

Re: Life and Exoplanets (Was: Belief in God is NOT incompatible with science!!)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-02/msg00032.html>

- *From:* "Brad Guth" <ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 1 Feb 2006 23:21:12 -0800
-

Thanks for the mostly positive and otherwise informative feedback, starting off with your having answered a few items I'd previously mentioned, such as;

>> Trust me, "direct observation" doesn't mean diddly squat

>> to these naysay fools.

>I would not say that. Observation is a much better option than with

>trying to refine your estimated guess.

I happen to agree that the human perceptions as to whatever's observable beats most other arguments. However, most of these Usenet fools that reside upon their global warming hills are intellectually as well as biologically blind. Thus whatever you and I might have to share as to what we honestly perceive is worth knowing and doing something about means squat to most of these extremely mindset and otherwise highly mainstream brown-nosed fools that'll never be happy until Earth becomes flat again.

>I may be more open minded, but science is science.

How true that the regular laws of physics and of the subsequent science or rather the unusual lack of NASA/Apollo having any science to share that reinforces their claim, has in fact supported that we have NOT walked upon the moon, as well as those very same laws of physics and even the best available hard-science as to supporting what's observed as existing upon Venus that isn't looking as so natural, is otherwise looking every bit as though it's nearly as good as the science of observationology gets.

>> Even though myself and most any open minded individual (smart or not)

>Are you trying to tempt them? :-]

I'm always trying out my lose cannons upon anyone that so happens to be in my path or anywhere otherwise within range, thus tempting others into taking action has become the name of the game. Much like your life-pods going off to some forsaken planet that needs to become eventually pillaged and subsequently destroyed by way of our incest mutated human DNA, whereas this is tempting myself to be suggesting that we'd best be careful about what sort of worlds we intend to contaminate. After all, we wouldn't want to create a exohuman race of super Hitler's and the likes of born-again GW Bush monsters-R-us, as any thriving collective of such absolute fools upon some better world of vast energy resources greater than Earth (such as Venus).

>I think that everything that I have ever claimed has been studied to

>death long before I ever got here. So it is kind of a bitch to never

>be able to mention new concepts.

As you say, that most of what you've mentioned isn't all that new, just having been better thought about and put into a context that only a few of us can appreciate. I can give you all sorts of examples as to what

Re: Life and Exoplanets (Was: Belief in God is NOT incompatible with science!!)

this Usenet from hell considers as topic taboo/nondisclosure, and the list is actually quit long as to what's off-limits unless the context of such topics are sufficiently pro-Jewish. Life-pods of plants, animals, insects and human DNA simply is not within the high and almighty standards and accountability of their Koran.

Personally, I think that the rotten to the core DNA of such intellectual naysay bigots came from Mars, and the likes of Buddha, Muslims and of Cathar DNA came from Venus. At least I wish that I could somehow prove that was the case, as it would certainly have explained a great many things, that otherwise are not making any more sense than having to consider that all life upon Earth is terrestrial evolution limited.

Just doing the math of the supposed original population of two doubling in their numbers per 100 year cycle becomes obvious that intelligent humanity upon Earth simply hasn't been around for all that long. Certainly no long enough for local/terrestrial evolution to have mastered the necessary DNA/RNA code for the vast complexity of life upon this planet, meaning that a great deal of life as we know it has been imported.

>Getting us out there is a much more difficult plan.
It'll get much less difficult if transferring our DNA on beams of light, although micro pods of life could conceivably reach and survive the velocity of 0.1 c, therefore you and I don't have to physically go anywhere, other than perhaps our moon.

>my knowledge of pre-life planets is somewhat limited.
>They would need to have liquid water on the surface. The atmospheric
>pressure should be thick and be mostly nitrogen and carbon dioxide,
>where our introduced life forms would have to remove the carbon to
>store in the ground and to produce methane. The temperature should
>already be within the limits of Earth life due to the liquid water
>matter, but that has to be offset against pressure.
Not that human life is all that important (certainly is the least importance for Earth), as per thousand souls how many mega, giga or terratonnes worth of water are you talking about?

Why should water need to be flowing lose upon the surface? How about volcanic lava and mud flows?

Once upon a time, prior to Venus being traumatized, there may have been a good amount of surface water, although it currently has terratonnes of water stored within the upper atmosphere and of those thick clouds, and I believe it's extremely easy to get to.

>The star around this planet would also need to be considered along the
>line of how much radiation would reach the ground (no ozone layer
>here) and if the planet is tidally locked or not.
Venus gets a sufficient amount of near-UV and certainly an adequate amount of the visual spectrum that's below 650 nm, but otherwise there's hardly any of the solar IR influx that reaches the geothermally hot surface. Of the potentially harmful sorts of solar and cosmic radiation is far less than received here upon Earth, especially if we're talking about the Venus season of nighttime being downright influx dosage deficient, and therefore so much safer than Earth's average environment unless you happen to be living deep underground or within a submarine.

