

The Planet That Moves

QTC-018 · From Quarks to Consciousness

The Universe, Life, and How We Found Out

Author: Juan Seguroloa

Version: v1.0 EN · 2 September 2026

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge

License: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Plate tectonics is often told as a delayed triumph: Alfred Wegener noticed that continents fit, geologists refused to believe him, and the ocean floor finally proved him right. The real history is stronger. Wegener combined fossils, rocks and ancient climate, but his proposed forces were inadequate and the decisive evidence had not yet been measured. Echo sounding, Marie Tharp's maps, earthquake locations, magnetic reversals and seafloor stripes changed the problem from suggestive resemblance into a testable global mechanism. Transform faults, deep earthquakes and spherical plate motions then closed the geometry, while modern space geodesy made present movement directly measurable. This article follows that evidence chain and shows why scientific resistance can be reasonable until a new class of observation makes an old question answerable.

In 60 Seconds

Continents do move, but their outlines were only the beginning of the case. Wegener joined the fit with fossils found on separated lands, matching rocks and mountain belts, and glacial traces that became coherent when southern continents were restored together. Critics nevertheless had a serious objection: his tidal and centrifugal forces could not drive continents through oceanic crust. The missing evidence lay beneath the sea. Echo sounding revealed a global ridge-and-trench system; Marie Tharp mapped a rift along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge; magnetic surveys found alternating bands. Vine and Matthews linked those stripes to seafloor spreading and repeated reversals of Earth's magnetic field, while Morley had independently reached the same idea. Transform-fault earthquakes then behaved as Wilson's geometry predicted. Deep earthquake zones traced slabs descending at trenches, closing the circuit by recycling oceanic lithosphere. McKenzie, Parker, Morgan and Le Pichon turned the pattern into rotations of nearly rigid plates on a sphere. Today GPS measures motion in millimetres to centimetres per year, while broad boundary zones remind us that rigidity remains an approximation.

Why This Question Matters

Plate tectonics is more than a theory of moving continents. It is an example of how a scientific field changes when new measurements connect observations that once belonged to different disciplines. Fossils, maps, ship soundings, magnetometers and seismograms did not repeat one another; their different failure modes made convergence powerful. The history also corrects two easy myths: an initially rejected idea is not automatically correct, and a correct large-scale claim need not arrive with

a workable mechanism. Understanding that distinction prepares the next article, where plate motion becomes one component of Earth's long-term chemical and climatic regulation.

1. Continents Fit, but Shape Was Not Proof

The Question

If Africa and South America look as though they once touched, why was that not enough? Because coastlines change, chance resemblances occur, and geometry alone says neither when separation happened nor what physical process could have moved a continent.

The Atlantic margins invite the eye to close the ocean. Wegener used that complementarity, but the familiar classroom puzzle can distort his argument. Modern shorelines migrate with sea level, erosion and sedimentation; a visual match is therefore a clue, not a measurement. Wegener's 1912 paper and 1915 book placed shape inside a broader case.[1,2] Half a century later, Bullard, Everett and Smith fitted selected continental margins by computer and made the geometry explicit enough to test.[38]

Wegener did not begin with an isolated flash of resemblance. He assembled observations from geography, palaeontology, stratigraphy, structural geology and palaeoclimate.[1,2] The strength he sought came from consilience: a reconstruction should explain why several independent patterns end at today's oceans and continue on another continent. Some observations were imperfect, but the method was already recognizably scientific—move the continents back and ask whether unrelated evidence improves together.

Nor was continental mobility one man's untouched invention. Frank B. Taylor published a model of major lateral displacement in 1910 and connected it to young mountain belts.[3] His forces, routes and reconstruction differed from Wegener's. The distinction matters: Taylor deserves a place in the prehistory of drift, while Wegener's achievement was a sustained, international synthesis developed through later editions. Historical priority belongs to specified ideas, not to one indivisible trophy.[7]

Quantitative fitting later showed both the power and the limit of the outline. Bullard's group chose a boundary near the continental slope rather than the modern beach and solved for rotations that closed the Atlantic.[38] The fit was close, not perfect. Rifting stretched and fragmented margins, sediment accumulated, and the selected contour affected the answer. That is what turned a picture into science: the reconstruction stated choices, residual errors and parameters that other evidence could challenge.

