

## Re: Don's blog

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2004-07/0607.html>

---

**From:** Oriel36 (geraldkelleher\_at\_hotmail.com)

**Date:** 07/18/04

Date: 18 Jul 2004 09:34:02 -0700

"Carsten Troelsgaard" <carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk> wrote in message  
news:<40f92324\$0\$209\$edfadb0f@dread12.news.tele.dk>...  
> "don findlay" <don@tower.net.au> skrev i en meddelelse  
> news:5f164087.0407160741.5be70e4e@posting.google.com...  
> > "Carsten Troelsgaard" <carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk> wrote in message  
> news:<40f66bfe\$0\$213\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk>...  
> > > "don findlay" <don@tower.net.au> skrev i en meddelelse  
> > > news:5f164087.0407141919.54ab44ca@posting.google.com...  
> > > > "Carsten Troelsgaard" <carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk> wrote in message  
> news:<40f1359a\$0\$161\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk>...  
> > > > > I've started out with two comments \*1) and \*2) that favorably can be  
> read in  
> > > > ordered succession before  
> > > >  
>  
> > > > >  
> > > > > You have also been forced to accept that this  
> > > > > 'subducted/crossed thing' is somewhere of very consideral  
> extend.  
> > > >  
> > > > The most substantail override is the Eastern Pacific, where the  
> > > > Americas are overriding.  
> > >  
> > > If you do not acknowledge atleast 200 miles of 'override' at the  
> > > northwestern Pacific then take out your own references to tomography  
> out.  
> > > Ok, so this is another kind of override.  
> >  
> > Not sure what you mean here.  
> >  
> >  
> > > > I went to look as you by no standard known to me make any sense.  
> > > >  
> > > > <http://users.indigo.net.au/don/ee/transforms.html#template>  
> > > >  
> > > > I seem to grasp from your figure that growth of plate not only  
> happens

> *in an*  
>>>> *ordered fashion in a direction perpendicular to the spreadingzone*  
>>>> *(registered in remanent magnetism) but also at an 90 degree angle to*  
> *this,*  
>>>> *along the spreadingzone itself?*  
>>>>  
>>>> *That's right; The "propagating rifts" "duelling propagators" of the*  
>>>> *consensus – though they have no real explanation how to accommodate*  
>>>> *these in the convection model of plate tectonics. It just causes*  
>>>> *problems for them.*  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> *Your point A expands in two directions (fig.*  
>>>>> *2b). This direction of expansion (along the spreidingridge) is*  
> *invalid as*  
> *it*  
>>>>> *is not expressed in the magnetic signature.*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *Yes it is.*  
>>>>  
>>>> *Show me.*  
>>  
>> *I mean that that area of the ocean floor expresses growth (as does all*  
>> *the ocean floor). Therefore the magnetics express that growth. Proof*  
>> *for growth comes from the larger scale, not from anything intrisically*  
>> *'magnetic' – other*  
>> *than the +ve and –ve striping.*  
>  
> *The large scale may equel or not, give a shrink or an expanse.*  
> *I have pointed out elsewhere that expanse has all the reason for showing in*  
> *separating the already loosely connected strips of plate, and appear in the*  
> *magnetic signature.*  
>  
>>>> *The magnetics of the ocean floor are a fact. Yes, the*  
>>>> *detail in the gravity suggests the contouring could propably do with a*  
>>>> *complete overhaul*  
>>>>  
>>>> *like physics*  
>>  
>> *I do believe there is an opinion so. But physics 'works' (mostly),*  
>> *... you know, 24 hours a day (without maintenance). (If it ain't*  
>> *broke, don't fix it.)*  
>>  
>  
> *It seems as if a big–bang has been underway for some time. In the heart of*  
> *our planet.*  
>  
>>>  
>>>> *but the gist is fine to make the point: what you see*  
>>>> *(what you get) is the summation of expansion in ALL directions; it*  
>>>> *just so happens that the configuration is 'mastered' by the symmetry*

