

## Re: Bad News for 'Moon Hoax' Buffs

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/11142.html>

---

*From:* Brad Guth ([ieisbradguth\\_at\\_yahoo.com](mailto:ieisbradguth_at_yahoo.com))

*Date:* 03/21/05

Date: 21 Mar 2005 10:05:11 -0800

It seems that all that's being suggested about our lunar surface neatly fits into the classical yet entirely conditional laws of physics, all the way from Kodak film that's not only thermally and hard-X-ray insensitive but entirely insensitive as to recording the unfiltered near-UV and UV/a energy that's a good 256 fold greater than existing here upon Earth, to whatever it takes in order to sustain their perpetrated cold-war ruse/sting of the century. Thus whatever 'knowledge in = conditional law of physics out' remains as exactly as it's supposed to be, even though there's not an actual stitch worth of hard-science backing that up.

"bz; The rock is ALWAYS radiating photons. The amount depends on its temperature. After sunrise, as the rock reaches equilibrium under the new conditions, it will be radiating 1.4 kw/m<sup>2</sup> into space and absorbing 1.4 kw/m<sup>2</sup> from the sun.

In other words that my three remaining dyslexic brain cells can understand, said solar heated rock is semi-exposed above the meters deep clumping-moon-dirt, that which in of itself is highly insulative. Nearby a considerable surround of other semi-exposed dark basalt rocks, and the surrounding soil itself being mostly that of strewn basalt shards from countless meteorite impacts and from the ongoing collective process of absolutely anything and everything that comes along, that plus whatever the gravity assist of 1.623 m/s/s can attract since there's supposedly hardly any atmosphere that might otherwise have diverted and/or partially dissolved whatever stuff upon reentry. Thus for supposedly 3.5+ billions of years this moon of ours has been in 100% accumulation mode (minus a few megatonnes worth of displaced moon rock which landed mostly upon Earth), plus whatever volcanic deposits and, since this is an absolute cosmic morgue where absolutely none of that volcanic substance nor anything other has ever eroded and/or compacted due to the rather obvious lack of moisture, as well as hardly due to having such a slight factor of gravity.

Here's my second hot-rock lose cannon shot in the dark;  
If that partially exposed rock that's offering a good average square meter that's continuously receiving said solar influx of 1.4 kw per each and every second, and is associated with a mass of 7.87 tonnes of

## sci.physics: Re: Bad News for 'Moon Hoax' Buffs

total rock (say a little more than 2.5 m<sup>3</sup> of mostly basalt) that this rock that is roughly equal to a m<sup>3</sup> worth of iron is supposedly going to eventually become toasted to not more than 123°C throughout, and partially because of that 2.5 m<sup>3</sup> rock being so nicely insulated by the near vacuum and by all of the magic clumping–moon–dirt, that in order to increase that item by 100°C it's going to take:

$$.45 * 7.87e6 * 1e2 = 3.5415e8 \text{ joules}$$

$$3.5415e8 / 1.4e3 = 2.53e5 \text{ seconds} = 70.267 \text{ hrs or roughly } 2.928 \text{ days.}$$

Thus obviously there's sufficient hours within a given moon–day to fully heat the entire body of that partially exposed rock by an differential amount of 100°C, and then some. Therefore, if there were but a 300°C differential from night to day we're into roughly 8.8 Earth days worth of solar influx as to creating that 300°C amount of differential thermal shift. However, since most of said rock is nicely burried deep into that vacuum cash of magic clumping–moon–dirt and thus extremely well insulated, as such perhaps not all of the solar influx is lost by night. Of course, since there's never been an interactive instrument telling us squat worth of hard–science about the lunar surface (much less of what the core of any rock is like), and so much less of the sub–surface, chances are that the variables involved are going to be somewhat complex and thus extremely difficult as to continually speculate as based solely upon whatever highly conditional laws of physics are suggesting is the case.

