


## What do flat-Earthers believe is on the bottom of the Earth?



**Michael Brenner**

Studied Mechanical Engineering & Comparative Linguistics at Vienna University of Technology · Updated Jan 17

One of the favorite past times of globe believers is to point out the four elephants *they* think flat earthers *think* the world is resting upon. That's of course hilarious nonsense, no flat earther believes such a thing. But what globblings in turn seriously *do* believe is a molten iron mantle with temperatures between 1000°C and 4000°C and a solid iron core with 7000°C, hotter than the suggested surface temp of the sun.



Plus they believe that a churning molten core produces earth's magnetic field, conveniently ignoring the fact that metals lose their magnetism above the Curie temperature: ***"In physics and materials science, the Curie temperature, or Curie point, is the temperature at which certain materials lose their permanent magnetic properties, to be replaced by induced magnetism. The Curie temperature is named after Pierre Curie, who showed that magnetism was lost at a critical temperature."***


For **Iron**, that temperature is **1043°C**, and less for most Iron alloys. Metals heated above the Curie point can only hold induced magnetism, that is, they are magnetic only in presence of a magnetic field, but cannot produce a magnetic field. So, if anything, the core is magnetic *because* of the presence of a magnetic field, not vice versa, and there dies one of the globblings' own elephants.

Next gigantic globe elephant is the silly notion that a core almost the size of the moon at a temperature higher than the surface of the sun - which supposedly heats us at a distance of 93million miles - can be so insulated from the surface as to allow ice caps.

The composition of the crust though does not read like the stock materials of an insulating company:

### Earth's Components

- Earth's elemental composition reflects mostly heavier elements not blown away by solar wind during formation of the solar system
- Most abundant elements
- Fe, O, Si, Mg
- Most common minerals consist of silica (SiO<sub>2</sub>) mixed in varying proportions with other elements such as Fe, Mg, Al, Ca, K, Na
- Felsic = **more silica (less Fe/Mg) & less dense**
- E.g. Granite
- Mafic = **less silica (more Fe/Mg) & more dense**
- E.g. Gabbro / Basalt
- Range: **Felsic / Intermediate / Mafic / Ultramafic**



**Bulk Earth composition**

Why not you try and have your house insulated with the above materials and spend a hot Florida summer in it, or a cold Maine winter. We have supposedly been sitting on that type of "insulation" for billions of years, and the ice is still here, unaffected by 7000°C just couple of thousand miles away. How more detached form reality than "elephant" can it get?

I hear "volcanism" being shouted form the rear seats.... oh, well: think of a 30km thick layer of rock pressing on a sea of molten iron with 150,000Psi and imagine that molten material finding an opening in such a layer. When do you think lava will stop pouring out of the opening?

Below images of what looks like volcano tips, but they are spoil tips, which ever now and then erupt just like volcanos, as happened in Donetsk, Ukraine, in the 1960ies.



That volcanos should be connected to an underground pressurized sea of molten material many times larger than the world's oceans is as silly as believing in elephants .....




Globe geology is based on silliness like turtles and elephants and globe defenders don't even know it, because they never research anything, they just repeat stuff - but heap a lot of condescension on people who do their research.

**Nikolas Stenonius** (1638 – 1686) - whom scholars still consider as one of the founders of modern stratigraphy and modern geology - was not even a geologist, he was a physician and later priest and cardinal... yet, after a casual walk on the beach where he found encrusted shark teeth, he went home and postulated the still accepted "**laws of stratigraphy**":

- the **law of superposition** ☞: "... at the time when any given stratum was being formed, all the matter resting upon it was fluid, and, therefore, at the time when the lower stratum was being formed, none of the upper strata existed";
- the **principle of original horizontality** ☞: "Strata either perpendicular to the horizon or inclined to the horizon were at one time parallel to the horizon";
- the **principle of lateral continuity** ☞: "Material forming any stratum were continuous over the surface of the Earth unless some other solid bodies stood in the way"; and

- the [principle of cross-cutting relationships](#): *"If a body or discontinuity cuts across a stratum, it must have formed after that stratum."*

Every single point here is complete nonsense and not supported by either observation nor experiment, yet it is called "science".




Just try to wrap your mind around the outlandish idea that at one point in time there's only white material suspended in water, it falls out, the water disappears - to where? - the sediment solidifies .... the water comes back, this time carrying only dark brown material - from where? - the material settles, the water disappears again, comes back with yet another colored material - from where? -and so on..... for how many times in the above image?

The next two points are too silly to even consider, and the last point is easily disproved by observations which at the same time disprove the first.





Here it becomes clear that sedimentation is a highly dynamic, catastrophic, one time event, where the time line is not bottom up, but lateral in direction of flow.



