

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2006-09/msg00150.html>

- *From:* "George" <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 9 Sep 2006 14:24:50 -0400
-

"J. Taylor" <nchiwana@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:15m5g29muqlbnqt7rv4d7ecvmpprkmjk9@xxxxxxxx>

On Sat, 9 Sep 2006 02:37:28 -0400, "George" <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

"J. Taylor" <nchiwana@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:ipb4g25grhnhjf6fmh6ak8ojvgm8jt4cqa@xxxxxxxx>

On Fri, 08 Sep 2006 19:39:47 -0700, Timberwoof
<timberwoof.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In an obscure thread in this ng that you Real Geologists wouldn't touch with a ten-foot pole, this Don Findlay person wrote that plate tectonics theory is "based on the assumption of a panthalassa." I wrote that that is wrong. Plate tectonics theory is based on the assumption that physics, geochemistry, geophysics, thermodynamics, fluid flow, seismography, astronomic theories on planetary formation, and so forth are correct. (Observations and interpretations follow, with the conclusion that the crust consists of plates that move around ... and that the continents were stuck together in various supercontinent configurations in the past.)

Of course, since you Real Geologists know better than to waste your

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

time
arguing with that funny little man who won't
talk to you at geodynamics
conferences down under, none of you read
that, nobody answered me, and
now he's dancing with glee. Maybe he thinks
I'm as lonely as he is. Not
that I actually care what Don "200 years of
physics is wrong" Findlay
thinks >

At a most basic level a discussion cannot exist where there is
dishonesty. Would you mind providing a link where Don
said, "200
years of physics is wrong" since you placed it in quotes, to
signify
it was his statement. The only person I remember making
that
statement is you, claiming it is what Don is saying, not that
he said
it.

It is not a small point, since you are the one making all sorts
of
claims as to what is or is not EE, then claiming it is the
position of
those giving evidence for it.

It is not only dishonest, but a sign of desperation. You have
nothing
so you make things up.

JT

The dishonesty is in EEers making wild assed guesses at how all of the
continents around the Pacific are alleged to have been stuck together 200
million years ago with no corroborating physical evidence whatsoever to
support the wild assed guess.

And is just an out and out lie. Further proof of your dishonesty and
desperation.

How is it a lie? I've challenged you to present verifiable physical
evidence that the continents were all together in the Pacific 200 million
years ago, and also explained to you in detail how to go about doing it.
You have yet to reply with one shred of corroborating evidence, and can
apparently only make more wild assed personal accusations in response. How
dishonest of you to do so. But you knew that already.

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

I'm still waiting for your corroborating rock samples and stratigraphic reconstructions across the north and south Pacific Ocean, Mr. T.

And I know you will not accept any evidence presented in support of EE, but will just deny its existence. Which means, it is just another lie you are waiting.

JT

If it could be proven, based on the evidence requisite to do so, I would be the first to lend credence to EE. Since your only response is to make more wild assed personal accusations, I can only assume what I've assumed about you all along.

George