

Re: more struggle with the buoyancy principle for our brilliant hydrogeologist.

Re: more struggle with the buoyancy principle for our brilliant hydrogeologist.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2008-09/msg00395.html>

- *From:* "George" <George@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 29 Sep 2008 02:30:20 -0400
-

"Florian" <auxotectonics_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:linzz47.he57vxkl6wvmN%auxotectonics_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

George <George@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

From a moron that can't understand the difference between
sinking and
floating.
Hey moron, do you know that a boat is partially immersed?
So you must
claim that this boat sinks following your own definition?

And no doubt, if one were to set your fat ass into the boat, it would
sink
all the way to the bottom!!!

Enjoy, already.

Moron. Fat is less dense than water.

How many fatasses sank to the bottom of the ocean inside the Titanic?

Do you understand that one can assume there is a rational
explanation
without knowing it?

So you don't know and have no rational explanation. [...]

And there is certainly one. Period.

Re: more struggle with the buoyancy principle for our brilliant hydrogeologist.

Re: more struggle with the buoyancy principle for our brilliant hydrogeologist.

Really? Perhaps you could enlighten the planet as to what that one is?

you can't read, the answer to the question was in the text
embedded in
the term "buoyancy", because if you had basic education,
you would know
that as soon as one evoke buoyancy, then gravity is involved,
as there
is no buoyancy without gravity.

No one is claiming otherwise, Floppy.

You do moron, by separating both.

I didn't separate anything. You made some wierd assumption that I did, and
that's your problem, not mine.

But you are claiming that additional
mass can have no effect on the buoyancy of an object, and that is plainly
in
error.

No moron. YOU claimed that increasing GRAVITY (you never said "mass")
would make it sink. That is plainly wrong and prove that you don't
understand the relationship between gravity and buoyancy.

If you increase the mass of an object you increase the gravitational pull on
that object. When the gravitational pull is greater it tends to have a
greater pull towards the center of the Earth, and therefore has a greater
tendency to sink. Or did you think that 5 pound weights aren't
substantially different in mass (and therefore gravitational attraction)
that a 20 pound weight? Did you ever make it out of highschool?

Ice never sinks, i.e. is going
totally below the surface,
because it
floats, you idiot.

Sink – To cause to descend beneath a
surface.

Re: more struggle with the buoyancy principle for our brilliant hydrogeologist.

Re: more struggle with the buoyancy principle for our brilliant hydrogeologist.

Entirely beneath the surface idiot! if there is enough water
and it is
only partially immersed, we use another verb "to float".

The definition of sink does not qualify that an object be completely
below a
surface, as I've pointed out before, only that it assumes an elevation
that
is lower than its starting point.

Yeah, we know that you consider that boats sink and do not float.

Put a hole in the bottom of a boat, and it will sink. Overload the boat
with too much mass, and it will sink. Next.

George