

Re: Detailed oceanic floor analysis. What does it really tell us?

Re: Detailed oceanic floor analysis. What does it really tell us?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-04/msg00164.html>

- *From:* firstname@xxxxxxxxxxxxx (Florian)
 - *Date:* Tue, 10 Apr 2007 01:14:32 +0200
-

George <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I'm not your secretary, Flo.

You make the claim that McCarthy was discredited, you back up your claim. Period. I won't read the whole google archives just because you're lazy to tell me when and where this discussion took place.

The paper contains a map and a description of the map. None of the data that was used to make the map was included in the paper. You know what data is, right? Charts, graphs, analysis, numbers? He talks about geomagnetic data but doesn't include that data in the report. So how is anyone supposed to check the data against his interpretation?

Jeez... Georgie. Are you a scientist?

Do you know what represents the numbers in brackets all over the text of that paper? We call them REFERENCES. So I suggest you to read these references in the paper before making dumb remarks like above.

Guess what? These data are in agreement with EE.

You're living in a dream world. EE doesn't even recognize that ancient oceans existed much less any landmasses older than Pangea.

Then you should update your notes on EE. It is perfectly known there was water on the earth before 200 MA, but not in ocean basins the way we know them.

Re: Detailed oceanic floor analysis. What does it really tell us?

Re: Detailed oceanic floor analysis. What does it really tell us?

EE says that the earth began expanding 250 million years ago, and they use as evidence the growth of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans.

wrong again. EE says that a particular phase of growth started 200 millions MA ago. This phase corresponds to the spreading of ocean floor.

They've never once discussed Rodinia, not in any paper I've seen.

Of course, Rodinia never existed! Rodinia is just an attempt by PT theorists to explain data showing that the Pacific was closed. The only issue is that they have a 500 million years offset.

And they have repeatedly insisted that there were no ocean basins before 250 million years ago, and cite as evidence the fact that no ancient oceans exist (ignoring the fact that there is ample evidence of ancient oceans, as I've pointed out dozens of times).

Absolutely. The ocean basin as we know them did not exist. But it is clear that the Earth has always expanded by rifting as demonstrated by the discovery of ophiolite sequences 3.8 BYA old. Ophiolites are just the products of underwater rifts.

The paper you cite shows just such an ancient ocean, and DOESN'T show all the continents in one solid continuous landmass that circles the globe.

Another very clever remark. Of course it doesn't! They're working inside the PT framework!

They have a much smaller earth starting 250 million years ago that was one continuous continental crustal landmass (where the water went if there were no oceans, and where it came from after, they never explain).

Your lack of knowledge of EE is embarrassing. Water is continuously feeding the ocean through the hydrothermal vents all along the rifts.

Re: Detailed oceanic floor analysis. What does it really tell us?

Re: Detailed oceanic floor analysis. What does it really tell us?

Massive amounts of water were identified in the mantle not too long ago:

http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2002/03/0307_0307_waterworld.htm

1

George, I definitively suggest you to keep you a bit better informed about EE theory. NCGT's newsletter should be a good start:

<http://www.ncgt.org/>

—

Florian

"Tout est au mieux dans le meilleur des mondes possibles"
Voltaire vs Leibniz (1–0)

.