

Re: God=G_uv proves 40k B.C. Creation

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/4263.html>

From: bv_schornak (nowhere_at_schornak.de)

Date: 09/15/04

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 17:00:52 +0000 (UTC)

George Hammond wrote:

>bv_schornak wrote:

>

>>No, George. As others already told you, ...<snip>

>>

>

>

>[Hammond]

>Before you start telling me about Physics, why

>don't you correct an elementary MISTAKE

>in your website:

>

You mismatch something. It's the SPoG site where those errors can be found...

>[Hammond]

>By the way

> let me point out an error in

>your website. You say:

>

>[Quote from Bernies website at: <http://schornak.de/aspog/0000.htm>]

>

>"Opposite to his statement, both graphs in Hammond's diagram

>(see http://geocities.com/scientific_proof_of_god/index_files/img2.gif)

>start at zero with no visible difference at the zero point. Both graphs

>diverge from each other with growing distance from the zero point.

>Reading Hammond's diagram, the "brain growth deficit" (BGD)

> – whatever that is – definitely increases with growing age."

>

>[Hammond]

>This statement is WRONG.

>The BGD is the difference between 100% and the value of the

>curve (either curve) at any point.

>Thus for the "genotypic curve" the BGD starts at 100%

>at birth, and slowly goes to 0 at adulthood.

>

- >For the "Phenotypic curve" the BGD starts at 100%
- >at birth, but only decreases to about 15% at adulthood.
- >
- >You have **TOTALLY MISUNDERSTOOD** what the BGD
- >is, and your statement above is **WRONG**.
- >

No, George, you have shown you have absolutely no knowledge about simple math. Otherwise, you wouldn't try to correct one grave error with an even worse error.

To help you understand the graphs you've painted:

The x-axis of your diagram is time (in years)

The y-axis is growth of all parameters related to the human body – as you've published – height, weight, intelligence and strenght (in percent)

The upper graph is "genotypic growth" guessed by you (it is a speculative, hypothetical curve, as we already have seen in the discussion in this NG)

The lower graph is "phenotypic growth" guessed by you (real human growth follows this curve
<<http://209.209.34.25/webdocs/Anatomy/brain%20growth.jpg>>)

Your definition for "BGD" – it can be found in several places of your homepage – is:

"The difference between genotypic and phenotypic growth."

If x is age and y is growth in percent, then "BGD" is defined as

"BGD" = $y_{\text{genotype}}(x) - y_{\text{phenotype}}(x)$.

So far this was okay, except you have misinterpreted your own diagram in the text passages of SPoG. Now you have added some very stupid arrows to your diagram which tell us "BGD" is the difference between 100% and (genotype – phenotype) growth. As every 3rd class pupil could tell you – this is mathematically impossible. Or did you meanwhile invent your own mathematical system, too?

- >Likewise, just about everything else in your A-SPoG
- >website is wrong too.
- >

Seems you never would understand the things one learns in the Kindergarten over here – most of your errors are violations

sci.physics.relativity: Re: God=G_uv proves 40k B.C. Creation
of the stuff 10 year old children learn at school.

Greetings from Augsburg

Bernhard Schornak