

Re: A better working principle

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2008-03/msg00206.html>

- *From:* don findlay <don@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 20 Mar 2008 00:04:38 -0700 (PDT)
-

oriel36 wrote:

On Mar 19, 4:12pm, Timberwoof <timberwoof.s...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article
<f18f3f94-92e9-480f-ae23-d059ea590...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

ýoriel36 <kelleher,ger...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I have nothing to say to guys who believe in an ee concept that makes a flat Earth look intelligent,I have much to say to plate tectonics guys who are dragging those great outlines into a similar situation by ignoring geodynamics.It is almost harder to ignore geodynamics than to take it into account in respect to geological evolutionary influences but so far,I have the distinct and unpleasant feeling that the trajectory of reasoning ýis now lost ,a reasoning which uses stellar dynamics to generalise rotational principles and apply them to the Earth first and then graft in the mechanism as a more productive solution for plate motion.

Re: A better working principle

What people hope to achieve by ignoring geodynamics I do not know, it has been on the table in its present form for a good few years now with no pressure to adopt it, basically it exists as a halting mechanism to stop 'convection cells' diluting the main argument for plate motion and its long and short term effects.

I cannot imagine what dynamicists are going to apply to the Earth's interior to generate the ≈ 40 km spherical deviation insofar as the generalised rotational dynamics will almost certainly involve differential rotation of the rotating composition in a fluid/flexible state.

If it didn't rotate (and was fluid) it would be spherical. But it does (and it's not), ..so it isn't. ('Few get my drift..) By 40km. It's not a lot. The thickness of the crust. Which is like the shell of an egg, relatively speaking.

We're not talking big bikkies here, at least not when it comes to the bits that are bursting open at the ridges. In fact it's a lot less than that – about 8km, ..1/5th of the eggshell.

It's when we get to the subduction zones it's different. Not 40km, ... not 400km, ..but double that to 1000km. *Now* you're talking bikkies. Bigger ones.

****BUT**** (The differential rotational dynamics you're talking about, about latitudinal differentials (transform faults) are all in the small bikkie basket. What *you* have to do is start plugging the message that this differential rotation you're on about is valid for subduction zones. which are the bikkies in the BIG basket – (remembering that there isn't a gradation between this lot and the small ones.)

****THEN**** you have to start talking about differential rotation on flat dislocations, ..on the earth's shells. And then you're not just talking (geodynamically speaking), you're grunting. People will (or should) listen. Because what you're talking about then is not just fiddling with the mantle, but with the integrated picture of the entire continental margins of the planet.

And when you do that (oink oink) you're talking reassembly of the continents across the Pacific. Just as directly as you can with the

Re: A better working principle

Atlantic and the Indian and Southern Oceans. No probs cobs (EE)
mate. Spin leads to Earth Expansion, and it's that simple.

Lay down (misere) Sally.

("When's the last bus?")

There is no great upheavel with current plate tectonic
outlines
other than the more productive geodynamics will answer
more questions
than it will raise and besides, the 'convection cell' notions in
setting the internal composition and viscosity is not so
important or
so far down the road that it cannot ybe set aside for a more
realistic
approach.

Well that bit's right. Working out the big picture from assumptions
about playdough and calling it science is silly. Don't just set it
aside, put it in the big where it biglons. Alog with the Dakine.

Maybe the problems are no longer technical but the bigger
headache of
the 'scientific method' ideologies and that I cannot get
involved in
insofar as it is what is generating junk concepts which are
now in
competition with plate tectonics or keeping a geostationary
mechanism.

Let me see if I can summarize your rambling statement.

You don't think that geophysicists can figure out why the Earth is
oblate rather than spherical. While you think that differential rotation
(which happens in stars) occurs in the Earth, you're adamant that
convection (which happens in stars) does not happen in the Earth. And
you have no data to support any of your claims.

Do I have it right?

--

Timberwoof <me at timberwoof dot com><http://www.timberwoof.com>

Re: A better working principle

"When you post sewage, don't blame others for emptying chamber pots in your direction." ýChris L.– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

This has gone on for far too long,differential rotation as a generalised dynamic has been on the table for years while nobody else has proposed exactly what causes the Earth sphericity to deviate 40km.

The onus is on those to come up with the actual rotational dynamics for sphericity if they cannot accept differential rotation as a generalised dynamic,I can't imagine how an alternative explanation using actual observations is possible given the detailed analysis already being done on rotating stars and the degree of sphericity with respect to variations in Equatorial speeds.

Until somebody actually comes out with a explanation for the Earth sphericity other than the details I added in terms of rotational dynamics then I have nothing to gain from any response,even silence looks stupid when geodynamics remains cut off from geological evolution.

Good luck to you and your stationary Earth or expanding Earth perspectives,I enjoy my rotating Earth perspective regardless and I mean that.

Ah, Oriel, you're wedded to Sufi, the cool beauty, the tantric temptress

<http://users.indigo.net.au/don/cpr/horse.html>

.