

[OT in SPR] NOMINATION – George Hammond for Usenet Kook of the Month (was: Re: Hammond Teh Moderator)

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004–10/6530.html>

From: Peter J Ross (*gadfly_at_NOSPAMmeow.org*)

Date: 10/30/04

Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 05:15:38 +0100

Although George's lifelong devotion to being a first-class kook can't be demonstrated by quoting a single post, I think this one contains all that's needed to support a KotM nomination:

On Friday 29 October, George Hammond wrote in alt.usenet.kooks:

```
> "Vanilla Gorilla (Monkey Boy)" <vgorilla@pobox.alaska.net> wrote in message
> news:6ab3o01pm2jqpl8cq5768231ib5qfu63b8@4ax.com...
>> On Thu, 28 Oct 2004 19:27:30 –0600, Art Deco <art_deco@127.0.0.1>
>> wrote in alt.fan.art–bell in message
>> <281020041927307100%art_deco@127.0.0.1>:
>>
>> >Aratzio <a6ahlyv02@sneakemail.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >> On Thu, 28 Oct 2004 07:22:53 –0400, "George Hammond"
>> >> <nowhere@nomailspam.com> transparently proposed:
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > "Adam H. Kerman" <ahk@chinet.chinet.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:PL0dnYKFLKrMuOLcRVn–jw@newedgenetworks.com...
>> >> >> George Hammond <nowhere@nomailspam.com> wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >For your newsgroups file:
>> >> >> >alt.sci.relativistic–god.moderated Relativistic theory of God
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Ah. This'll be a good group to try out the MVI for alt.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >[Hammond]
>> >> >> >You have a reputation for being an expert on computer hacking
>> >> >> >and the psychology of hackers.
```

If Adam H Kerman really has such a reputation, I apologise to him for doubting it. Meanwhile, I'll just point out that George seems to have no idea who he's replying to.

>> >> >I have a question:

>> >> >

>> >> >I plan to (initially) moderate this group under Windows 98 using
>> >> >News Express 2.01 to write my own headers and post the messages
>> >> >received in my NG–email account. I can't write a word of "script"
>> >> >but will learn to as it becomes necessary. Within a year I will
>> >> >doublessly develop a more sophisticated system.

Observe George's delusions about his learning abilities, and marvel!

>> >> >Obviously

>> >> >this would not work for any kind of a busy group, but initially I
>> >> >don't expect more than a couple of posts per day, if that.

What this amounts to is a statement that George wants a group where only he and the non–existent people who agree with him are allowed to post. Am I the only one reminded of Eddie Wollmann (winner of ~40 kook awards) here?

>> >> > However, if I can do something as easy as that, what is to keep
>> >> >hackers from simply doing the same thing by forging approval
>> >> >headers... or from posting forged cancel messages in the same way?
>> >> >I'm aware that an ISP would pull the plug on them if caught, but
>> >> >that involves a lot of red tape. Why don't all moderated groups
>> >> >have a problem with this?

That's a sensible newbie question. However, it shows that George has thought deeply about his vanity group and really cares about it, and therefore constitutes evidence of kookery.

>> >> > In your estimation, what kind of trouble can I run into if some
>> >> >nut gets fixated on hacking this moderated group?
>> >> > I realize I can cancel forged posts and repost anything
>> >> > canceled by forged messages... but I'm not looking forward to,
>> >> >and have no interest in electronic warfare per se. I'm a physicist
>> >> >interested in discussing a scientific proof of God, and not
>> >> >interested in much else.
>> >> > Anyone having a comment, please advise.

I haven't seen any evidence in sci.physics.* that anybody describes George as a physicist except George himself. "Nutjob", "kook" and "troll" are words more frequently applied to him.

>> >With his "software" lined up to handle the moderation task, all he is
>> >lacking now is a newsgroup and some people to post there. I guess the
>> >tried–and–true solution will always work –– sockpuppets.
>>
>> Just what Usenet needs, another NG that gets 20 posts a year, half of
>> which are rejected by our esteemed self–appointed moderator.
>> Wonderful.

physics.relativity: [OT in SPR] NOMINATION – George Hammond for Usenet Kook of the Month (was: Re: Hammond Teh

- > *[Hammond]*
- > *Na.... I know about the problem with dead moderated NG's and I have no*
- > *intention of creating yet another one of them.*

Note that George thinks that his intentions are enough to make a group successful. In fact, there's no evidence that anybody wants to discuss his theories. Anybody who has tried to reason with him in the past has been dismissed as a troll.

- > *Lack of posters is no problem. One crosspost to talk.origins, or*
- > *alt.talk.creationism will drown the group in posts. Yes, from 4 years of*
- > *experience in the unmoderated NG's I have discovered that 60–80% of*
- > *these posts are OT trolls, and will reject most of them.*

I rather get the impression that George wants to derail discussions in the above-mentioned groups by adding a crosspost to his vanity group and then moderating all the replies away. I've formed this theory because I can't think of any other reason why George should want to encourage crossposting to groups where anybody who isn't a creationist loon is certain to laugh at him.

- > *The aim here is to attract high level posters who are adverse to posting*
- > *in an unmoderated environment. It may be slow for a year or so, but*
- > *my dedication to the subject has passed 22 years now*

This claim appears to be true. George has a history of 22 years of pseudo-scientific kookery, and therefore can't be called a troll. He's a genuine kook, and deserves proper recognition on Usenet at last.

- > *and considerable*
- > *interest has been shown by potential VIP posters in private email.*

Unlike lesser kooks, George isn't satisfied with being supported by the lurkers in email. The people who support George are VIPs!

This statement alone would qualify George as a true Usenet kook, but there's more. Much, much more!

- > *On the*
- > *other hand some of the Usenet regulars may take a more disciplined approach*
- > *in a more exclusive environment.*
- > *My primitive software limitations will slow things at first.... but after*
- > *a*
- > *year or so I should be up to speed with possibly a Unix system and*
- > *Stump semi-robo moderation. At 62 hopefully I'll be moderating this group*
- > *for at least 8 years and at that time someone else can take over.*

I wish George a long life and continued devotion to his lost cause. He could be the next Alexander Abian if he plays his cards right. He's a delightfully old-fashioned kook, whose kookery is genuinely grounded in Weird Science rather than in common-or-garden stupidity.

[OT in SPR] NOMINATION – George Hammond for Usenet Kook of the Month (was: Re: Hammon&Teh Mo

physics.relativity: [OT in SPR] NOMINATION – George Hammond for Usenet Kook of the Month (was: Re: Hammond Teh

Here's George's famous kooksite:

<http://proof-of-god.freewebsitehosting.com/>

It's a good introduction to the bizarre ideas that he also posts regularly to Usenet.

George has already once been a KotM candidate against strong competition without success, and has won the Victor von Frankenstein "Weird Science" Award and the Palmjob Paddle.

Any seconds?

A second from a scientist would be nice. I dropped physics in favour of Greek at the age of sixteen, and can't claim even an informed amateur's knowledge of the subject.

I've taken the liberty of adding sci.physics.relativity, since that seems to be the group where George is best known. If anybody there wants to second the nomination without continuing an off-topic thread, snecking all the groups but alt.usenet.kooks is acceptable. I mention this because I know many people would be happy if they never saw a reference to George "SPoG" Hammond again.

PJR :-)

--

alt.usenet.kooks award-winners and FAQ:

<http://www.insurgent.org/~kook-faq/>

[To reply by email, remove "NOSPAM".]

[OT in SPR] NOMINATION – George Hammond for Usenet Kook of the Month (was: Re: Hammond Teh Mo