Continental drift also was not yet plate tectonics. It asserted that continents had changed position dramatically. Plate tectonics would later add newly created oceanic lithosphere, consuming boundaries, transform faults and motion on a sphere.[24–26] Some early proposals anticipated parts of that framework, but none possessed its entire geometry and evidence. The first task is therefore narrower: determine whether continents were formerly connected before asking how a whole planetary shell moves.

Where That Leaves Us

Continental outlines opened a question but could not close it. Wegener's case became serious because the same reconstruction had to improve several patterns at once, and because later fits made its

geometry auditable. The next layer of evidence was not another map edge: it was the history carried by organisms, rocks and ancient climates.

2. Fossils, Rocks and Climate Turned Pattern into History

Fossils can connect lands more tightly than a coastline. Mesosaurus, a small aquatic reptile, occurs in Permian rocks of southern Africa and South America; related terrestrial assemblages also cross today's southern oceans.[1,2,4] The claim is not that organisms never disperse. It is that several freshwater or land organisms, in rocks of compatible age, would require increasingly contrived routes if the continents had always occupied their modern positions.

Glossopteris supplied a botanical version. Fossils of this seed fern and its associated flora occur across South America, Africa, India, Antarctica and Australia.[2,4] Reassembled as Gondwana, those localities form a connected biogeographic region rather than islands separated by vast oceans. A fossil map does not calculate an Euler pole, but it constrains which lands could share environments and pathways at a particular time.

Geology added lines that continued through the water. Rock sequences, mineral provinces and deformed mountain belts on one Atlantic margin could be paired with compatible ages and structures on the other.[1,2,4] The important word is compatible. Similar-looking granite is common; a defensible correlation combines age, stratigraphic order, structural history and provenance. When independent geological threads reconnect under one restoration, shape becomes a history rather than a silhouette.

Ancient climate reversed another apparent absurdity. Permo-Carboniferous glacial deposits occur across southern continents now separated by warm oceans, and indicators of ice movement seemed incoherent on the modern map. Restoring Gondwana organized the deposits around a plausible ice centre and made flow directions intelligible.[1,2,4] Coal, evaporites and other climate-sensitive rocks likewise constrained old latitude. The continents moved; the climatic belts did not need to perform impossible migrations.

Alexander du Toit deepened this southern case through field-based comparisons of Africa and South America.[4] His 1937 synthesis preserved ideas that modern geology rejects, but its detailed cross-ocean correlations made continental mobility harder to dismiss as a European map trick. This distributed history matters: Wegener organized a programme, Taylor anticipated movement, du Toit expanded geological support, and later measurements would decide which parts survived. [7]

Where That Leaves Us

Fossils, strata, mountain belts and glacial traces made one former geography explain many observations. Yet explanatory reach did not supply the missing physics. A reconstruction could be historically persuasive and mechanically incomplete at the same time. That gap explains why serious scientists resisted drift—and why a plausible objection should not be rewritten as ignorance after the fact.

3. The Objections Were Scientific

The Question

Suppose the continents really had moved. Wegener still had to explain how rock crossed thousands of kilometres without an adequate driving force or a mapped oceanic system. A correct reconstruction could therefore remain an incomplete physical theory.

Wegener invoked pole-fleeing effects from Earth's rotation and westward tidal drag. The available forces were far too weak for the task, especially if continents had to plough through resistant oceanic crust.[2,6,7] This was not a minor missing coefficient. It joined an observational proposal to a material model that geophysicists could test and reject. Later plate tectonics did not rescue those forces; it changed what moved and how boundaries accommodated motion.

Harold Jeffreys gave the mechanical objection formidable form. His Earth models treated the solid interior and crustal strength quantitatively and argued that the proposed agents could not sustain Wegener's displacement.[6] Some assumptions would later change, but Jeffreys was not simply refusing a fact visible on a school map. He was asking whether the claimed motion obeyed the physics then available—a courtesy scientific history should preserve even when the conclusion changed.[7]

Arthur Holmes offered a route around the impasse. In a 1928 lecture published in 1931, he described slow convection generated by differential radioactive heating and sketched rising flow, lateral motion and return currents.[5] The idea anticipated important later elements, but it did not prove that such circulation occurred at the required scale. Without mapped ridges, young oceanic crust, magnetic stripes or descending slabs, convection remained a physically suggestive hypothesis rather than a complete tectonic system.

