

# Re: Solar Shell

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-01/msg00839.html>

---

- *From:* "Williamknowsbest" <[William.Mook@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:William.Mook@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 23 Jan 2007 10:21:16 -0800
- 

scottlowtherATixDOTnetcomDOTcom wrote:

Williamknowsbest wrote:

There is one detail that's pretty well known-- the Sun is gawdawful big! So, impressing a few cubic kilometers with patterned light doesn't seem like such a big deal.

Or even useful.

A dense hydrogen rich plasma is a nonlinear optical environment. Such an environment may be ideally suited to be an optical computing platform. With laser induced fast fusion powered light sources, such platforms may be established and maintained in such a plasma by controlled fusion events formed by the operation of the platform itself. The use of optical tweezers have been demonstrated in plasmas in the lab. This might be used by the platform described to manipulate the plasma environment. The use of optical molasses have been demonstrated in plasmas in the lab. This might be used by the platform described to cool and structure the plasma environment. These are all reasonable research goals directed toward making use of the solar environment.

The existence of the cotton gin flies in the face of your remark (which you removed) that no technology has ever existed that has not been turned into a weapon or weaponized.

But the second two are clearly and obviously bad examples on your part. The ability to quickly engineer and build bridges has long been a staple of warfare.

I challenge you to show me a weaponized bridge.

Re: Solar Shell

<http://www.militaryfactory.com/armor/imgs/av1b.jpg>

How does it kill people exactly?

Athletic  
shoe design has had some role in designing combat boots.

I challenge you to show me a weaponized Nike shoe.

[http://www.militarykit.com/images/products\\_full/footwear\\_lowa\\_combat\\_boot\\_gtx.jpg](http://www.militarykit.com/images/products_full/footwear_lowa_combat_boot_gtx.jpg)

I didn't ask to be shown a combat boot made by Nike. I asked you to show me a weaponized running shoe. Sorry for any confusion. You are showing me here not a running shoe or athletic shoe but a combat boot.

Even so, how does this boot kill people exactly?

Same technology.

No its not. This isn't designed for marathon running.

It's much easier  
to break a rock apart than it is to carve it into a little elephant.

That's a rock. Not the sun. The sun is more like a candle.  
It's much easier to blow a candle out than make it explode.

Please refer to what it takes for a star to go Supernova. It ain't  
easy

Please refer to what it takes to surgically repair a human brain. And  
what it takes to bash said brains out with a rock.

That's how rocks and brains work. Not the sun. As I said, it's easier  
to blow a candle out than to make it into a bomb. Oh, you can take the  
wax in a candle, grind it to a powder, and mix it with an oxidizer and

Re: Solar Shell

## Re: Solar Shell

then add the right detonator, and get a dandy bomb! But that's a lot harder than lighting the candle, and far far harder than blowing it out.

Similar for the sun. Lots of dwarf stars like the sun are easy to light. Not so many blow up. With structured blasts the sun can be made to blow off its metals, and can be made to break into pieces that would dramatically reduce its output. It would take more effort than any of these other projects to tune the ejection events with compression events to cause the sun to detonate. – and even then, the detonation wouldn't be complete – not that it would matter to any civilization orbiting it – since a partial detonation would be bad.

But we should be clear about the reality of the situation. If my technology works as advertised, it's clearly easiest to pull stuff out of the sun compared to controlling the ejection across the whole sun to cause it to spin. It's plainly easier to get it to spin than break apart. It's obviously easier to get it to break apart than rapidly burn. It's clear that such rapid burns for dwarf stars like the sun cannot go to completion without being restarted at some point.

No, for tiny stars like the sun, and its sub-parts if they are ever made, it's far easier to reduce their output than increase it, and very hard to cause a complete conversion of hydrogen in the sun explosively.

If you have the technology to actually carve up the sun into a group of smaller, separate stars, you will have already long since developed the tech to just plain destroy the star.

You say that based on models inappropriately applied. Rocks, rocks smashed into someone's head. I know it seems clear to you –but your apparent knowing is not arrived at through critical thinking, but through prejudice.

Consider what is really going on for a second. I am talking about introducing self-replicating plasma structures that produce controlled ejection plumes to gather and shape materials for human use that are presently located in the sun.

