

Re: Negating Plate Tectonics – Strike 11

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2006–07/msg00025.html>

- *From:* "don findlay" <don@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 6 Jul 2006 21:54:14 –0700
-

Stuart wrote:

don findlay wrote:

Desertphile wrote:

don findlay wrote:

–

Negating Plate Tectonics – Strike 11
Plate Tectonicsists don't understand their
own model.

–

"Plate Tectonicsists?" Okay, I surrender: I concede the fact
that "don
findlay" is a troll and not the raving lunatic he is pretending
to be.
I lost the bet: who do I send the \$5 to?

(Let's make it double or quits, shall we?)

And who says I'm pretending anything. I don't think I'm a raving
lunatic – Just because Stuart and John Harshman find it politic to say
things like that, doesn't mean you have to believe them. I'll bet more
than half the people here thought the same as John, but what can they
do when that geezer in the board shorts fancy dress parades in front of
them with his frangipani showing? They're bound to feel a bit, ..you
know, ...less.... But he's still to explain what happens on the u'p'
part of the cycle.

Now this the funny part.

Re: Negating Plate Tectonics – Strike 11

Don now understands why things go down.

Oh, do I. Then you must agree with something I'm saying. Well, I for one would be very interested to know what it is. What I *am* saying is that I understand why Plate Tectonics *must say* "things go down" because the crust pushes them down, if that's what you mean. Is that what you mean I mean?

Can't figure that out for the life of him. And yet he has a PhD!

Exactly! And that's why I can't figure it out. Unless you mean it sinks like the Titanic? Which is fine by me. Which of the two ("pushing" or "Titanic") do you mean I mean? Let's hear what you think you mean I mean you mean I mean ..you mean, ..I

Let's hear it one more time from the Horse's Mouth, stu, ..for John Harshman's befuddled sake (since I already know what you mean),.. What do you mean drives subduction? And that's not Plate Tectonics, and it's not convection cells, ..it's *subduction*.

And oh, yes, ..how transform faults form.

Funny, myself and several other researchers have shown how transforms can form.

And oh yes really? Then in the millions of sites on the web (four or so) it seems nobody has seen fit to pick this gem this gem of yours up,

...Stu:–

"how transforms can form." <http://tinyurl.com/efa2w>

or "How transform faults can form" <http://tinyurl.com/kum4t>

....seems its relevance is lost on everyone. It's sunk under the pile of dust. Care to refresh?

Less of this 'can' and more of the 'do', .. Why don't you be more positive and use the string "how transform faults form" instead?

<http://tinyurl.com/nsuvp>

Don hasn't actually read a paper on PT, mantle convection etc. Real science scares the crap out of him.

Re: Negating Plate Tectonics – Strike 11

It certainly does, .. But your pile of crap is higher than my pile of crap. . Go on,..go for a swim in the mantle, Iron Man. ...Show us how it's done.)

Don hasn't actually read a paper on PT, mantle convection etc. Real science scares the crap out of him.

It certainly does, .. But your pile of crap is astronomically higher than my pile of crap. In fact when it comes to crap, you win, hands down.

Now, go on,..go for a swim in the mantle Iron Man. ...Show us how it's done.)

STuart