

smidgen of addelepatated snobbism between the lines? Of course "scholarly treatment" would mean having to be knowledgeable, accurate, and studious, so I can understand why he "just can't do that." It certainly puts new meaning into the words "carefully, objectively, and critically," doesn't it?

Frazier went on to say: "I have no reason to believe that the outcome of Martin's examination would have been any different had he spent three years looking at it." Obviously, from past experience, he knew Gardner's work would not improve, no matter how long he studied the Book. Such a chilling thought evokes the wit of Oscar Wilde: "There is much to be said in favor of modern journalism. By giving us the opinions of the un[principled] it keeps us in touch with the ignorance of the community." Once again we stand in debt to SI for redefining the English language: now the phrase "does not reject claims on a priori grounds" must mean "any claim that requires true scholarly effort to research is automatically considered bunk."

"Criticism is prejudice made plausible."

H. L. Mencken

Gardner went on to say: "As for the book's scientific merits, its enthusiasts are like the early Velikovskians. They pick out statements that reflect the common knowledge of the day, imagine anticipations of new science in vague remarks, and rationalize passages that have turned out to be false on the grounds that the extraterrestrials were forced to phrase their revelations within the limited knowledge of the channeler." Two pages earlier in the very same issue of SI, David Morrison and Mark Chapman state: ". . . a majority of the members of that (Harvard Geology) department had still not accepted plate tectonics as of the mid-70's, even though history will record the plate tectonic revolution as having occurred a decade earlier." Even a third grade researcher could easily find the dozens of pages in The UB which accurately describe plate tectonics in minute detail. It is a well-known fact that many people studied the Urantia Papers from from the

"I have no reason to believe that the outcome of Martin's examination would have been any different had he spent three years looking at it."

late thirties through 1955, when it was published. More incredible is that with 2,097 pages to attack, Gardner's original essay did not accurately describe a *single* "out-dated" scientific statement. Ironically, Gardner made several false and totally out-of-context scientific statements himself in a space of only six pages; a remarkable feat, by **CSICOP** standards.

When reader John Brawley and I brought this to his attention in letters to the editor of SI, (Summer 1990) Gardner still did not name a *single* incorrect UB scientific statement in his rebuttal, or even address comments correcting his misinformation.

In the summer 1990 issue of SI, Gardner replies to letters written in defense of The UB: "I consider the book fair game

for a Mencken-type attack because of the angry attacks that Urantians make on anyone who dares to criticize The UB." (Alas! Is this the same North Carolinian pedant who could not find Dr. Sadler's Who's Who entry in the Mayberry Library?) Are those so-called "angry attacks," which he claims were made *before* he wrote his article, my attempts to persuade him to be the first kid on the skeptical block to actually read The URANTIA Book prior to venting his wrath on it? I did mention to him that if he didn't read it, he would be right up there with several Christian reviewers who had likewise not bothered to read the Book before denouncing it. And it's funny – I don't find "Mencken-style attack" among the objectives of **CSICOP**; is this yet another new SI interpretation for "responsible or impartial?" Perhaps it is a new meaning for the word "scientific." At last! A phrase worthy of the emotions bottled up in those pseudo-skeptics who parade around as pseudo-scientists.

"Get your facts first; then you can distort them as you please."

Mark Twain

Obviously, most SI readers have never read much Gardner outside of their little fanzine. If they had, they would know that Gardner has written "I am not only a theist but also, on a sense, a Platonic mystic," and "I have believed in an afterlife since my boyhood, when