Now consider;

A single ejection plume can extract material from the sun at very high rates.

A single plume is easier than multiple ejection plumes being coordinated. Multiple ejection plumes can construct huge objects around the sun, like the shell we're discussing.

Multiple plumes are easier than using relativistic ejection plumes

Re: Solar Shell

## Re: Solar Shell

directed tangentially to the solar surface which are needed to cause the sun to spin.

Multiple relativistic plumes are easier than using variable relativistic ejection plumes that vary in direction to the solar surface to cause the sun to break up in a controlled way as it spins.

Multiple relativistic plumes that vary are easier than using highly variable relativistic ejection plumes very precisely coordinated to produce spherical compression waves that cause detonation of a portion of the solar fuel – incidentally wiping out the self replicating plasmas that sustains it.

Precise spherical compression waves – that are self limiting in objects the size of the sun – are easier than precisely colliding and configuring divided masses in controlled ways to obtain larger yields than are possible with precise spherical compression

So, clearly, while it might one day be possible to use these systems in warfare, if they are ever developed, the weaponized version of this technology is several steps removed from its commercial version – and likely will never be developed by humanity unless there is a pressing need for it.

Success  
along  
the  
lines  
I  
envision  
totally  
outclasses  
anything  
else  
humanity  
could  
do  
prior  
to  
success.  
And  
very  
quickly  
too.  
The  
ability  
to  
eject  
from  
the

Re: Solar Shell

sun  
in  
a  
controlled  
way,  
planetary  
system  
sized  
masses  
of  
raw  
material  
and  
shape  
and  
form  
them  
into  
operating  
finished  
products  
by  
scattering  
structured  
photons  
off  
them  
–  
is  
just  
mind–boggling.

Indeed.  
And  
imagine  
the  
fun  
one  
could  
have  
hacking  
into  
the  
control  
computers  
and  
making  
the  
system  
go

Re: Solar Shell

nova  
rather  
than  
just  
calving  
off  
calmly.

Who would  
do that and  
what would  
be their  
motivation?  
Especially  
since  
the perps  
would get  
killed in the  
process.

Ever hear of a suicide  
bomber?

Yes. This is germaine how?

Wow. Just... wow. The fact that you can't figure that out...  
says much.

The fact you can't figure out why I asked the question says equally  
much.

Yes... that you are monstrously ignorant of human motivations.

You are ignorant of how we have been kept safe from nuclear  
annihilation for over 50 years.

For fuck's sake, Bill. Take  
things to a ridiculous  
extreme: imagine  
giving a package to every  
human on Earth today.  
Inside the package was  
a vial of "Instant Extinction"

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

brand super-Ebola,  
genetically modified  
to wipe out humanity. Also  
included in the package was  
\*very\* clearly  
written and recorded verbal  
instructions: you push the  
red button, the  
virus is released. You push  
the green button, the virus is  
incinerated  
and a hundred-dollar bill  
pops out. Do you honestly  
believe that  
\*nobody\* would push the  
red button?

Inappropriate comparison. – give the box to  
10 top leaders who took  
the threat seriously and and you would have  
a more realistic response.

Incorrect.

Absolutely correct, you don't get to come to the control room without  
an invitation. Others must deal with security. Ever try to get into  
the control room of a nuclear power plant?

You don;t get to enter a cockpit without an invite, either... yet a  
group of people whose motives you couldn't possibly comprehend managed  
to do it a few years back.

Inappropriate comparison. There are tens of thousands of commercial  
aircraft flying billions of people around the world everyvyear for the  
past quarter century at least. Manifestly not what I'm proposing. I'm  
proposing a single control room managing a single ejection plume  
produced in the sun. Even my comparison to nuclear power plants is not  
truly appropriate. As there are 101 nuclear plants operating in the  
US.

No, a more appropriate comparison is a nuclear power plant control  
room, or entry into the PANTEX plant in Texas

<http://www.pantex.com/issm/index.html>

I would have security on par with this, with similar successful

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

results.

This control system will be

at least as secure as that.

By the time mankind can subdivide the sun, our population will probably be measurable in trillions.

