The Impact of Plate Tectonics on Mountain Building in the Uttarakhand Himalaya

Aastha Singh

Department of Geography, School of Earth Sciences,
Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University (A Central University), Uttarakhand, India.

Abstract

The Uttarakhand Himalaya, a significant segment of the Himalayan range, presents a unique opportunity to study the interaction between tectonic plate movements and mountain-building processes. This research aims to analyze the role of tectonic convergence between the Indian and Eurasian plates, focusing on how these processes have shaped the region's geological features, particularly through uplift mechanisms, seismic activity, and resultant landforms. This paper synthesizes recent literature and integrates field studies from the Garhwal and Kumaun regions, particularly focusing on duplexing and extrusion tectonic models. Understanding these processes is vital for comprehending the region's geodynamics and evaluating the seismic hazards associated with tectonic activity in the Uttarakhand Himalaya.

Keywords: Uttarakhand Himalaya, plate tectonics, mountain building, duplexing model, seismic activity, geodynamics

INTRODUCTION

The Himalaya, known for being the highest and youngest mountain range in the world, results from the continuous northward movement of the Indian plate and its collision with the Eurasian plate. This collision, which has been ongoing for approximately 50 million years, has created a complex system of thrust faults and shear zones that accommodate tectonic stresses and drive mountain-building processes (Searle, 2010). In the Uttarakhand Himalaya, the Main Central Thrust (MCT) and South Tibetan Detachment (STD) are key structural features contributing to uplift, deformation, and seismicity (Valdiya, 1980). This research explores how tectonic mechanisms, particularly duplexing, play a crucial role in shaping the geomorphology and ongoing mountain-building processes in the region.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The development of the Himalayan orogen has been explained through two primary tectonic models: extrusion and duplexing. The extrusion model posits that mid-crustal material is exhumed and pushed to the surface between surface-breaching faults, typically involving a thrust fault at the base and a normal fault at the top (Beaumont et al., 2001). This mechanism is supported by evidence of large-scale slip along the South Tibetan Detachment (STD) system, which separates the high-grade Himalayan crystalline core from the overlying sedimentary rocks (Searle, 2010).

In contrast, the duplexing model involves the accretion of material from the underthrusting Indian plate, resulting in crustal thickening and uplift without the necessity of normal faulting at the surface (He et al., 2015). This model is supported by the progressive stacking of thrust slices from the Indian plate beneath the Himalayan orogen, as seen in the Uttarakhand region (Burchfiel & Royden, 1985). The duplexing model has gained significant traction, particularly with recent studies suggesting that the STD may act as a backthrust for much of its history, contributing to the tectonic wedging that drives uplift (Herman &Avouac, 2010). Both models have been applied to explain the evolution of the Uttarakhand Himalaya, with recent field data favoring the duplexing mechanism.

GEOLOGICAL SETTING OF THE UTTARAKHAND HIMALAYA

The Uttarakhand Himalaya is geologically characterized by a series of crustal-scale thrust systems, most notably the Main Central Thrust (MCT) and the South Tibetan Detachment (STD). These structures represent the primary tectonic boundaries responsible for the uplift and exhumation of the Greater Himalayan Sequence (GHS) and Lesser Himalayan Sequence (LHS) (Searle, 2010). The MCT marks the boundary between the Higher Himalaya and the Lesser Himalaya and has been the locus of significant tectonic activity during the ongoing India-Eurasia collision (Valdiya, 1980).

The duplexing model, which has been increasingly supported by recent field studies, suggests that the uplift of the Uttarakhand Himalaya is driven by the underplating of material from the Indian plate beneath the Himalayan orogen (He et al., 2015). This process leads to the thickening of the crust and the upward displacement of the Greater Himalayan Crystalline complex. The merging of the STD and MCT at depth, as observed in regions like the Garhwal Himalaya, supports this interpretation, with the Tila Shear Zone acting as a key structural feature that accommodates the tectonic stresses driving uplift (Grujic et al., 1996).

