

Chapter 2k

Absolute Scientific Proof of the Discovery

Putting the Skeptics to Bed

The following consensus is where theomantics either lives or dies. This is where this subject must stand naked before the death rays of the scientific method and confront reality honestly and objectively. If there is one department where theomantics has done its homework, this is going to be it.

In a certain aspect, this chapter is the most important on Angelfall. The theomantics code in the Bible is something that either exists or it does not exist. If true, then the validity of the concept must be beyond dispute, which requires it to be objectively examined and analyzed in an unbiased manner, and a final determination made according to the rules of the scientific method. There is an old saying in science that "extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof." That is undoubtedly true here.

A number of very capable and brilliant individuals have tried their best over the years to debunk (disprove) theomantics. For whatever reasons, they refused to believe even the possibility that something like this could exist. They tried to poke holes from every angle. When they were appropriately confronted with hard facts and impenetrable data, without exception all gave up and limped off into the shadows. No one has successfully challenged this subject, and no one ever will. In fact, no one will even come close to it. Why? The answer is simple. **It is impossible to disprove something that simply exists!**

IMPORTANT: There are three chapters in **Theomantics II** that cover this scientific proof aspect more thoroughly and in a technical manner. Two comprehensive experiments are also shown here in Angelfall (see chapters **2m** and **2n**), one by the author and the other by an independent statistician in Germany. In addition, there is a 400-page manuscript, **Theomantics and the Scientific Method**, which presents more computerized testing and data. This is available at:

www.theomantics.com/theomantics/books.html.

The Objective of This Chapter

The purpose of the following is intended to provide an easy reading format for the general public to be able to understand clearly and easily, the logic of how all of this is proven in the laboratory—according to scientific testing procedures that have the proper controls.

It is so very important for people to understand and realize the fact that theomantics is NOT something imagined, or the result of someone's bias, i.e. some sort of arbitrary manipulation of data where the proponents are "picking and choosing" the results.

In other words, theomantics is valid strictly on its own merit and strength, and no human being has anything to do with it whatsoever.

The Scientific Method

The most simple definition of the word science is simply "the state of knowing—knowledge of fact—as opposed to intuition or belief."

Science deals with real facts in a real world. It deals with that which can be tested through a process that is repeatable and produces an outcome that is determinate and predictable.

The World Book Encyclopedia would define science or the scientific method as,

Science covers the broad field of human knowledge concerned with facts held together by principles (rules). Scientists discover and test these facts and principles by the scientific method, which is an orderly system of solving problems. Scientists obtain data by performing experiments and observing the results. The information collected has to be interpreted; science has therefore an intellectual as well as a practical side and it is at least partly rational. The sciences include: (1) mathematics and logic; (2) the physical sciences (such as physics, chemistry, astronomy); (3) the biological sciences, (such as botany and zoology); and (4) social sciences (sociology and anthropology). (**World Book Encyclopedia**)

The Purest of All Sciences

The one branch of science that concerns us is **mathematics and logic**. It is the purest of all the sciences. It is also the most objective and absolute. The state of development of any science is indicated by the use it makes of mathematics. A science begins with simple mathematics to measure then works toward more complex mathematics in order to explain. Known or established mathematical laws are without question the most undisputed and universally provable facts in all the universe, for they are eternal in nature. The fact that $2 + 2 = 4$ is something that was never created; therefore, it is impossible to destroy it. The fact $2 + 2 = 4$ never had a beginning (only the discovery of it had a beginning). Every similar mathematical formula or equation is also eternal and absolute truth.

Science versus Theology

Over the centuries, there has been a great canyon or divide between scientists and theologians. Both live on almost completely different planets. It has been said that science deals with the realm of facts, and religion deals with the realm of values, i.e. faith and anticipation. Science concerns itself with things seen, and religion with things that are invisible; the former is material and the latter spiritual.

The scientist is always in search of strictly universal laws. This is necessary in order for him to find comprehensive explanations for all that exists. The theologian can rarely, if ever, test his beliefs by any such method(s). For that reason, the scientist can usually be more confident that his knowledge and beliefs lie at a higher level of objectivity and certainty.