Our population will never exceed 12 billion on Earth without off-world support.

Ummm... who said "on Earth," Bill?

I did.

Please do try to keep up with your betters.

When I meet them, I do.

Maybe quadrillions. So there will be vast numbers of people spread to hell and gone from here to Omicron Persei 8, all of whom you will need to control and prevent from tinkering with your little construction project.

Actually, if this idea works as expected, this could happen in your lifetime.

Riiiiight.

I see you have formulated a well-reasoned cogent response! lol. My betters indeed! haha..

(ever hear of the "Human extinction Movement?"),

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

No.

Then you really need to research your fellow man for a while. We ain't exactly quite right in the head as a species.

The rantings of lunatics don't interest me! lol.

Your own writings don't interest you?

Indeed they do. QED

(Wow, that was easy)

hahaha... ayup! lol.

or that an apocolypse would help bring the Second Coming of Jesus or the Hidden Imam or Big Bird or whatever. And there is more than a share of people who are just plain evil or nuts.

True. There are causes for that and those will be addressed as we advance as a species.

Sure. Genetic engineering will make a better breed of ideologically pure super-slave ready to serve their Draka overlords.

Actually, cross-breed vigor works in humans too.

ZOOM! And the point goes right over Bill's head.

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

No, yours.

Oh, I was thinking more along the lines of Ferengi

No doubt.

You're the star-trek fan aren't you?

Yes, and? That's hardly  
stopped mobs from making  
such demands before.  
or even today. A lot of  
people actually want to turn  
a lot of power  
over to the UN, \*despite\*  
the fact that it's run by  
incompetent  
criminals.

A lot? I don't think so.

Once again: do some research.

Most of humanity doesn't trust their mayor, let alone the UN.

When did "lots" become synonymous with "most?"

Because what most people do is what determines the response of society.

If, say, one million  
people wanted to kill \*you,\* it'd be fair to say that "lots" of people  
wanted to kill you. But one million people compared to the population  
of Earth, or even the US, is not "most."

That's true. But you are raising all these examples as if they  
actually mean something to what I'm proposing and you haven't shown a  
connection.

Re: Solar Shell

## Re: Solar Shell

If I fly a solar sample return mission using the technology described I don't see anyone objecting to it or opposing it if properly presented and managed. There was none for the comet return mission.

Once the ejection plume is operational on the sun, I don't see anyone objecting to the commercial use of returned samples (if any) after the science is done.

And, once samples are returned, I don't see any objections occurring as the rate is quietly increased. In fact, with the right PR campaign being hailed as a hero. After all, increased use of strategic materials along with energy allows expansion of industry to occur cleanly, and safely. Profits earned by the mining companies who process and market the increasing flow of metals allow them to shut down mines and reclaim them to a high degree, and muster out with very good pension all their workers, and send to college all the kids of all the workers to train them in other professions.

Actually, I think I know the theme song I'll use for the campaign...

Here Comes The Sun  
(George Harrison)

Here comes the sun, here comes the sun  
And I say it's all right  
Little darlin' it's been a long cold lonely winter  
Little darlin' it feels like years since it's been here  
Here comes the sun, here comes the sun  
And I say it's all right  
Little darlin' the smiles returning to their faces  
Little darlin' it seems like years since it's been here  
Here comes the sun, here comes the sun  
And I say it's all right  
Sun, sun, sun, here it comes  
Sun, sun, sun, here it comes  
Sun, sun, sun, here it comes  
Sun, sun, sun, here it comes  
Sun, sun, sun, here it comes  
Little darlin' I feel the ice is slowly meltin'  
Little darlin' it seems like years since it's been clear  
Here come the sun, here comes the sun  
And I say it's all right  
Here come the sun, here comes the sun  
It's all right, it's all right

Re: Solar Shell

"Holy shit, they're fucking with the sun" will be one hell of a motivator.

Depends on the details of how its done.

Please. There are loonies who believe that the Galileo mission to Jupiter was a secret NASA project to drop a nuke into Jupiter and casue it to turn into a second sun.

Really? References?

Listen to the Art Bell show.

Why?

