Re: Space Policy Sucks, while there's Life on Venus

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005−01/1911.html

---

From: Brad Guth (*bradguth_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 01/23/05

Date: Sun, 23 Jan 2005 02:22:03 +0000 (UTC)

"Albedo shift from a core sample?

Not really. I believe I can relocate the research accomplished that was based upon what moonlight and earthshine had been accomplishing as of a thousand years ago, or something like that.

"Sirius isn't the closest star system, Alpha Centauri is. Based upon your logic we must be in orbit with AC as well.

I don't think so, however Alpha Centauri could certainly lay a gravitational role in forming and/or influencing the elliptical orbit we're taking in relationship to the massive Sirius star system.

"Sirius is a fairly large star that is close to us. THAT makes it the brightest star in the sky. Surely, you are aware of Rigel in the constellation Orion and how much bigger and brighter it is than Sirius?

Thanks for that feedback. However our motion with respect to other such other or bigger stars isn't playing along with the perceived 105,000 year timeline. Rigel bing a bluish−white supergiant is certainly a worthy contender, however being 900 light years away and 55,000 times the luminosity of our sun is more than 100 fold that of the Sirius gravity influence. Gravity goes by the square of the distance, thus being less than 1.1e−4 the gravity isn't exactly taking the point on this trek.

Rigel being so much brighter than Sirius represents that coming to within 0.1 light year would certain have manage to illuminate the environments of those diatoms. Thus size and brightness are not nearly as important as being as close as Sirius has been, like perhaps closer than 0.01 light year sort of make the case for Sirius.

Where's the insurmountable evidence that entirely eliminates Sirius?

Why are you objecting to Sirius?

"Sirius is 26 times as bright as our sun, according to Pat
Moore'sastronomy guide.

I believe "26 times" represents the human visual brightness and not the actual shifted spectrum energy that's offset by roughly 150 nm towards the UV spectrum, that which we hardly perceive squat in terms of lumens/watt or whatever visual basis, but diatoms absolutely thrive upon such near−UV energy, and nocturnals see just fine and dandy by such starlight illumination. Thus essentially the sun never goes down.

"Look I'm no Bush fan, but I fail to see how politics fits into the discussion.

Our country has self inflicted the entire world with at least several trillion dollars/euros worth of this 9/11 fiasco, of systematically dog−wagging, spinning and hyping the hype, of pushing so much disinformation−R−us, and of that which isn't over until our fat lady sings. You do realise he's planning upon gong nuclear over this global energy domination fiasco.

You simply can't blow off those sorts of dollars/euros and of whatever humanity that gets in the way at the same time without impacting the needs of science and physics research.

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

−−