

# Re: Geostationary or rotational dynamics

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2008-02/msg00312.html>

---

- *From:* oriel36 <kelleher.gerald@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 29 Feb 2008 09:08:31 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Feb 29, 5:58 pm, Timberwoof <timberwoof.s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

In article  
<f019983e-16ec-4c6a-bb97-766ebdec1...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

oriel36 <kelleher.ger...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 29, 6:35 am, Timberwoof  
<timberwoof.s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

In article  
<ef92719e-3e1e-4f48-b22b-1d47b0c86...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

oriel36 <kelleher.ger...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 28, 9:28 am, Timberwoof  
<timberwoof.s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

In article  
<27fb3978-d116-4c54-aa1d-8901b176e...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

The  
rub  
is  
that  
you  
cannot  
speak  
of  
planetary

Re: Geostationary or rotational dynamics

shape

without  
discussing  
differential  
rotation let  
alone the  
implications  
as  
the  
underlying  
mechanism  
for crustal  
motion

As I said, you're free to  
show your measurements of  
how much  
differential rotation there is  
and how much you think it's  
affecting  
surface crustal motion.

Timberwoof <me at  
timberwoof dot  
com><http://www.timberwoof.com>  
"When you post sewage,  
don't blame others for  
emptying chamber pots in  
your direction."  
<ETH>Chris L.– Hide  
quoted  
text –

– Show quoted text — Hide  
quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

I am being honest when I implore you to  
stick with what you know and

Re: Geostationary or rotational dynamics

don't bother with planetary shape and differential rotation. Probably a good dynamicist would recognise that equatorial speed and differential rotation is not enough by itself to conclude effects on the shape of a rotating celestial object but variations in Equatorial speed or differential rotation or shape is enough to combine all as a set of generalised dynamical rules.

But you're not a good dynamicist. You haven't the foggiest notion of how to calculate the effects of the Earth's rotation on its soggy insides.

You, as representative of a geostationary view, design the internal structure, composition and viscosity of the Earth to support convection cells whereas the alternative rotational mechanism requires a different set of criteria. It would be an enjoyable challenge based on the generalised dynamics, planetary shape owing to the composition and viscosity of the molten interior, evolution of surface features and so on.

Well, then. Let's see it.

That is why many would be reluctant to promote 'convection cells' nowadays insofar as the internal mechanism dictates so much. You want to remain with your limited view then that is fine but as I said to Brad, why would I care to hear of a geostationary Earth point of view..

Re: Geostationary or rotational dynamics

I'm not trying to tell you about a geostationary point of view. I'm asking you to illustrate, with some reasonable scientific analysis, your differential rotation model.

I don't believe that Earth's rotation has a significant effect on crustal motion, but I could be convinced otherwise with good data and theory. But you've never presented any, so why should I change my mind?

—  
Timberwoof <me at timberwoof dot com><http://www.timberwoof.com>  
"When you post sewage, don't blame others for emptying chamber pots in your direction." ðChris L.– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Good luck now, have fun with the geostationary convection cells and the 'soggy' inside that goes with it and that is my final response to you and all others who need convincing or geological breastfeeding. When an adult shows up to discuss the matter then I will demonstrate how to use stellar rotational dynamics to correlate with spherical deviation and then apply it to this planet.

You silly sod. I don't believe you, therefore you will not try to convince me.

I do not know if many or any can follow the basic outlines which link stellar dynamics to spherical deviation as a general principle, from there to the Earth's spherical deviation and from then into the internal mechanism which links shape with crustal motion

Because you've never presented it.

Re: Geostationary or rotational dynamics

but you seem  
happy with your thermally generated convection cells so I am not going  
to contend with people who enjoy these things and nobody should expect  
me to.

Well, you're right. Nobody should expect you to come up with any  
evidence, theory, or prediction for your hypothesis. Excepting of  
course, anyone whom you expect to convince that things are so.

Take care now and do your best with what you believe in, just like Brad  
who at least made an attempt to promote convection, something I would  
not care to be convinced of. If the situation was only a fraction  
right, this matter would have generated some discussion over the years  
it has been on the table but obviously there is some great attraction  
to keeping the motions of the Earth out of geological affects or  
rather, the dull reasoning of people who have no feeling for  
astronomy, geology and it appears, very little else. In any case, I rarely  
complain of external circumstances and when people are ready to  
discuss something they already know then something productive can  
happen.

Remember now, the internal mechanism for crustal motion dictates the  
internal composition and that is why this is important and must be  
addressed.

Okay, then. It is important. Address it. Show us! Present your data!  
Present your theory!

And above all, quit whining about how no one will believe something that  
you refuse to explain!

--

Timberwoof <me at timberwoof dot com><http://www.timberwoof.com>  
"When you post sewage, don't blame others for  
emptying chamber pots in your direction." 9Chris L. – Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

My good man, I spent the last few months showing how the Equatorial  
ring of Uranus changes with respect to the Sun, turning a full 360  
degrees over the course of an annual orbit demonstrating a new  
orbital component and when applied to the Earth explains variations in  
daylight/darkness North and South of the Equator and so on –

[http://asymptotia.com/wp-images/2007/08/uranus\\_rings.jpg](http://asymptotia.com/wp-images/2007/08/uranus_rings.jpg)

## Re: Geostationary or rotational dynamics

If you cannot grasp a motion that you can see, there is hardly a chance you will grasp the motions going on beneath your feet.

Stick with what you know whether it is a variable tilting Earth to the orbital plane, geostationary convection cells or whatever you want as you are not being offensive by what you believe.