>>>> *of the fracture pattern – ridge and transforms and layering. Three  
>>>> sides of a brick.*  
>>>> <<http://users.indigo.net.au/don/brick.jpg>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> *The stepped offset (which is your 3. law of EE) is depicted in the  
> figure*  
>>>>> *2d. You do not comment any relation between the other drawings and  
> these*  
>>>>> *stepped offsets and they have no apparent relation to the  
> structuring*  
> *that*  
>>>>> *you elaborate upon. Or to use your own words: Logical non sequitur.*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *Fair go Carsten. Sure I do. I don't think you can fault my  
>>>>> figures for not being cross-linked enough. Follow the figure link  
>>>>> (for example) to the Pacific*  
>>>>> <http://users.indigo.net.au/don/ee/pacific.html>  
>>>>> <http://users.indigo.net.au/don/re/apocalypse.html>  
>>>>> *The stepped offsets are pretty obvious ("No new data" – just ignored  
>>>>> in plate tectonics). If the transforms don't make it to the  
>>>>> continental margins, what logic is there in 'subduction'?*  
>>>>  
>>>> [http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/~dallas/abbott\\_int.html](http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/~dallas/abbott_int.html)  
>>>>  
>>>> *I don't see the word 'transform' in the clip. (I'm talking about the  
>> transforms and their relation to subduction zones.)*  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> *Furthermore, if the transforms adjust to the growing curvature of the  
> globe,*  
>>>>> *it occurs to me that the oldest part of the plates has the largest  
>>> curvature–adjustment needed. They are however those with the least amount  
> of*  
>>>>> *transforms.*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *Transforms form as an adjustment to the growth at the ridge. They  
>>> 'die' once they are left behind as the ridge grows up. They will not  
>>> increase in number away from the ridge. But they will continue to  
>>> adjust. Which, as growth normal faults, they do. (Check out how wide  
>>> the fracture zones are in the North Pacific compared to the later ones  
>>> in the South Pacific.) And note in the passing that 'single'  
>>> transform fractures globally are commonly not single, but 'paired'.  
>>> Plate tectonics has no answer to either aspect of transforms. (And  
>>> Yes, expansion does)*  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> *You stress this occurrence as a vital observation to your theory of  
>>> expansion. Haven't you said somewhere, that EE has no issue with PT if it  
>>> wasn't for subduction. If this really is of vital significance to EE you  
>>> fail to get your message through. As with the physics and the torsion.*  
>>>>>>

> > *The assumption of a Panthalassa, and "Since the Earth cannot be  
> > getting bigger", are both pretty impenetrable aspects of consensus, I  
> > grant you. It takes a certain dash, a certain 'panache' (I'm  
> > surprised The Guapo isn't in on this), a certain self-confident  
> > suavity to question the consensus, ...or perhaps just a childlike  
> > curiosity, and a real interest in wanting to know.*  
>  
> *That's often how I learn. Take it all apart and reassemble it again. If the  
> final result work comes out wrong, I made a mistake.*  
>  
> > > > > *Ok,  
> > > > > admittedly I've used 'torsion' to express this growth, because  
> it's  
> > > > > longwinded to keep reminding folk that it's the way that torsion  
> is  
> > > > > taken up in expansion. Nothing of the mantle [expansion] is  
> really  
> > > > > 'twisting'; it just grows that way. But a lot in the crust is  
> > > > > twisting, spinning out, opening up, ...like a Chinese fan,  
> ..but  
> > > > > with some exceptions) it is by-and-large flat.  
> > > >  
> > > > \*2) There is one difference in PT's using 'subduction' and EE's  
> using  
> 'spin'  
> > > > > or 'torsional' growth. You accept that there mechanically is no  
> difference  
> > > > > between overriding and subduction. I, however, notice a huge gap  
> between  
> > > > > 'spin' or 'torsional' as complex terms of movement and it's  
> association  
> to  
> > > > > 'growth'. That torsion manifests itself in rockstructure (and I'm no  
> less  
> > > > > void of fantasy that I cannot imagine) is no warrent, what so ever,  
> for,  
> or  
> > > > > indication of growth of any kind.  
> > > >  
> > > > *That's right. the most noticeable effects of torsion are in the  
> > > > continental crust, due to decoupling from the mantle and (as I predict  
> > > > it will be recognised) adjusting to the tilt of the Earth's rotational  
> > > > axis. The mantle has largely growth (there are also torsions), but  
> > > > the trace of that growth records that incremental change of axial tilt  
> > > > as the Earth's surface grows upwards. (Crustal torsions are on  
> > > > 'flats' associated with decoupling; mantle 'twist/torsion' is on  
> > > > transforms  
> > >  
> > > I contributed a calculation. Do yours. Prove to us, that the  
> precessional  
> > > tilt of the earth's axis has a greater mechanical influence on the**

