Gita Sahgal, director of the Centre for Secular Space, began the sessions on pseudoscience in education. Her lecture unveiled the early history and myths of India and Pakistan and the influence they have had on nationalist movements and education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. My presentation fol-

Photos by André Sebastiani

The Sixth World Skeptics Congress drew an impressive stable of speakers and attendees.

From left: Kylie Sturgess, Eugenie C. Scott, and Camp Quest's Samantha Stein.

the face of James Randi. The conference, held in Berlin from May 18–20, 2012, was a lively mixed gathering of people with a great number of countries represented both on the stage and in the audience.

Despite the long weekend dedicated to the congress ahead, there were a number of well-attended tours on Wednesday and Thursday before the event that allowed attendees to learn more about the history of the underground bunkers and towers around the city. An open-day on Thursday featured magic shows, lectures, and a German session of "Science Slam"—an event similar to the traditional "Café Scientifique" but with a competitive edge.

Eugenie C. Scott started off the main event on Friday with a brisk but disturbing look at creationism outside the United States, involving the intersection

such acceptance. Johan Braeckman of Ghent University and the Flemish skeptical organization SKEPP presented on creationism in Belgium and the Netherlands, with an amusing tale about the potentially London-Olympic bound "authentic" Noah's Ark built by Dutch creationist Johan Huibers.

The high level of acceptance of creationism in the Islamic world was the focus of research conducted by McGill's Evolution Education Research Center, presented by Anila Asghar. An extensive study involving more than one hundred Muslim scientists and teachers and five thousand student surveys across Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, Indonesia, and Pakistan revealed that while the reconciliation of faith and evolution was possible for scientists, exposure to American creationist materials and religious messages pro-

lowed; inspired by a 2006 Australian paper on autism, dyslexia, and attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), it showed how the "unsinkable rubber ducks" like Dore, the "Mozart effect," Brain Gym, and Facilitated Communication persist even now—despite damning research, court cases, and even company bankruptcy.

Samantha Stein from Camp Quest echoed my overall point on the need for all stakeholders to develop greater responsibility when improving education. Her dynamic presentation on "Engaging Children in Science" critically examined the state of U.K. science education, the need for education reform, and the promotion of science literacy beyond the classroom. Her talk prompted a passionate outburst during the question-and-answer session by audience

member Simon Singh, who agreed with Stein's observation about the sorry state of science education. Stein is currently writing a book, *Atheists, Tents, and Unicorns: The Story of Camp Quest in the UK*, on her experiences as the founder and director of Camp Quest UK. The day concluded with awards for Simon Singh and Edzard Ernst, Luigi Garlaschelli, and Wim Betz, recognizing their ongoing efforts to promote science and reason worldwide.

For the start of Saturday's proceedings Professor Jürgen Windeler deliv-

ular science writer for a number of skeptical publications including *Skeptic* and SKEPTICAL INQUIRER, discussed the bogus and bizarre treatments that are touted as so-called complementary/alternative medicine (or "SCAM"). She presented on the issues that arise from meta-analyses and systematic reviews of pseudoscience in medicine (drawing on a paper by Ioannidis). Hall is the creator of the "tooth fairy science" analogy for the seductive appeal of such claims, and she introduced us to the German translation: *Zahnfeewissenschaft!* This was her first overseas pres-

member inquired about potential cheaper health insurance policies due to hypothetical companies not endorsing pseudoscientific practices.

The end-of-day sessions on "Psychology and Pseudoscience," chaired by James Alcock, brought us the very first public demonstration of Ray Hyman's PowerPoint skills for a lecture on the history of testing psychic claims, and he included some impressively deft rope tricks. Although Chris French's original presentation was beset by technical difficulties, his new lecture certainly cap-

Photos by André Sebastiani

Simon Singh

Massimo Polidoro

ered a presentation on evaluating the benefits of conventional and complementary medicine, looking specifically at some misunderstandings of medical evaluation—what is involved in randomization and how simple blinding methods are not always possible. He also presented a case for ignoring the claims of homeopathy rather than giving them any potential therapeutic credibility. The topic of diagnostic and therapeutic interventions was expanded upon by Gerd Antes of the University Medical Center in Freiburg, who interrogated the systematic research into the deficiencies of the research and publication process and how this contributes to what would be otherwise avoidable diseases and deaths: "Don't fight belief; fight the justification of belief through the abuse of science and knowledge."

