

Re: GOD=G_uv FOR IQ's OVER 150

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-02/2295.html>

From: George Hammond (*nospam1_at_nospam.net*)

Date: 02/10/05

Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 01:26:54 GMT

"Lawrence Wong" <s371388@student.uq.edu.au> wrote in message
news:cudt67\$1v0g\$1@bunyip2.cc.uq.edu.au...

> "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...

> > > "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.

[Hammond]

Remember "intelligence" = IQ x age for the first 18

years of your life.... i.e. intelligence increases approx.

linearly for the first 18 years of your life. OBVIOUSLY

this is (mainly) caused by brain growth... therefore, certainly

in the growing person... intelligence IS related to brain size.

When you begin life (conception) you have "zero intelligence" because you have "no brain". Intelligence only begins to appear when the brain appears. At first your intelligence is very low because your brain is the size of a pea... then it increases when your brain is the size of a golf ball... and intelligence keeps on growing as your brain gets bigger... finally the brain stops getting bigger (around age 6) but then continued (dendritic/neuronal) brain growth continues on into your teens.. and all the while this "brain growth" continues to increase your "intelligence" approximately linearly with age.

>

> > *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?*

[Hammond]

YES... there is plenty of reason to rule out such a thing.

In fact the "Secular Trend in human growth" is scientifically known to be a "Sigmoidal Curve"

(S-curve, so called). Such a curve is monotonic, and always increases... and finally reaches a plateau of "100% 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 reputation 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?)*

[Hammond]

YES... it originates at the subconscious level... as a constant and persistent instinct to try and do anything that will allow us to "see" better. The fact that part of the brain is ungrown causes a major form of "perceptual blindness"... just like a child is "perceptually blind" compared to an adult... which is why minors are protected by law.

Anyway... if you wind up with a "terminal growth deficit" at age 18 (which we ALL do)... then this means that WE ALL have a significant "perceptual blindness"... i.e. we don't see "all of reality". There is NOTHING scarier in life than being blind... and this "perceptual blindness" is the source of all human FEAR, PANIC, HYSTERIA, DEPRESSION, ANGER, HOPELESSNESS, CONFLICT, ACCIDENTAL DEATH, LIFETIME FAILURE... ETC. And this is why "God" is considered the most important theoretical subject in the history of the human race!

- >
- > >> *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 enviornment. Thus people
- > would have to be working together for this goal to be accomplished, I
- > guess.

[Hammond]

YES... that was basically the message of Jesus... that mankind is inherently "cooperative" rather than "competitive".... and for that exact reason... because the only road to God is for society and civilization to be "cooperative" so that the world standard of living can be raised... there is no other way.

- >
- > >> 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
- > percieved. 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 describbe is merely a psychological reality not
- > an ontological reality. That is God is merely subjective not objective.

[Hammond]

The point is, that when it comes to "reality" there is no other reality than "subjective reality".... the only reality you see, hear, or know... is in fact "subjective reality". Therefore... even though "theoretically God is subjective", in point of fact "God is objective". If it "appears" that god is "out there"... then God "really is out there".... the fact that you can "theoretically explain he isn't"... means absolutely nothing. Until you can understand that... you will never understand what Religion is all about.

Theoretical physics assumes a "perfect observer". But the point religion is making is that this "perfect observer"

is actually fictional... he doesn't actually exist (not until we reach kingdom come). In the meantime, the actual real world is governed by people's "subjective reality". the perfect observer would not miss seeing another car coming and wouldn't have an accident... but the (imperfect) observer (people with brain growth deficits.. which is all of us) might miss seeing the car and will wind up dead. Therefore, "life and death" is mediated by "subjective reality".

>

> >> *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".*

[Hammond]

Of course he's the "creator God". If increasing brain growth produce "new reality"... then the brain itself must be the "creator of reality"... therefore, since Man only appeared 40,000 years ago... the world ("reality") was actually CREATED 40,000 years ago... and this is the explanation of the Genesis Bible Creation.

> *As humans are finite we have*

> *not always been. So why does anything exist at all, according to your*

> *worldview?*

[Hammond]

The word "existence", that is existence itself only has a MEANING with respect to human beings. Therefore when we appeared, the world came into "existence".

Notice that in the Bible Man and the Universe were created at the same time. Scientifically this is explained by the fact of Man appearing, opening up his eyes and seeing grass, sky, four footed animals, billion year old fossils, "existing". Obviously they (subjectively) did not "EXIST" before he appeared to make the "exist".... in fact... if we all died tomorrow at 9am... they would no longer "exist" at 9:01 am.