> > > *surface–structure, than the daily orbital motion. Remember, your  
> 'override'*  
> > > *is the most active zone of earth surface.*  
> >  
> > *Yes, but you didn't state what your calculation was trying to show,  
> > whether coriolis could or couldn't work, or whether it was a valid  
> > consideration in the first place. You didn't make clear where you  
> > were coming from. Are you 'glass' or 'mirror'?*  
> >  
>  
> *If you don't know what I talk about, you prove that your first 'rule' of EE  
> is beyond your comprehension.*  
>  
> >  
> > > > *It's difficult to imagine that some differentiated movement or  
> growth of*  
> > > > *ocean plates*  
> > > > *has not happened, but it's beyond me why it should be in any contrast  
> to*  
> *PT.*  
> > > > *To take it as the main 'proof' of EE is ridiculous.*  
> > > >  
> > > > *The main proof of Earth Expansion lies in the deficit that plate  
> > > > tectonics ignores – Along–ridge spreading.*  
> > >  
> > > *That, inspite of your insurance, does not manifest itself in the  
> magnetic*  
> > > *contours.*  
> >  
> > *By definition it must.*  
>  
> *It does not.*  
>  
> > *(Growth does not take place in the  
> > transforms). It is however implied in the orthogonal 'network' of  
> > ocean floor gravity.*  
> >  
> >  
> > > > *Plate tectonics recognises*  
> > > > *the extra length of the ridges relative to the continental margins,  
> > > > but cannot accommodate it in its model ("propagating ridges" "ridge  
> > > > propagation").*  
> > >  
> > > *You use the PT model of propagation. There is no hint of expansion in  
> it.*  
> >  
> > *No, I don't. I used the plate tectonic words as reflections in the  
> > mirror. The ridges don't 'propagate' from their ends; they get  
> > bigger in the middle, and finally break in the middle.*  
>

- > *This is close to fraud. One whole splitting up in two halves is not 'growth*
- > *by cell-division', it's just division. The oceanic crust is thin at the*
- > *transforms and would expand to enlarge the surface of the earth, if this is*
- > *growing. It does not. If it did, it would be visible in the magnetic*
- > *signature.*
- >
- > *You 'see' that ridge created 'now' is cracked to accomodate a growing*
- > *curvature that happens tomorrow. The old crust that really needs adjusting*
- > *get no cracks. That you put faith in the inverted order enough to make it a*
- > *'proof' that expansion is ... as you express in the most positive term ...*
- > *counterintuitive.*
- > *If rule number 1, 2 or 3 is not understandable then you have no bricks to*
- > *build with.*
- >
- > > *<<http://users.indigo.net.au/don/pr/transpropind.html>> And yes there*
- > > *is expansion in it. But read any of the popular sites on plate*
- > > *tectonics and you will find no mention of it. Because this is one of*
- > > *those 'splintery knobbly bits' that refuse to fit, that is an area*
- > > *requiring "more research". Pteros can't accommodate their own*
- > > *observation in their own model. (Oh so the model needs shifting; we*
- > > *can be even cleverer if we show how)*
- > >
- > >
- > > > *But you won't find much explanation how to accommodate*
- > > > *it in the cycle of ridge – subduction. Look at the difference in*
- > > > *length of the ridges compared to their continental equivalents. Of*
- > > > *course the ridges have grown along their length. The architecture of*
- > > > *that growth is shown in the stepped offsetting of ridge terminations*
- > > > *(ignored in plate tectonics), which proves the direction of growth is*
- > > > *\*\*RIDGE-AWAY-FROM-THE-CONTINENTS\*\**
- > > >
- > > > *You fail to deliver logic.*
- > >
- > > *It's a simple observation that the African 'plate' margin is bigger*
- > > *around its perimeter than the African continental margin, and I'll*
- > > *agree a modicum of logic is required to infer that they were once one*
- > > *and the same thing. But I wouldn't have thought it much. Are you*
- > > *saying it's not a logical inference?*
- >
- > *I get what you mean. There is no subduction around the plate, so one can see*
- > *it as the ridge growing away from the continent. There is nothing in the*
- > *structure itself that convey this logic.*
- >
- > > *Your local growing mountain doesn't seem to have a welldefined sharp*
- > *ridge.*
- > >
- > > *Do you mean Plate tectonics' sharp ridge is sharper than Earth*
- > > *expansion's sharp ridge? (Same ridge.)*
- > >
- > >
- > > >