Harriet "Skep-Doc" Hall, MD, a pop-

ulation at a skeptical convention, and considering the extremely positive response to her work from the audience, it should certainly not be her last.

The sessions on alternative medicine concluded with an in-depth and entertaining look at acupuncture by Benedikt Matenaer, who has a background in anesthesiology and palliative care. He critically analyzed the economic influences acupuncture has had on the German health system and the reasons that public health insurances and public health systems should be held accountable for promoting acupuncture (particularly why practitioners are acquiring a "pseudo-education" to "put needles anywhere"). The assumptions made by acupuncturist "professionals" are "stupid" and "disgusting lies"—and he proposed a hilarious quiz on chi for the next time skeptics encounter their claims. One canny audience

tured the audience's attention with a tale of scientists attempting to replicate Daryl Bem's precognition studies and the frustrating and sometimes bemusing lengths that must be taken to be published in peer-reviewed journals. Polish skeptic Tomasz Witkowski's talk on pseudoscience in psychology investigated not only how dodgy claims in the field are detrimental for science in general but also how they mislead those who hope to find help with health issues such as brain damage and cancer.

On Sunday, skepticism entered the political sphere when Chris Mooney discussed his recent investigations into cognitive differences between liberals and conservatives—which may help or hinder the development of a civil society—as discussed in his new book, *The Republican Brain*. Simon Perry's talk on the advent and application of fill-in-

complaint-form website Fishbarrel (adapted by a handful of countries to help target pseudoscientific products online) was well received by the mostly German audience; this may also be due to another innovative example of using similar methods of social media manipulation by Germany's *Piratenpartei* (Pirate Party), which has influenced local political change. The last session featured a standing-room-only Houdini Séance with Ray Hyman, James Randi, and Massimo Polidoro delving into some of the lesser-known stories of the great magician. We were then treated to a lengthy question-and-answer session, ranging from the history of the Million Dollar Challenge (lauded by African skeptic Leo Igwe as invaluable to activist efforts worldwide) to the danger of lie detectors to budget spending on paranormal claims worldwide.

The event concluded with the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry, the European Council of Skeptical Organisations (ECSO), and the *Gesellschaft zur wissenschaftlichen Untersuchung von Pseudowissenschaften* (GWUP) releasing a resolution calling for high standards of scientific practice in scientific institutions and in science education—to focus on challenging pseudoscience when it is being established within academic and instructional institutions, particularly when funded by tax-payers. (See box for text.) Considering the scope of the topics and presentations at the congress, a call for international action was a fine way to finish a dynamic and stimulating weekend of skepticism.

The next World Skeptics Congress will be held in Sweden in 2013.

Kylie Sturgess is the host of *Token Skeptic*, a podcast that garners around 15,000 listeners per month (and growing) and is syndicated to radio stations in the United States. She regularly writes for numerous publications worldwide and authors CSI's "Curiouser and Curiouser" online column. An award-winning philosophy and special needs teacher, Kylie is a member of the James Randi Educational Foundation Education Advisory Panel.

Resolution

Scientific Standards in Academia and Education

On the occasion of the Sixth World Skeptics Congress in Berlin, the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry (CSI), the European Council of Skeptical Organizations (ECSO), and the German skeptical organization Gesellschaft zur wissenschaftlichen Untersuchung von Pseudowissenschaften (GWUP) adopted the following resolution calling for high standards of scientific practice in scientific institutions and in science education.

Scientists and skeptics from around the world are deeply concerned with the growing tolerance, acceptance, and even promotion of pseudoscientific and occult ideas and practices within scientific, academic, and educational institutions. Students worldwide are in danger of being instructed in the unsubstantiated claims of ideologues and purveyors of pseudoscience, rather than learning to base conclusions on dependable, scientific knowledge. Scientists and academics may be reluctant or afraid to speak up, even when scientific principles and criteria are blatantly violated, fearful of antagonizing colleagues or those on whom their own careers may depend.

At the occasion of the Sixth World Skeptics Congress in Berlin, CSI, ECSO, and GWUP call for high standards of scientific practice in scientific institutions and in science education. They call on scientists and academics worldwide to raise their voices when pseudoscience is being established within academic and instructional institutions. When such institutions are publicly funded, it is additionally of crucial importance that taxes not be used to promote pseudoscience or ideologies.

