

# Re: evidences against subduction theory

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-07/msg00283.html>

---

- *From:* J. Taylor <nchiwana@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 11 Jul 2007 03:57:26 GMT
- 

On Tue, 10 Jul 2007 18:53:23 -0700, Stuart <bigdakine@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 10, 2:31 pm, J. Taylor <nchiw...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Tue, 10 Jul 2007 16:54:24 -0700, Timberwoof

<timberwoof.s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article

<6uo793h7s281dr4jtc1vu5i09ik9m37...@xxxxxxx>,

J. Taylor <nchiw...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Tue, 10 Jul 2007 12:48:43 -0700, Stuart  
<bigdak...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

In this universe. Sure there  
are plenty of things we don't  
know about  
the universe. However, what  
we do know, rules out  
Expanding Earth  
for now. The onus is on the  
EEers to either come up  
with unambiguous  
evidence  
for expansion or a  
mechanism for it. Without  
either of those, they  
don't have a theory.

Re: evidences against subduction theory

Claiming that because we  
don't know everything  
that therefore anything is  
possible is the hallmark of  
kookdom.

Coming from a quack would expect nothing  
less than an intimate  
knowledge of kookdom.

You are free to show the \*factual\* error in Stuart's statement.

Simple, the fact is I did not make the claim, so it is false.

How is that, you little toady!

First, I am not claiming, because we don't  
know everything that  
therefore anything is possible, am showing  
the ludicrousness of your  
position you know impossible.

Yes, you are. You have demanded that I explain the precise  
nature of  
matter and said that since this is not understood, there could  
be some  
way for matter to appear in the Earth and make it expand.

MASS, MASS, MASS you dumbass!!

distinction without a difference

The difference is I did not say matter, but mass

It is the same with your using theory, Timberwolf using hypothesis,  
when I repeatedly said demonstrated. It is these word shifts by which  
you continue to change my argument to make it into something I never  
argued.

Re: evidences against subduction theory

## Re: evidences against subduction theory

And for the benefit of wolffy, this is a strawman argument, making up something then showing its failings when it was not the argument made.

What I said, remains true, we do not know where mass comes from

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Higgs\\_boson](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Higgs_boson)

"In the Standard Model, the Higgs field consists of two neutral and two charged component fields. Both of the charged components and one of the neutral fields are Goldstone bosons, which are massless and become, respectively, the longitudinal third-polarization components of the massive W and Z bosons."

How does this help explain Earth expansion? do not know it does, not my argument

The fact this fundamental component, mass, is not known where it comes from, means you cannot close the set to conclude impossible. That is the point!

Which means expansion is still possible regardless of how small you wish to argue is the probability of its existence, and should move the question back to the evidence for it, and what was originally stated, the ocean floor shows expansion and has been demonstrated to show it.

In addition

No evidence is a lie. It has been demonstrated

That it can be shown by another processes does not change the fact it was shown for expansion, however, there have been many claims, but no demonstrations to show it can be done by another process.

So back to page one, can you show Maxlow's demonstration is flawed?

If not, accept it and move on.

JT

.