

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/msg00180.html>

- *From:* auxotectonics_deletethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Florian)
 - *Date:* Sat, 11 Oct 2008 01:50:33 +0200
-

George <George@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

Moron. Fat is less dense than water.

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

Said idiot, that got trapped like a rat.

And there is certainly one. Period.

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

Idiot. Don't you understand that scientists do not know everything? Only crank can imagine that scientist know everything but simply want to hide it.

you can't read, the answer to the question was in the text embeded 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

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

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

is no buoyancy without gravity.

No one is claiming otherwise, Floppy.

You do moron, by separating both.

I didn't separate anything.

You did by claiming that gravity could overcome buoyancy, as if gravity was opposed to buoyancy. All parts of the system are subject to gravity, including the fluid, and that is the reason why there is buoyancy. Without gravitational attraction of the fluid, no buoyancy. You fail to understand that basic principle because you are an idiot.

—

Florian

"Toute vérité franchit trois étapes. D'abord elle est ridiculisée. Ensuite, elle subit une forte opposition. Puis, elle est considérée comme ayant toujours été une évidence." – Arthur Schopenhauer

.