Reception also differed by discipline and country. Palaeontologists, stratigraphers, geodesists and geophysicists did not weigh the same observations in the same way; American geology in particular often demanded causal models and locally grounded field evidence.[7] Institutions and authority mattered too. Saying that objections were scientific does not make every dismissal fair. It means that today's successful theory cannot be used retroactively as evidence that yesterday's incomplete proposal already deserved unconditional assent.

The asymmetry of available evidence was decisive. Continents exposed fossils, structures and glacial deposits to fieldwork, while most ocean basins were hidden beneath kilometres of water and known through sparse soundings.[8–10] The record needed to distinguish stationary ocean floors from mobile plates was largely inaccessible. The debate changed when instruments began to reveal that missing two-thirds of the solid surface as a patterned, seismic and magnetized world.

Where That Leaves Us

The old debate was underdetermined because the proposed motion lacked adequate mechanics and the oceanic record was mostly unseen. Holmes supplied a possible engine, not the missing map. When echo sounders and seismic catalogues exposed ridges, valleys and global earthquake belts, the argument acquired an entirely new class of evidence rather than a louder repetition of the old one.

4. The Ocean Floor Revealed a New Planet

Continuous echo sounding replaced isolated lead-line depths with profiles recorded along a ship's path. Repeated tracks revealed abyssal plains, enormous ridges, deep trenches and fracture zones. [8–10] The ocean floor was not a smooth, passive container receiving continental debris. It had organized topography on a planetary scale. Because early tracks remained sparse, cartography required disciplined interpolation—making the map both an empirical product and an explicit model of gaps.

Marie Tharp turned tens of thousands of soundings into comparable North Atlantic profiles. A persistent V-shaped notch at the ridge crest suggested a rift valley. In her 1999 first-person account, Bruce Heezen initially dismissed the interpretation as 'girl talk' because it resembled the heretical drift theory.[8] Tharp redrew, compared and continued. The episode is not decorative biography: who was allowed to interpret data affected how quickly the feature became an admissible geological claim.

Earthquake maps helped the interpretation survive. When epicentres plotted at the same scale fell along the axial valley, Heezen accepted the correlation and the pair traced a connected mid-ocean ridge system.[8] The 1959 work by Heezen, Tharp and Maurice Ewing published profiles and a physiographic map of the North Atlantic.[9] Ship crews, instrument builders, plotters and interpreters all entered that picture, even though credit and authority were not distributed equally.

The ridges connected across oceans; trenches and earthquake belts marked other boundaries. Earlier Mid-Atlantic exploration had already shown a structurally complex ridge, but the later synthesis made a global pattern visible.[9,10] Seismicity established activity, not yet motion direction. The crucial advance was conceptual: the ocean floor itself now possessed a history and a geometry capable of testing whether new material emerged, moved laterally and disappeared elsewhere.

Two influential proposals filled that opening. Robert Dietz published 'spreading of the sea floor' in 1961; Harry Hess's 1962 'History of Ocean Basins' described crust formed at ridges and consumed near trenches, while labeling the speculative essay 'geopoetry'. [14,15] Their details differed and earlier convection ideas mattered. The responsible story is distributed: bathymetry posed the mechanism, spreading made it imaginable, and a different instrument would make it predictive.

Where That Leaves Us

Bathymetry and earthquakes transformed the seafloor from blank space into an active global system. Dietz and Hess proposed that ridges manufacture crust and trenches remove it, but a plausible circulation was still not a measured rate or sequence. Magnetometers supplied the next test by finding a record written continuously into the new basalt itself.

5. Magnetic Stripes Made Spreading Testable

The Question

If basalt forms at a ridge and moves outward while Earth's magnetic field repeatedly reverses, the seafloor should preserve alternating bands of polarity, paired across the ridge. A spreading history could therefore be calculated from a magnetic pattern.