Now.. you have two choices here... you can either become a sophisticated person and comprehend all this.. and thereby UNDERSTAND what 20 billion people have been talking about in the 2,000 year history of Christianity... or you can simply sit there arguing using "Mixed metaphors" forever and simply remain ignorant of it. Neither Religion or the world really cares

what your choice is. But in the long run... the truth will ultimately decide your fate in life.

Of course there is a third choice... you could take 20 years to become an expert in Psychometry and Relativity so that you could comprehend the scientific proof of all this... but that of course is rather unlikely. So until then, you will simply have to be a "good guesser" as to what the truth is... and that of course (assuming your not competent scientifically) becomes a matter of "attitude". My guess is that constructive, positive, cautious, and sensible people will recognize that 20 billion people over 2,000 years couldn't possible be talking about "nothing sensible"... and will tend to make an effort to understand my scientific explanations... while the abusive, negligent, reckless, and destructive people will simply ignore or ridicule it... and of course, eventually they will be destroyed by their wanton ignorance of Life.

that is the only position I can take with regard to discussing this discovery with amateurs. Of course when discussing it with professionals (if I could find any)... we have the option of discussing (the advanced) scientific evidence.

>

> >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).

[Hammond]

No shit! ... you're a physicist.... whew.... no wonder you seem so logically straight! I am quite impressed to find that out. Also, of course, your interest in Art and Philosophy has a major bearing on all this. Finally, it appears that you are still a college student... and therefore still in your 20's I would imagine.... that is awefully young to be discussing a "theory of God".. I can tell you. When I was 20 (or even 40) I would have looked you straight in the face and told you there "is no such thing as God". It took me another 20 years (I'm now 62) to find out there is!

I don't know what kind of a world we're heading into when there might be 20 year old people walking around who actually know scientifically what God is... it will be a far different world than I knew when I was 20, that's for sure. Then again.... I suppose it's inevitable that eventually I will become old and outdated and no longer in touch with the "new world"... but I guess that's the fate of every generation.

> I

> consider myself as more of a philosopher than a scientist (which is imho a

> *good thing because philosophy is more fundamental than science*).

[Hammond]

And theology is more fundamental than Philosophy.

In fact, I'd put it in this order:

Theology

Physics

Philosophy

> *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.*

[Hammond]

You say it "could still exist, objectively". But I say it

you... give me ONE EXAMPLE of an operational

way that you could prove that it "still existed".

In point of fact, all you are saying with that statement is that "I believe that if a single person were sent back there to take a look around, then I'll bet it would still be there".

OK... I'll certainly agree... it most certainly would be... BUT notice that you had to wake up at least one person from the dead to go back there and take a look... so therefore you have violated the premise of the argument that "all people are dead".

In point of fact... my statement is beyond disputation, and the proof of that is the existence of WORLD RELIGION accounting for 5-Billion adherents... and the fact that world religion is based on the truth of my argument.

Now... if you want to argue with the existence of 5-billion believers... be my guest... but I'm not about to... I can ALREADY SEE AS A SCIENTIST... the complete LOGIC of the argument.

> *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.*

[Hammond]

If there are no living observers... then there is no distinction between "objective existence" and "subjective existence".

The term "objective existence" merely means "exists according to a perfect observer". If all life was dead, there would be no "perfect observer" either... hence no "objective existence".

Anyway... I would caution you that the scientific proof of

God is not a "philosophical problem" and is not based on "philosophical argument". It is based on two decimal point experimental scientific data... and the existence of that data makes all "philosophical argument" irrelevant.

- >
- > > *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).*

[Hammond]

Without some form of "observer" there is neither objective nor subjective existence.

- >
- > > *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.*

[Hammond]

The argument is irrelevant, because in both cases, it requires a HUMAN BEING. If there are no human beings... the argument becomes irrelevant... neither coin exists.

<snip>

- > *There is a branch of philosophy called "Idealism" which agrees with what*
- > *you are saying here. ala Bishop Berkeley.*

[Hammond]

Yes.. of course I am totally aware of it years ago. Mary Baker Eddy is commonly accused of using Bishop Berkeley's ideas to found the Christian Science Church. Fact is, both of them are right... they simply didn't have any scientific proof of it at the time.

- > *However this seems to be a*
- > *problem for you (maybe?) as if existence is dependant on humans then*
- > *humans must have always existed.*

[Hammond]

Your statement is a trivial trueism. By definition, if existence depends on humans, then humans have always existed... since existence didn't begin until humans appeared.

- > *But humans are finite. Science tells us*
- > *that our universe/cosmos is finite. HThus if existence depends on humans*
- > *and at one time humans did not exist then nothing exists *now* (Humans did*
- > *not exist so no humna could *ever* exist as existence depends on humans,*
- > *all thatt is of course if what you are saying is true).*

[Hammond]

Your attempt to argue against a scientific discovery using philosophical arguments is a waste of time in the first place... just as firing a bullet into a tree disproves Xeno's paradox... the bullet DOES hit the tree despite the philosophical argument that it can never get there.