Or do a \*very\* basic Google search, and you'll turn up nuts like this:  
<http://www.cyberspaceorbit.com/JUPFULLx.htm>  
"7/30/03: The author believes the nuclear events reported here to be very unlikely and only remotely possible, but just as an asteroid impact with earth is remotely possible (and widely researched and reported on), the Jupiter impact issue deserves exposure also, because there is compelling evidence to suggest the feasibility of at least a temporary Jupiter ignition. Given the potential consequences of this, serious research is warranted."

How's that working out for him as a career choice? lol.

The only thing you have succeeded in proving is that there are some troubled people in the world. You have not succeeded in demonstrating why I should be concerned with them or how their existence adversely affects my project. You say very surely and loudly that people will stop me, will object, will kill me, whatever. You have failed to demonstrate that is the case. Fact is, I can see rather clearly how it will all go, providing of course the technology can be made to work as advertised. Which is the REAL show stopper.

but enough, in their tiny little minds, to kill everyone on the planet.

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

That was a miscalculation

No, it was a crazy-ass \*lie.\* A \*knife\* is capable of killign every human on the planet... at least in a weirdass hypothetical world where everyone line sup for it.

Like they did for Reverend Jim Jones. so what?

Same bullcrap applied to the RTG issue. But people \*believe\* that crap.

Yes, lots of troubled people exist in this world. You have yet to show me why I should be concerned with them or take them into account in any of my thoughts or planning for this. As I said, I see very clearly how this would proceed if the technology can be made to work, and there are no showstoppers politically – despite the existence of trouled folk who have done stupid things.

There are people who think that  
Apollo was a hoax,

They are crazy.

They exist.

I agree. That doesn't mean they'll impact the proposed project here at all.

that the Holocaust didn't happen,

Equally so.

They exist. In annoyingly large numbers.

Fuck 'em. Whether they believe the holocaust happened or not has nothing to do with what I'm discussing here. You have yet to show a clear compelling connection.

Re: Solar Shell

13

Re: Solar Shell

Indicator of the abject failure of the Democratic party to lead the nation effectively. Where are the likes of Tilden and Cleveland when you need them?

Buried. Typically about 6 feet down.

I didn't ask where Tilden's or Cleveland's bodies are today – I asked where the likes of Tilden and Cleveland are when you need them?

They controlled the party during the Gilded Age of massive expansion of US industry, making of the US a world power where previously it was only a regional power.

The national vote was very evenly balanced in the 1880s. Though Republicans continued to control the White House until 1884, the Democrats remained competitive. Very similar to the situation facing us today. The party at that time was dominated by conservative pro-business Bourbon Democrats led by Samuel J. Tilden and Grover Cleveland, they had a solid base in the South and great strength in the rural lower Midwestern United States. The very base that has eroded in modern times giving ascendancy to the Republicans.

They controlled the House of Representatives for most of that period. In the election of 1884, Grover Cleveland, the reforming Democratic Governor of New York, won the Presidency. He was defeated in the election of 1888 but was re-elected in 1892. Cleveland was the leader of the conservative Bourbon Democrats who represented mercantile, banking and railroad interests, opposed imperialism and overseas expansion, fought for the gold standard, opposed bimetallism, and crusaded against corruption and high taxes and tariffs. The Bourbon Democrats were overthrown by William Jennings Bryan in 1896.

I'd like to see a return to the gold standard and the end of government imperialism the rise of mercantile interests and a more just world where resources are abundantly produced by business and shared by all in a free and fair global market.

'fucking with the sun' would be a mischaracterization. 'a minor structured ejection event smaller than 99.999% of all ejecta produced by the sun but due to the sun's huge size, will deliver all the world's need for metals, whilst eliminating the need to harm the earth with

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

dangerous and dirty mines –

Asteroid mining would be vastly easier and incredibly less insane.

Depends on the technical details, and asteroids are covered by the OST.

So is the sun.

I understand your position. Please understand mine.