> > > > *Not the other way round. [Plate*  
> > > > *tectonics glosses over this as merely a question of relativism, but*  
> > > > *it's not] And the only way this can happen is if the ridges move up*  
> > > > *– and keep moving up – that ridge, which at any snapshot in time*  
> > > > *shows, is a ridge – is moving up. UP. What's ridiculous about it*  
> > > > *Carsten? It's obvious: Ridge. \*UP\* actually means 'up'. Why do you*  
> > > > *want to keep shoving it sideways*  
> > >  
> > > *And it is the mantle that slides sideways? You do recognize that the*  
> *globe*  
> > > *is not 200 km high at the spreading zone.*  
> >  
> > *You don't do it justice Carsten, it's more like 2,000km. (But gravity*  
> > *is a wonderful thing). Look, ..you're happy enough to use gravity as*  
> > *a means to buoyancy, why are you not happy to use its effect directly?*  
>  
> *Why don't you? Letting the globe swell by changing petrological fases would*  
> *create density–light matter that pop to to the surface through boyancy. This*  
> *is not happening. The change of fase would be the have to be something like*  
> *swapping a volume with density 11 into two volumes of 5,5 at the core/mantle*  
> *boundary. Doubling the radius would give your early globe a surface–gravity*  
> *four times the present and a severe change in speed of rotation. Letting*  
> *matter appear like in 'big–bang' would make the globe heavy enough either to*  
> *'fall into the sun', or, if the matter is 'born' with an initial velocity,*  
> *just lets momentum swel in the same pace. Where is Oriel if momentum isn't*  
> *constant?*  
>

Once you go down that road, and I've seen it so many times before you end up destroying yourself. It is always the case when a person is simply not capable enough of handling the principles which generated the term 'angular momentum' or indeed anything relating to gravitation and astronomy, the form fitting to get observations to fit into equations. If this looks offensive it is not meant, it is only a matter of how you wish to fit forces into geology rather than the other way around, forces in this way are complimentary to the material rather than dictating it.

What do you hope to achieve, that Don will determine that I have been in some way astronomically deficient in pointing out that in accounting for orbital motion by way of angular momentum there is no room left to incorporate axial rotation within variable orbital motion and certainly this is what Newton did via Kepler's planetary laws of orbital motion. What do you want, that I should go over the whole thing again and explain the unethical manner in which the gravitational agenda is set within astronomy. I have always conditioned Newton's approach as fine until he makes the astronomical translations from geocentric observations to heliocentric modelling, put it another way, the utter garbage of appealing to the coriolis force is the just another form fitting attempt as angular momentum is to account for planetary motions and the effects they generate.

Don appears to consider that I am in a hopeless position but this is not how I see it. Geologically there is nowhere left to go with a gravitational agenda and the rotation of the Earth set against the celestial sphere or variants such as the homocentric 'every point is the valid center of the universe'. Surely geologists learned their lesson from decades ago in adapting from consideration of individual features of rocks and their formation to consideration of plate movement and the planet as a whole. The next step is astronomical motions.

So, everyone is in a bad spot unless people have a great love of remaining to croaking in a gravitational swamp. Determining, as Newton did, that the Sun going around the Earth is equivalent to the Earth going around the Sun is pretty cheesy so the next time you mention angular momentum, Newton's orbital geocentric/heliocentric orbital equivalency is part and parcel of it. Say goodbye to the effects of planetary astronomical motion on planetary terrestrial/geological motion and it shows everytime you argue against it.

I hope you are happy with your stationary Earth and an Earth that has a crust already formed billions of years ago ( no crustal expansion), while the indications were that you were capable of assimilating the concept of an increase in physical volume through crustal expansion it now appears that by tethering my name to the gravitational 'angular momentum' (which is deficient description of planetary motions) for the purpose of attacking Don, it was bad enough to appeal to the coriolis force but after this you become a lost cause and I could't care less what you had to say further.