Yet as wonderful as science is, we need to also understand that it has its own limitations. Although scientists can study many objects and events, there are many things they cannot test. For example, a scientist cannot measure a mother's love for her children. He cannot measure the difference between good and evil. There is no way to tell scientifically what feeling an artist expresses in a painting. Such information cannot be scientifically observed and measured. (**World Book Encyclopedia**)

Virtually no Biblical teaching or doctrine can be scientifically proven in a laboratory. Theologians must use entirely different methods, or tools of logic (hermeneutic principles and exegesis), in order to arrive at their conclusions. These methods, while valid in their own realm, do not necessarily produce conclusive results. One man's heresy may end up being another man's orthodoxy. For instance, there is no way to scientifically prove or disprove the doctrine of eternal security (once saved always saved). There is no way to scientifically prove or disprove that Sunday is the proper day of worship (and the Seventh-Day Adventists are all wrong). There is no way to scientifically prove in a laboratory whether or not there is going to be a future millennial reign of Christ on earth (or as many people believe, that the "1000 years" is symbolic). None of these teachings are provable in any way that would be acceptable to science. This brings us to a critical statement.

The Validity of Theomatics

The validity of theomatics has nothing to do with theology (or even the "existence" of God Himself). The methods of theology are not applicable in attempting to either prove or disprove theomatics. Whether the entire concept makes sense to a person or agrees with their belief system about God and the Bible—how they think God should operate—none of this is relevant. We don't accept the validity of theomatics based upon any theological standards, confessions, or creeds. Whether or not theomatics exists must be based solely on pure science. In the end, if theomatics is proven to be true, then our

theology must conform to fit the facts. We must bow to it (and to the God who placed it). It does not have to bend to us and our own way of thinking.

Does Theomatics Exist?

This is the critical question. All other concerns and arguments fall into the secondary category of the "implications of theomatics." And in that department, there are certainly many theological and philosophical considerations.

The implications have been discussed in numerous chapters of our books. Here, however, our concern is not "why" or "what," but IF.

Numerous people have clearly seen the fact that theomatics either exists or it does not. There is no gray area. It is either present in the Bible in its entirety, or not at all. There is no such thing as a woman being 50 percent or partially pregnant. We can safely assume that if God did place an inherent structure—based upon the number-to-letter allocations—then it probably saturates everything from top to bottom.

Time to "Round 'em Up"

Before proceeding to show the reader the method and manner in which all of this is unequivocally proven (and subsequently put the skeptics to bed), it is important to pin down any possible or potential criticism of the validity of this subject. In other words, at the outset, we are going to corral the skeptics and box them into a corner from which there will be no escape.

Many individuals will ultimately reject the reality of the existence of theomatics for a host of philosophical or theological reasons. However, no matter what the reason or logic may be, there is one highway that all of them must eventually travel.

All Roads Lead to This

For any destructive critic, the only valid assumption is that no matter how impressive the theomatic features, no matter how logical and conclusive the data, no matter what the statistical odds, the one inevitable position he must essentially and irrevocably maintain, as a matter of necessity to his position, is that these so-called results are only coincidence and nothing more than the product of random chance. All data that theomatics has ever discovered was found by the claimant, carefully and arbitrarily picking and choosing from a base of numbers that is strictly random; it is selective data. The researcher in some careful and subtle manner has "cooked the results" of the inquiry—he is the reason, not "God." In the end, there must be nothing unique or special—no special characteristics or supernatural element—relative to the assignment of numerical values to the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible.

For the skeptic, this is the only possible conclusion. **To admit otherwise is to admit that theomantics may actually be true.** The only other alternative is to provide a natural cause that would explain the positive results (if there are any). There are only two possibilities.

- The whole thing is the product of lost ancient knowledge, handed down. It was then introduced into the Bible according to a conspiracy that lasted sixteen hundred years, in which all forty Bible writers secretly participated (and for which there is not even the slightest historical evidence). This idea, of course, is absurd (see **Theomantics II**, p. 185).
- It is a product or aberration of the Hebrew and Greek languages. In other words, there are certain inherent characteristics of the Biblical languages that produces the results. When examined, this argument completely falls apart as well (see **Theomantics II**, p. 186 and a complete chapter here on Angelfall that discusses that very issue—chapter **2o**). Whoever put the patterns there had to engineer the words. The patterns only appear in the Bible. And they only appear with the standard numerical values. **But they only appear when related words or theological meanings are examined.**

Finding the Fatal Flaw

I have had occasion to observe many skeptics over the years. What I have learned is that various individuals who are skeptical about various sensational claims (those who enjoy playing the role of devil's advocate) will immediately look to find a weakness or fatal flaw, either in the scientific logic or in the test results from the statistical procedure.