All layers of one event are laid down in one horizontal sequence, and therefore a fossil found in the bottom layer downstream can be younger than one found in the top layer upstream. This dynamic reality completely demolishes the accepted chronology of the fossil record, which is based on a static bottom up sequence..... so, this is equivalent to the turtles and the elephants globblings love to make fun of.



**Charles Lyell** (1797 – 1875) - a lawyer by profession and hobby geologist - is another still accepted "father of geology", and he added yet another turtle to the globe zoo: "**Uniformitarianism, also known as the Doctrine of Uniformity, is the assumption that the gradual geological and meteorological processes observed today are the same that operated in the past**"

This, like so many aspects of a globe philosophy, has become dogma, "catastrophism" - the idea that large scale catastrophes played an important role in shaping the world - was declared heresy. "**.....all theories are rejected which involve the assumption of sudden and violent catastrophes and revolutions of the whole earth, and its inhabitants**" and "**It appeared clear that the earlier geologists had not only a scanty acquaintance with existing changes, but were singularly unconscious of the amount of their ignorance....**" this comes from somebody who has never left his studio, never done serious research, condescending upon field geologists who did nothing but collecting evidence.....evidence that was not to his liking though, and therefore discarded.

Here's a taste of the degree of Lyell's detachment from reality which nevertheless still forms one of the the core aspects of globe "science": Lyell about the findings of Hippopotami in England: "**The geologist ... may freely speculate on the time when herds of hippopotami issued from North African rivers, such as the Nile, and swam northward in summer along the coasts of the Mediterranean, or even occasionally visited islands near the shore. Here and there they may have landed to graze or browse, tarrying awhile, and afterwards continuing their course northward. Others may have swum in a few summer days from rivers in the south of Spain or France to the Somme, Thames, or Severn, making timely retreat to the south before the snow and ice set in.**" this is NOT a joke, this is accepted "science"

The "zero science" turtles of **Stenonius** and **Lyell** are at the feet of yet another elephant, that of **Darwinism**. Darwin was totally sold to Lyell and incapable or unwilling of standing by his own observations: "**he who can read Sir Charles Lyell's grand work on the Principles of Geology ... and yet does not admit how vast have been the past periods of time, may at once close this volume**"

From his Journals though, written in the face of direct observations, a totally different picture emerges: "**The mind at first is irresistibly hurried into the belief of some great catastrophe; but thus to destroy animals, both large and small, in Southern Patagonia, in Brazil, on the Cordillera of Peru, in North America up to Behring's Straits, we must shake the entire framework of the globe.**" ..... yes, catastrophism stares any field geologist right in the face, but it is not allowed into the books, such is "globe science".

Darwinism is nothing but the Lyell dogma translated into biology, and is as detached from reality and real observations: "**Scarcely any palaeontological discovery is more striking than the fact that the forms of life change almost simultaneously throughout the world.**" says Darwin despite Lyell's dogma in his very "**Origin of Species**" and in his chapter, "**On Extinction**" Darwin reiterates the puzzlement he experienced when standing in front of a fossil site of mass extinction when he writes: "**The extinction of species has been involved in the most gratuitous mystery.**" because according to his theory "**the extinction of a whole group of species is generally a slower process than**

*their production...*" and therefore the *"extermination of whole families or orders"* seemed to him *"wonderfully sudden"*

Now, here comes the defining characteristic trait of all "modern science": against better knowledge, because against his own observations, Darwin declares the following: *"It is, indeed, quite futile to look to changes of currents, climate, or other physical conditions, as the cause of these great mutations in the forms of life throughout the world, under the most different climates."*

And then after three hundred pages following the promise of revealing *"The Origin of Species"* the only solution Darwin could offer was: *"Blank intervals of vast duration, as far as the fossils are concerned, occurred. ... During these long and blank intervals I SUPPOSE that the inhabitants of each region underwent a considerable amount of modification and extinction."* .....great science indeed, when clueless, just invent dark time, dark matter, and dark energy.

There is not a single observation, demonstration or example in the fossil record of the origin of a single new species, yet it is considered fact. The idea itself is nonsensical, because "species" is defined as an interbreeding island: *"a group of living organisms consisting of similar individuals capable of exchanging genes or interbreeding."* A mutation which would be considered a new species would not be able to interbreed any longer with the pool it came from, but how would this first accidental individual of a new species procreate?

Bottom line is, that all aspects of globe science are wild speculation only and have been so for hundreds of years.


"Flat Earth" does not pretend to know everything, but first and foremost seeks to "un-know" nonsense. Logic and physical principles are the guides, not wishful thinking and mathematics. Nobody knows for sure what is under the ground we stand on and above the skies, and it would be good scientific practice to admit that. The wild speculations of accepted "geoscience", not supported in the least by experience, experiment and observation are certainly not more than turtles and elephants.

