The sub-horizontal planation surface modelled by exogenous levelling and weathering acquired features of a structural surface the deformations of which (uplifts, normal faults and flexural bends) can be measured and evaluated as other planar structures. This fact, however, has been taken into considerations only insufficiently so far. Earlier compression phases of the Alpine tectogenesis have brought about thrusts faults, the later phase of extension has resulted in normal faults (Hanžl 1996).

We can find an example of an undeformed sub-horizontal levelled surface in the south-eastern flank of the Bohemian Massif. It is the B te -type of surface situated 500-600 m a.s.l., containing characteristic monadnocks and inselbergs. In the area between the river valleys of Oslava and Dyje, limited westerly by the Bíteš fault zone, this surface underwent deformation by antithetic normal faults. Thus it is defined as the Znojmo type and with inclination from 500 to 250 m a.s.l. constituted, in the Neogene, the outer part of the Carpathian foredeep. On the Carpathian-Lower Badenian divide this surface was flexured and inclined into the present form of a Carpathian forebulge. The flexure of the platform flank consists of individual steps separated by half-graben valleys stretching in the north-south direction which confirms a block character of the deformation (Hrádek 1995, 1997). The south-eastern flank of the Bohemian Massif which was exposed to intense brittle deformation on the border of the Variscan tectogenesis front showed, in the Alpine tectogenesis, an increased susceptibility to a renewal of older deformation system (Grygar et al. 1997).

Some structures, above all the anticlinal, have a long-term tendency to affect the surface morphology. It is not quite clear whether the matter is a protracted slow uplift being in connection with, e.g., the distribution of rather light granitic masses into their "roots" (Suk 1984) or whether we have to do with the consequence of an indirect, differentiated exogenous development. From this point of view it is not even clear whether there is an uplift mechanism of the marginally situated Sudetes mountains which is generally believed to be very young. No discontinuities in structural surfaces have been discovered here so far, however, in their surface morphology, with the exception of the Sudetic and perhaps Lugic Faults.

References

FRANKE W., DALLMEYER R. D. and WEBER K. 1995. Geodynamic evolution. *Pre-Permian Geology of Central and Eastern Europe*. Springer-Verlag. 579-593, Berlin--Heidelberg.

FRITZ H. and NEUBAUER F. 1995. Structure. Autochton. Moravo-Silesian Zone. *Pre-Permian geology of Central and Eastern Europe*. Springer-Verlag, 490-494. Berlin--Heidelberg.

GRYGAR R. et al. 1996. Morphotectonics and geophysical investigation in surroundings of Ivančice viaduct. In: KALÁB Z. (ed.) *Data analysis in seismology and engineering geophysics*, 212-224. *Institute of Geonics AS CR*, Ostrava-Poruba.

HANŽL P. 1996. *Geologický profil brněnským masivem mezi Čebínem a Skalním Mlýnem*. MS-Disertační práce, 73 pp., PF MU Brno a ČGÚ Brno.

HRÁDEK M. 1995. Valleys of the eastern margin of the Bohemian Massif: brief outline of their origin, age and natural hazards. *Acta montana IRSM AS CR, A*, 8(97), 29-41.

HRÁDEK M. 1997. Morfotektonika epikratonního křídla kolizních předhlubní na příkladu jihovýchodního okraje Českého masivu. In: *Sborník II. seminář České tektonické skupiny*, 29-30, Ostrava.

HRÁDEK M. 1997. Direct and indirect anthropogenic transformation of relief incurred by the construction of the Dukovany-Dalešice energy systém {in czech}. *Přírodověd. Sbor. Západomorav. Muz. Třebíč*, 25, 67.

IVAN A. 1982. Relief brněnské kotliny, *Studia geographica*, 80, 23-42.

OLLIER C. D. 1981. *Tectonics and landforms*. Longman, 324 pp. London and New York.

SUK M. et al. 1984. *Geological history of the territory of the Czech Socialist Republic*. 400 pp. ÚÚG Praha.

Theoretical Models of Magnetic Anisotropy to Strain Considering Triaxial Magnetic Particles

František HROUDA[1,2], Josef JEŽEK[2] and Stanislav SAIC[3]

[1] *AGICO Ltd., Brno, Czech Republic*
[2] *Faculty of Science, Praha, Czech Republic*
[3] *Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Czech Republic*

The movements of individual triaxial particles in the Jeffery (1922) model of strained rocks are much more complex than the movements of the spheroidal particles. However, the degree of anisotropy in the magnetic anisotropy to strain models considering multiparticle systems of triaxial magnetic particles shows very similar values to the models considering spheroidal particles. We explain this observation by assuming that even though the movements of individual particles are very different, the multiparticle system as a whole "averages out" in some way the movements and the resulting magnetic anisotropy tensor does not differ very much from the tensor of the model considering spheroids.