Newton explains Kepler's planetary laws for orbital motion but cannot account for axial rotation

> > *And you talk about coriolis, why are you not happy to use rotation  
> > directly? What is it about this ridge that keeps moving up, that you  
> > want to be keep turning it through 90 degrees?*  
>  
> *You wave the word 'torsion' and 'twist' around as primery constituents of  
> your construction – the clue to understand expansion. Since you cannot apply  
> these in any attempt to describe the mechanics, you lost your case.*  
>  
> > *You didn't answer*  
> > *either what all these "dykes intruding the ridge" are supposed to be  
> > feeding. What about it? How do you see it?*  
>  
> *Do you ask becource you do not know the PT answer?*  
> *There is a picture of it at Fowler's 'The solid earth' pg 287.*  
>  
>  
> > > *If an expanding earth is covering one third of the surface of the globe  
> by a*

- > > > *diapire ... how is it related to the local diapire at 'the ridge'?*
- > >
- > > *Well, it grows, grows, ..keeps growing,*
- >
- > *Up, according to you*
- >
- > > *..to make that big circular*
- > > *thing called the Pacific.*
- >
- > *Horizontal expanse of an area not logically connected to upward growth.*
- > *A petrologic fase–change would focus negative gravity anomalies in the area*
- > *and the geoids lie low enough to lift the area well out of the water. The*
- > *reverse seems to be more pronounced.*
- >
- > > *If subduction worked the way you want, the*
- > > *Pacific would never open. Nor would the Atlantic. Nor the Indian/*
- > > *antarctic oceans. As soon as opening cranks up, subduction would*
- > > *accommodate it. So, ...now,.. you explain your logic*
- > > *(of Panthalassic*
- > > *proportions). (And leave out the hocus pocus of intuition.)*
- > > *(Gotcha!)*
- >
- > *You want it from 'Adam and Eve' and forward?*
- > *It initially started out as 'oceanic plate' and grew continents. Not the*
- > *other way round as you suggest. How does EE explain continents anyway? You*
- > *never left a reference to that, and that's after all the primary concern for*
- > *a lot of geologists.*
- >
- > > > *Should I spend money on getting it, to convert you?*
- > > > *Why don't you end the discussion by providing a deep seismic section*
- > *that*
- > > > *shows the lack of it.*
- > >
- > > *Well I could repeat the link you posted with the section of the*
- > > *Kuriles, showing how it all turns flat (instead of bending down), but*
- > > *I think the tomography shows it generally.*
- >
- > *If you defy tomography, then be consequent about it.*
- >
- > > *Goodness, it's (the*
- > > *so–called subduction zone) it's only defining the edge of the*
- > > *lithosphere, ...which is regarded as basically 'crustal' How is*
- > > *that proof of "bending down into the mantle"? The 'ghost droppers'*
- > > *you see are simply bits that get left behind in the growth –*
- > > *'palimpsests' – like in two dimensions a ridge is a palimpsest of a*
- > > *continental margin.*
- >
- > *Subduction or override, the tomography shows the phenomenon to be very*
- > *extensive.*
- >
- > > > > *In fact the reflectors actually rise into*

> > > *the overthrust.*  
> > >  
> > > *You should use a real pointer.*  
> >  
> > *No,*  
>  
> *I do not know what you talk about, that's why you should use a pointer.*  
>  
> > *..if you want to illustrate subduction you should use something*  
> > *that shows bending down, not something that shows overriding (or*  
> > *bending under).*  
>  
> *Don, if EE has anything, the crust would come up from beneath. It does the*  
> *reverse.*  
>  
> > *I don;'t want to illustrate subduction. I want to*  
> > *illustrate overriding, and the sections you have posted thus far of*  
> > *the cocos, himalyas and kuriles all illustrate it nicely.*  
> >  
> >  
> > > *A collaps and slush off that does not reveal the 'real thing' beneath*  
> >  
> > *'real thing' = the Pacific. What do you mean it is "not revealed"?*  
>  
> *The Asian continent 'slushes in' over the Pacific as it skid down a none*  
> *existing gradient, and in absens of not being where it just left, should*  
> *reveal considerable stretches of 'upward grown earth' open to public view.*  
> *Since stacking and folding, which you acknowledge, contributes to the area*  
> *of 'lain bare', this area should be very considerable and not have the*  
> *location of 'slushed off' matter as it's primary location.*  
> *Have I made myself clear enough?*  
>  
> > > > *('settling') against the continent. The real*  
> > > > *global motion*  
> > >  
> > > *According to what mechanical principles?*  
> >  
> > *The rotation of the Earth. I don't rightly know what physical*  
> > *principle this reflects. Some would say conservation of angular*  
> > *momentum of planetesimal accretion (but I find that difficult)*  
>  
> *You take it as your primary proof of expansion. Shouldn't your lack of*  
> *understanding it prevent you from using it as such? Have you forgot ... you*  
> *are trying to show us all the logic behing EE, and you get stuck in your*  
> *first sentence!*  
>  
> > > > *All I hope I'm doing is helping people to look at things a bit*  
> > > > *differently. To 'see it'.*  
> > >  
> > > *You managed to provide a vision that the world is screwed up.*  
> >