P.S.: following a suggestion by Mike Miller, I add here in the PS something in way of an answer to *"So...what's on the other side of the flat Earth?"*

The same question goes for what is above: the idea that the atmosphere is fading out to a *"vacuum of space"* is irrational and unphysical nonsense: take the oceans for instance: you can calculate the water-pressure at the surface of the ocean as being zero:  $p = \rho \cdot g \cdot h$ , for  $h=0 \Rightarrow p=0$ .... does that mean there is a vacuum outside or above the oceans? NO, of course not, would there be, the oceans would be gone, despite what is called gravity, which is falsely given the responsibility of holding on to the oceans.

The same principle applies for elastic fluids like the atmosphere: only because the pressure approaches zero doesn't mean that there is a vacuum above the atmosphere: like above the oceans, there must be a medium of some sort which keeps atmosphere and consequently oceans in place, and earth - whatever shape - is embedded in this medium.

The below illustration shows that without a rigid wall there is no holding on to a gas, and therefore vacuum of space is infantile wishful thinking, which Newton only gave in to so he could maintain the equally infantile concept of lumps of matter whizzing unimpeded through emptiness.



4.4K views · View 12 upvotes · View 9 shares

1 of 63 answers



Add a comment...

Add comment



David W. Vogel · 6y

I'm impressed by all the work you've done! You mind if I run a tricky question by you? (I suspect that you enjoy challenges and will not be offended.) Do you have any family or close friends on what would be the other side of the spherical [\(more\)](#)

11 upvotes

Reply



Neil Helgeson · 6y

What are the physics behind this limited "light cone?" It would seem that an incandescent object like the sun should radiate in all directions.

11 upvotes

Reply

David W. Vogel You replied to my comment instead of Michael Brenner's. He won't be...



Michael Brenner · 6y

Why would you think that earth needs to be a globe to experience night and day? the sun is not a gigantic gas ball 93mio miles away, but small and local and therefore casts a limited light cone. The sun is a phenomenon, not a thing .....

4 upvotes

Reply

David W. Vogel Very good. So, as it moves away from me, I should see it become elliptical...

[View more replies](#)



Patrick Stott, Witchfinder General · 4y

So much misinformation gathered in one spot is quite impressive.

6 upvotes

Reply



Steven Spielman · 6y

Why do you think there can't be ice caps on a planet with a molten iron core? You state it like it should be obvious, but I don't see the problem. My house has a furnace and a refrigerator.

4 upvotes

Reply



Tony Emmerton · 6y

SS you cant compare apples to oranges... With a conventional gas furnace, you should be at about 140°F-170°F at the supply plenum. A high efficiency furnace will be lower, around 110°F-140°F. However, the temperature a [\(more\)](#)

1 upvote

Reply

Steven Spielman Okay, now I have a kiln. At what point is there a problem? Things can be...



Michael Brenner · 6y

As Tony said, why not strip the insulation form your refrigerator, put it right next to the furnace - that means physical contact - and heat the furnace to a

red glow ..... tell me then how long it takes until your Coors light isn't really refreshing any more.....

1 Reply ...

Jacob Fox There is an amazingly huge difference between a furnace and an uninsulated...



Tim Good · 6y

Wow Michael. That's a lot of verbiage. You say there is no support for the globe model, but that's only because you believe the evidence is conspiracy. I'm curious how you explain how the night sky rotates in the opposite direction in the.. (more)

2 Reply ...



Michael Brenner · 6y

Why do you think or say that the stars rotate in the opposite direction? It is you who turns around thereby looking in the opposite direction, but the canopy of stars is obviously always going in one direction only. There is (more)

2 Reply ...

Tim Good Ok. I'll make it simple. By "opposite" I mean clockwise vs. counterclockwise. Thi...



Abdul Moiz Qureshi · 6y

And why would the government have to hide the world's shape anyway? And how would they do it? The larger the conspiracy, the harder it is to maintain.

2 Reply ...



Michael Brenner · 6y

If people had actual knowledge of who they are where they live and where they come from, had access to their inner power and the abundance of the universe, you couldn't suppress them or enslave them, the powerful wc (more)

1 Reply ...

Abdul Moiz Qureshi Yeah, the bigger the lie, but not the conspiracy. A conspiracy is a...

View more comments ▾

View 62 other answers to this question >

About the Author



Michael Brenner

Studied Mechanical Engineering & Comparative Linguistics at Vienna University of Technology

981.1K content views 15.5K this month

Active in 1 Space

Joined August 2016

Following · 583 Notify me Ask question ...