

## Re: God=G\_uv ....serious physics

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-12/2293.html>

---

**From:** TMG (TMG\_at\_Nowhere.org)

**Date:** 12/03/04

Date: Fri, 03 Dec 2004 00:36:28 -0500

In alt.sci.relativistic-proof-of-god.moderated, George Hammond screwed up the attributions and typed:

Serious Physics wrote:

> "fencingsax" <christocbd@aol.com> wrote in message  
> news:c1aaf5a4.0412021921.a595f2b@posting.google.com...  
>  
>> "George Hammond" <nowhere@nomailspam.net> wrote in message  
>  
> news:<mPNrd.1639\$714.39@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...  
>  
>>> "stew dean" <stewart@webslave.dircon.co.uk> wrote in message  
>>> news:2b68957a.0412021332.6e06214e@posting.google.com...  
>>>  
>>>> "George Hammond" <nowhere@nomailspam.net> wrote in message  
>>>  
>>> news:<Rnord.404\$Va5.362@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...  
>>>  
>>>>> "Thomas H. Faller" <faller@sgi.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:41ADFC48.34F599B@sgi.com...  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> stew dean wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Luba Luft <luba.luft@gmx.net> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> news:<k4vqq01lcbmq2v3qud4o547rq771jn52m1@4ax.com>...  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>><snip... cheaptalk>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> [Hammond]  
>>>>>>>> Your point is well taken. There is something remarkable about  
>>>>>>>> Stew Dean's approach to this controversy.  
>>>>>>>> The way I read it is this:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> 1. Stew Dean is probably a Republican.. altho probably not by  
>>>>>>>>> choice. More or less in a position where the Republican  
>>>>>>>>> right can claim him any time they want to.

>>>>  
>>>>*They don't have republicans in the UK.*  
>>>  
>>>*[Hammond]*  
>>>*We've been over this before... ALL political parties*  
>>>*are either "Left wing" or "Right wing".*  
>>>*In England the right wing is called "the conservative*  
>>>*party", and the Left wing is called "the Labor party".*  
>>>  
>>><snip... cheaptalk>  
>>>  
>>*Yes, so there are no republicans. Thanks for affirming this.*  
>>  
>>  
>>>  
>>>>*You'd never make a psychologist.*

With enough parts and a car battery, I bet I could!

>>>  
>>*I doubt many of us here have the qualifications to be a psychiatrist.*  
>>  
>>  
>>>*[Hammond]*  
>>>*Having discovered the world's first scientific proof*  
>>>*of God, I'm de facto the world's leading psychologist*  
>>>*right now.... successor to Sigmund Freud!*

Sick, sad delusion. Nobody else sees or agrees with this.

>>>*God=G\_uv, the envy of every physicist, psychologist*  
>>>*and theologian in the world was discovered an published*  
>>>*by GEORGE HAMMOND!*

No, you're mocked, laughed at, and pissed on by every single physicist, psychologist and theologian in the world.

If that's not the case, post their actual words of support. Not "They support me in secret private email and hushed conversations" Post the names and their published words of support or shut the fuck up.

>  
>>*[fencingsax]*  
>>*Wow, this isn't an arrogant rant of bull. By the way, how did you*  
>>*prove God scientifically? How does God fit in with the rest of*  
>>*science? Why hasn't God exploded in a puff of Logic. (since proof and*  
>>*evidence destroys faith). And why does God only involve the forces G,*  
>>*u, and v? What about all the other forces in the universe? Since God*  
>>*is everything, doesn't that require a bit more complicated a proof? I*  
>>*highly doubt the supreme, all knowing being equals G\_uv.*  
>>

>>  
>>><snip... cheaptalk>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>George. SPOG is a delusional rant.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>[Hammond]  
>>>No.... you're denial of SPOG, is a delusional rant.  
>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>[fencingsax]  
>>Not really. God cannot be scientifically proven, because his  
>>influence cannot be proven. We don't see how he affects any part of  
>>the physical universe. You could make the arguement God= Quantum  
>>force, and be more correct.  
>>  
>>By the way are there more than one proofs of God? How was it an  
>>accident that you came up with it? How is the discovery of God  
>>psychological? How does a tiny amount of Gravity affect electricity?  
>>  
>>By the way, please relabel your figures. You label Fig2 as Fig7. (the  
>>faces one) The figure has absolutely nothing to do with anything  
>>except drawing, and you create whole personalities our of one  
>>expression.  
>>  
>>By the way, the idea that the knowledge of this improves mental  
>>health is ludicrous. The mind electric. Tiny amounts of Gravity  
>>don't affect it. We know this because people in outside the atmosphere  
>>act in generally the same way they did on earth.  
>>  
>>The Bible is not a scientific text, so it really shouldn't be used as  
>>a source.  
>>  
>>you have some stuff you need to edit out. "Speed correlates with  
>>time" is kind of a given, what with the definition of speed and all.  
>>  
>>Assuming that the God is the Judeo-xtian one is highly arrogant. Also,  
>>why only human brains. Most of the brains in the world are not human.  
>>  
>>I don't understand what you mean by man is developing according to the  
>>Secular Trend. You give the higher standard of living, especially  
>>nutrition as a reason. This is true. It means we have more energy to  
>>grow.  
>>  
>>This is intersting, because I though specific intelligence had nothing  
>>to do with brain size. And adults are always 100% grown. There is a

