

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/msg00161.html>

- *From:* "George" <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 9 Sep 2006 20:26:17 -0400
-

"J. Taylor" <nchiwana@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:qvd6g290msamkun91smp2vt1bjm53f7i8j@xxxxxxxx

On Sat, 9 Sep 2006 14:24:50 -0400, "George" <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

"J. Taylor" <nchiwana@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:15m5g29muqlbnqt7rv4d7ecvmpprkjk9@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

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

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
curst
consists of
plates that
move
around ...
and
that the
continents

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

were stuck
together in
various
supercontinent
configurations
in the past.)

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

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

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

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

This was like four days ago, right? And at the time said it was something which needed to be examine, but now, after the incredible time of four days, it just proves by my silence there is not a shred of corroborating evidence?

It certainly demonstrates that you, of all people, who so ardently support EE haven't done your homework. Now get to it, Mr. T.

Does something happen to your brain when you use an alias? Is there a trend here, Art Deco, Timberwoof and George, all aliases and all morons.

Yeah, it's all a big conspiracy against you, Mr. T. Take yer meds, son.

George

.