

Re: What is this convection cell nonsense

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2007-08/msg00195.html>

- *From:* oriel36 <geraldkelleher@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 12 Aug 2007 03:43:52 -0700
-

On Aug 12, 1:23 am, Darwin123 <drosen0...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 8, 5:46 am, oriel36 <geraldkelle...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:> On Aug 7, 4:02 am, Darwin123 <drosen0...@xxxxxxxxxx> 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!

The point of departure for all this is an appreciation for the planet, its evolution and all those things which make existence possible. The standards from which I work exist long before empiricism

Re: What is this convection cell nonsense

and its doctrines emerged to kill intuitive and intellectual intelligence hence the apparent casual nature in which I discuss how a common dynamic of differential rotation binds plate motion with planetary shape betrays the enormous sorting and sifting of data into make the necessary correlations. The correlation between planetary shape, the mid-Atlantic ridge and crustal evolution and motion exists as a working principle rather than an isolated fact and it stops this rubbish of misusing data to reach whatever conclusion is desired be it 'earth expansion' or 'convection cells'.

I recognise that people somehow grasp the correlation already for most certainly the correlation between planetary shape and rotational dynamics have existed for centuries however the idea of crustal motion allied to rotational dynamics allows differential rotation to be proposed as the mechanism for crustal evolution and ultimately a large factor in the development of surface features. Like pieces of a puzzle, the dynamics of a molten/flexible interior allows planetary shape to fit with the component plates which profile the planetary deviation from a perfect sphere. The mid-Atlantic ridge and its geographical orientation somehow supports 'differential rotation without explicitly dictating how the actual process works. That is how I like it and am prepared to leave it.

I have people now trying to talk over my head, the original proposal is now thrown back at me as a common assertion and although I have little regard for the merit system it is extremely rude to have individuals try to stumble their way through a conversation with me without the necessary background.