

Contents

<i>Foreword by Denis Kent</i>	<i>page</i> xi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xiv
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xvi
<i>Introduction</i>	xvii
1 Geomagnetism and paleomagnetism: 1946–1952	1
1.1 Breaking the impasse: the three main paleomagnetic groups	1
1.2 Blackett and Runcorn begin their years together at the University of Manchester (1946–1949)	2
1.3 Blackett’s fundamental or distributed theory of the origin of the geomagnetic field and Runcorn’s introduction to it	3
1.4 Elsasser develops a self-exciting dynamo in Earth’s core as the source of the geomagnetic field	5
1.5 Runcorn and colleagues carry out the mine experiment and discriminate between fundamental and core theories	7
1.6 Blackett and Runcorn become interested in paleomagnetism; Runcorn accepts a position at the University of Cambridge	10
1.7 Work at the Carnegie Institution in Washington and the case for a geomagnetic field without gross changes	12
1.8 Graham develops field tests of stability	14
1.9 Graham and others at the Carnegie Institution abandon the fold test	17
1.10 Graham opts for self-reversals rather than field reversals	20
1.11 Igneous baked contact test of stability	23
1.12 Hospers arrives in Cambridge, 1949: his early education and commencement of Iceland surveys	25
1.13 Hospers’ first results from Iceland, 1950–1951, and genesis of Fisher’s statistics	29
1.14 Consistency or dispersion as a test of paleomagnetic stability	31

vi	<i>Contents</i>	
1.15	Runcorn arrives in Cambridge, 1950, decides to work on paleomagnetism, and hires Ted (E.) Irving, 1951	32
1.16	Irving's early education and undergraduate years	34
1.17	Irving and Runcorn's first work, July through December 1951: only red beds give coherent results	37
1.18	Irving devises a paleomagnetism test of continental drift, autumn 1951	41
1.19	Realization in 1943 by Sahni that paleomagnetism could be used to test continental drift	43
1.20	Irving initiates his test of motion of India	44
1.21	Why Runcorn and Irving did not immediately redirect all their work to test continental drift	45
1.22	Reaction of Blackett and Runcorn to Irving's work	46
1.23	Summary	48
2	British paleomagnetists begin shifting their research toward testing mobilism: summer 1951 to fall 1953	56
2.1	Outline	56
2.2	Blackett initiates and Clegg leads the paleomagnetic group at Manchester	57
2.3	Clegg builds a new magnetometer at Manchester	59
2.4	The Manchester group expands and focuses on the Triassic redbeds	60
2.5	Irving investigates the origin of magnetization of the Torridonian and begins magnetostratigraphic survey	62
2.6	Irving completes magnetostratigraphic survey of the Torridonian	67
2.7	Fisher defends mobilism	68
2.8	Hospers returns to Iceland, builds an "igneous" magnetometer, and develops his case for reversals of the geomagnetic field	69
2.9	Hospers develops the geocentric axial dipole hypothesis and tests polar wandering and continental drift	75
2.10	Creer, his education and initiation in research	80
2.11	Creer constructs the Cambridge magnetometer	82
2.12	Creer begins fieldwork	84
2.13	Runcorn and his research	88
2.14	Rationality in deciding to launch a paleomagnetic test for continental drift	89
3	Launching the global paleomagnetic test of continental drift: 1954–1956	94
3.1	Paleomagnetists on the move	94
3.2	Four stages in the paleomagnetic test for continental drift	95

<i>Contents</i>		vii
3.3	The January 1954 Birmingham meeting	96
3.4	Irving's thesis, support of continental drift, and plans for Australia	98
3.5	Clegg and colleagues publish the first paleomagnetic support for continental drift: Stage I	104
3.6	Creer's 1954 APW path for Britain evolves through three versions: move to Stage II	106
3.7	Creer compares his British APW path with a Silurian pole from North America: move to Stage III	117
3.8	Colorado Plateau, a favored sampling area in 1954	122
3.9	Runcorn's attitude to mobilism before his first North American survey	125
3.10	Runcorn continues to favor polar wandering after his first North American survey	129
3.11	Paleomagnetism at Australian National University: Jaeger's key role	131
3.12	Irving's initial work at Australian National University: his move to Stage IV	134
3.13	Imperial College moves to Stage III	138
3.14	Blackett expresses strong preference for mobilism	141
3.15	Differing reactions of the British and Carnegie groups to the paleomagnetic results	145
4	Runcorn shifts to mobilism: 1955–1956	154
4.1	Runcorn returns to North America then moves to Newcastle	154
4.2	Runcorn hires Opdyke to help collect rocks and they formulate a new paleoclimatologic test of the paleomagnetic method	156
4.3	Runcorn changes his mind and supports continental drift	162
4.4	The Canadian paper	165
4.5	Opinions of others as to why Runcorn changed his mind	168
4.6	False accounts of why Runcorn changed his mind	169
4.7	Westoll's influence	172
4.8	Creer shows Bradley's manuscript to Runcorn	175
4.9	Bradley and his paper	178
4.10	Further implications of Runcorn seeing Bradley's paper	182
4.11	The Dutch paper	187
4.12	Bradley, Runcorn, and Euler's point theorem	191
4.13	Creer and Irving, Runcorn, and Graham: a study in contrasts	192
5	Enlargement and refinement of the paleomagnetic support for mobilism: 1956–1960	197
5.1	Outline	197
5.2	Imperial College and the Tata Institute continue surveys in India	198