UPLIFT PROCESSES IN THE UTTARAKHAND HIMALAYA

The tectonic uplift of the Uttarakhand Himalaya is largely explained by the duplexing model. According to this model, crustal thickening occurs through the progressive stacking of thrust slices, resulting in significant vertical displacement. Recent GPS measurements have revealed that the Indian plate continues to converge with the Eurasian plate at a rate of approximately 5 cm per year, with much of this motion being accommodated by thrusting along the MCT (Bilham et al., 1997).

The duplexing model has been confirmed through studies of metamorphic gradients and thermochronology, which show that rocks in the Uttarakhand Himalaya have experienced rapid exhumation since the Miocene (Cottle et al., 2009). The uplift is further facilitated by tectonic wedging along the MCT and STD, which act in concert to bring deeply buried rocks to the surface. This process is most evident in regions like the Garhwal Himalaya, where field evidence suggests that the STD acts as a backthrust to the MCT during periods of heightened tectonic activity (Herman &Avouac, 2010).

SEISMIC ACTIVITY AND ITS ROLE IN MOUNTAIN BUILDING

Seismic activity in the Uttarakhand Himalaya is closely tied to tectonic movements along the MCT and STD. The region has experienced several significant earthquakes, including the 1991 Uttarkashi and 1999 Chamoli earthquakes, both of which were associated with movement along the MCT (Seeber & Armbruster, 1981). These seismic events are a manifestation of the ongoing tectonic stresses generated by the convergence of the Indian and Eurasian plates.

Seismicity plays a critical role in the mountain-building processes of the Uttarakhand Himalaya. The release of tectonic stress through earthquakes facilitates vertical displacement along thrust faults, contributing to the uplift of the region. Studies suggest that the accumulation of strain along the MCT and STD periodically leads to large earthquakes, which in turn drive crustal thickening and mountain growth (Bilham et al., 1997). This cyclical process of stress accumulation and release is a key factor in the region’s ongoing tectonic evolution.

CASE STUDIES: GARHWAL AND KUMAUN REGIONS

Garhwal Region

In the Garhwal Himalaya, the duplexing model is particularly prominent, as evidenced by field studies conducted along the Tila Shear Zone. This zone, which forms the southern continuation of the STD, plays a crucial role in accommodating crustal shortening and driving uplift. Geochronological data from this region indicate that the Greater Himalayan Crystalline complex has been rapidly exhumed since the Miocene, with tectonic wedging along the MCT and STD driving much of this uplift (Grujic et al., 1996).

The interaction between the MCT and STD in Garhwal leads to significant seismicity, with large earthquakes contributing to both vertical displacement and crustal thickening (He et al., 2015). The presence of the Tila Shear Zone, which acts as a backthrust to the MCT, further enhances the region's tectonic complexity, making Garhwal one of the most tectonically active regions in the Uttarakhand Himalaya (Cottle et al., 2009).

Kumaun Region

In the Kumaun region, tectonic activity is similarly driven by the duplexing mechanism, although the patterns of seismicity and exhumation differ slightly from those observed in Garhwal. The STD and MCT appear to merge at a shallower depth in Kumaun, resulting in more widespread deformation across the region. This tectonic interaction has led to the formation of steep topography and high exhumation rates, similar to those observed in Garhwal, although the seismic activity in Kumaun is somewhat more distributed (Hodges et al., 1996).

DISCUSSION

The duplexing model provides a comprehensive explanation for the tectonic processes driving mountain building in the Uttarakhand Himalaya. Unlike the extrusion model, which emphasizes surface-breaching faults, the duplexing model suggests that crustal thickening is achieved through the stacking of thrust slices from the Indian plate beneath the Himalayan orogen (Herman &Avouac, 2010). This process is consistent with field observations that indicate a close association between the MCT and STD, with the STD functioning as a backthrust to the MCT (He et al., 2015).

Recent GPS data and thermochronological studies support the duplexing model, showing that the Uttarakhand Himalaya is experiencing rapid uplift and exhumation due to tectonic wedging and crustal thickening (Bilham et al., 1997). Seismic activity further facilitates these processes, with large earthquakes contributing to vertical displacement along the MCT and STD. The duplexing model thus offers a robust framework for understanding the region's tectonic evolution and assessing the seismic hazards associated with ongoing tectonic activity.

