

Re: God=G_uv BACK TO PHILOSOPHY

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-08/8238.html>

From: George Hammond (research137_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 08/27/04

Date: Fri, 27 Aug 2004 02:10:25 GMT

"TomGee" <lvlus@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:cc2dde17.0408261518.22877ff4@posting.google.com...
> "George Hammond" <research137@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<_DkXc.94499\$TII.11579@attbi_s52>...
>> "Scot McDermid" <scotmc@optNOSPAMonline.net> wrote in message
>> news:tJbXc.3154\$ZD4.3546870@news4.srv.hcvlly.cv.net...
>>> "George Hammond" <research137@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>> news:Sh7Xc.68440\$mD.43941@attbi_s02...
>>>>
>>>> "Bill" <wmech@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:q_4Xc.515673\$Gx4.499921@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>>>>> There are thousands of God beliefs. Does his scientific proof of
God,
>> prove
>>>> which God is the correct one and that all the others are fakes???
>>>>>
>>>>> [Hammond]
>>>>> It proves all of the world's major religions... e.g. Christianity,
>>>>> Islam, Judiasm, Hinduism and Buddhism are true,
>>>>>
> No, it does not. <snippity snip>

[Hammond]

Yes it does to.

>>
>>>> and all
>>>> worship the same God.... namely the God described by
>>>> God=G_uv. This accounts for the overwhelming majority
>>>> of the world's estimated 5-billion religious adherents.
>>>>

<snip trite common knowlege>

>>> It is your paper that you are pushing. It is your theory.
>>> So to be complete you really need to establish the link from

> > > *G_uv to God. This, of course, brings us away from the*
> > > *PURE PHYSICS back to the philosophy.*
> > >
> > > *1 –You have said that God is an invisible man that rules*
> > > *the universe. (But Brahman, for example is not a man*
> > > *at all. Brahman is attributeless.)*
> >
> > *[Hammond]*
> > *I take Brahman to be the analog of the "Holy Ghost" in*
> > *Christianity. He is in fact part of the Trinity that may be*
> > *identified in Hinduism. He is "personified" in fact by the*
> > *"Brahmins" (the priestly caste). He is in fact one member*
> > *of the "Trimurti" or Trinity in Hinduism.*
> > *the Hindu Trimurti however is a slight corruption of the*
> > *christian Trinity (which is scientifically correct) in that*
> > *the Trimurti ignores the "Son" and includes the "Devil".*
> > *the "Son of God" in Hinduism is Krishna, and the Devil*
> > *is Shiva. Thus the Trimurti is "Vishnu, Brahma, and Shiva"*
> > *while the true Trinity of Hinduism is actually "Vishnu,*
> > *Krishna and Brahma"... the "Father, Son and Holy Ghost".*
> > *This is all based on my observation that the "Trinity of*
> > *God" is the dynamical description of God's action in*
> > *society which is a feedback loop (input, output, feedback)*
> > *and theologically this was discovered in Apostolic times and*
> > *named "Father, Son and Holy Ghost"... I believe even*
> > *Jesus in the New Testament makes the statment that*
> > *people should be Baptized in the name of the "Father,*
> > *the Son and the Holy Ghost", so it was certainly recognized*
> > *2,000 years ago.*
> >

<snip... more common knowege tripe>

> > *[Hammond]*
> > *Wrong. Clearly the term "Big Bang creation" is known to*
> > *you, AND the term "Biblical Creation" is known to you.*
> > *Both of them are given considerable credence in the*
> > *Western world.*
> >

<snip>

> >
> > *Fact is, my discovery proves that BOTH "creations"*
> > *are true. To wit:*
> >
> > *1. 40,000 years ago the human brain and therefore*
> > *"perceptual reality" came into existence... this*
> > *explains the Biblical Creation. Without perceptual*
> > *reality there is no physical reality, because human*
> > *perception is the ONLY AGENCY by which*

> > *we detect physical reality.*
> >

<snip.. more oxymorons>

> >
> > *2. Because of 1, we see that when the Biblical Creation*
> > *occurred, it "Created" the "existence" of physical*
> > *reality including time itself.*
> >

<snip... more unscientific crap of no interesst>

> >
> > *Part of this Creation*
> > *of time was the creation of the "15-billion year*
> > *history" of the universe, including the Big Bang.*
> >

<snip more pantywaist academy fat lip tripe>

> >
> > *3. So, therefore, "within Biblical Creation" there*
> > *is a "physical creation" known as the Big Bang.*
> >

<snip.... yawn...>

> >
> > *I don't see how this should be considered "incredible",*
> > *or "unbelievable" or "irrational".... it seems as simple*
> > *as 1, 2, 3 to me.*
> >

