# The excitation of the **Earth's polar motion**

**SEMINAR II** 

Wei-Yung Chung

鍾霨詠

- Hide, R., 1984. Rotation of the atmospheres of the Earth and planets, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., A 313, 107-121.
- Chao, B.F., 1985. On the Excitation of the Earth's Polar Motion, Geophys. Res. Lett., 12(8), 526- 529.
- Wilson, C., 1985. Discrete Polar Motion Equations, Geophysical Journal Royal Astronomical Society, 80, 551-554.



#### Earth's Rotation

#### **Astronomical** (external torques  $\rightarrow$  angular momentum change)

Precession **Nutations** N Librations Tidal Braking Milankovitz Cycles



**Geophysical** (internal forces  $\rightarrow$  no angular momentum change) Length-of-day (LOD) change Polar motion



**0**, centre of the Earth; **R**, rotation pole; **C**, North Celestial Pole



## Earth's Rotation



#### Earth's Rotation Earth system





#### Meteorological

# How is their coupling ?

All components of angular momentum would be zero if that surface were **perfectly spherical** and **perfectly slippery**, for then normal stresses would exert no couple and tangential (frictional) stresses would be absent. In practice both 'topographic' and **frictional stresses** are present, with **normal pressure forces** acting on the Earth's equatorial bulge playing a major role in the coupling associated with the changes in excitation that manifest themselves in the observed polar motion.

\*\*\*A brief summary\*\*\*



Zonal wind field near jet stream levels (sampled here for January 1997), the primary contributor to atmospheric angular momentum and length of day changes.

#### Dynamics of the earth's rotation

$$
dH_i/dt + \epsilon_{ijk}\omega_j H_k = L_i, \t\t\leq L_i \text{ (b) } H_i(t).
$$
\n
$$
I_{ij} \equiv \int_{V} \rho(x_k x_k \delta_{ij} - x_i x_j) dV
$$
\n
$$
h_i \equiv \int_{V} \rho \epsilon_{ijk} x_j u_k dV
$$
\n
$$
d(I_{ij} \omega_j + h_i) / dt + \epsilon_{ijk} \omega_j (I_{kl} \omega_l + h_k) = L_i \text{ (a) } H_i \text{ (b) } H_i \text{ (c) } H_i \text{ (d) } H_i \text{ (e) } H_i \text{ (f) } H_i \text{ (g) } H_i \text{ (h) } H_i \text{ (i) } H_i \text{ (j) } H_i \text{ (k) } H_i \text{ (l) } H
$$

※ ignoring products of small quantities

 $JII / JII \sim U I$ 

1

2

 $|\Delta I_{ij}| \ll C, \quad |h_i| \ll \Omega C, \quad |m_i| = O(10^{-7}), \quad \dot{m}_i \ll \Omega$ 

$$
m_1/\sigma_r + m_2 = \psi_2,
$$
  
\n
$$
m_2/\sigma_r - m_1 = -\psi_1,
$$
  
\n
$$
m_3 = \psi_3.
$$
  
\n
$$
\sigma_r \equiv (C - A) \Omega/A \quad \text{``Chandler wobble}
$$
  
\n
$$
\psi_1 = ( \Omega^2 \Delta I_{13} + \Omega \Delta I_{23} + \Omega h_1 + h_2 - L_2 ) / \Omega^2(C - A),
$$
  
\n
$$
\psi_2 = ( \Omega^2 \Delta I_{23} - \Omega \Delta I_{13} + \Omega h_2 - h_1 + L_1 ) / \Omega^2(C - A),
$$
  
\n
$$
\psi_3 = \left( - \Omega^2 \Delta I_{33} - \Omega h_3 + \Omega \int_0^t L_3 \, dt' \right) / \Omega^2 C,
$$
  
\n
$$
\Gamma(t) = e^{i\lambda_r t} \left( (m0) - i\sigma_r \int_0^t \psi(\tau) e^{-i\sigma_r \tau} d\tau \right)
$$
  
\n
$$
m_3 = \psi_3 + \text{constant},
$$
  
\n
$$
m_4 = \psi_3 + \text{constant},
$$
  
\n
$$
\Gamma(t) = m_1 + i m_2,
$$
  
\n
$$
\Gamma(t) = m_1 + i m_2,
$$
  
\n
$$
\Gamma(t) = \psi_1 + i\psi_2 = [\Omega^2 \Delta I - i\Omega \Delta I + \Omega h - i\hbar + i\Delta I)/\Omega^2(C - A)
$$