Towed magnetometers off western North America found remarkably straight, regional bands of positive and negative anomaly. Mason and Raff reported that topography alone did not explain the pattern and that major faults offset it.[13] Lawrence Morley, trained in aeromagnetic interpretation, recognized that the bands had to involve remanent magnetization.[21] The survey had produced a code before anyone possessed an accepted key.

The key required a second record on land. Lavas acquire thermoremanent magnetization as iron-bearing minerals cool through critical temperatures. Allan Cox, Richard Doell and Brent Dalrymple used radiometrically dated volcanic rocks to show that Earth's field had reversed polarity repeatedly.[17] The early timescale was short and imperfect, but it converted normal and reversed magnetization from a nuisance into a chronological sequence that a growing ocean floor might copy.[20]

In 1963 Frederick Vine and Drummond Matthews joined the pieces. New basalt at a ridge would cool in the current polarity, move outward and be followed by basalt magnetized after the next reversal.[16] Spreading on both sides predicted roughly symmetric stripes whose widths combined time interval and spreading rate. The idea was risky because spreading, repeated reversals and durable remanence were all still disputed. Their conjunction made each one test the others.[20]

Lawrence Morley had reached the same explanation independently in December 1962. His later account records a Nature submission rejected for lack of space and a Journal of Geophysical Research referee who deemed the idea unsuitable for serious publication.[21] Vine and Matthews published first; Morley's independent route remains part of the discovery. The episode warns against confusing publication priority, conceptual priority and later recognition—or treating peer rejection as proof that a claim is either false or visionary.

Vine and Wilson matched anomalies over the young Juan de Fuca Ridge to the reversal sequence, and Heirtzler and colleagues extended calibrated profiles across older seafloor.[18,19] Later polarity timescales revised ages and rates.[36] Globally, surviving oceanic crust generally grows older away from active ridges and is almost all younger than about 200 million years.[32] The stripes can be asymmetric, interrupted or offset; those departures record tectonic history rather than erase spreading.

Where That Leaves Us

Magnetic stripes converted spreading into a retrodictive clock: a mechanism predicted order, symmetry and rate, while revised timescales could improve the calculation. Yet stripes chiefly measured motion perpendicular to ridges. To build a complete moving shell, geologists still needed the sideways boundaries that offset ridges and a geometry capable of linking every direction on a sphere.

6. Transform Faults and Earthquakes Made Plates Kinematic

Offsets in a ridge look at first like ordinary strike-slip faults continued indefinitely. J. Tuzo Wilson's 1965 transform model reversed the expected logic.[22] Only the segment between two ridge axes should accommodate active relative motion; beyond the axes, the matching fracture-zone traces travel together on the same plate. That geometric distinction predicted where earthquakes should occur and which way the two sides should slip.

Lynn Sykes tested the prediction with earthquake locations and focal mechanisms. Mid-ocean ridge events were shallow, transforms concentrated earthquakes between ridge segments, and their inferred slip sense agreed with the spreading geometry.[23] A map feature had become a risky seismic forecast. The success also showed why earthquake mechanisms matter: the epicentre says where rupture began, while the radiation pattern constrains the direction of faulting.

Dan McKenzie and Robert Parker then treated plate motion on the actual shape that matters—a sphere. An approximately rigid plate can move through a rotation about an Euler pole, so velocities at different points are linked rather than chosen independently.[24] Their North Pacific example turned local offsets and slip vectors into one kinematic object. Plate tectonics now contained a calculation that could fail if boundary observations refused to share a rotation.

Jason Morgan developed the rotational description across major crustal blocks, and Xavier Le Pichon assembled spreading directions and rates into a globally consistent six-plate model.[25,26] Six was not nature's final inventory; it was the smallest partition the available data supported. The achievement was the closure of plate circuits. Ridges, transforms and convergent margins had to agree around the globe rather than work only as separate regional stories.

Modern maps retain rigid interiors where the approximation works and broaden boundaries where strain is distributed.[29,34] Collision zones, microplates and inherited faults prevent every boundary from being a thin line. Earthquakes and volcanoes trace much of the network, but hotspots and intraplate events are real exceptions.[27,30] Rigidity is powerful because it links distant observations, not because the lithosphere is literally undeformable.

