

Re: GOD=G_uv FOR IQ's OVER 150

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-02/2239.html>

From: Lawrence Wong (s371388_at_student.uq.edu.au)

Date: 02/09/05

Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2005 20:52:24 +0000 (UTC)

"George Hammond" <nospam1@nospam.net> writes:

> "Lawrence Wong" <s371388@student.uq.edu.au> wrote in message
> [news:cu902v\\$hoi\\$1@bunyip2.cc.uq.edu.au](mailto:news:cu902vhoi1@bunyip2.cc.uq.edu.au)...

>> "George Hammond" <nospam1@nospam.net> writes:

>>

>>

>> >> > To answer your question..... what I am saying is that if all
>> >> > people could utilize the "ungrown/latent" part of their brain,
>> >> > they would actually be "God incarnate" (God in the flesh)..
>> >> > which, traditon has it, is what Jesus of Nazareth was reputed
>> >> > to be.

>> >>

>> >> So if Jesus was who He claimed to be then he'd have no latent part of
> His

>> >> brain?

>>

>> > [Hammond]

>> > Precisely correct. Actually we know he wasn't "100% fully
>> > grown"....

>>

>> You "know" this because of the size of his head (on the shroud of turin?
>> maybe?)

> [Hammond]

> Na... nothing like that... scientific reasons indicate it.

ok, that's good. Because I was going to say that I believe the theory that intelligence is related to brain size has been disproven.

> The "Secular Trend" in human growth is the measurement
> of the increase in growth in each generation. This is a large
> field of study that has been going on for 100 years. Data
> shows that the human population is significantly far from
> full growth today, and was even far worse off 2,005 years
> ago when Jesus lived. Scientifically, it is simply statistically
> highly improbable, in fact impossible, that he could have

>been "fully grown".

This seems to be assuming that because things are growing *now* they could not have been fully grown in the past. Is there any reason to suppose that brain growth could not be like a sin curve, where it goes through a time of growth then decline then growth and we happen to be living in the time of growth?

>>

>> > *The "fully grown man" is referred to as the "son of God"..*
>> > *simple because the "latent ungrown man" is God in Heaven..*
>> > *and therefore if and when a fully grown one comes along...*
>> > *he is called the "Son of God"... or "God incarnate".*
>> > *So far no such individual has ever appeared... the reputaion of*
>> > *Jesus notwithstanding. However... jesus is taken as the*
>> > *"model" of what such a thing would actually look like and*
>> > *behave like if it ever happened. It is in fact the universal*
>> > *biological goal of the entire human race.*
>>
>> *If it is a goal, then there is a purpose.*

>[Hammond]

>Yes.... there is a "goal and a purpose" to life.
>The goal is in fact to reach "full growth" and every
>human being is working on that problem every day
>of his life. The reason everyone is trying to reach
>"full growth" is that the fully grown man has what is
>euphemistically called "Eternal Life"... and THAT
>is the goal of life and what every person is killing
>himself working 8 hours a day trying to obtain.
> The full grown man is de facto in a condition of
>"eternal life" because he sees "real time" (i.e.
>un-dilated, un-curved spacetime or reality). He sees
>what is called "paradise on Earth"... he sees a
>"perfect world"... has no fear, feels no pain,
>is invincible, and even though he can get run over
>by a car and killed.... he cannot "die" as we
>know it... simply because he is in a condition of
>"eternal life". We, in our present un-fully grown
>state, cannot see real time, do not see paradise,
>and ARE NOT in a condition of "eternal life"..
>and therefore we greatly fear death, and undergoe
>a myriad of sufferings.

This goal must be innate in us, as a lot of people would have different subjective goals, is that how you see this goal (workling at the subconscious level?)

>> *On the one hand you seem to be describing a universe that has a*
>> *goal/purpose, hence it would seem logical to see that a Creator God has*
>> *initialed that purpose.*

>[Hammond]

>Ah... well, at the present time in Man's existence we have a
>"goal" and that is to reach full growth so we will have
>eternal life and paradise, on Earth... this is called "kingdom
>come" by the way in Theology. After Man achieves that..
>i.e. reaches kingdom come.... then he no longer has a
>goal in life and only remains living because he "likes it".
>So the ultimate goal in life is to obtain a condition of
>"eternal life" (aka to reach full growth). After achieving
>that man has no "purpose" other than to enjoy it... and simply
>functions by rational instinct. Ultimately man lives only
>because he "likes it".

