

# Re: evidences against subduction theory

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-07/msg00593.html>

---

- *From:* [first\\_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Florian)
  - *Date:* Mon, 16 Jul 2007 01:14:43 +0200
- 

Nicolas Krebs <[nicolas1.krebs3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:nicolas1.krebs3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Are you allowed to use this email address ?

Why? this is not a valid email address.

Continental plate are deformed.

Then the sentence "all the continental margins came together with a fit of 99% or better." is wrong. It should "all the continental margins came together with a fit of 100.00% if i can deforme the contiental plate as i like".

LOL! You're quite a funny creationist.

Models have been done for more than 70 years.

Give me the reconstitution map step by step and their making of.

Then I suggest you to read the PhD thesis of Maxlow:

<http://adt.curtin.edu.au/theses/available/adt-WCU20020117.145715/unrestricted/>

--  
Florian

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

Re: evidences against subduction theory