

## Re: Apollo Trivia Question

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2006-08/msg00172.html>

---

- *From:* "Brad Guth" <[ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 1 Aug 2006 14:33:18 -0700
- 

jonathan wrote:

<[hallerb@xxxxxxxx](mailto:hallerb@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1154380685.478648.112290@xx](mailto:news:1154380685.478648.112290@xx)

I think its funny when people talk of mars quarantine:) The multi month trip home should be enough to answer that question, no need for extended stay at a space station///

More likely they'll need straight jackets for the return trip not a quarantine.

They won't be able to answer the question of life on Mars.

On the way home they'll go nuts trying to figure it out and trying to reconcile their emotions from being responsible for such a Grand Scientific Failure.

I tend to agree with that anti-Mars mindset of yours, as for Mars being nothing but another spendy space-toilet that's anything but end-user friendly.

However, since we haven't bothered to establish the most ideal and relatively energy efficient LL-1 science platform, as such we still know next to nothing about the Earth/moon relationships and thereby zilch as to that of our vanishing magnetosphere. We don't even know of the voltage differential that exist between Earth and our moon, or of whatever's potentially alternating in polarity as our moon orbits about whatever's left of our magnetosphere.

Of course, our rad-hard Buzz Aldrin on C2C will soon enough set that almighty record straight, along with all of those missing Apollo-11 records. Fortunately for our NASA, Hoagland still thinks we've walked on that gamma and hard-X-ray lethal moon, rather than on some passive guano island that's xenon lamp illuminated.  
<http://www.coasttocoastam.com/shows/2006/07/31.html>

The Earth's Magnetic Field is Still Losing Energy / 7.5e12 MJ

## Re: Apollo Trivia Question

-0.05%/year

[http://www.creationresearch.org/crsq/articles/39/39\\_1/GeoMag.htm](http://www.creationresearch.org/crsq/articles/39/39_1/GeoMag.htm)

[http://www.creationresearch.org/cgi-bin/MasterPFP.cgi?doc=http://www.creationresearch.org/crsq/articles/39/39\\_1/G](http://www.creationresearch.org/cgi-bin/MasterPFP.cgi?doc=http://www.creationresearch.org/crsq/articles/39/39_1/G)

This paper closes a loophole in the case for a young earth based on the loss of energy from various parts of the earth's magnetic field. Using ambiguous 1967 data, evolutionists had claimed that energy gains in minor ("non-dipole") parts compensate for the energy loss from the main ("dipole") part. However, nobody seems to have checked that claim with newer, more accurate data. Using data from the International Geomagnetic Reference Field (IGRF) I show that from 1970 to 2000, the dipole part of the field steadily lost  $235 \pm 5$  billion megajoules of energy, while the non-dipole part gained only  $129 \pm 8$  billion megajoules. Over that 30-year period, the net loss of energy from all observable parts of the field was  $1.41 \pm 0.16$  %. At that rate, the field would lose half its energy every  $1465 \pm 166$  years. Combined with my 1990 theory explaining reversals of polarity during the Genesis Flood and intensity fluctuations after that, these new data support the creationist model: the field has rapidly and continuously lost energy ever since God created it about 6,000 years ago.

-

Try replacing "God" with seriously smart ETs and you've got yourself a working deal, along with rational accountability.

<http://www.sdsc.edu/GatherScatter/GSSummer95/raeder.html>

Simulating Earth's Magnetosphere on the Paragon

Joachim Raeder, Jean Berchem, and Maha Ashour-Abdalla, University of California, Los Angeles

Earth's magnetosphere is that region of space where the Earth's dipole-like magnetic field is confined by the solar wind, a tenuous, fast-flowing, and magnetized plasma stream coming from the sun. Because the solar wind is supersonic, a bow shock forms in front of the Earth, at a distance of approximately 15 RE (1 RE is 6,372 kilometers, or one Earth radius). The magnetosphere extends from the ionosphere about 100 kilometers above the Earth and is bounded by the magnetopause, which lies at about 10 RE on the Earth-Sun line; towards its flanks, it flares out to about 14 RE, and, beyond 20 RE behind the Earth, it becomes nearly cylindrical with a radius of 15-25 RE.

While the solar wind compresses the Earth's dipole on the sunward side, it also causes the Earth's magnetic field to be stretched out several hundred RE in the anti-sunward direction, thereby forming the geomagnetic tail. Most of the oncoming solar wind is deflected around the magnetosphere to form the "magnetosheath," the region between the bow shock and the magnetopause. However, a small fraction of the impinging energy of the solar wind enters the magnetosphere by various local processes. The energy is ultimately dissipated, mostly in the ionosphere.

-

## Re: Apollo Trivia Question

It's sufficiently clear that without a rotating core of such highly magnetic iron and having sufficient metallic elements within the crust would have excluded our having a viable magnetosphere, by which we certainly wouldn't have all that much of a remaining atmosphere, and obviously we'd be summarily irradiated from the solar, cosmic and lunar dosage by at least a thousand fold greater dosage, from which our frail human DNA couldn't survive.

Once upon a time Earth's atmosphere was 50+ bar, and of it's magnetosphere at the time was substantially greater. Today we're at something less than 1 bar, and even though it has become rather badly polluted with damn near everything including the kitchen sink, it's in the process of losing rather than gaining mass.

Solar winds that often vary from  $1e14$  to  $1e15$  Joules can at short periods of time exceed  $1e16$  Joules. Earth's protective magnetosphere of perhaps  $7.5e18$  Joules ( $1e19$  joules maximum) is reported by others as somewhat greater by way of using the rotational energy loss being worthy of  $6.33e19$  joules at 100% efficiency, that's otherwise having been well established as currently losing magnetic flux intensity at an accelerated rate of roughly better than 0.05% per year.

I'm estimating that's putting our magnetosphere half life at a very predictable threshold or critical point of no-return, whereas we either unavoidably start to die off or perhaps get saved by something of the interstellar ice-age cycle that's roughly transpiring every 105,000 years, that'll either reset our magnetosphere's clock or allowing some ET intelligent design improvements to our otherwise frail DNA, that which as is can only take so much radiation trauma without mutating in the wrong direction.

Life as we know it, of which the entire species of humans represents such an it'sy bitsy part of that life, and that's mostly as having been destructive at that, probably couldn't have ever existed without a robust atmosphere as would have been magnetosphere enhanced, any more so than a mostly water world could have managed so well without having involved a tidal generating moon. If all things being equal from a given starting point, except going without a magnetosphere and especially without a moon would have made such a wet and salty Earth into a rather tough place to live, if at all. However, if having been a sufficient ET terraforming wizard, whereas first things first, we'd have to either establish the magnetosphere prior to having incorporated such a gamma and hard-X-ray moon to deal with, or else we'd have to be damn happenstance lucky as all get out to have been given such a nifty one in a billion trillion of a do-everything planet to start with, and yet if that were the case, here we're still into doing everything imaginable in order to global pollute and warm it to death, with far less than 50% of those diatoms available for converting and/or storing the excess CO<sub>2</sub> (are we good at nailing mother Earth, or what?).

—

Brad Guth

Re: Apollo Trivia Question

Re: Apollo Trivia Question