

Re: evidences against subduction theory

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-07/msg00343.html>

- *From:* Timberwoof <timberwoof.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 11 Jul 2007 11:21:53 -0700
-

In article <1i13fvk.1psygv71abxfaN%first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Florian) wrote:

Timberwoof <timberwoof.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

It doesn't matter. Whether it's matter (as in atoms and molecules needed to create new material for the interior of the Earth) or mass (as in a property of atoms and molecules needed to create new material for the interior of the Earth), you still have to account for where it came from and how it acquired the correct velocities.

Not at all!

Science is always based on observations and a model built from the observations. The best model is the one that fit the best the observations.

EE is obviously the best model accounting for the change of Earth's surface, like RG is the best model for gravity, despite there is no known mechanism for both.

You can't build a mechanism of EE if you don't have the proper data to do so. The best that can be done is to make model and estimate growthrate from the data we have. That what's Maxlow did.

That's all.

That's all fine and good, but you've cr