And this goal is only achieved by improving our environment. Thus people would have to be working together for this goal to be accomplished, I guess.

>> On the other hand "God in heaven" seems to mean a
>> shriveled bit of our brains...?

>[Hammond]

>Whoa... it means the "mental effect on perceptable reality
>of having part of our brains shriveled". Having part of our
>brains shriveled drastically effects our "reality".

Sorry, my bad. But this is what has been confusing me since the start and I think was the reason I asked my initial question. Is God merely perceived. It seems that you are saying that there is no God external to humans. It seem to me that your view is not really much different from atheism, as the "God" you describe is merely a psychological reality not an ontological reality. That is God is merely subjective not objective.

>> So I guess I want to know if according to
>> your belief system, there is a God who exists independantly of humans?

>[Hammond]

> I'll give you the short answer... which is NO.

So why (in your worldview) is it the case that something exists rather than nothing exists. After all the God you speak of is not independant of humans and thus cannot be a "Creator God". As humans are finite we have not always been. So why does anything exist at all, according to your worldview?

>Look at it this way... if there are no humans,
>NOTHING exists.... not the world, not the Universe,
>not God, not time or space, not anything.

While I have a Bachelor degree in Science (majoring in physics) I also have a Bachelor degree in Art (with a double major in philosophy). I consider myself as more of a philosopher than a scientist (which is imho a

good thing because philosophy is more fundamental than science). As such I am familiar with this notion of existence that you describe here. However might I suggest you are mistaken here. If no humans exist then it is true that nothing can be *known* by humans. However this does not mean that our knowledge *causes* existence. This confuses the notion of subjective existence with objective existence. Consider a universe with no subjects (no sentient creatures). Such a universe can still exist, objectively. However because there is no one around to observe it, it is not *known* to exist. So it does not exist subjectively (as there are no subjects in that universe) but it does exist objectively.

- > *If you don't believe this there is a way to prove it...*
- > *imagine that all humans died tomorrow at 9am.*
- > *How would you ascertain, prove or demonstrate that*
- > *ANYTHING existed at 9:30 am? You couldn't.*

Yes, this is *subjective* existence. It is talking about what can be known (epistemology) not what is ontologically (metaphysics).

- > *The*
- > *reason being is that "existence" only has an operational*
- > *meaning in relation to MAN. "Existence" is in fact, nothing*
- > *other than a "sensory function of Man".*
- > *The definition of "existence" is in fact:*

- > *=Definition of existence=*
- > *The property of being detectable or discernable*
- > *by the 5 senses and mental function of Man.*

Some philosophers argue along these lines. Imagine a coin. Ok, now imagine a coin that exists. Is there any difference between these two coins (there shouldn't be). Therefore existence doesn't "add anything" to the coin. And then they will have concluded with a definition of existence similar to yours above. However existence as the word is normally used "adds" objectivity. The above example of the coin is false because *both* coins are imagined, that is the only existence either coin has is a subjective one. However there *is* a difference between an actual coin and an imagined one. Basically you confuse epistemology with metaphysics.

There is a branch of philosophy called "Idealism" which agrees with what you are saying here. ala Bishop Berkeley. However this seems to be a problem for you (maybe?) as if existence is dependant on humans then humans must have always existed. But humans are finite. Science tells us that our universe/cosmos is finite. Thus if existence depends on humans and at one time humans did not exist then nothing exists *now* (Humans did not exist so no human could *ever* exist as existence depends on humans, all that is of course if what you are saying is true).

- >> *Is*
- >> *the "God in heaven" bit in our heads, the ungrown part, is that something*
- >> *the God who exists external to us has placed there so (as Paul writes)*

>> everyone knows there is a god, so that no one is without excuse (Romans >1)?

