Re: Life on Venus is absolute hell, but doable

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005−02/0150.html

---

From: Brad Guth (*bradguth_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 02/01/05

Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 20:52:24 +0000 (UTC)

Thanks for your honest interest, even if it's a wee bit on the side of being critical. I hope this revised reply is somewhat more readable, as I do seem to have an ongoing dyslexic complication, not to mention having to deal with all of the favor returning on behalf of what the mainstream has been attempting to accomplish in spite of all the facts that I seem to be having more than my fair share of difficulty getting across.

josephus; "Do yu thnk life could survive in a a kiln?"

The latest generation of AI/robotic machines have become most certainly capable of surviving Venus, at least at full capacity while operating within 811°K has become an established fact, just as humans surviving quite nicely at 68 bar and upon 1% O2 and 99% H2 is fully established as being survivable, and I'm not even all that certain as to the temperature at which blood boils while at 90 bar.

Minature vacuum tube and essentially hard−wired circuitry is certainly good for 811°K, if not hotter. Electro−mechanicals of solenoids, motors and generators are somewhat off the shalf these days. I believe the elevated nighttime environment of Venus could be as slight as 600°K, and of extreme sothern/northern terratories even cooler, especially the Istar Terra that's offering a major zone elevated some 10+km.

Technically even life as we know it, as dumb and dumber and thereby as easily dumbfounded and snookered as we've become, even this daunting challenge can be accommodated by way of applied technology. However, why bother or much less risk physically setting an extremely spendy hot−foot upon Venus if suitable interactive surface probes can relay whatever without any chance of our DNA getting roasted?

Thus the answer has been a resounding YES as to machines as well as man surviving within a kiln. At least within an R−1024/m insulated reverse−kiln that's efficiently keeping the mostly conductive form of heat out, and of a reverse−kiln that's got access to unlimited energy and that fairly nifty ocean of mostly CO2 that's offering a perfectly good alternative for freon, except that you can efficiently utilize a single−pass process of compressing, heat−exchanging and evaporating

since there's no good reason as to recirculate the spent CO2 that's utilized for air−conditioning. Certainly the process of CO2−−>CO/O2 isn't going to represent any problem that I can think of. But, what's important is what do you think?

Those upcoming ESA/Russian missions to Venus need only to employ a new and improved radar imaging capability of obtaining 10 m/pixel from orbit, of which this much should have been easily doable. It would be somewhat nicer if the mission orbit was established a bit less elliptical so that the northern and southern territories are obtained at the 10 m/pixel, and it obviously would be even nicer yet if those pixels were of 16 bit instead of the Magellan 8 bit format. Their lander/probe(s) needs only as little as 1% of the internal energy demands of their previous probes, and there's certainly no technical reason as to why existing circuitry (miniature vacuum tube if need be) and energy source can't be configured as to sustain itself at 811°K. A relatively small balloon/craft by volume should carry their descending phase along for days before selectively deciding where to shoot for an actual landing. There's way more than sufficient nighttime illumination of the 400~450 nm spectrum that'll light up the nighttime season of Venus from starshine and earthshine, being just fine and dandy as for the sorts of nocturnal eyes and nightvision cameras, and/or of efficient radar imaging that doesn't need a pico lumen to see by. Aerodynamics has always been there for the taking, with 65+kg/m3 to boot, whereas an h2o2/c12h26 powered robotic airship like craft (possibly an IRRCE turboprop driven rigid airship) would offer an extremely energy efficient and thereby enable a controlled and entirely selective landing at the GUTH Venus interplanetary tarmac (how good is that?).

I would have liked to have seen a TRACE−II established at Venus L2. That way all sorts of perfectly good information can be efficiently obtained and relayed to/from whatever interactive surface instruments, possibly via laser transceiving (thus a quantum packet stream of 1e12 bps becomes doable) and then by way of our having to use the traditional inefficient microwave methods of sharing such data to/from Earth. Of course the TRACE−II team would be multi−tasking on behalf of continuing their mission of researching of our sun, except for having a better perspective than ever possible by the original TRACE instrument that's somewhat out−dated and about to go off−line due to old age.

Regards, Brad Guth / GASA−IEIS http://guthvenus.tripod.com/gv−topics.htm

"josephus" <dogbird@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:A0PLd.3426$Nn1.2723@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net

>
>
> *Brad Guth wrote:*
>
> *> > Good Christ almighty folks; if this sort of topic about the hot and*
> *> > nasty prospects of other life surviving upon Venus, if this isn't even*

> > sufficiently 'sci.skeptic' qualified, then what the heck is?
> >
> > Regards, Brad Guth / GASA−IEIS http://guthvenus.tripod.com/gv−topics.htm
> >
> >
> I doubt it though. None of our probes has lasted long enough to look
> around. Life may be more resilliant than a machine, but if the machine
> cant survive, there is little hope for life in that condition. sort of
> looking for life in the enviromental equivalent of a furnace. Do yu
> thnk life could survive in a a kiln? there are limits to everything
>
> Terraforming would be necessary, but noone know how it could be done and
> the current ideas would take 100000 years.