

Re: evidences against subduction theory

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-07/msg00732.html>

- *From:* first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Florian)
 - *Date:* Wed, 18 Jul 2007 18:40:44 +0200
-

Timberwoof <timberwoof.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <1i1f8ui.v66sk51bd830gN%first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Florian) wrote:

George <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I'll repeat the question for those who may not have understood it. So where is your data that shows that the mass of the Earth has increased?

Jeez, are you slow. Surface increased so volume increased. Then either mass increased and gravity increased, or density increased and gravity decreased.

Run that by me again?

Sure.

Surface increased then volume increased. Two possible explanations for a volume increase:

- 1 – Volume increase is due to density decrease. But it means that density was much higher in the past which means that gravity was also much higher. That hypothesis is ruled out by the gigantism of past fauna/flora.
- 2 – Volume increase is due to matter creation. It follows that gravity changed with a rate depending on the density of created matter.

Considering d the average density and g the gravity at the surface, then $g = Gm/r^2 = G \cdot d \cdot V/r^2 = (G \cdot d \cdot 4\pi \cdot r^3)/(3 \cdot r^2) = 4/3 \cdot \pi \cdot d \cdot G \cdot r$

Re: evidences against subduction theory

It follows that if d remained approximatively constant, then the gravity increased linearly with the radius of the planet.

--

Florian

"Tout est au mieux dans le meilleur des mondes possibles"

Voltaire vs Leibniz (1-0)

.