Most skeptics out there who are cynical will only give the subject a perfunctory examination. If they think they have found the fatal flaw, like a predator they will tend to pounce. However, if they eventually find themselves in quicksand and cannot produce a substantial and provable weakness, at that point they will usually make some snide remarks and you never hear from them again (the Internet is loaded with thousands of these types of arrogant smart alecks, especially in the newsgroups.)

Or they will resort to an approach called **deflection**. If theomantics has as its established defense scientific data that is irrefutable, then the critic will ignore that evidence—refusing to admit to it—and in lieu of challenging the facts, focus on other more trivial issues that are non-fatal. Or they will try to find one silly mistake, or lack of sophistication in a certain discipline, and from that "build a man of straw," knocking him down.

Quite honestly, no skeptic will waste a lot of time with something like this, unless there is a personal "reward" at the other end. What is most unfair is the fact that if someone ever does make a serious attempt to debunk theomantics, and the attempt fails, we are unlikely to be told.

One Attempt has Been Made

The only approach someone can take, is to completely throw out all the theomatic findings and evidence—and in that process outright deny and/or ignore both the data and objective basis of proof; then start from scratch, and in that process conduct their own designed experiments (which will provably be biased), **essentially saying that theomatics must be something different than what it is in order to be valid.**

A fellow in Texas did try that approach and published an anonymous major website claiming they had "solidly debunked" theomatics. But the effort backfired and proved absolutely nothing in the end because he was not even dealing with the same data or test method. A highly qualified statistician in Germany with a master's degree in science and mathematics, did a thorough analysis of that effort and **concluded that this individual's approach and test method was both invalid and irrelevant to theomatics.** He then performed his own independent experiment and concluded that the odds of one theomatic pattern were no less than a million to one, which the fellow in Texas conceded was true by his own conservative calculations—the odds indeed were 1.25 million to one. (See independent rebuttal and experiment at www.theomatics.net).

The Science of Statistics and Probability

Professional statisticians and probability experts have been consulted and a great deal of work has been done to calculate the actual mathematical probabilities for various design structures in theomatics. It has been shown that the mathematical odds of many theomatic patterns occurring by chance (assuming a valid null hypothesis that numbers must occur at random unless someone with intelligence arranges things differently) is only one in so many millions, billions, trillions, quadrillions, etc.

Presenting this type of data can become quite technical and takes great effort to explain to the average person. In this chapter here, I will bypass that sort of evidence and simply focus on "the Method." This discussion here will be conclusive and mathematically unimpeachable.

The scientific method according to which theomatics is effectively proven (or disproven) is simple. In fact, it is so simple and straightforward that those who want to build a big, complicated thesis to try to debunk the subject will find that, when confronted with "the method," their trail ends abruptly at the edge of the Grand Canyon. Unless they can find a way to build a bridge over this one, all philosophical or theological arguments they will seek to set forth, or any deflative arguments, will be completely nullified by "the method."

How Many Permutations Are There?

To demonstrate how impossible it would be for there to exist any divine or supernatural element in the Bible—based on the numerical values of the Hebrew and Greek alphabets—**unless someone with intelligence deliberately put it there**, I now present the explanation that forms the backbone of theomatics validity. We have already seen that there are twenty-two letters in the Hebrew alphabet and twenty-six letters in the Greek alphabet. **There is a mind-boggling number of other possibilities present for the numerical values that theomatics uses.**

GREEK ALPHABET RANDOM COMBINATIONS

1	1
2	2
3	6
4	24
5	120
6	720
7	5,040
8	40,320
9	362,880
10	3,628,800
11	39,916,800
12	479,001,600
13	6,227,020,800
14	87,178,291,200
15	1,307,674,368,000
16	20,922,789,888,000
17	355,687,428,096,000
18	6,402,373,705,728,000
19	121,645,100,408,832,000
20	2,432,902,008,176,640,000
21	51,090,942,171,709,400,000
22	1,240,007,277,776,000,000,000
23	25,852,016,738,884,900,000,000
24	620,448,401,733,239,000,000,000
25	15,511,210,043,330,900,000,000,000
26	403,291,461,126,605,000,000,000,000