Specifically, we call on all those responsible to:

Ensure that universities, medical institutions, and colleges teach dependable, scientific knowledge and

resist the temptation to let unproven claims enter professional education; such institutions are obliged to assist students to clearly distinguish between science-based and unscientific methodologies within the context of science and evidence-based medicine; and

Ensure that scientific standards of evidence-based medicine are applied without compromise, resisting attempts to grant exemptions for ideological or commercial reasons to some forms of therapy that potentially risk patient welfare; and

Ensure that schools base the science curriculum on accepted science, rejecting attempts to influence the curriculum on ideological, political, or religious grounds, such as has occurred with the teaching of evolution and climate change.

We also call upon our sister skeptical organizations from around the world in the spirit of consumer protection to commit themselves to ensuring good science within academia and schools, in addition to continuing their efforts to promote science and critical thinking to the public.

Dear Dr. Phil

Dear Dr. Phil,

Your May 25, 2012, show about psychics, “Inside the Other Side” (<http://www.drphil.com/shows/show/1853>), did not demonstrate the “healthy degree of skepticism” you claimed in the show’s opening. As a person who has taken many critical thinking courses—such as research—as part of his PhD, you would, I assume, understand how to draw logical conclusions based on available scientific evidence. Here are a few examples of why the show lacked a healthy degree of skepticism along with some explanations for why the guests *appeared* to be psychic.

When “color” psychic Dougall Fraser told you he saw purple in your aura, therefore you’re a leader and like to be in control, I don’t think that was a particularly risky prediction for someone who hosts a major television show. With a healthy degree of skepticism, you could have pointed this out—but I suspect your producers and sponsors preferred that you didn’t.

Your poll at the beginning of the show indicated that 78 percent of the audience believed in psychic ability. Do you suppose this could account for why so many audience members assessed the psychics as accurate?

If you have a healthy degree of skepticism, why were there more than four guests who were allegedly psychic and only one person who was a skeptic? Also, why was the skeptic not on stage with the psychics?

That lone skeptic, as you know, was James Underdown, who pretended to be a psychic and convinced the subjects that he had supernatural abilities—so much so that he even brought three of them to tears. Because Underdown had never given a reading before, it made perfect sense when psychic Rebecca Rosen was labeled as more accurate than him (after giving the same subjects a reading). But your implication was that Underdown

wasn’t very convincing while the psychics were. This is extremely unfair—especially considering that Rebecca claimed to have given thousands of readings. Had you not had her provide a reading to those same subjects, Underdown would have clearly convinced most that he had psychic ability. This was the most important thing that happened in the show, and you discredited Underdown’s convincing performance. He was actually magnificent, but you wouldn’t acknowledge it.

If you have a healthy degree of skepticism, why were there more than four guests who were allegedly psychic and only one person who was a skeptic?

The seemingly amazing hit from Rebecca Rosen regarding her vision of a hummingbird (and then discovering the subject had a hummingbird tattoo) illustrates why testing needs to be conducted under controlled, scientific conditions. As a skilled researcher with a PhD, why didn’t you suggest tighter controls using impartial assistance (researchers not affiliated with your show) to monitor Rebecca’s reading and make certain the two had never come in contact with each other? Or, perhaps you could have allowed the impartial researchers to select

your subjects (and perhaps not from your audience). This would have made the apparent hit more believable. Should you ever do another show on the subject—with Rebecca as a guest once again—I’d be happy to supply the subjects and see if she is as apparently accurate with her readings as before.

As for one of your guests trying to validate remote viewing because of the U.S. government’s research into the subject, I want you to know that the government eventually abandoned remote viewing research because it didn’t work.

With this kind of unskeptical stance from the host, is it any wonder that 84 percent of your audience claimed belief in psychic ability by the show’s end?

You do some really good shows—and for the right reasons—but I get the feeling you did this one primarily for ratings. If you do another show on the subject, I hope it’s with a balanced panel of guests. Since you seem so convinced of the validity of the psychics’ readings, would you suggest people with relationship problems seek psychics rather than mental health professionals? If this is the case, consider doing the rest of your relationship shows with psychics—you’ll get the ratings and the sponsors will love it. Just curious—did your audience members fill out a card before the show began commenting on concerns and issues in their lives?

