

Re: evidences against subduction theory

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-07/msg00801.html>

- *From:* "George" <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 19 Jul 2007 13:07:57 -0400
-

"Florian" <first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:li1h416.r3fagflkwtbrN%first_name@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Timberwoof <timberwoof.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Surface increased then volume increased.

Do you mean "then" to denote two distinct events in time, or to mean "therefore"?

I stand corrected: Surface increased therefore 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.

Also, there's no way for matter to have been 8x as dense.

Though, James Herndon published a paper supporting this hypothesis.

<http://understandearth.com/WEDD.pdf>

Re: evidences against subduction theory

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georeactor>

The following is taken from a San Francisco Chronicle article by Keay Davidson describing that test[1]:

One of Herndon's leading critics is planetary scientist David Stevenson of the California Institute of Technology. He says in an e-mail: "Herndon is a solid and knowledgeable person when it comes to (nuclear) reactors. But the amount of attention this (georeactor) idea has received is out of proportion with its plausibility. ... It's not complete nonsense, but it's highly unlikely. There are many instances in science where this happens. This one has merely received more attention than most.

"The idea is based on two very dubious propositions: (a) That uranium (or any heavy element) would naturally go to the center of the Earth. This is almost certainly untrue. It is a misunderstanding of chemistry and statistical physics at a very fundamental level. (b) That there is something about Earth's heat flow or helium that is so wildly discordant with our usual ideas that it requires an outrageous hypothesis to explain it. This is incorrect."

I don't buy it, because I don't think that decompression would occur over billions of years. Moreover, decompression would be unique to Earth while there are some clues of expansion of other telluric planets (Mars, Ganymède, Europa...)

Not.

2 – Volume increase is due to matter creation. It follows that gravity changed with a rate depending on the density of created matter.

So how was the matter created?

Don't know. More Science is needed to figure it out.

Well? Get busy, Floppy. If more science is needed, why are you wasting your time (and everyone else's here) posting this nonsense on usenet?

Considering d the average density and g the gravity at the surface,
then

Re: evidences against subduction theory

$$g = Gm/r^2 = G \cdot d \cdot V / r^2 = (G \cdot d \cdot 4\pi \cdot r^3) / (3 \cdot r^2) = 4/3 \cdot \pi \cdot d \cdot G \cdot r$$

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

But you have no independent evidence for that.

Independant from biomechanics? No. But If people were seriously looking for direct evidences of gravity increase, they may find some.

Well, get to it. Where does the mass come from, floppy? You claim increased mass, so prove where it comes from. It's your claim, so its up to you to find it.

George