To illustrate, let us suppose that we were to create a language that had an alphabet that consisted of only two letters, *a* and *b*, each having a specific numerical value. *a* could equal a value of 1, and *b* could equal a value of 2. From a mathematical standpoint, there are two different possibilities, or ways that these numerical values could be assigned.

$$\begin{array}{l} a = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad a = 2 \\ b = 2 \quad \quad \quad b = 1 \end{array}$$

If we had a three-letter alphabet, *a*, *b*, and *c*, each with a respective numerical value, there would be six different combinations or permutations possible.

a = 1 a = 1 a = 2 a = 2 a = 3 a = 3
b = 2 b = 3 b = 1 b = 3 b = 1 b = 2
c = 3 c = 2 c = 3 c = 1 c = 2 c = 1

To find the combinations for a particular number, one simply multiplies that number times the total combinations for the previous number.

For two letters, it would be $2 \times 1 = 2$ combinations. For three letters it would be $3 \times 2 = 6$ combinations. For four letters it would be $4 \times 6 = 24$ combinations. For five letters it would be $5 \times 24 = 120$ combinations.

For all 26 letters in the Greek alphabet, that is 403 septillion, 291 sextillion, 461 quintillion, 126 quadrillion, 605 trillion combinations! And that is considering only the **standard numerical value sequence** of 1 to 9, 10 to 90, 100 to 800. If other numerical arrangements were used, the number of possible random combinations would be infinite.

Here Is the Crux of the Whole Matter

What is important to note is that each one of these 403 septillion possibilities would produce a completely **different** set or mix of numerical values for all the words in the Bible. Two inescapable requirements are necessary in order for theomatics to be a valid discovery. It must be proven beyond any reasonable doubt that

- The **only** number-letter arrangement that can possibly work to produce "theomatic features" that go consistently beyond the laws of chance is the one that theomatics uses—the one that has been traditionally known for thousands of years and can be found in **Webster's Dictionary** and the earliest New Testament papyrus fragments, and that
- The only manuscripts in history that can produce any consistency that can be demonstrated according to the scientific method, i.e., that goes beyond the laws of chance, are the original sixty-six books of the Bible—Genesis through Revelation.

None of the other 403 septillion alphabetical number-letter arrangements can work. **If even one of them could produce the same average side-by-side results that theomatics has been able to produce, theomatics would be null.** This would prove, or at the very least indicate, that there was nothing unique or special about the features that theomatics has found.

You see, if God (or anyone else) did not place the theomatic structure in the Bible, then the numerical values theomatics uses would produce nothing more than random numbers

when applied to the Hebrew and Greek words. Therefore, any other random number-letter equivalencies would have just as good a chance of producing "features" as theomatics has. Why not? If the theomatic number-letter equivalencies are random, they are **only one out of 403 septillion possibilities.**

Let's Ask an Expert

For the record, here is the professional statistician's report that appeared in my original book.

Mr. Del Washburn:

I have considered the material you sent me concerning your approach to proof of "theomatic" design in the Bible. In considering your material, I addressed myself in particular to your proposal of the construction of "random interlinears." I am in complete agreement with you in the idea that if there is nothing inherently "special" or "non-random" about the interlinear resulting from the assignment of number values to Greek letters as given in Webster's dictionary, then one should be able to substantially duplicate your findings with *any random assignment* of number-letter equivalencies. More precisely, if one examines an interlinear resulting from random assignment of equivalencies in the same manner as you examined the interlinear resulting from the assignment appearing in Webster's, and if there are no special characteristics of the latter assignment, then one should be able to produce results, i.e., theomatic features with the same general probability (or improbability) as those you have been able to produce. In comparing the results of both efforts one should then expect: (1) As many features from the one as from the other. (2) The features produced from the one would have the same clear significance as those of the other. By this I mean one should be able to find groups of phrases with the same theological theme, i.e., Jesus, Satan, the flesh, etc., rather than phrases consisting of odd collections of words with no clear theological significance and chosen only for the similarity of numerical equivalents. (3) The features would exhibit the same general "clustering" characteristics. In particular, the clustering from the random interlinear should be around multiples of numbers of the same general magnitude as those of Webster's, not smaller numbers. It should be noted that numbers of the same general magnitude would be necessary to produce comparable probabilities of occurrence. Pursuant to the idea discussed above, I have constructed a table of random numbers, two random assignments of number-letter equivalencies which may be used to construct random interlinears. In closing I would like to wish you good luck with the forthcoming publication of your book.