>And the last main factor I guess is to have continents, when most life
>suitable exoplanets should be water worlds. Not that you cannot seed a

Re: Life and Exoplanets (Was: Belief in God is NOT incompatible with science!!)

>water world, where it is just that making advanced technology and
>spaceships would be a lot more difficult.
Without a good resource of green/renewable energy you and your
continents haven't got squat to work with. With energy is key to where
all sorts of life becomes doable, and that's almost without regard to
whatever continents do or do not exist. However, Venus has both
factors of sufficiently high-rise continents of sufficient elevation,
plus having more spare/free and renewable energy than you or I can
shake a fist full of flaming sticks at. You name it, as in how many
KW, MW, GW or even TW would you like, and it's all squeaky clean
renewable at that.

>There is some flexibility here when Earth has gone through periods of
>a snowball world to a nice hot greenhouse. So there should be bacteria
>here suitable for most viable exoplanets.
I agree that being flexible is key to realizing that perhaps a very icy
proto-moon that was also quite salty is what delivered the vast bulk of
what made Earth into such a water world, that subsequently became the
new host to the sequestered life within that ice. Unfortunately, your
purely terrestrial "snowball" theory needs a little work before you
flush that one down the drain. Although, there's little question that
Earth was once upon a time nearly exactly like Venus, as in nearly as
hot and nasty and supposedly as having been surrounded by 54 bar worth
of an atmosphere that was a great deal like the existing atmosphere of
Venus. Too bad Venus didn't receive the benefits of what an icy
proto-moon could have managed to have significantly moderated the
situation.

>That I believe is all I know in terms of what would count as a
>suitable pre-life planet. And should I recall correctly then these
>series of TPF missions will include searches for this planet type
>mostly through the carbon dioxide and water vapour.
Guess what, Venus has plenty of accessible water for at least
thousands if not a million folks, and it certainly has more than it's
fair share of CO₂ that can be easily converted into CO/O₂. Remember
that there's been no shortage of green/renewable energy upon Venus,
whereas any ET worth his/her halfwit of salt shouldn't be without a
cold beer and that of an environmentally pressure cooked pizza.

>ET seeding Earth is one option, but we do not yet have any indication
>that this did happen.
The lack of evidence is in of itself evidence:
I believe the far better science has been deductively telling us all
along that we have no evidence indicating that ET seeding and/or of
their having transported significant life upon Earth didn't happen. At
least that's my positive and open mindset way of connecting the few
dots the best we can, especially considering the lack of any evidence
to the contrary.

>It would be nice if any race seeding a planet did leave behind a nice
>sign reading "Life here began out there", including a map to show
>exactly where. The big question is just where would they put such a
>sign to last such a long time?
Considering how short of geological as well as evolutionary timespan
that a sufficiently intelligent version of human has been able to
adequately fend for him/her self, I'd say we're looking at not much
further the declining cycle of the last ice-age as being one of the
best times of ETs seeding Earth with somewhat more substantial forms of
their best DNA that'll look pretty much as we do, and that's not to
mention our interstellar cycle of having been within 0.086 light year
of the Sirius Star system shouldn't be ignored unless you also intend
to ignore the 750,000 years worth of ice core science while you're at

Re: Life and Exoplanets (Was: Belief in God is NOT incompatible with science!!)

it.

Of such supposed proto-humans as having supposedly evolved enough intelligence beyond picking their own nose, whereas such their DNA and intelligence seemingly materialized pretty much well after the peak of last ice-age, as perhaps also a good time to have been arriving upon Earth for defective ETs serving out their banishment/incarceration. Of whatever transpired prior to the last ice age that was human like was at best ape DNA, except not nearly as smart nor therefore nearly as capable of surviving as modern day apes that don't seem to care all that much for ice, or otherwise for being the least bit cold isn't exactly their cup of tea.

Therefore ET assisted evolution (aka intelligent design) seems a bit more likely than not. At least I can't think of any viable arguments as to why the hell not.

Do you have any pre last ice-age examples of human intelligence, say 125,000~150,000 years ago as providing an exception to my argument that proves otherwise?

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image:Vostok-ice-core-petit.png>

Otherwise, how would our having survived just the last ice-age cycle have so extensively altered our DNA, plus having created the necessary leap in intelligence so significantly within such short order of 25,000~50,000 years?

Would you care to focus upon one given factor about Venus? Or, would you prefer clumping all of your existing naysay thoughts into one enormously insurmountable mindset that'll tend to keep your NASA certified textbook status quo about Venus as is?

-

Brad Guth

.