>[Hammond]

>Classically speaking, there is no "God external to us".. it only >APPEARS that God is external to us. This is because when >your brain changes (say some of it is only partially grown), >it changes your REALITY.... the world looks different. OK, >if you didn't KNOW that this was being caused by your >BRAIN... (which is not something we are born knowing)... >then you would ASSUME that some mysterious external >force was changing external reality... which historically, is >what most believers in God always believed... and in fact >continue to describe God in that kind of language. Of >course now we know better... there isn't any "God out there >fiddling with reality".... it is in fact nature fiddling with your >braingrowth which makes it LOOK like reality is changing.

ok, well this leaves you with the metaphysical problems I've asked you above, so I won't repeat them here, but look forward to your answers :)

> ON THE OTHER HAND.... don't get the idea that >religious people are stupid and deluded... the fact is that >if your braingrowth changes... "reality actually does change" >(as far as you are concerned)... so therefore, for all >practical purposes.. there actual IS a God "out there" as >far as any individual is concerned.

I presume you realise that "relativity" and "relativism" are not the same thing?

>> So when you speak of "growth" you do not mean it is because we stop >> growing at a certain age. Which I understand is a result of some gene >> somewhere in our bodies which basically tells our bodies to stop growing. >> But rather the environment that we grow up in. So it is not the length of >> time, of the growth, but the quality of the growth within that fixed time?

>[Hammond]

>Correct. Growth essentially stops at age 18. But that >DOES NOT MEAN that you are "fully grown". >A stalk of corn for instance will stop growing after >say a few months... however, if it didn't rain all summer >it could be as much as 2 feet under its normal height. >It has a PERMANENT 2 foot "growth deficit". >The same is true for any living thing... including people.

Yes, I believe I am following you now. You mean like how the Japanese were around 5 foot before ww2 but after the war they have improved in height dramatically, and it is because they now get more protien in their diet.

>>

>> >It turns out that "God" is

>> >NOT genetic and in fact is entirely due to "growth"

>> > There is only one way to effect the impact of

>> >"NURTURE" (growth)... and that is to raise the entire world

>> >Standard of Living.... and that is what every human being

>> >gets up and goes to work every morning and trys to do.

>> >The Standard of Living has been climbing as you know for

>> >thousands of years... and this is what accounts for the

>> >Secular Trend in human growth (every generation is a little

>> >more fully grown than the last). Obviously it will take

>> >thousand of more years before we begin to see anything

>> >like "full growth" (God in the flesh) appearing in the

>> >population.

>>

>> >This stnadrad of living, does that include our moral standards as well?

>[Hammond]

>Well for certain it includes, food, closthing, shelter, transportation,

>central heat, hospitals, schools, governments, and just about

>anything money can buy.... including a non-dysfunctional upbringing

>which would produce bad moral standards which could further

>stunt your growth... such as starting smoking at age 9 or something.

So basically it is a *healthy* standard of living.

>> > Not only that... you can't even buy it if you are rich...

>> >rich families (like the Royal Family of England) who have

>> >been millionaires for tens of centuries.. aren't that much

>> >better of growthwise than the average person... well,

>> >somewhat better off obviously (by looking at them)...

>> >but even they are nowhere near being "God in the flesh".

>> >Fact is.... were all in the same boat... there is only one

>> >way to get there... and that is to improve the entire

>> >world standard of living. By the way.... when we finally

>> >cross the finish line thousands of years in the future

>> >and God is actually walking around in the flesh on Earth...

>> >that is referred to as "kingdom come" by the theologians.

>>

>> >I think I'm following you. :)

>[Hammond]

>Anyone seriously looking for the truth about God

>would probably listen to me... as they would recognize

>that's what I'M looking for. However, so far I have

>found such people to be rather rare in the scientific

>arena.

Yes, I once niavely, believed that science was the "search for truth".

Then I later discovered that it is impossible for a human to not have

presuppoisions, and therefore objectivity in science is a myth (because

science is done by scientists, and scientists are humans and humans are subjects and subjects are subjective.)