Please keep me informed.

Sincerely,

LaVerne W. Stanton,
Ph.D., Associate Professor and Chair,
Department of Quantitative Methods,
California State University, Fullerton

With his letter, Dr. Stanton provided two sets of random number-letter equivalencies, which I used in the statistics chapter of the original **Theomatics**. Using them now is completely unnecessary because the computer programs that I currently use can mix up to one million random seed numbers and number-letter equivalencies.

Standard Allocations	Random Allocations
α 1	α 6
β 2	β 5
γ 3	γ 3
δ 4	δ 9
ε 5	ε 8
ζ' 6	ζ' 2
ζ 7	ζ 1
η 8	η 4
θ 9	θ 7
ι 10	ι 30
κ 20	κ 70
λ 30	λ 50
μ 40	μ 80
ν 50	ν 10
ξ 60	ξ 20
ο 40	ο 70
π 80	π 90
ρ 90	ρ 60
σ 100	σ 700
σ - ζ . . . 200	σ - ζ . . . 200
τ 300	τ 400
υ 400	υ 500
φ 500	φ 800
χ 600	χ 100
ψ 700	ψ 300
ω 800	ω 600

Shown above is an example of a random assignment. In order to make it as objective as possible the letters have been mixed up within their respective groups: the single digits (1 to 9), the double digits (10 to 90), and the triple digits (100 to 800).

Any time I run theomatic tests of phrases by computer, I can simultaneously call up **one million random assignments** of number-letter equivalencies. The computer then duplicates the exact same calculations in searching for features with the random values as it does with the theomatic values. Also, if a theomatic word comes out a multiple of 10, so will the random word. This removes any argument that the theomatic values may have certain characteristics that produce the "results," or that the outcome results from some mathematical artifact.

Shown below is a Greek phrase from John 3:16: "For thus loved God the world so as the Son the only begotten He gave." The first example shows the theomatic numerical values. The second example is random. Only the values in the first line would be able to produce meaningful results. The words with the random values would only yield results according to what mathematicians call "the null hypothesis."

1770 104 355 70 284 420 450 1305 420 530 420 296 884
 ΟΥΤΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΗΓΑΠΗΣΕΝ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΚΟΣΜΟΝ ΩΣΤΕ ΤΟΝ ΥΙΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗ ΕΔΩΚΕΝ

1740 709 325 40 255 450 440 1208 450 580 450 195 705
 ΟΥΤΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΗΓΑΠΗΣΕΝ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΚΟΣΜΟΝ ΩΣΤΕ ΤΟΝ ΥΙΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗ ΕΔΩΚΕΝ

"Tit for Tat"

It is clear that in comparing both efforts, theomatic versus random, the following similarities should and would in all probability occur (if theomatics was not valid.)

- On the average, both efforts should produce the **same number** of features or examples of the supposed phenomena.
- On the average, both efforts should produce features or multiples of numbers of the **same size** or magnitude or of equal probability.
- On the average, both efforts should produce features of the **same general distinction** relative to meaning or theological theme.
- On the average, both efforts should produce features of phrases of the **same length**.

In any scientific test that is performed, there must be no advantage given to either the theomatic or the random values. Each side must stand on an equal footing.

What About the Phone Book?

Let the following illustration show how ridiculous all of this would be if theomatics was not true.

Suppose that someone came along and tried to publish a scientific paper in which they claimed to have had an amazing revelation concerning the Greater Chicago telephone directory. He has discovered that the vast majority of phone numbers for people with the last name of "Smith" clustered around multiples of 93. Furthermore, he has discovered that phone numbers of people with the last name of "Jones" were structured primarily on multiples of 153.

In publishing this discovery (even if it were true), the most difficult problem our investigator would have would be getting another scientist to even take the time to test such a hypothesis. Everyone knows that numbers in a phone book are simply random numbers. In fact, even to consider the possibility of anything else would be incomprehensible, a total absurdity. A Jones number has just as good a probability or chance of producing a 93 as a Smith number does. In looking for multiples of 93 from any random number, one would only be able to find an exact hit every 93 numbers. (To find a hit within a cluster of 93 would be only 1 chance in 18.6, i.e., $93/5 = 18.60$.) So why should the Bible, or any other work of literature, be any different when one tries to apply numerical values to words and theological themes? I must constantly remind myself to be somewhat sympathetic to those who are skeptical of the validity of theomantics. Certainly, by all human or secular logic, applying this sort of a method could not be expected to produce any consistent numerical patterns (like theomantics) in any work of literature, any more than in a local phone directory. It would be no more likely.