All my best,

Dr. Bryan

(a person with a genuinely healthy degree of skepticism)

(See also “Dr. Phil Gives Psychics a Pass,” Kendrick Frazier, “From the Editor,” *SI*, July/August 2012.)

Bryan Farha is professor of behavioral studies in education at Oklahoma City University. He is a CSI consultant and editor of *Paranormal Claims: A Critical Analysis*. His email address is bfarha@okcu.edu.

Victims in Psychic-Inspired Hoax Sue Police, Media

BENJAMIN RADFORD

A Texas couple that owns a ranch that was searched by police following false information about a mass grave provided by a psychic is suing the police and several major news organizations for defamation.

Though the incident became a national embarrassment, the police refused to apologize, saying that procedures were followed and that the severity of the claims warranted an investigation.

The case began June 6, 2011, when a psychic called police describing a horrific scene of mass murder: dozens of dismembered bodies near a ranch house about an hour outside of Houston, Texas. There were rotting limbs and headless corpses; chillingly, many were children. Deputies from the Liberty County Sheriff's office went to investigate but didn't see anything amiss. After a second call the following day, dozens of officials from the Texas Department of Public Safety, the FBI, and the Texas Rangers were on the scene—not to mention cadaver dogs, news helicopters, and gawkers. It all turned out to be a false alarm.

Though the incident became a national embarrassment, the police refused to apologize, saying that procedures were followed and that the severity of the claims warranted an investigation. Whether a tip comes from an ordinary citizen, an anonymous informant, or a self-proclaimed psychic, information about mass murders cannot be ignored.

NRC Booklet Answers Common Questions about Climate Change

The National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council on July 3 issued a glossy, well-illustrated, forty-page booklet for the general public about climate change. It is based on a number of recent NRC reports prepared at the request of Congress that examined and presented the peer-reviewed scientific evidence about climate change.

The booklet, *Climate Change: Evidence, Impacts, and Choices*, has easy-to-understand sections on the three aspects in the subtitle. Perhaps the most valuable section is the first, "Evidence for Human-Caused Climate Change." It gives short, clear discussions about questions still raised in public forums: How do we know that the Earth has warmed? How do we know that greenhouse gases lead to warming? How do we know that humans are causing greenhouse gases to increase? How much are human activities heating Earth? How do we know the current warming trend isn't caused by the sun or by other natural processes?

The booklet and its accompanying twenty-four-minute video are available online from the National Academy of Sciences at <http://americas-climatechoices.org>.

Now the couple that owns the ranch is suing. According to a story in *The Dayton News*, “Joe Bankson and Gena Charlton, through their attorney, Andrew B. Sommerman, filed a lawsuit on June 5, 2012, in the 193rd Judicial District in Dallas claiming that the sheriff’s office and the media groups acted in reckless disregard and caused damage to the couple’s reputation and good name. Bankson and Charlton . . . are now unable to return to their rented home in Hardin because ‘everyone looks at them askance because

of the accusations made against them.”

Bankson and Charlton accuse the *New York Times*, CNN, Thompson Reuters, ABC News, and other news media of publishing false statements claiming that bodies had been found on their property.

This was only one of many false psychic tips given to police. In March 2004, a Florida psychic contacted the Transportation Safety Administration to inform them that a bomb was aboard an American Airlines flight headed for Dal-

las, Texas. Nothing was found, but the delay caused by the psychic’s tip forced cancellation of the flight, and over one hundred passengers were placed on later flights, most delayed until the following day. Whether Bankson and Charlton will win their defamation lawsuit remains to be seen, though if they do it may make police more cautious about following up on psychic information.

Benjamin Radford is the deputy editor of the SKEPTICAL INQUIRER.

Americans’ Anti-Evolution Beliefs Steady for Past Thirty Years

KENDRICK FRAZIER

The 2012 version of the Gallup Poll’s biennial survey about U.S. beliefs on evolution vs. creationism presents few surprises—in fact it demonstrates a thirty-year picture of virtually stable belief. In this year’s poll (issued June 1) 46 percent of Americans believe in the creationist view that God created humans in their present form. This is essentially unchanged from thirty years ago, when Gallup first posed the question. About a third of Americans believe that humans evolved, but with God’s guidance. Fifteen percent say humans evolved but that God had no part in the process. The virtually flat trend of data since 1982 is shown at right.