> > *No no no no, ..Just Pteros that are screwed up... The world is  
> > behaving exactly as it should.*  
>  
> *You made a drawing of the globe, not of a pterorist.*  
>  
> > > *And still ignore that structural activity is focussed in spreading and  
> > > subduction zones.*  
> >  
> > *I don;'t know why you keep saying this. My whole site is all about  
> > how spreading ridges and subduction zones and transforms form. Do  
> > the google search and see if you don't believe me (google believes me)*  
> >  
> >  
> > > *The 'slush off' is very active and should be accompanied  
> > > by an equal activity of 'upward growing' and reveal considerable  
> stretches  
> > > of exposed mantle or 'grown up stuff' that, unfortunately to your  
> theory,  
> > > does not exist.*  
> >  
> > *No the "slush-off" is dead; kaput (mostly), left behind.*  
>  
> *No, it's actively happening as Asia is busy 'overriding' the oceanic crust*  
>  
> > *(mountain  
> > belts on the continents that are now being worn away) According to  
> > my "theory" (it's not a theory, it's a fact) the 'upward growing' is  
> > the ocean floors.*  
> > *Why do you keep inverting this? What is it about  
> > what I;'m saying that is going past you?*  
>  
> *Beccourse you adress the Himalayns, the 'roof of the world' as the center of  
> the rise of the pacific diapire.*  
>  
> > *What you see is what you  
> > get. It's simple. Ridges, growth, ocean floors, ... You have to  
> > believe the evidence of your own eyes before you accept your  
> > 'intuition'*  
>  
> *I used my intuition to accept a linear sideways growth from the  
> spreadingridge though the line is not straight. That's as far as I have  
> applied my intuition on behalf of a more rigid deduction.*  
>  
> > > > *They'll be able to find the holes in the  
> > > > arguments most familar to them that they can build on. 50 years of  
> > > > plate tectonics has contributed virtually \*nothing\* to understanding  
> > > > global geology.  
> > > > Strong words? Things are virtually as they were at  
> > > > right from the beginning. The tools have just allowed things to be  
> > > > defined a bit better, but that's all.  
> > > > > > *You are not facing the evidence and you'r ready to**

> > > > > > *digest any row of absurde consequences that follows.*

> > > > > >

> > > > > > *How come you use tomography on your own pages?*

> > > >

> > > > *Not at all. I used Malcolm's because it goes on a sphere, and can be*

> > > > *integrated with other data sets. All these little sectional stills*

> > > > *tell us nothing about "moving down".*

> > >

> > > *You've made your point on subduction/overriding.*

> > > *You deleted my point made on the tomography based on the quality of the*

> > > *data – yet you keep using tomography yourself.*

> >

> > *Well I'm sorry, ... if it's significant then repost and we'll dissect*

> > *it. (And I'm still waiting for an answer from you about those dykes*

> > *at the ridge and what they are feeding. So there. You keep snipping*

> > *it. )*

> >

> > > *I pointed out to you that adjusting to a growing curvature would make the*