Supposedly 'energy in = energy out' is what I believe is the case. However, that equation as being applied to the physical and atmospheric lunar environment is clearly somewhere outside the known box.

Of how much actual hard–science of stellar influx or even earthshine influx contributes is unknown.

Of how much of the residual influx of heated rock remains prior to sunrise remains unknown.

Of exactly how much of the lunar core heat has contributed is still another unknown.

Of how much other heat as contributed from other nearby surface–exposed rocks is unknown.

Of how much solar IR is reflected off the surface and other rocks on behalf of heating said rock in question is at least somewhat unknown but otherwise entirely unknown as to specific hard–science.

Of how much of the solar influx is converted into secondary/recoil photons of IR is unknown.

## sci.physics: Re: Bad News for 'Moon Hoax' Buffs

Even so much as for how long an exposed liter of water would have lasted if set upon said rock is unknown.

In fact, the hard-science of any volume of ice or water surviving upon the moon or even in space is still entirely unknown.

In fact, the secondary-recoil dosage of hard-X-rays/m<sup>2</sup> remains as entirely unknown.

In fact, the near surface atmosphere of heavy atmospheric atoms remains as unknown.

Since the best reported optical resolution of our moon is suggested as 80+ meter/pixel, and even SMART-1 at best 30 meters/pixel means there's really not a good method of independently telling much of anything about the surface environment of the moon.

Obviously data from orbiting missions has been better off than from terrestrial sources. Still the best resolution images from orbit being those of the Apollo missions, of which there's no question as to those being the real thing. However, it does little good having only what's filtered and thus moderated to death by whatever suits the NASA/Apollo mainstream status quo. Thus whatever hard-science as to the surface environment that we do have either cold-war sucks as dog-wagging perpetrations or, it's simply inadequate and/or entirely bogus from the very get-go, based almost entirely upon the best possible speculations from conditional laws of physics that suck wherever it's necessary in order to conform to the status quo.

Subjective postulations and whatever conjectures as based upon the known laws of physics and of the computer models as based upon remote readings is all that what we have of our moon. Thereby so darn little is actually known from hard-science about our own moon that other moons like those of Saturn are entirely outside the box of everything that's known about moons. Missions such as the more than decade postponed LUNAR-A have only added further evidence exclusions to deal with. Thus knowing what damn little we do of our own moon is more than reason enough to achieve a well documented AI/robotic fly-by-rocket lander as safely deploying instruments perhaps for the very first and only time upon our moon, with all of the essential instruments and even an energy efficient laser transponder as beacon and atmospheric spectrum tool is what's needed, along with my phonon detector and a dozen other invaluable instruments that'll share the hard-science truth about our moon. Of course that should have transpired decades ago, and guess what, it's still not happening and there's no honest plans of ever allowing such to happen.

For the ongoing benefit of others, and not that it matters to those without a stitch of remorse outside of whatever appeases their NASA/Apollo cold-war or bust God, within my spare dyslexic time I've slightly polished on my external 'gv-topics' page, and I'm working on

## sci.physics: Re: Bad News for 'Moon Hoax' Buffs

other pages as soon to be improved. As I learn more that can be independently supported by sufficient hard-science, I'll share that knowledge, which will likely include revisions and retractions of what I've offered thus far. Unfortunately, since I'm unfunded and on the usual 'need-to-know' bases with regard to anything that might rock a mainstream boat, this process is going to take many thousands of my lose cannon shots before the truth and nothing but the truth is going to be told. And I bet you thought big and fully loaded aircraft smashing into fully occupied tall buildings was as bad as it gets; think again.

Basic township that's situated upon Venus:

<http://guthvenus.tripod.com/gv-town.htm>

Basic LSE (Lunar Space Elevator):

<http://guthvenus.tripod.com/lunar-space-elevator.htm>

Other available topics by; Brad Guth / GASA-IEIS

<http://guthvenus.tripod.com/gv-topics.htm>