

Re: PLATE MAPS OF THE PAST

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2004-07/0695.html>

From: George (george_at_george.net)

Date: 07/21/04

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 2004 21:45:34 -0400

"Carsten Troelsgaard" <carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk> wrote in message
news:40fd944c\$0\$214\$edfadb0f@dread14.news.tele.dk...

>

> "George" <george@george.net> skrev i en meddelelse

> news:_0gLc.2388\$QO.2374@bignews5.bellsouth.net...

>>

>> "Carsten Troelsgaard" <carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk> wrote in message

>> news:40fce57b\$0\$282\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk...

>>>

>>> "don findlay" <don@tower.net.au> skrev i en meddelelse

>>> news:5f164087.0407191750.7c4fe54e@posting.google.com...

>>>> "George" <george@george.net> wrote in message

>>>> news:<[UkRkKc.302\\$%S4.241@bignews1.bellsouth.net](mailto:UkRkKc.302$%S4.241@bignews1.bellsouth.net)>...

>>>>

>>>> snip

>>>>

>>>>> <<http://users.indigo.net.au/don/ee/ridgegrowth.html#s0s>>]

>>>>>

>>>>> snip

>>>>>

>>>>>> Check out the Abusal Hills, and the scarps, and the

>>>>>> growth faults, and then tell us all what the dykes are feeding...

>>>>>> Lava flows?

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I've checked out your link.

>>>>>> I don't see any issues with PT, unless you try to make the appearance of

>>>>>>> magnetic contours a diachronous affair. Your figure 2 seems to let the

>>>>>>> surface of the atlantic fit into the opening gap and thus gets it's

>>>>>>> magnetic

>>>>>>> signature by stretching the thing. And you wonder why George think that

>>>>>>> you

>>>>>>> are wearing down your credibility! Who wouldn't? Turning people mute by

>>>>>>> sheer quantity of information seems to be your strategy – that it

>>>>>>> generally

>>>>>>> lack reason does not disturb you the least, on the contrary: another 15

>>>>>>> pages will do the trick.

>>>>>>>

sci.geo.geology: Re: PLATE MAPS OF THE PAST

>>
>> *As someone else said recently in this newsgroup, "Generating a 5 dollar
> opinion
>> supported by a nickel's worth of data is
>> stupid in ANY context. It's called "wild speculation", and it has NO
> place in
>> what is supposed to be a scientific discussion." What say you, Carlsten?*
>
> *It could make a big difference. Making a new model as Don does is admirable,
> but it sooner or later has to face geological reality.
> Popping a suggestion as above could be ok, but either I get it wrong or it
> just is wrong. I can't figure Don out though – it seems to be a very
> extensive joke, if that is what it is.*
>

He's a creationist. Pure and simple. The fact that he hangs out with JPT should clue you in to his reasoning, or lack thereof.