> > > *cracks propagate away from the ridge and proliferate in that direction.*

> >

> > *(Ah dear,) ....the World is counterintuitive Carsten, .. (Tut tut,*

> > *we'll need to see if we can be clever and sort it out – give it a*

> > *right set of rules and obligations to behave itself by) Which is of*

> > *course a comment, not on the world but of our intuition.*

>

> *So much more emphasis on you to make your point clear. You totally fail that*

> *part.*

>

> >

> > > > > *\*1) I have never left anything unexplainable to a child. I started*

> *out*

> *with*

> > > > > *a boiling pot for a pointer to convective cells,*

> > > >

> > > > *J.F Moyen set me straight long ago on the plate tectonics' view of*

> > > > *convection cells vitually in reply to my first post. He put it in*

> > > > *capital letters with marching ants "CONVECTING CELLS DON'T EXIST".*

> > > > *(Stuart had something to say about that – I forget what)*

> > >

> > > *There is several points to "J.F Moyen" on a google. Does he have an*

> *english*

> > > *one dealing with the problem?*

> >

> > *(I thought you would google up the "convecting cells don't exist") (my*

> > *intuition got screwed up) Try here:–*

> >

>

<http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=1fk1uts.1tspplcjc8dmoN%40lap-moyen.u>

> >

>

> *He doesn't seem to have any issues with PT.*

>  
>>  
>>  
>>>  
>>>> *use straight physics all*  
>>>> *the way from condensation (cooling) of our solarsystem over*  
> *surfacegeology*  
>>>> *to a few inferences of the obvious principle (cooling) by geophysics*  
>>>> *(seismics and tomography).*  
>>>>  
>>>> *And DAH's recent post on the fundamentals of physics puts that in its*  
>>>> *place right away.*  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> *It occurs to me that you start out with a principle of expansion,*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *You won't believe this, but I started out with the connection between*  
>>>>> *mountain belts and boudinage. Mind you, I've modified/ adapted things*  
>>>>> *along the way, but it has proved a good working template. ( Takes you*  
>>>>> *in only one direction though.) I mean by that I'm not following any*  
>>>>> *'creed' of anyone else's. Expansion is the way that global geology*  
>>>>> *makes sense to me, and all the sheckels are still tumbling out. It's*  
>>>>> *a fascinating thing, this difference between opposite sides of the*  
>>>>> *glass, that you'd swear should be transparent, but isn't.*  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> *put your*  
>>>>>> *main observations on tomography and explain surfacegeology from*  
> *there*  
> *with*  
>>>>>> *the addition of mechanical functions who's details you omit.*  
>>>>>> *I don't see anywhere that you involve factual surfacegeology except*  
> *for*  
> *the*  
>>>>>> *oceanic–plate maps, so look at \*2).*  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> *I think I do, with a broad brush.*  
>>>>>>  
>>>> *PT stacks crust through compression.*  
>>  
>> *So does Earth Expansion, but there is a significant difference. Plate*  
>> *tectonics sees vertical lift as a RESULT of the compression; Earth*  
>> *expansion sees it as the CAUSE of compression.*  
>  
> *Expansion is an expression of pressure–release, so stating that it's a cause*  
> *of compression contradicts your principle. As I said before, you cannot make*  
> *a metamorphic compression by adding matter from below. That is, if you want*  
> *to involve the above matter into the metamorphism.*  
>  
>> *Now just think: which*  
>> *is the more economical in terms of what you know about geology?*

> > *Plate tectonics: exactly aligned compression; half a world of travel:*  
> > *convective overturn; Asymmetrical uplift (e.g. India goes down;*  
> > *himalayas up; why isn't it symmetrical?) etc etc*  
>  
> *I'm sure that the world contains a lot of geology that I have not payed*  
> *attention to.*  
>  
> > *And importantly –*  
> > *IGNORES TORSIONAL*  
> > *ADJUSTMENTS*  
> > *Earth expansion: uplift in situ; collapse in situ; torsional*  
> > *adjustment <<http://users.indigo.net.au/don/ee/torsion.html>>*  
>  
> *Have I put my point on you and torsion clear enough?*  
>  
> > > *You have not applied factual geology to*  
> > > *your model of this.*  
> >  
> > *I think I have / am*  
>  
> *Yes, considering the oceanfloor. And your result is counterintuitive.*  
> *You have not used/added continental geology data and compared it to your*  
> *model.*  
>  
> > > > *The detail, which I think is what*  
> > > > *you want, is the domain of armies, and decades. What we're doing*  
> > > > *here, geologically speaking, is pressing the reset button.*  
> > > > *But as*  
> > > > *you can see, there are no marks for doing it, when the machine is*  
> > > > *working nicely, and smoothly, 24 hours a day, with no maintenance*  
> > > > *needed.*  
> > > >  
> > > > > *I have been involved in reconstruction*  
> > > > > *of palaeogeology and it's second to impossible to get reliable*  
> *results*  
> *(in a*  
> > > > > *regional area) unless you are a pro. Noone can blame you for putting*  
> *a*  
> > > > > *question to it. But from there to offer your own plan that reverses*  
> *most*  
> > > > > *known physics brings you nowhere.*  
> > > >  
> > > > > *I don't know if it reverses physics. DAH had a comment about first*  
> > > > > *principles on that score <refe4ence> and I must say, mostly I just see*  
> > > > > *mystery, in all the stuff they claim as 'understanding'.*  
> > >  
> > > *So do I. That's a good start for learning geology.*  
> >  
> > *Nah, ..you have a guru Carsten, somewhere, hidden.. (Though it's not*  
> > *stuart I'll grant you that.) You've blotted your copybook, talking to*  
> > *me, you know. ( Trouble with gurus teaching you, you don't get to*

