

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/2008-10/msg00000.html>

- *From:* don findlay <don@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 30 Sep 2008 14:53:54 -0700 (PDT)
-

George wrote:

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

George <George@xxxxxxxxxxx> 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?

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

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

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

And there is certainly one. Period.

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?

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

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

Sink – To cause to descend
beneath a surface.

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

Next? Put George in the boat and hope it sinks...

.