 $\Omega C(1+m_3)+\Omega\Delta I_{33}+h_3=\text{constant}.$  $\cdot$  absence of external torques (Li = 0)  $m_3 = (\omega_3 - \Omega)/\Omega$ 

$$
\Lambda = 2\pi/\omega_3 \quad A_0 = 2\pi/\Omega.
$$

$$
m_3 = -\Delta A / A_0
$$





※ European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (E.C.M.W.F.) ※ Bureau International de l'Heure (B.I.H.)

 $\widetilde{\chi}$  dimensionless atmospheric 'effective angular momentum'  $\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}$ 

$$
\widetilde{\chi} = \widetilde{\chi}_1 + i \widetilde{\chi}_2 = (\Omega \Delta I + h) / \Omega (C - A)
$$
  
\n
$$
m(t) = e^{i\sigma_r t} \left[ m(0) - i\sigma_r (1 + \sigma_r/\Omega) \int_0^t \widetilde{\chi}(\tau) e^{-i\sigma_r \tau} d\tau \right] - (\sigma_r/\Omega) \left[ \widetilde{\chi}(t) - e^{i\sigma_r t} \widetilde{\chi}(0) \right].
$$







Our evaluation of the atmospheric equatorial effective angular momentum functions from meteorological data over an interval corresponding to 3.6 Chandlerian periods indicates that **atmospheric excitation alone was sufficient to account for the observed polar motion over that interval. There is apparently no need to invoke substantial excitation either by the fluid core of the Earth, or movements in the mantle associated with earthquakes, of which, admittedly, there were no major instances during the interval covered by our study.** 



# The conclusion is unjustified !!



#### **Hypothetical excitation**

$$
\psi_x(t) = A_x \cos(\omega t + \theta_x) + N_x(t),
$$
  

$$
\psi_y(t) = A_y \cos(\omega t + \theta_y) + N_y(t).
$$

 $\triangleright$  Nx(t) and Ny(t) denote two computergenerated, zero-mean, Gaussian random series with standard deviations Sx and Sy.

ω=2π/365days

5-day intervals





 $m(t) = m(0)exp(i\sigma t) + \psi(t) * m_o(t).$ 













$$
\begin{bmatrix}\n\text{(4a)} & X_t = \frac{i \exp\left(-i\pi F_c T\right)}{2\sigma_c T} \left[ M_{t+T} + \left[1 - \exp\left(i\sigma_c T\right)\right] M_t - \exp\left(i\sigma_c T\right) M_{t-T} \right] \\
&- 2i\sigma_c T \exp\left[i\pi (F_c - 2f) T\right] \\
\hline\n1 + \left[1 - \exp\left(i\sigma_c T\right)\right] \exp\left(-2\pi i f T\right) - \exp\left[i\left(\sigma_c - 4\pi f\right) T\right]\n\end{bmatrix}
$$

<span id="page-21-0"></span>
$$
\int_{(5b)}^{(5a)} M_t = \frac{-i\sigma_c T \exp(i\pi F_c T)}{2} \left[ X_t + X_{t-T} \right] + \exp(i\sigma_c T)M_{t-T}
$$

$$
= -i\sigma_c T \exp(i\pi F_c T) \left[ 1 + \exp(-2\pi i f T) \right]
$$

$$
= 2(1 - \exp[i(\sigma_c - 2\pi f) T])
$$

#### Direct approach !



## Conclusions

• Atmospheric angular momentum fluctuations are of interest also to geophysicists and astronomers concerned with the structure and dynamics of the Earth, who must make allowances for the meteorological contribution to the variable rotation of the solid Earth when dealing with effects due to 'non-meteorological' processes.

• If we want to compare a geophysically observed excitation function with the excitation function deduced (via deconvolution) from the polar motion observation, we should do so directly (the "direct approach").

## Conclusions

- It would be useful for estimating  $X_t$  from Mt since the transfer function would then be the reciprocal of (4b) and thus would attenuate Nyquist frequency variations, a desirable feature if the Mt values are corrupted by noise.
- However, despite decades of effort by many investigators, the major excitations source(s) for the Chandler wobble still remain a mystery.

#### Thanks for your attention!