

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/msg00238.html>

---

- *From:* s\_k\_y\_bolt99@xxxxxxxxxxxxx (Charles Cagle)
  - *Date:* Sat, 16 Sep 2006 19:07:38 -0700
- 

In article

<timberwoof.spam-9A8E7B.09501516092006@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Timberwoof <timberwoof.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article

<s\_k\_y\_bolt99-1609060418100001@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, s\_k\_y\_bolt99@xxxxxxxxxxxxx (Charles Cagle) wrote:

In article

<timberwoof.spam-BCEA96.09403809092006@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Timberwoof <timberwoof.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

J Taylot, it seems like weeks since you offered anything remotely resembling actual facts and observations. Lately you've focused purely on trying to discredit everyone around here by throwing around big words like dishonesty, desperation, and fantasy. If EE made any sense at all, then you could answer questions that have been put to you without complaining that the questions themselves are dishonest or deceitful. But the simple fact is, there's nothing to EE; it's just a cherished belief of yours, and you refuse to critically examine it. The depth of your thinking is limited to one-liners or turgid word-salad.

Objections to EE abound but at the center of most is the claim of a lack of a mechanism. If one suggests a hitherto unknown mechanism for the creation of mass in an ex nihilo process, laughter is the compensation, with a claim that the laws of physics with respect to conservation of mass

## Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

and energy have some 200 years of experimental verification. What we actually have a right to suggest is that all known chemical and nuclear processes are conservative. The key is 'all known'. The notion of the conservation of mass then would also suggest that all the mass that is present in the universe is all that ever was and all that ever could be (with a somewhat limited allowance for mass that is converted into energy via fusion).

Yeah, it would, and so far that has caused problems only for those wishing that the Earth's oil reserves were infinite and a few kooks on some obscure newsgroups.

<snip fanciful strings of words not nearly as interesting or rigorous as Penrose>

From these principles or heads which emerged from deductive processes related to simple axioms of quantum – quantum motions one can obtain solutions of the nature of matter, charge, and much much more including a new model for fusion, the proof that stars don't work by fusion, that supernova's are different than has been taught, and much much more.

Now you get to explain some more things.

### 1. What chemical elements would such newly created mass appear as?

The problem is that you don't even have a clue as to the right questions to ask. Mass is generated in the form of neutrons, and those neutrons immediately migrate to the gravitational terminus of the flux loop which created them. Some decay (into a proton, electron and antineutrino) so that populating the gravitational terminus loop are only neutrons and protons and the charge separation effect excludes electrons... So, there is merely a ring of material that is only protons and neutrons. There are no electrons in the region so the material doesn't possess chemical properties (related to electrons) and hasn't even atomic volume but only nuclear volume. This is the heavy dark matter but I've named such matter *Isaacium*. Isaac is the English translation of the Hebrew word for Laughter of disbelief. I would think that the general community of physicists, astrophysicists, and cosmologists will laugh in disbelief at the suggestion of the existence of *Isaacium* rings in the cores of stars and of planets.

### 2. How did this mass get created in exactly the correct chemical composition so as to be indistinguishable from what's expected from current planetary formation theories?

## Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

Once you assume that it exists as ordinary elements then you're bound to ask questions that can only reflect your assumptions.

3. How did that newly created mass acquire exactly the correct dynamic vectors to keep the Earth and the moon in their orbits?

You assume without any proof or data whatsoever that both the radius of the Earth and the size of the sun and the radius of the Earth's orbit and the radius and mass of the moon and the radius of the moon's orbit are and forever have been fixed to what they are presently.

4. How come the continents don't actually show the deformations associated with having been formed on a small sphere and being stretched onto a large one?

They actually do show such deformations. The curvature of the base of the lithosphere becomes higher with respect to the decreasing curvature of the top of the mantle during an expansion episode. This produces a cupping effect of the lithosphere over the mantle but gravity rules and the lithosphere that was the continental crust only is pulled down producing mountain chains and ideally on a spherical surface this would tend to produce circular mountain chains and there's a wonderful example of such a mountain chain on the back side of the Earth's moon. At first glance it looks like a meteor crater but there are no splash trails. The Himalayas are an example of the results of such a kirkogen (circle generator) process.

5. How come you haven't published your results anywhere?

Get serious. Look at your own hatred of new ideas that threaten what you think you know for sure. Look at your inability to begin your questions at a level that doesn't presuppose things for which you have no data and no logically based physics. You ask questions assuming matter coming into existence as chemical elements when the genesis of all matter is in the form of neutrons. The genesis of chemical elements is the differentiation of bulk Isaacium into a variety of atomic species when and if the Isaacium is able to acquire electrons when the primary gravitational terminus loop is displaced too rapidly from the Isaacium. Then the Isaacium can acquire electrons from outside of what was once the electron exclusion zone and the acquisition of electrons produces a huge flux of radiation and the immediate transition of some of the Isaacium going from only nuclear volume to atomic volume which may be at least a near instantaneous  $10^6$  fold increase in volume. This is the very process of a supernova. If it occurs in the core of a planet then either the planet will rapidly grow or

Re: plate tectonics is based on what assumptions?

it could even possibly detonate the planet (as in what happened to the planet that once orbited between Jupiter and Mars). The formation of chemicals cannot occur before the differentiation of the Isaacium into elements. So, seeing that your own questions emerge from a set of concepts that are completely out of harmony with reality what possible chance do you suppose might be given to publishing a paper that is so foreign to the set of beliefs that have dominated the whole community of geophysicists, astrophysicists, cosmologists, particle physicists, etc.? Academia has never been consistently dedicated to the truth but only dedicated to the proposition that they must maintain to the public (for their very livelihood) that they are experts with regard to the nature of reality. You think that publishing these ideas that essentially say that almost all that the community of physical scientists believe is nonsense is realistic? You are seriously out of contact with any sense of integrity and hence reality.

Charles Cagle

--

for email delete underscores

"I sought the fount of fire in hollow reed Hid privily,  
a measureless resource For man, and mighty teacher of all arts."

– Prometheus Bound by Aeschylus –

.