At any rate... without even appealing to the scientific proof...the success of world religion testifies to the fact of the philosophical truth of the argument that "existence is a human sensory function" and that without humans therefore "nothing exists" is an absolutely sound argument against which Philosophy cannot muster anywhere near the historical, or now even the scientific evidence, to dispute it.

- >
- >> *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*
- >> *>I)?*
- >
- >>[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 :)*

[Hammond]

there is no "metaphysical problem". The only people who would believe so are the people who are not capable of understanding the scientific proof. I of course have no interest in arguing philosophy or metaphysics, since I have discovered an experimentally confirmed axiomatic physics explanation of God.

- >
- >
- > > *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?*

[Hammond]

Science does not argue "semantically or rhetorically"... it argues axiomatically and experimentally. So far, Science seems to have the more persuasive arguments.

- >
- > > *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.*

[Hammond]

Exactly. It is also a docmuneted scientific fact that 2nd and 3rd generation Japanese Americans are significantly taller than their parents.. and this is attributed simply to the higher standard of living in the US. For a dramitic picture of this see this amazing picture of a (US) Japanese family:

<http://economics.sbs.ohio-state.edu/rsteckel/Articles/time3.htm>

This is a visual picture of the "SECUALR TREND" in human growth.

(BTW, the complete Time Magazine article is posted on my website at:

<http://economics.sbs.ohio-state.edu/rsteckel/Articles/time1.htm>

>
> >>
> >> >*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.*

[Hammond]

"More expensive" standard of living is the main thing.. and this is why the conflict over "money" is the world's number one occupation. There are plenty of people who will tell you "God is money" .. and they certainly have a point.

>
>>> > *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 naively, believed that science was the "search for truth".*
> *Then I later discovered that it is impossible for a human to not have*
> *presuppositions, 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.)*

[Hammond]

Interestingly enough... your argument is incorrect. Science is actually the business of measuring what "God sees"... that is, formulating the laws of what you call "objective reality"... i.e. the reality as seen by a "perfect observer". religion on the other hand is concerned with the fact that there actually is no such thing as a "perfect observer" in the real world. Hence, the big argument between Religion and Science over what "reality" is.

>
>>>> > *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 :)

[Hammond]

Being right is a lot harder than being wrong. People who are wrong are "instantly understood and agreed with" and this of course is because people are deathly afraid of people who are wrong and don't dare to disagree with a dangerous person. It is the job of the state.. of the civilization itself to disagree with "people who are wrong", because rarely does the average person have the strength to resist them. Hitler is the prime example. Before the war everybody had to agree with him even though they knew he was wrong. After the war, after the Allies had defeated him... then they could publicly say he was wrong.

>

> >> 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 vace 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)?

[Hammond]

OBVIOUSLY! the first requisite of a Hollywood movie star is that he (or she) be a specimean of "very high growth". "Beauty" is in fact the first manifestation of "very high growth". All of human conflict is over "how fully grown are you". This is why women walk around in high heels.. to make them look more fully grown (higher on the growth curve).

>

> > *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, Physicis 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.*

[Hammond]

You're forgetting that it is only "theoretical reality" which says God is internal to us.... in point of fact "experienced reality" says that God is external to us. So apparently you want to sit here and argue over "which view is correct".

Well, in point of fact, 20 billion people in the history of Christianity alone (and other billions in other religions) have already DECIDED what view is "operationally correct" answer is.... that "experienced reality" has a far more profound impact on the human race than does "theoretical reality". Consequently, Religion holds the view that "God is out there", and I as a scientist who knows the complete story.... TOTALLY AGREES WITH THE POSITION OF RELIGION on the question. In fact... "philosophical arguments" are totally academic and irrelevant.

>
>>>
>>> > *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.*

[Hammond]
Tell me about it.

>
> *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...

[Hammond]

Hmmm... your mail program is reprocessing the header
and taking out the extra spaces. Usenet is sensitive
to the extra spaces. Thanks for letting me know about this..
perhaps I should stop putting extra spaces in my headers...
I might be missing some posts.

>
>
> RAZA 2005

[Hammond]

At any rate... I do appreciate your posts... a serious and
thoughtful person is always a pleasure to talk to.

=====
SCIENTIFIC PROOF OF GOD WEBSITE

http://geocities.com/scientific_proof_of_god

mirror site:

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

=====
please ask you news server to add:
alt.sci.relativistic-proof-of-god.moderated
=====