

What is this convection cell nonsense

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-08/msg00052.html>

- *From:* oriel36 <geraldkelleher@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 04 Aug 2007 11:01:17 -0700
-

It is a painful experience to watch reasonably intelligent people ignore that the largest single surface feature, namely the mid-Atlantic ridge, follows the rotational orientation of the Earth and still not infer the differential rotational mechanism which causes it. Not just the surface feature but its evolution is contingent on the same internal mechanism that fits neatly with the planetary deviation from a perfect sphere.

I would not bother to challenge a creature who cannot geographically locate where these figments of the imagination, otherwise known as 'convection cells' emerge and descend but I can imagine that the same creatures would love to continue believing in their existence even though it cannot be proposed as a binding mechanism linking plate motion with planetary shape.

Even though 99 % of science is politics based on protecting agendas, I would have thought that some correlations are so obvious and have a background into which to fit that a normal discussion would be possible. Instead there are two phony groups, one with excellent data such as plate motion but with the dumbest known mechanism possible assigned to plate motion while the other crowd I have nothing to say even though they do raise valid points in an effort to discredit surface evolution via plate motion.

When somebody is ready to grow up, I suggest aligning the surface feature evolution with plate motion by way of rotational orientation with a strong emphasis on the dynamics that cause the planet to deviate from a perfect sphere, this dynamic is differential rotation in the molten/flexible interior.

.