5.3	Australian National University obtains apparent polar wander path for Australia	200
5.4	Surveys of Karroo System through 1959	208
5.5	Magnetic cleaning boosts the record	213
5.6	Survey of South America	218
5.7	Surveys of Antarctica	222
5.8	Surveys in Japan and China	226
5.9	Surveys in the USSR	228
5.10	Paleowind studies, previous work	233
5.11	Paleowind studies, work in Britain in the 1950s	238
5.12	Newcastle begins paleowind studies in North America	239
5.13	Paleowinds, the 1957 Royal Astronomical Society meeting	240
5.14	The Newcastle contribution to paleowind work	243
5.15	A spin-off paleowind study	246
5.16	Attempts at paleogeographies by Newcastle and Canberra groups	247
5.17	The increasing necessity for continental drift	258
5.18	Clarification and further support for the GAD model	259
5.19	Alternative approach of Imperial College group	263
6	Earth expansion enters the mobilist controversy	278
6.1	Outline	278
6.2	Laszlo Egyed and his version of Earth expansion	279
6.3	Holmes assesses Egyed's expansion theory	282
6.4	Egyed develops his expansion theory and proposes a paleomagnetic test	285
6.5	Carey, the man and his views	290
6.6	Carey's defense of mobilism	297
6.7	Carey's oroclinal	297
6.8	Carey's solid but flowing mantle	309
6.9	Examples of rheid flow	312
6.10	Mantle convection as rheid flow	314
6.11	Carey's fit of Africa and South America	317
6.12	Carey's views in the 1950s prior to embracing expansionism: his appeal to mantle convection	320
6.13	Carey switches to expansionism	323
6.14	Carey's account of seafloor generation after he embraced Earth expansion	327
6.15	Carey's appeal to paleomagnetism	330
6.16	Other contributions to the 1956 Hobart symposium	335
6.17	Jaeger favors mobilism because of its paleomagnetic support	346

<i>Contents</i>		ix
7	Development and criticism of the paleomagnetic case for mobilism: late 1950s and early 1960s	355
7.1	Removing difficulties during the development and enlargement of the paleomagnetic case for mobilism	355
7.2	Maintaining standards: quarrels among paleomagnetists supportive of mobilism	359
7.3	Preview of the attacks against paleomagnetic support for mobilism and their defeat	364
7.4	Graham's magnetostriction difficulty	364
7.5	Removing the magnetostriction difficulty	367
7.6	Cox's troublesome Siletz River Volcanics	371
7.7	Irving explains the aberrant Siletz paleopole	375
7.8	Other rotations	378
7.9	Hibberd's rapidly spiraling polar wander paths	380
7.10	Stehli raises a Permian paleobiogeographic difficulty and Runcorn and Irving counter	384
7.11	Munk and MacDonald attack paleomagnetism	389
7.12	Billings attacks paleomagnetic support for mobilism	400
7.13	Jeffreys attacks paleomagnetism and its support for mobilism	402
7.14	Concluding remarks: the prevalence of the three research strategies	404
8	Major reaction against the paleomagnetic case for mobilism and early work on the radiometric reversal timescale: 1958–1962	410
8.1	Introduction	410
8.2	Doell and Cox and their milieu and their attitude toward mobilism before 1958	412
8.3	Genesis of the <i>GSA</i> and <i>AG</i> reviews	422
8.4	The <i>GSA</i> review	424
8.5	Doell and Cox's earlier attitude to the paleomagnetic case for continental drift	431
8.6	The <i>AG</i> review	434
8.7	Was the <i>GSA</i> review an unreasonable assessment of the paleomagnetic case for mobilism?	438
8.8	Some later reflections on the <i>GSA</i> review	444
8.9	Runcorn's response to the <i>GSA</i> review	447
8.10	Irving's response to the <i>GSA</i> review	449
8.11	Cox–Irving correspondence	450
8.12	Irving becomes critical of the <i>GSA</i> review: further Cox–Irving correspondence	453
8.13	Cox reviews Irving's <i>Paleomagnetism</i>	465

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87505-9 - The Continental Drift Controversy: Volume II: Paleomagnetism and Confirmation of Drift

Henry R. Frankel

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

x	<i>Contents</i>	
8.14	Cox and Doell on expansion	466
8.15	Initiation of the radiometric reversal timescale at the United States Geological Survey and the Australian National University	469
8.16	Postscript	484
	<i>References</i>	491
	<i>Index</i>	511