

Re: ALL the oceanic crust is recycled in 180 My: unrealistic

# Re: ALL the oceanic crust is recycled in 180 My: unrealistic

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2008-09/msg00067.html>

---

- *From:* "George" <George@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 7 Sep 2008 21:38:37 -0400
- 

"Florian" <auxotectonics\_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:limwvjr.vf556r1ksvmeN%auxotectonics\\_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:limwvjr.vf556r1ksvmeN%auxotectonics_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

George <George@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Florian" <auxotectonics\_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in  
message  
[news:limk7ut.1oi5fj7g711h1N%auxotectonics\\_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:limk7ut.1oi5fj7g711h1N%auxotectonics_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Never heard about fractionnal crystallization? What happen  
when  
volatiles are added to peridotite? Do you still get silicate  
poor  
melts?

Volatiles are added to peridotite at MORs all the time (hydrothermal  
fluids  
from fractures in the ocean floor).

Jeez, yet another idiocy. No it doesn't! the water does not reach the  
place of melting! If it was the case, you'll get silica rich magmas.

Umm, black smokers:

<http://whyfiles.org/coolimages/images/csi/nur04506.jpg>

Next.

Re: ALL the oceanic crust is recycled in 180 My: unrealistic

The big difference is in the scale.  
Plate tectonics claims that ALL the oceanic crust is recycled  
in 200  
My.

You'll have to point out what is your source for that statement.

Jeez. Your ignorance of basic plate tectonics principle is pathetic.

Except a small area in the Med sea, ALL of the ocean floor is less than 180 My. If you assume (Plate tectonics assumption) that the size remained constant, then you assume that there was at least the same surface of ocean floor 180 My ago (2/3 of Earth surface), and that this floor was totally destroyed in the last 180 Ma (recycled).

All of the CURRENT OCEAN FLOOR is from 150–230 million years old. If you ignore the former ocean basins that have been incorporated into the continental land masses and have otherwise accreted to it, of course, you can make up any old story you choose. But in doing so, you risk ridicule (not like you haven't already been subjected to that) from the entire geologic community.

=> ALL the oceanic crust is recycled in 180 My leaving no floor older than 180 My.

Totally unrealistic isn't it? Yep, but that is what YOU believe.

No ocean crust older than 180 my? So you truly are an old Earth creationist. I'm not surprised. Floppy, there are massive volumes of former oceanic crust as accretions onto the continent as well as composing the basement rock of many of the continents, as well as former basins that have been filled in. You really should stop this bullshit and take a geology class.

Upduction implies that just a few hundred km get buried.

Since all you are doing here is renaming subduction, and since you now agree that recycling occurs, how is growth occurring?

What don't you understand in "The big difference is in the scale."  
If there is only a few thousand square km that are recycled, then almost all the floor produced by ridges is extra surface.

Re: ALL the oceanic crust is recycled in 180 My: unrealistic

Re: ALL the oceanic crust is recycled in 180 My: unrealistic

And what evidence, given all the data on continental accretion, and remnant oceanic crust, do you have that only "a few thousand square kilometers" have been recycled? While you are answering that question, you can explain how crust is recycled in an expanding Earth (and cite real world examples), and how that differs from the explanation posited in plate tectonics. Then you can explain where the extra mass is coming from, what it is composed of, how it differs from normal matter, and how EE avoids violating the laws of physics and chemistry, and why it ignores the biological and stratigraphic evidence.

George

.