>>point were average size will stop increasing, but every adult is 100%  
>>grown.  
>>  
>>With figure 1, I don't understand where your proof is coming from. Who  
>>theorized our size that way? Who measured our actual size that way?  
>>How can God be caused by something?  
>>  
>>Your age levels are definitely arbitrary. It is well known that  
>>people develop at different times, and at different speeds. So people  
>>grow at different times, and 18 is an arbitrary age.  
>>  
>> You don't define the orders of intelligence well. How does how much  
>>people can see with age, once their eyes start working? You never  
>>actually established a connection between Gravity and the human brain,  
>>as opposed to all the other brains.  
>>  
>>Again, how can God be caused by something? I thought he was the  
>>creator. You have a lot of tenses wrong. The equation reflects the  
>>quadratic metric exists, not the equation created a quadratic metric.  
>>(meter?)  
>>"It is for this reason, that Nature uses the Cartesian Body Plan for  
>>all (multicellular) plants and animals including Man." makes no sense.  
>>Nature isn't a calculator. These things happen because they are  
>>simple shapes, not because of some graphing method.  
>>  
>>Are you suggesting Nature knows(and I mean knows) complex  
>>trigonometry, calculus, graphing styles, etc?  
>>  
>>How is a human simply and only a Cartesian machine? Aren't we a bit  
>>more complex than that?  
>>  
>>More to come later, maybe.  
>  
>  
> [Hammond]  
> You're "almost but not quite" serious enough for me to respond to.

arrogant putz.

> However, obviously you think all this is an "academic game" or  
> something. I can't waste my time talking to such fatuous people.

But you will. You need the attention. You'll spend a HUGE amount of  
time/effort responding – let's watch this post, and all of the follow-ups.

> You simply aren't abused, oppressed, desperate or serious  
> enough to be of interest.

Hmmm,..the abused and desperate theme again – back to the [Hammond]  
physically and sexually abused observation.

- > *BUT, you have given me an idea. Perhaps I've been talking to the*
- > *wrong people.... I mean I've tried to reach the "intelligensia" and*
- > *the "academics"....*

And ALL have mocked or ignored you.

- > *maybe I've been looking in the wrong place*
- > *for someone serious.*

No – this is the correct reading of spog.

- > *Maybe I should be looking for people who*
- > *know what abuse, oppression, persecution and struggle actually*
- > *are....*

Ahhh, back to the small child curled up on the rug whimpering. It's not your fault that you were abused, but it isn't science.

- > *rather than mod squad hip style fat lipped academics who*
- > *want to discuss "philaawsephy" and math games and who don't*
- > *have a CLUE as to what God is.... or what those 1.3 billion Christians*
- > *have been talking about for the past 2000 years.*

complete nonsense.

- > *I've tried the Jews of course... but the problem there is they*
- > *simply CAN'T support a scientific proof of God under any*
- > *circumstances... simply for fear of initiating another Holocaust...*

Insane statement.

- > *can't blame them for that... Jesus discovered the same thing*
- > *2000 years ago. It's impossible to make Israel an offer it*
- > *can't refuse, that's obvious.*

Totally detached.

- > *On the other hand... maybe I should be trying sinners... you*
- > *know.. what about that crazy bomb guy... Kazinski... he's got*
- > *a PhD in mathematics and is doing a life stretch somewhere...*
- > *I wonder if he has an email address...*

Yeah – pitch SPOG to the Unibomber! I SO support this idea! Oh, how we hope he supports your vision.

- > *maybe he would consider*
- > *coming out of retirement and using his PhD for something useful*
- > *rather than blowing up people trying to save the Redwoods?*

Nope, you haven't a clue about this, do you?

- > *I mean a guy like that who owes a debt to society, might figure*
- > *he could cop some positive karma by helping to deliver the*
- > *world's first SPOG to the world?*
- > *Or what about some terminally ill PhD physicist dying of*
- > *inoperable colon Cancer.... maybe someone like that would be*
- > *willing to give this thing an honest to God serious review? If a*
- > *guy had a Phd in physics and only 6 months to live.... this would*
- > *be the ideal opportunity to mail his personal calling card to every*
- > *person on Earth. I'm absolutely serious!*

And that's what makes it both tragically sad and hugely amusing.

- > *And there are others who come to mind. There must be*
- > *physicists somewhere on Earth who were born in Third World*
- > *countries and have relatives or kinsman and certainly fellow*
- > *countrymen living in poverty and oppression.... maybe they*
- > *would have a more serious attitude about a scientific breakthrough*
- > *in world religion than your average "oh so wise and skeptical"*
- > *American physicist.*
- > *Maybe there are some newsgroups that would enable me to*
- > *contact some of these more serious people... basically*
- > *anyone who isn't a wiseguy.... ; you know what I mean?*

We ALL know what you mean. And we laughed.