

Re: What is this convection cell nonsense

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-08/msg00187.html>

- *From:* don findlay <don@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 11 Aug 2007 19:34:12 -0700
-

Darwin123 wrote:

On Aug 8, 5:46 am, oriel36 <geraldkelle...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 7, 4:02 am, Darwin123 <drosen0...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
Geophysicists indeed !, I looked at your attempts to explain the planetary deviation from a perfect sphere by referencing the deviation from the dead center of the Earth rather than using differential rotation perpendicular to the rotational orientation of the Earth –

<http://www.phy6.org/stargaze/Srotfram1.htm>

I would easily explain how stupid it is to reference the deviation from the 'dead center' but you lot seem intent in continuing to make idiots of yourself and I could not be bothered addressing such a pretentious and childish group.

This is a very false argument, which shows how poor your model really is. The reference point of a physical model is arbitrary, and can not affect the conclusions. If the mathematics is done correctly, and if valid physical conclusions are being used, the same results should arise whether the reference point is at dead center or in alpha centauri. The coordinate system is chosen for convenience, not because of how right it is. If you get results that vary with reference center, than something in your model is wrong. Therefore, please explain how stupid it is to reference the deviation from dead center. Of course we are a pretentious and childish group. We include you!

Earth expansion references the Earth's deformation from the Earth's centre (if that's a help). The regular one (sea level) rather gets in the way when we're talking about uplift and subsidence.