Putting the Big Argument to Sleep

At this point I will briefly interrupt the progression of thought to discuss the major argument skeptics try to throw at both Bible codes and theomantics.

Many evangelical leaders opposed to the entire concept of a hidden numerical structure in the Bible have asserted that the phenomenon can be found anywhere outside the Bible. In other words, the methods employed by the proponents will exhibit the same identical results when applied to any work of literature. Of course, the conclusion they are trying to draw from that argument is that since the methods are suspect and not valid to begin with, they can work just as easily anywhere.

Chapter 20 here on Angelfall deals specifically with this very issue.

Unfortunately, this conclusion will fall flat on its face when it comes to theomantics. One is no more likely to find theomatic patterns in other works of literature than to find provable patterns in the Chicago phone book. **No one could ever demonstrate that any other work of literature contains words and topics that produce number patterns that go beyond the laws of random chance.**

Let us suppose that someone takes any number of references from a Hebrew or Greek literary work, tries all the various phrase combinations, and eventually produces a string of hits that contain a common denominator. This could never be done in such a manner that another person, adhering to the same ground rules, could not take a random or different set of allocations to the letters and words, and following the same procedure, achieve similar average results. It would be a "piece of cake" to prove and demonstrate that fact.

The Final Conclusion

If theomantics is untrue, then everything that has been shown in all of our books and writings (including everything on Angelfall) could be easily duplicated by **any one random assignment**. A person could take any one random assignment and produce as many short phrases on "agape" love all with values of multiples of 93 (or any number of the same general magnitude). In reference to fishing, the net, fishers of men, etc., he could produce as many multiples of 153, 170, and 289 (or any other relational numbers), and he could also produce as many 122 examples from Revelation 12 (that are equally impressive) in relation to Satan the dragon.

If a person wishes to investigate all this thoroughly, there is material available for in-depth analysis. The computer software currently used is very sophisticated and absolutely mathematically thorough.

Testing the Hypothesis

Here now is an explanation of both the ground rules and the testing procedure.

- To begin the experiment, **every single passage or possibility** that exists within a distinct category must be clearly identified in ADVANCE of performing any tests (No human bias factor or selective use of data is allowed; see **Theomantics II**, pp. 170,171.) The references that do not work out theomatically must be examined alongside all the ones that do.
- Only **one Hebrew or Greek text** can be used, with no variant readings. If variant readings are looked at, then all variants need to be calculated into the program.
- Every possible phrase combination that exists, i.e., all mathematical possibilities, are taken into account and extracted by computer.
- Each phrase used from all the feature references must **contain a specific Hebrew or Greek word**. Without doing it this way there is no objective way of defining what constitutes a feature.
- The computer program then goes through **every single phrase combination** from every reference and looks for theomatic results. These results are then recorded.
- Then the program does a parallel analysis, recalculating the value of every word according to a random seed number, reassigning all the allocations of numbers to letters. The entire base is shuffled and changed so it is unquestionably random.

- Finally, the computer looks for features with the best possible number that is similar in size to the theomatic multiple and tries just as hard to find hits with the random values, as it did with the theomatic values.

The computer programs are also able to search through a whole string of references and find the one random number that produces the best results common to the greatest number of references.

Theomatics is confined to the use of one set of allocations of numbers to letters. The skeptic trying to debunk theomatics is allowed use of literally thousands of random/alphabet allocations (trying the same experiment over and over again) in trying to find **just one** of them that will come close to matching the results.

This investigation and comparison of theomatics versus random numbers is absolutely conclusive. There is not a mathematical scientist on the face of the earth who will find any fault with it. Again, if the theomatic base is random (and there is no supernatural or Divine element present), then any other random assignment should by all reasonable logic, produce similar average results.

Right now there are hundreds of studies in my files that can apply the above analysis in an absolutely thorough and objective manner; random numbers cannot even come close to producing the same results.