>> >> >As far as the brain goes... this "growth shortfall" causes
>> >> >the phenomena of "God in heaven"... which is what the
>> >> >"latent/partially grown brain" actually does... is cause
>> >> >"God in Heaven".
>> >>
>> >> >Because (I presume) He's not "in us" (as He is the missing part of the
>> >> >brain), so He's elsewhere (ie. in heaven). So I guess as animal's
>brains
>> >> >are not as developed as ours that is why humans are "in the image of
>God"?
>>
>> >[Hammond]
>> >No... its more logical and simple than that.
>> >the "ungrown" part of your brain is not actually "missing"..
>> >it's just shrivelled and only "subconsciously working"
>> >(it causes what is called the 'unconscious mind'). This
>>
>>
>> I see I was misunderstanding what you'd written.

>[Hammond]
>Don't feel bad... so does everyone else apparently.

If it makes you feel any better I'd had lots of people misunderstand what I've said before too :)

>> >Does this mean if someone
>> >became "God in the flesh" with their brain fully grown, they would have no
>> >unconscious mind (or subconscious)?

>[Hammond]
>> >Yes, exactly, precisely. And it sure would be something
>> >spectacular to behold... you would be looking God right
>> >in the face. Imagine meeting face to face the only source
>> >of help known to Man! Cripes... if you ever saw a person
>> >like that you wouldn't be able to take your eyes off him...
>> >you'd be looking at "eternal life" in the flesh... millions of
>> >people would be following him around night and day.

Just out of curiosity do you believe that beauty and "fully grown brains" go hand in hand? (ie. the more fully grown ones brain is the more beautiful they will be)?

>> >This is why Jesus attracted such crowds... even though
>> >he wasn't the actual real thing... he apparently was closer
>> >to it than anybody had ever seen before. All he had to do
>> >was step out into the street and it would cause a riot.

:)

>> >As Jesus himself said "God is a spirit" (John 4:24).
>> >All I have done is scientifically discovered the cause,
>> >and scientific proof of and description of that "spirit"
>> >that Jesus spoke of. Hence I have discovered the
>> >world's first "scientific proof of God".
>>
>>
>> Ironically I've told some people, years ago, that one day scientists would
>> discover the spirit and call it something else, and say, "See there is no
>> spirit". Yet you seem to be doing just the opposite of what I predicted :)

>[Hammond]
>Yes you are correct... my position is that it indeed
>IS the "God of the Bible", and that the Bible, the
>Church, and world religion in general is
>ABSOLUTELY CORRECT in their doctrinal
>description of "God". My position on Religion
>is that "its all true"...
>Of course religion doesn't use the language of Physics,
>however, Physics has now proven that the language of
>Religion is completely accurate and true when
>interpreted in the light of the scientific explanation.

I think you'll find the bible describe a God who can maipulate this universe if He so desires, and His existence is external to our own (He is our creator according to the bible) not we, His.

>>
>> > Stunningly... this "spirit" is described by Einstein's
>> >theory of Relativity... i.e. it is ultimately caused
>> >by GRAVITY... which is a major piece of news...
>> >and a central point of the discovery.
>>
>> Yes, I gathered that much from your website.
>>
>> RAZA 2005

>[Hammond]
>I hope you'll keep in touch. You seem to have a positive
>and constructive attitude and seem to have a natural
>intuition for all this. Of the hundreds of people I've
>talked to on the Internet... that is quite RARE!
>I don't know if you realize that or not?

I realise that most people do not care to learn but to make fun of others.

I am interested in different ideas, even when I don't always agree with them. :) I recognise that I am finite and hence do not have infinite knowledge, so there is always more I can learn. And I also know that

through reasonable debate one can "sharpen" ones own ideas. I have a non-christian friend who keeps me on my toes in regards to my own beliefs, but it is done in a friendly way, not a "let's put the other person down" way. :)

> *For some time now I've suspected that I've been*
> *"talking to the wrong people". I don't know who might*
> *be the "right people"... but apparently you are one*
> *of them... whoever "they" might be.*

heh

> *PS: Please be careful to use the identical title header as*
> *mine when you post... I notice your word spacing in the*
> *header is a little different. This can cause your post to*
> *show up in another place on the newgroup rather than*
> *in its correct position on this thread, and it might get*
> *lost and I might not see it.*

umm I don't change the header at all. I just hit "f" for follow up and then reply...

RAZA 2005