CONCLUSION

The Uttarakhand Himalaya is a dynamic region shaped by the continuous convergence of the Indian and Eurasian tectonic plates. The duplexing model, which involves crustal thickening through the stacking of thrust slices, provides a robust framework for understanding the region's uplift and deformation. The interaction between the MCT and STD plays a crucial role in driving these processes, with seismic activity contributing to both vertical displacement and long-term mountain-building. The complex tectonic interactions observed in the Garhwal and Kumaun regions highlight the variability in uplift and seismicity, offering valuable insights into the region's geodynamic evolution.

Understanding these tectonic mechanisms is essential for assessing the seismic hazards faced by the Uttarakhand Himalaya. As tectonic stresses continue to accumulate along the MCT and STD, the region remains at significant risk of large seismic events, which could have profound implications for the local population and infrastructure. This research underscores the need for continued study of tectonic processes in the Himalaya to better predict future seismic activity and to inform disaster preparedness and mitigation strategies.

REFERENCES:

1. He, D., Webb, A. A. G., Larson, K. P., & Schmitt, A. K. (2015). Comparative analysis of extrusion and duplexing models in the formation of the Himalayas: A study of the South Tibet detachment at the Dadeldhura klippe. Tectonophysics, 667, 36-49.
2. Burchfiel, B. C., & Royden, L. H. (1985). The northward movement of southeastern Tibet. Science, 228(4700), 467-472.

3. Molnar, P., &Tapponnier, P. (1975). Tectonic developments in Asia during the Cenozoic: Consequences of continental collision. Science, 189(4201), 419-426.
4. Valdiya, K. S. (1980). The Dynamic Himalaya. Indian Academy of Sciences.
5. Beaumont, C., Jamieson, R. A., Nguyen, M. H., & Lee, B. (2001). Explaining Himalayan tectonics through the movement of a low-viscosity crustal channel linked to focused surface erosion. Nature, 414(6865), 738-742.
6. Hodges, K., Parrish, R., and Searle, M. (1996). The tectonic development of the central Annapurna Range in the Nepalese Himalayas. Geology, 24(12), 1075–1078.
7. Searle, M. P. (2010). Geological investigation of colliding continents: The Himalaya, Karakoram, and Tibet. Oxford University Press.
8. Thakur, V. C. (1992). Western Himalaya geology. Pergamon Press.
9. Robinson, D. M., Pearson, O. N., & Yin, A. (2006). Perspectives on the tectonics of the Himalaya and southern Tibet. Geological Society of America Bulletin, 118(7-8), 865-885.
10. Bilham, R., Larson, K. M., &Freymueller, J. (1997). Current convergence measurements across the Nepal Himalaya using GPS. Nature, 386(6620), 61-64.
11. Herman, F., &Avouac, J. P. (2010). Current insights and unresolved issues regarding mountain formation and exhumation processes. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 115(F3).
12. Yin, A. (2006). Tectonic evolution of the Himalayan orogen during the Cenozoic: Insights from variations in structural geometry, exhumation history, and sedimentation in the foreland. Earth-Science Reviews, 76(1-2), 1-131.
13. Grujic, D., Casey, M., Davidson, C., Hollister, L. S., Kuendig, R., Pavlis, T., & Schmid, S. M. (1996). Evidence of ductile extrusion in Bhutan's Higher Himalayan Crystalline based on quartz microfabrics. Tectonophysics, 260(1-3), 21-43.
14. Cottle, J. M., Larson, K. P., & Kellett, D. A. (2009). Timing of metamorphism and deformation in the central Himalaya, south Tibet: U-Pb zircon constraints. Tectonics, 28(6).
15. Seeber, L., & Armbruster, J. (1981). Major detachment earthquakes along the Himalayan arc: Implications for long-term forecasting. In Earthquake Prediction: An International Review (pp. 259-277).