

Re: So how can we afford that ?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-09/msg00222.html>

- *From:* "Brad Guth" <ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Sep 2005 19:05:30 -0700
-

paris2; "So how can we afford that ?",
With somewhat better chosen words; I believe it's called MOS
disinformation-R-us infomercials. It's otherwise called the GW Bush
method of "so what's the difference" worth of artificial inflation via
arrogance as per diverting essential life and global environment
talents and resources, of essentially taking and/or if LLPOF need be
extracting by force from the poor and summarily giving to the already
rich. After all, there's not one red cent that actually goes into
space, instead it goes directly into someone's offshore tax-avoidance
bank account. Thus it's called LLPOF religious and social/political
greed, arrogance and bigotry on steroids, all transpiring without a
stitch of remorse.

Purely AI/robotic missions, such as to/from our moon or for
establishing the LSE-CM/ISS, and certainly the likes of accommodating
nearby Venus, isn't but 0.1% of what's being planned upon as we're
having to get raped and otherwise reamed out of us less fortunate and
all of the other less brown-nosed minions.

Since most anything about our moon and especially if pertaining Venus,
or for that matter of just about whatever's researched and authored by
little old me has become officially usenet off-limits (perhaps because
I tend to return the warm and fuzzy favor of topic/author stalking and
bashing), other than for my being on the official receiving end of
whatever mainstream flak and spermware that the good MI6/NSA folks of
usenet can manage to send my way, as in otherwise my topics are quite
taboo/nondisclosure or bust, in which case we still have access to
these official taboo/nondisclosure Apollo archives of their grand
ruse/sting of the century to admire:

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/resources/apollo/catalog/70mm/>

Whereas you can believe whatever's a Kodak moment as obtained from
orbit but, what the hell happened to the Kodak physics as to the lunar
albedo and natural color while supposedly EVA/moonsuit strolling about
upon the deck of a nicely clumping and thus great deal of surface
tension worth of cornmeal and portland cement composite that also
looked as though entirely xenon lamp illuminated?

I guess that I'm still absolutely dumbfounded as to why these highly
official orbit obtained images of our moon haven't been highly scanned

Re: So how can we afford that ?

and re-published in every science journal and textbook, especially the highest resolution of B&W frames and otherwise sharing those of depicting the perfectly natural color of the moon as nicely balanced or qualified by whatever other is artificial in frame or of having included mother Earth, as everything having been viewed from their nearby orbit which still isn't a technical requirement of even those being manned. Instead, we're continually shunned way from these originals and continually offered relatively low resolution formats of such extremely complex geological and meteor impacted moonscapes of what's otherwise an extremely dark surface albedo as having even darker amounts of strewn shards and of what subsequently looks like extensive areas offering meters deep moon-dirt as having been collecting into various low elevation pits or geological as well as large crater formed basins, and there's even the dark golden brownish/reddish coating of mostly iron, carbon and titanium composite dust wherever the surface has long been displaced from such a good number of whatever created those 100+km diameter sized impacts, that which many seem to be indicating as nearly 20 km deep. That's actually a relatively shallow impact that may have been due to whatever layers of ice taking up the bulk of impact energy, though still offering one freaking heck of a lot of vaporised and/or physically displaced basalt.

Megatonnes of moon rock resides upon Earth;

At least it's a whole lot easier to substantiate this statement as being true than not.

Even if you'd care to insist upon believing that our moon has always been exactly right here for all but the first billion years worth of the creation of Earth, then there's a whole lot of trouble in NASA's River City, and without any doubt their Pope likes boys best.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_craters_on_the_Moon

Of course there's been absolute loads of smaller than 100 km craters and certainly a great many that are much larger, whereas presumably those larger sorts would logically be somewhat older. However, if we simply took a highly conservative average of 20% the radius of whatever a given 100 km diameter sphere represents, whereas lo and behold there's roughly $1.466e13$ m³ of the moon that got pushed/deformed out of the way, though a good portion of such may have become vaporised and/or having physical amounts of moon stuff that obviously went somewhere, and if perhaps originally at 3.35 tonnes/m³ represents $4.9e13$ tonnes, or 49 teratonnes per each and every nasty 100 km crater. Obviously much of the displaced material that wasn't vaporised into becoming lunar atmosphere ended right back upon the moon. Although, if even 0.1% had managed to exit the lunar gravity influence, and that's not even including the mass of whatever icy or solid meteorite had to contribute, as such we're talking about nearly $0.5e11$ t that simply had to eventually go somewhere other (such as Earth), and what if merely 0.1% of that portion actually arrived upon the surface, as that's still a whopping though conservative $0.49e8$ t or 49 megatonnes worth of lunar remains as having been deposited upon Earth per each of those 100 km craters upon the moon.