As Gallup’s Frank Newport says, “All in all, there is no evidence in this trend of a substantial movement toward a secular viewpoint on human origins.”

The poll also shows, again no surprise, that Republicans tend to believe that God created humans in their present form in higher numbers (58 percent) than do Independents (39 percent) or Democrats (41 percent).

If there was any comfort at all for educated, science-minded observers it is that Americans with a postgraduate education are most likely to say humans evolved in their present form without divine guidance (42 percent, compared with 35 percent for those with only a col-

lege degree and 25 percent for those with a high school degree or less).

Newport acknowledges that Americans’ views are out of step with the scientific evidence: “It would be hard to dispute that most scientists who study humans agree that the species evolved over millions of years, and that relatively few scientists believe that humans began in their current form only 10,000 years ago without the benefit of evolution. Thus, almost half of Americans today hold a belief, at least as measured by this question wording, that is at odds with the

preponderance of the scientific literature.”

Still, all three questions ask about something that is essentially a scientific concept (evolution) in terms of God and religion. It would be nice if a future poll would add a question framed in purely scientific terms without explicit reference to God or religious belief. Mentioning God and religion obviously reinforces the idea that the issue should be interpreted only in terms of one’s religious beliefs.

Kendrick Frazier is the editor of the SKEPTICAL INQUIRER.

Psychic Medium Convicted of Sexual Exploitation

BENJAMIN RADFORD

In June, a psychic went on trial in Britain, accused of tricking two women into stripping and performing sex acts in order to speak to their dead relatives. According to an article in the *Daily Telegraph*,

A young woman told a jury today how a psychic tricked her into performing “like a porn star” in the hope of getting in touch with her dead grandfather. Medium Karl Lang is accused of persuading the woman, twenty-six, to strip naked during a séance because it increased her powers to contact the spirit world. The other victim, now twenty-seven, said: “The first time I stripped off my clothes he said ‘Well done! You’ve gone up a level in the spiritual world.’ . . . He told me the more outrageous I behaved, the higher level I would get.”

The second victim claims that Lang convinced her that her dead father was communicating with him, and he en-

couraged her to undress and masturbate to improve her psychic powers. She said that she felt “brainwashed, manipulated and groomed” by Lang. “He was an abuser taking advantage of the fact that my dad died when I was young and I never had the chance to say goodbye,” she said.

The women said that they were introduced to Lang after being impressed with a psychic reading he’d given at a friend’s party. On June 22, Lang was convicted of twelve counts of causing women to engage in sexual activity without consent; Judge Patrick Curran of the Newport Crown Court described Lang’s activity as “systematic conduct and a breach of trust involving two very vulnerable young women . . . vulnerable in the sense that they were bereaved and sought the defendant’s consultation in communicating with those who died, and he took the

most gross advantage of the situation.”

Trickery and exploitation by alleged psychics is nothing new. Harry Houdini crusaded against fraudulent mediums, his training and experience as a magician allowing him to effectively expose many psychic mediums’ fake ghostly phenomena. Mediums were caught using everything from assistants camouflaged in black to hidden wires and strings in order to simulate supernatural events. By the 1920s an entire cottage industry devoted to faking ghostly communication was thriving on both sides of the Atlantic. One big reason for their success: emotionally manipulating grieving people’s desire to believe. When a person in authority is claiming to have unproven, special powers that can send messages from the dead to vulnerable and grieving people, it’s a recipe for emotional manipulation and exploitation. ■

SCIENCE AND THE PUBLIC

Earn your master’s degree in Science and the Public through the University at Buffalo and the Center for Inquiry!

Explore the methods and outlook of science as they intersect with public culture and public policy. This degree is ideal for enhancing careers in science education, public policy, and science journalism—and prepares you for positions that involve communicating about science.

This unique two-year graduate degree program is entirely online. Take courses from wherever you are in the world at your own pace! Courses include: Science, Technology, and Human Values; Research Ethics; Critical Thinking; Scientific Writing; Informal Science Education; Science Curricula; and History and Philosophy of Science.

Science and the Public 
Graduate School of Education & the Center for Inquiry

For details, visit www.gse.buffalo.edu/online/science

Questions? Contact John Shook, CFI Vice President for Research, at jshook@centerforinquiry.net.