> > *make mistakes.*)  
>  
> *I took a turn with Ed too.*  
>  
> > > > *You have no chance anywere to explain your principle of expansion  
> without*  
> > > > *hitting a malstroem of absurdities. IMO.*  
> > > >  
> > > > *200%. This is exactly in the nature of paradigm change*  
> > >  
> > > *Find something solid for your paradimshift.*  
> >  
> > *Aww, Carsten, ...I thought I'd made it clear by now paradigm shifts  
> > aren't based on anything solid at all,*  
>  
> *I wasted a considerable amount of time then.*  
>  
> > *they are based on the meme on*  
> > *people's lips.*  
> > *That's why Oriel feels sorry for me. In a few years,*  
> > *all the stuff I've been saying ..nobody will know where it all came*  
> > *from, ...and it won't matter. And by that time anyway your memory*  
> > *will be fucked too. And it will matter even less. People will think*  
> > *I got it all from somewhere (nobody is allowed to think anything by*  
> > *themselves any more. Whoever flashes the biggest 'big' will get the*  
> > *credit. What counts is right now, .. Just think of all those poor*  
> > *buggers cowering in the dark, that are missing out on the fun of*  
> > *showing off how dumb plate tectonics is. Or even Earth expansion (!)*  
> > *They could make a career out of the difference between the two, and*  
> > *save the world billions of dollars in the process that could be used*  
> > *for something useful, like find water in Africa, stop the killing, etc*  
> > *etc.. But no, they hang about, indignant at the notion of "academic*  
> > *fraud" and intellectual dishonesty, and accusing the likes of me of*  
> > *saying 'conspiracy'. They don't understand what conspiracy is, though*  
> > *even in denial, they "bend it in neon". (Not too much flashing on*  
> > *this ng though.)*  
> >  
> >  
> > > *In other words, when you say that your model of a regional geology is*  
> > > *better, you don't base your evaluation on ahtual geological data.*  
> >  
> > *No, I mean it's a 'lay-down misere'*  
>  
> *You have no adress to factual geological data, so my point stands.*  
>  
> > > > > *than anything plate tectonics can deliver, once you 'translate'*  
> > *all*  
> > > > > *the jargon about microplates, and allow for the slices of mantle*  
> > *going*  
> > > > > *the wrong way.*  
> > > > > *and the notion of "far field tectonics" bred of the*

> > > > > *notion of India 'colliding with Asia and causing all the*  
> *deformation*  
> > > > > *as far as the Kamchatka Peninsula. (Why, ... even pushing the*  
> > > > > *Kuriles over the subduction zone there....)*  
> > > > >  
> > > > > *It's not the plate that's pushing. If mantleconvection from south*  
> *dives*  
> *it*  
> > > > > *could well be expected to be synchronized with an equal dive or*  
> *orientation*  
> > > > > *of a neighbouring convection (counterclockwise from north). My*  
> *speculation.*  
> > > >  
> > > > *What? More speculation? You'll be suggesting \*TWO\* panthalassas next!*  
> > > > *And why not. If you've got one, why not two? (Three even). Also,*  
> > > > *it's very economical since only the same logic is needed, not twice or*  
> > > > *three times as much. (By which I mean that is precisely the basis of*  
> > > > *plate tectonics – 'if' and 'could' – speculation of a Panthalassa)*  
> > > >  
> > > > >  
> > > > > >  
> > > > > > *snip*