Where That Leaves Us

Transform earthquakes supplied directional tests, and spherical rotations made separate boundaries answer to one global kinematic model. The surface network could now move without tearing its geometry apart. One major balance remained: if ridges continually created oceanic lithosphere, some boundary had to consume it. Deep earthquakes beneath trenches revealed where the return path entered the planet.

7. Subduction Closed the Global Circuit

The Question

New crust at ridges cannot accumulate forever on a planet of nearly constant size. Where did it go? Beneath ocean trenches, earthquakes descend along inclined planes hundreds of kilometres into the mantle, marking the hidden half of the circuit.

Kiyoo Wadati mapped intermediate and deep earthquakes beneath Japan in the 1930s, including inclined zones in which focal depth increased landward.[11] Hugo Benioff later connected inclined seismic zones with major faulting near oceanic deeps.[12] Their observations preceded the modern concept of a descending lithospheric plate. Calling them Wadati–Benioff zones preserves that chronology: the geometry existed in data before plate tectonics supplied its successful interpretation.

In 1968 Bryan Isacks, Jack Oliver and Lynn Sykes integrated those earthquake planes with the new global tectonics. Intermediate and deep events occurred within cold, descending lithosphere rather than along an arbitrary mantle crack.[27] Seismicity illuminated a slab's path from trench into the

mantle. It did not show every part: some slabs become aseismic, and later tomography would trace structures beyond the deepest earthquake.[30]

Subduction closed the area budget. Ridges create oceanic lithosphere; convergent margins bend and return it to the mantle.[15,27,30] The rates need not balance locally or instantaneously, but the first-order global circuit avoids both endlessly growing oceans and an expanding Earth. Continents participate differently because buoyant crust often resists deep subduction, deforms, accretes fragments or builds mountains above the convergent boundary.

A subduction system is not one identical machine repeated everywhere. Trenches, volcanic arcs and inclined seismic zones are characteristic, yet their spacing and intensity vary with slab dip, age, hydration and overriding-plate structure.[27,30] Water and other components leave the slab, influence melting and enter arcs; some material mixes into the mantle, some may stagnate, and some descends further.[30,31] Recycling is established, while its detailed paths remain measurable questions.

Nor is a plate carried by one universal conveyor belt. Force balances include the gravitational pull of dense slabs, ridge-related gravitational forces and tractions from mantle flow.[28,31] Their relative importance varies among plates and through time. Holmes's convection was therefore an important ancestor, not a complete answer. Modern tectonics couples plates and mantle dynamically without pretending that one arrow under every ocean explains every velocity.

Where That Leaves Us

Deep earthquakes made the return limb visible: oceanic lithosphere descends, dehydrates and recycles while ridges renew the surface. This closed the global circuit without reducing its dynamics to one force. The theory's last transformation was observationally audacious—motions reconstructed from ancient rocks would be compared with positions measured repeatedly from space.

8. Plate Motion Became Directly Measurable

Geological plate models recover motion over millions of years. Dated magnetic anomalies supply distance and time across ocean basins; transform orientations and earthquake slip directions constrain geometry.[33,37] MORVEL and its predecessors solve angular velocities that best satisfy many such observations. The result is not an animation inferred from coastlines. It is a quantitative, uncertainty-bearing model whose inputs can be reidentified when the magnetic timescale or plate circuit changes.

Space geodesy asks a different question: how are stations moving now? Repeated GPS and related measurements estimate velocities in a terrestrial reference frame, then separate plate rotation from earthquake cycles, subsidence and local monument motion.[34,35] Typical plate motion is millimetres to centimetres per year—small enough to miss in daily life, large enough to rearrange an ocean over geological time. A human lifetime now samples the process that once seemed accessible only through ancient rocks.

The Global Strain Rate Model v2.1 combined 22,511 horizontal velocities, represented 50 plates as rotating caps and allowed about 14 percent of Earth's surface to deform across broad boundary zones.[34] Those figures describe one published model, not nature's final census. Their value is

conceptual as well as numerical: measurement can honor the success of rigid plates without hiding the regions where that approximation fails.