<snip more one liner academy crap>

> >
> > *Problem is.... most people would say "so what... what is the*
> > *PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE of such a theory"?*
> > *And up until NOW there was no proven scientific significance*
> > *of this "philosophical argument".*
> > *But NOW, Hammond has discovered that there is a*
> > *significant, fundamental and systematic DEPARTURE*
> > *of "perceptual reality" from "absolute physical reality".*
> > *that this difference can be measured to two decimal points,*
> > *is at a minimun at least 15%, and it CAUSES the phenomena*
> > *that we call "God" as well as all of Psychology... and in*
> > *fact accounts for the existence of Religion.*
> >

<snip... more Reader's Digest crapola>

>>
>> *And of course..... it finally ENDS the philosophical*
>> *dispute that has been going on for 1700 years as to whether*
>> *"reality" is "perceptual" or "absolute". Turns out it is*
>> *BOTH.... and the DIFFERENCE between the two explains*
>> *the existence of the "God of the Bible".*
>>

<snip... more low grade moron typing>

>>
>> [Hammond]
>> *I certainly have made a historic discovery irregardless of whether*
>> *you agree with it or not.*
>>

<snip... more Reader's Digest cliches>

.
>>
>> *Einstein in fact said he did*
>> *not believe in a "personal God" (anthropomorphic God)*
>> *and believed in a "cosmical God". Basically this is the*
>> *what Spinoza advocated.... Spinoza said "God is Nature".*
>> *Well, the fact is my discovery indicates that BOTH views*
>> *i.e. the "person-God" and the "cosmic God" are correct.*
>> *However, we must point out that said discovery clearly shows*
>> *that both Spinoza and Einstein were INCORRECT when they*
>> *said that the "person-God"... that is the "invisible man God"*
>> *did not exist. He does exist!*
>>
> *No, he doesn't.*

yes he does

>>
>> *And moreover, it is the*
>> *"person-God" that has been, and still is, the workhorse of*
>> *religion for 3,500 years. And no doubt will remain so!*
>>
> *No doubt.*

already said that.... stop repeating me.

>>
>> *OK, the reason my discovery confirms that BOTH views*
>> *of God are correct is that my discovery shows that "God is*
>> *caused by Gravity". The invisible person-God is caused*
>> *by Classical Gravity, which indicates immediately that when*
>> *the theory of Quantum Gravity is ever discovered, we are*
>> *going to get a "cosmological" description of God. And,*

> > *people are already working on this despite the fact that the theory*
> > *of Quantum Gravity hasn't even been discovered.*
> >

<snip... more boring trivia cliches>

> >
> > *The whole*
> > *field of "Consciousness Research" is in fact a search for this*
> > *"cosmological God".*
> >
> >
> *No, that is not a fact at all.*

Tis so.

> >
> > *However, the "cosmological God" theory*
> > *is very old... and Spinoza is a well known example of it.*
> > *However... to start a speculative digression into quantum*
> > *gravity and the nature of the cosmological God at this point,*
> > *when what we have on the table before us is an ACTUAL PROOF*
> > *of the "classical God"*
> >
> *No it isn't. That's just wishful thinking on your part.*

T'aint.

> >
> > *.... that is the invisible man God... I*
> > *consider nothing but an attempt to change the subject or*
> > *an attempt to obfuscate the dramatic proven discovery that*
> > *we have before us now.*
> >
> *Yours is neither a discovery, dramatic, and nor is it proven.*

Nope, yup.

> >
> > *So.. to answer your query.... YES the "God of Spinoza"*
> > *is a correct theory.... and this theory does make it's appearance*
> > *in many of our "unsophisticated Third World religions".*
> > *Why? Because when all is said and done.... the "cosmological*
> > *God" is actually a LESS SOPHISTICATED idea than the*
> > *PERSON-GOD of classical religion.*
> >

<snip>

> >
> > *After all.... saying things*
> > *like "God is energy" which any office secretary is apt to say...*

> > *is a far less sophisticated ruminaton than discovering that*
> > *God is "an invisible man" which is what classical religion*
> > *discovered thousands of years ago, and is the MAINSTAY*
> > *of world religion today.*
> > *Fianlly, however... don't think I am pooh poohing the*
> > *importance of the "cosmological God"... or what we might*
> > *call the "quantum God". After all, comparing the "person God"*
> > *to the "quantum God" is sort of like comparing the*
> > *"political theory of Man" to the "medical theory of Man".*
> > *While it is true that Politics is more important than Medicine*
> > *in terms of direct impact on Civilization.... we all appreciate*
> > *that Medicine is vital to human survival. Likewise, it turns*
> > *out that the "classical theory" of God cannot answer the question*
> > *of "Life After Death"... and it is highly likely that we won't*
> > *get an answer to that until the "quantum God" (quantum gravity)*
> > *is discovered.*
> >
> *The question is moot*

Tis not.

Hey dude... where'd you get that frontal lobotomy,
or is that just a head injury from a car accident?

=====

SCIENTIFIC PROOF OF GOD WEBSITE

1st mirror site:

http://geocities.com/scientific_proof_of_god

2nd mirror site:

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

new site (under construction):

<http://home.comcast.net/~proof-of-god>

=====