

Re: ANCIENT EGYPT- GOD=G_uv

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-06/4050.html>

From: ZenIsWhen (ZenIsWhen_at_anywhere.com)

Date: 06/22/04

Date: Mon, 21 Jun 2004 23:26:06 -0400

"George Hammond" <research137@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:Z2JBc.87161\$HG.66671@attbi_s53...

>

> "ZenIsWhen" <ZenIsWhen_at_anywhere.com> wrote in message

> news:10de643ded2caee@corp.supernews.com...

>>

>> "George Hammond" <research137@hotmail.com> wrote in message

>> news:XJDBc.154195\$Ly.67251@attbi_s01...

>>>

>>> "Russell E. Rierson" <analog57@yahoo.com> wrote in message

>>> news:c410ffa5.0406202124.2fcd4fe4@posting.google.com...

>>>> TMG <TMG@Nowhere.org> wrote in message

>>>> news:<eNqdnbJfoqQKiUvdRVn-jw@comcast.com>...

>>>>> To begin, please understand the source:

>>>>>>

>>>>>> <http://www.insolitology.com/mail/Rierson.htm>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Of course – Rierson could/may be a Hammond sock puppet.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>

>>>> <snip "philawsephy" razza m tazza having no relevance

>>>> to an experimentally confirmed axiomatic physics

>>>> discovery>

>>>>

>>>> You have bellowed this crap before?

>>>> WHAT EXPERIMENT?

>>>> What discovery? Your babbling is NOT a discovery – it's an assertion

....

>>>> and a psychotic one at that!

>>>>

>>>> [Hammond]

>>>> Either read the theory enough so you

>>>> can comprehend it or get outta here.

>>>> Quit bellowing the world "crap" all over

>>>> the place.

Quit positing crap all over the place!

I read the theory enough to easily conclude it was the work of a deranged lunatic.

I even posted LOGICAL, RATIONAL, and SCIENTIFIC rebuttals and you, as usual, ignorantly ignored them.

I do not need to know how to comprehend crap to know it's crap!

My peer reviewed published papers
> *(two of them posted on my website)*

They are not "peer reviewed" in the ways REAL scientists have REAL, valid, scientific magazines, "peer review" papers.

A scientist offers a paper to a science journal.

That paper is passed off to many different people – experts in the same field as the writer. Those people look for errors, problems, test and experimental data. They go over the paper with a FINE TOOTH COMB. If it passes them, then, and ONLY then, is it sent back to the journal for publishing.

Your rag, and your bull shit, NEVER went through such "peer reviewed" tests and examinations!

And, apparently, you are still trying to pass off a "letter to the editor" as a published paper.

NO honest scientist would EVER commit such fraud!

> *CLEARLY CITE 100 years of published*
> *psychometry experimental evidence that*
> *EXPERIMENTALLY CONFIRMS THE*
> *THEORY.*

Do you even KNOW what an experiment is cow crap brain?

All you are doing is, as I have said before, bellowing a second pile of crap to support your first pile of crap!

You HAVE NO experimental data!

> > > > *Make a physical, testable prediction that Hammond's theory uniquely*
> > > > *predicts. Set up the bench test, test it, and publish the results.*
> > > >
> > > > *If you can't devise a test, your/Hammond's theory is bogus.*
> > > >
> > > > *If you can't do the test, you/Hammond are a fraud.*
> > >
> > > *[Hammond]*
> > > *THE TEST HAS ALREADY BEEN DEvised AND THE*
> > > *THEORY PASSES THE TEST.*
> >
> > *Where? How?*
> > *Or are we talking about you just shoveling more crap to justify the*

first

> > *pile?*

>

> [Hammond]

> *Either read the theory enough so you*

> *can comprehend it or get outta here.*

> *Quit bellowing the world "crap" all over*

> *the place. My peer reviewed published papers*

> *(two of them posted on my website)*

> *CLEARLY CITE 100 years of published*

> *psychometry experimental evidence that*

> *EXPERIMENTALLY CONFIRMS THE*

> *THEORY.*

IOW typical Hammond "bull shit and run" action.

Why don't you answer the question, donkey dung?

You have NEVER answered ANY rebuttals to your insane claims.

ANY honest scientist would.

ANY sane person would.

ANY non-psychotic person would!

> > *IT PREDICTS AND EXPLAINS*

> > > *100 YEARS OF HERETOFORE UNPREDICTED AND UNEXPLAINED*

> > > *PSYCHOMETRY RESULTS.*

> > > *WHAT THE FCUK'S WRONG WITH YOU?*

> >

> > *IOW you shoveled more deranged and deluded crap to, fraudulently,*

> > *defend the first pile of crap!*

>

> [Hammond]

> *Either read the theory enough so you*

> *can comprehend it or get outta here.*

> *Quit bellowing the world "crap" all over*

> *the place. My peer reviewed published papers*

> *(two of them posted on my website)*

> *CLEARLY CITE 100 years of published*

> *psychometry experimental evidence that*

> *EXPERIMENTALLY CONFIRMS THE*

> *THEORY.*

Three piles of the same bull shit; to ignore the question, and try to support the first pile of bull shit!

>

> >

> > *BTW claiming to be a scientist – you SHOULD know that the*

> > *details of ANY experiment must be presented so that other scientists can*

> > *duplicate the experiment to test your hypothesis.*

> > *What are those details? Where is the "lab work"? Where is the "work"*

that

- > > *other scientists can do to support/rebut your theory?*
- > >
- > > *MORE (deranged) CLAIMS ARE NOT EXPERIMENTS, scumbag!!!!!!*
- >
- > *[Hammond]*
- > *Either read the theory enough so you*
- > *can comprehend it or get outta here.*
- > *Quit bellowing the world "crap" all over*
- > *the place. My peer reviewed published papers*
- > *(two of them posted on my website)*
- > *CLEARLY CITE 100 years of published*
- > *psychometry experimental evidence that*
- > *EXPERIMENTALLY CONFIRMS THE*
- > *THEORY.*

That's four piles!

- > > > > *Put up or shut up.*
- > > >
- > > > *Hammond]*
- > > > *THE TEST HAS ALREADY BEEN DEvised AND THE*
- > > > *THEORY PASSES THE TEST. IT PREDICTS AND EXPLAINS*
- > > > *100 YEARS OF HERETOFORE UNPREDICTED AND UNEXPLAINED*
- > > > *PSYCHOMETRY RESULTS.*
- > > > *WHAT THE FCUK'S WRONG WITH YOU?*

5 piles!

- > > > > *Thanks for the help*
- > > >
- > > > *Hammond]*
- > > > *THE TEST HAS ALREADY BEEN DEvised AND THE*
- > > > *THEORY PASSES THE TEST. IT PREDICTS AND EXPLAINS*
- > > > *100 YEARS OF HERETOFORE UNPREDICTED AND UNEXPLAINED*
- > > > *PSYCHOMETRY RESULTS.*
- > > > *WHAT THE FCUK'S WRONG WITH YOU?*

6 piles!

- > > >
- > > > *<snip "philawsephy" razza m tazz having no relevance*
- > > > *to an experimentally confirmed axiomatic physics*
- > > > *discovery>*
- > > >
- > > > *Yaaawnnnnnn.....*

Tired of shoveling and ducking – sandbox brain?