Present geodetic rotations and million-year geological rotations are broadly comparable, but they need not be identical.[33–35,37] Boundaries evolve, deformation can be transient, magnetic ages average long intervals, and GPS observes decades interrupted by earthquakes. A disagreement is therefore not automatically a refutation. It can identify reference-frame error, elastic strain, changing plate organization or a mistaken anomaly assignment—provided the timescales and uncertainties remain explicit.

Directly measuring today's motion does not directly observe Pangaea. Ancient reconstructions still depend on dated ocean crust, palaeomagnetism, correlated geology and records that subduction has partly destroyed.[32,33,36] Plate tectonics is durable because those historical inferences agree with a mechanism seen operating now. QTC-019 will follow one consequence—how moving rock transfers carbon over immense times—while this article stops at the evidence that the planet's surface and mantle form a coupled moving system.[27,30,31]

Where That Leaves Us

Plate tectonics became compelling by linking reconstructions, risky predictions and present motion. No single map, fossil, stripe or GPS station carried the theory; independent records constrained one moving system across timescales. That system now supplies the physical circulation beneath Earth's long-term carbon cycle, where motion becomes one ingredient in a planetary thermostat rather than the whole explanation.

What We Know, and How

- Continents have changed relative position, and former connections are supported by geometry, fossils, geology and palaeoclimate rather than outline alone.[1–4,38]
- Oceanic lithosphere is created at spreading ridges, records geomagnetic reversals and generally ages away from the ridge.[13–20,32,36]
- Transform faults, earthquake mechanisms and Euler rotations connect local boundaries into a global kinematic plate system.[22–26]
- Subduction returns oceanic lithosphere to the mantle along trenches and inclined seismic zones.[11,12,27,30]
- Space geodesy directly measures present plate and boundary-zone motion at millimetres to centimetres per year.[34,35]

What We Still Don't Know

- The exact balance of slab pull, mantle traction and other forces for every plate through time.
- The detailed fate and mixing depth of all material carried into individual subduction zones.
- The best boundary between rigid microplates and continuously deforming regions at every observational scale.
- Ancient plate geometries where subduction has destroyed oceanic crust and no complete magnetic record survives.
- How and when plate tectonics began on the early Earth, a question outside this article's modern evidence chain.

What Could Change Our Minds

- A global magnetic, seismic and geodetic pattern that cannot be reconciled with lithospheric plates and their boundaries.
- Revised polarity timescales or anomaly identifications that alter regional spreading histories beyond current uncertainty.
- Dense geodesy showing that a supposedly rigid plate deforms systematically enough to require a new kinematic partition.
- Tomographic and geochemical evidence that substantially revises where slabs descend, stagnate or recycle material.
- Archival evidence that changes the documented independence, sequence or attribution of a specific historical proposal.

If You Remember Only One Thing

Continents move because lithospheric plates are created, displaced and recycled. We know this not from one brilliant clue, but from fossils, seafloor maps, magnetic stripes, earthquakes, geometry and GPS converging.

Related Articles

- QTC-016 — How to Build a Planet
- QTC-017 — How We Learned to Date the Past
- QTC-019 — Earth's Thermostat

References

- [1] Alfred Wegener. Die Entstehung der Kontinente. *Geologische Rundschau* 3, 276–292 (1912). DOI 10.1007/BF02202896. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02202896>
- [2] Alfred Wegener. Die Entstehung der Kontinente und Ozeane. First edition, Friedrich Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig (1915). <https://archive.org/details/dieentstehungder00wege>
- [3] F. B. Taylor. Bearing of the tertiary mountain belt on the origin of the earth's plan. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America* 21, 179–226 (1910). DOI 10.1130/GSAB-21-179. <https://doi.org/10.1130/GSAB-21-179>
- [4] Alexander L. du Toit. Our Wandering Continents: An Hypothesis of Continental Drifting. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh (1937). <https://archive.org/details/ourwanderingcont0000duto>
- [5] Arthur Holmes. XVIII. Radioactivity and Earth Movements. *Transactions of the Geological Society of Glasgow* 18(3), 559–606; lecture delivered 12 January 1928 (1931). DOI 10.1144/transglas.18.3.559. <https://doi.org/10.1144/transglas.18.3.559>
- [6] Harold Jeffreys. The Earth: Its Origin, History and Physical Constitution. First edition, Cambridge University Press (1924). <https://search.worldcat.org/title/352964>
- [7] Naomi Oreskes. The Rejection of Continental Drift: Theory and Method in American Earth Science. Oxford University Press (1999). <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-rejection-of-continental-drift-9780195117332>