Re: So how can we afford that ?

Re: So how can we afford that ?

I wonder how many 99~125 km class of craters there actually are?

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_craters_on_the_Moon

BTW; according to this calculator

<http://grapevine.abe.msstate.edu/~fto/tools/vol/partsphere.html>

And just for the sake of using round numbers, whereas I'm clearly outside the box by way of having to imply a 20% radius depression worth of a 200 km sphere, that which might help us to simulate the sorts of volumetric impression that's associated with a typically 5:1 ratio of diameter to depth of what's considered as a 100+km moon crater, as such this volume becomes worth $1.173e14$ m³

Therefore $1.173e14 \times 3.35t = 3.93e14$ tonnes worth of the lunar surface that got reshaped, vaporised and/or entirely displaced away from the scene of the crime by way of what a meteor that must have been a good 10 km worth of an icy coated diameter, thus added it's volume of $5.236e11$ m³ as having impacted the moon as whatever velocity you'd care to imagine.

Good grief folks; not to even mention the sizable meteor itself, that's certainly offering a rather serious bunch of moon-rock that has got to already be situated right here upon Earth, whereas as slight as 0.1% arriving towards the vicinity of our much thicker atmosphere of the time and, having obviously surrendered to the gravity grip of mother Earth is suggesting an influx of $0.173e12t$ or 173 gigatonnes, and if only 0.1% of that managed to survive reentry in order to have landed safely, in which case we're talking about receiving a mostly basalt deposit of 173 megatonnes of moon rock per 100+km crater. Fortunately for the moon, a good number of the meteors were of a fairly low density, as well as for our moon itself may have been quite nicely ice coated upon it's arrival so as to have kept such impacts somewhat moderated down to a dull roar, thus relatively shallow bedrock craters instead of getting seriously hammered.

Even if an icy proto-moon of 4000 km didn't manage to bounce itself off Earth in the process of arriving to save the otherwise hot and nasty day, by way of icing down and DNA/RNA seeding the once upon a time molten Earth that was perhaps at the time a bit Venus like, chances are the secondary impacts of what could have been a horrific Oort to Oort cloud exchange plus our relatively nearby Kuiper belt gauntlet worth of smaller icy orbs as having impacted our moon, is just as likely to have created those shallow craters and thus indirectly deposited sufficient amounts of all of that ice along with whatever became available as volumes of lunar basalt.

As bad as I usually am with math, I came up with better than 84 of those 99~125 km class of impact craters (excluding a few extremely shallow craters and of craters within craters, although perhaps of whatever's situated on the opposite side certainly shouldn't be discounted), thus of the relatively midlife-crisis of lunar history having been getting itself pulverised has potentially contributed into

Re: So how can we afford that ?

Re: So how can we afford that ?

our environment at the very least $84 * 173e6t = 14.5e9$ tonnes of mostly basalt that's somewhere upon and/or having been assimilated into mother Earth after every 100~110 thousand year reset/cycle of terrestrial ice having re-excavated and thus reshaped the surface of Earth. Remember that if it weren't for those nifty ice-age cycles, the ongoing erosion plus whatever cosmic influx of solids and perhaps a slight global shrinkage factor would have the livable dry portion of this terraformed planet down to 10%. As it is, we're surviving on perhaps 15% of what's sufficiently dry but not too dry, nor too damn cold, too flooded/swamp like or otherwise too high of altitude to count. So, unless our DNA/RNA mutates into reverting our physiology into having gills, chances are that it's going to get real crowded and testy, especially without an affordable reserve of geological/fossil fuel to spare.

~

Life upon Venus, Township w/Bridge and ET/UFO Park-n-Ride Tarmac:

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

The Russian/China LSE-CM/ISS (Lunar Space Elevator)

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

Venus ETs, plus the updated sub-topics; Brad Guth / GASA-IEIS

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

War is war, thus "in war there are no rules" – In fact, war has been the very reason of having to deal with the likes of others that haven't been playing by whatever rules, such as GW Bush.

.

• **References:**

◆ ***So how can we afford that ?***

◇ *From:* paris2012

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Could Falcon 9 compete with the Stick?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Could Falcon 9 compete with the Stick?***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: So how can we afford that ?***
- Next by thread: ***Whose decided Cassini's flight path?***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***