- [8] Marie Tharp. Connect the Dots: Mapping the Seafloor and Discovering the Mid-ocean Ridge. In Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory: Twelve Perspectives on the First Fifty Years, 1949–1999 (1999). <https://www.whoi.edu/news-insights/content/marie-tharp/>
- [9] Bruce C. Heezen; Marie Tharp; Maurice Ewing. The Floors of the Oceans: I. The North Atlantic. Geological Society of America Special Paper 65 (1959). DOI 10.1130/SPE65-p1. <https://doi.org/10.1130/SPE65-p1>
- [10] Maurice Ewing. Atlantic Cruise 152 to the Mid-Atlantic Ridge. Bulletin of the Geological Society of America 59, 1320 (1948). https://archive.org/details/sim_geological-society-of-america-bulletin_1948-12_59_12
- [11] K. Wadati. On the Activity of Deep-Focus Earthquakes in the Japan Islands and Neighbourhoods. Geophysical Magazine 8, 305–325 (1935). <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1571698600867573888?lang=en>
- [12] Hugo Benioff. Seismic Evidence for the Fault Origin of Oceanic Deeps. Bulletin of the Geological Society of America 60, 1837–1856 (1949). https://www.eps.mcgill.ca/~courses/c350/lecturestuff/jan09/Benioff_1949_GSAB.pdf
- [13] Ronald G. Mason; Arthur D. Raff. Magnetic Survey off the West Coast of North America, 32° N. Latitude to 42° N. Latitude. Geological Society of America Bulletin 72, 1259–1266 (1961). https://www.eps.mcgill.ca/~courses/c350/lecturestuff/jan28/Mason_1961.pdf
- [14] Robert S. Dietz. Continent and Ocean Basin Evolution by Spreading of the Sea Floor. Nature 190, 854–857 (1961). DOI 10.1038/190854a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/190854a0>
- [15] H. H. Hess. History of Ocean Basins. In Petrologic Studies: A Volume in Honor of A. F. Buddington, 599–620 (1962). <https://www.mantleplumes.org/WebDocuments/Hess1962.pdf>
- [16] F. J. Vine; D. H. Matthews. Magnetic Anomalies Over Oceanic Ridges. Nature 199, 947–949 (1963). DOI 10.1038/199947a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/199947a0>
- [17] Allan Cox; Richard R. Doell; G. Brent Dalrymple. Reversals of the Earth's Magnetic Field. Science 144, 1537–1543 (1964). DOI 10.1126/science.144.3626.1537. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.144.3626.1537>
- [18] F. J. Vine; J. Tuzo Wilson. Magnetic Anomalies over a Young Oceanic Ridge off Vancouver Island. Science 150, 485–489 (1965). DOI 10.1126/science.150.3695.485. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.150.3695.485>
- [19] J. R. Heirtzler; G. O. Dickson; E. M. Herron; W. C. Pitman, III; X. Le Pichon. Marine magnetic anomalies, geomagnetic field reversals, and motions of the ocean floor and continents. Journal of Geophysical Research 73, 2119–2136 (1968). DOI 10.1029/JB073i006p02119. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JB073i006p02119>
- [20] F. J. Vine. Spreading of the Ocean Floor: New Evidence. Science 154, 1405–1415 (1966). DOI 10.1126/science.154.3755.1405. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.154.3755.1405>
- [21] Lawrence W. Morley. Early Work Leading to the Explanation of the Banded Geomagnetic Imprinting of the Ocean Floor. Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union 67(36), 665–666

(1986). <https://courses.seas.harvard.edu/climate/eli/Courses/EPS281r/Sources/Plate-tectonics/Plate-motion-on-sphere-and-continental-drift/more/Morley-1986.pdf>

[22] J. Tuzo Wilson. A New Class of Faults and Their Bearing on Continental Drift. *Nature* 207, 343–347 (1965). DOI 10.1038/207343a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/207343a0>

[23] Lynn R. Sykes. Mechanism of earthquakes and nature of faulting on the mid-oceanic ridges. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 72, 2131–2153 (1967). DOI 10.1029/JZ072i008p02131. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JZ072i008p02131>

[24] D. P. McKenzie; R. L. Parker. The North Pacific: an Example of Tectonics on a Sphere. *Nature* 216, 1276–1280 (1967). DOI 10.1038/2161276a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/2161276a0>

[25] W. Jason Morgan. Rises, trenches, great faults, and crustal blocks. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 73, 1959–1982 (1968). DOI 10.1029/JB073i006p01959. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JB073i006p01959>

[26] Xavier Le Pichon. Sea-floor spreading and continental drift. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 73, 3661–3697 (1968). DOI 10.1029/JB073i012p03661. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JB073i012p03661>

[27] Bryan Isacks; Jack Oliver; Lynn R. Sykes. Seismology and the new global tectonics. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 73, 5855–5899 (1968). DOI 10.1029/JB073i018p05855. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JB073i018p05855>

[28] D. Forsyth; S. Uyeda. On the Relative Importance of the Driving Forces of Plate Motion. *Geophysical Journal International* 43(1), 163–200 (1975). DOI 10.1111/j.1365-246X.1975.tb00631.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1975.tb00631.x>

[29] Peter Bird. An updated digital model of plate boundaries. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* 4(3), 1027 (2003). DOI 10.1029/2001GC000252. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GC000252>

[30] Robert J. Stern. Subduction Zones. *Reviews of Geophysics* 40(4), 1012 (2002). DOI 10.1029/2001RG000108. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001RG000108>

[31] Clinton P. Conrad; Carolina Lithgow-Bertelloni. How Mantle Slabs Drive Plate Tectonics. *Science* 298, 207–209 (2002). DOI 10.1126/science.1074161. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1074161>

[32] R. Dietmar Müller; Maria Sdrolias; Carmen Gaina; Walter R. Roest. Age, spreading rates, and spreading asymmetry of the world's ocean crust. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* 9, Q04006 (2008). DOI 10.1029/2007GC001743. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GC001743>

[33] Charles DeMets; Richard G. Gordon; Donald F. Argus. Geologically current plate motions. *Geophysical Journal International* 181, 1–80 (2010). DOI 10.1111/j.1365-246X.2009.04491.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2009.04491.x>

[34] Corné Kreemer; Geoffrey Blewitt; Elliot C. Klein. A Geodetic Plate Motion and Global Strain Rate Model. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* 15, 3849–3889 (2014). DOI 10.1002/2014GC005407. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GC005407>

[35] Donald F. Argus; Richard G. Gordon; Michael B. Heflin; Chopo Ma; Richard J. Eanes; Pascal Willis; W. Richard Peltier; Susan E. Owen. The angular velocities of the plates and the velocity of Earth's centre from space geodesy. *Geophysical Journal International* 180, 913–960 (2010). DOI 10.1111/j.1365-246X.2009.04463.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2009.04463.x>

- [36] S. C. Cande; D. V. Kent. Revised calibration of the geomagnetic polarity timescale for the Late Cretaceous and Cenozoic. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* 100, 6093–6095 (1995). DOI 10.1029/94JB03098. <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JB03098>
- [37] Charles DeMets; Richard G. Gordon; Donald F. Argus; Seth Stein. Effect of recent revisions to the geomagnetic reversal time scale on estimates of current plate motions. *Geophysical Research Letters* 21, 2191–2194 (1994). DOI 10.1029/94GL02118. <https://doi.org/10.1029/94GL02118>
- [38] Edward Bullard; J. E. Everett; A. Gilbert Smith. The fit of the continents around the Atlantic. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 258, 41–51 (1965). DOI 10.1098/rsta.1965.0020. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1965.0020>