No! haha.. Because if the Sun were covered by the treaty then resources derived from the sun would be covered by the treaty. Sunlight is a resource derived from the sun. It is used commercially and individually every day by every one of us. Its use is not regulated by the terms of the treaty, therefore sunlight isn't covered by the treaty. If that resource from the sun isn't covered by the treaty, why would any other resource from the sun be covered by the treaty? Anyone holding to your position would have to bring a suit against me in court, show why they are the appropriate party to bring that suit, then, and only then answer this question (and others)

Fact is, once the sample return mission was done, the rates of sample recovery would quietly be raised to commercial levels. No one would need know what the heck was happening on a tiny little plume 150 million miles from here.

Someone somewhere would have to be motivated to assert that the treaty applied. And I wouldn't give them that motivation. The mere continuation and increasing of sample return rates wouldn't provide it.

Then such an assertion would have to be backed by legal action, because I sure as hell wouldn't accede to a mere assertion.

Once a suit was filed I would then ask the complaining party to show why they were the ones to bring the action, why I had to answer to them and what authority they had so forth – before they even got to argue their case –

Meanwhile, I would put together a PR campaign detailing the benefits I provide to humanity and the market, and question the rights of some bureaucrat to tortuously interfere with my business..

Privately I would get to the bottom of what is motivating this action on a political level – and correct that wherever possible to avoid embarrassment of them losing a case against me..

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

In short, I wouldn't make it easy for anyone, if it should come to that, and I would avoid it anyway, since all your objections amount to a lot of pointless handwringing over nothing.

..

Governments most commonly use the power of eminent domain when the acquisition of real property is necessary for the completion of public projects such as roads, military installations, or public buildings.

Or shopping malls.

Kelo v. New London – the Supreme Court decided that a few hold-outs could not stand in the way of 'progress'

There are far more cases than just that one.

This one is germane to what you're talking about and shows rather clearly that no one could easily bring an eminent domain case against a structure that existed on and inside the sun. And if I owned the damned thing, I sure as hell wouldn't make it easy for anyone to bring that case – and I sure as hell ain't gonna worry about the possibility of that happening or let it stop me from moving forward if I can.

Since the sun is not in anyone's jurisdiction, this is not going to happen.

You'll suddenly find that you are in somebodies jurisdiction.

Who's? Who would claim the sun?

Every jackass with a bureaucracy and lawyers.

What is the legal precedent? You can't stop any jackass from bringing a lawsuit against you for ANY reason. Does it make sense to worry about all those jackasses? HELL NO! It does make sense to proceed in a

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

reasonable manner to to the best you can with the best technology available and not worry about what idiots might do someday. sheez.

What is the reason? And what legal precedent would they cite?

Heck,  
what do you think would happen if asteroid mining were to begin?

Asteroids are a celestial body under the terms of the OST – so those rules would apply. The SUN is not a celestial body under the OST...

The phrase used repeatedly in the OST is "the Moon and other celestial bodies." This covers asteroids, planets, comets, the sun.

Article 11 paragraph 6,7 and 8 of the treaty speaks about ownership and disposition of natural resources that may be discovered on the moon.

Principle I in the Remote Sensing Annex of the treaty speaks about sensing the natural resources on Earth from space. Principle IV same thing.

Appendix E, talking about the special needs of developing nations, calls for in its Annex, in Paragraph 5 speaks of allocating financial and technical resources in nations where space faring nations have operating centers.

– it

isn't even mentioned – and is not covered. If it were covered, then any product imported to earth from the sun – i.e. SUNLIGHT – would have to be imported under the terms of the treaty.

Don;t give them ideas.

I'm not. I'm stating a legal position that a mining interest who economically recovered pieces of the sun would take. Its up to any adversary to make their argument. I'm merely stating my position where I to own such an asset and intellectual property. in fact that forms the basis of my later arguments should the earlier ones fail.

Re: Solar Shell

## Re: Solar Shell

But the early argument is a sound one. Solar powersats are permitted by the treaty – because they harvest sunlight in space. Clearly a resource from the sun. The use of solar batteries on satellites is permitted under the treaty. Clearly, any use of solar resources is not covered by the treaty, therefore I would argue that the treaty doesn't include the Sun, or any other star, as a celestial object under the terms of the treaty.

But say despite this argument, that you are right and the right to bring a lawsuit against my solar operations is allowed by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Alright, so you can bring a lawsuit, and you can interfere with my business, and you the rules that were clearly written for mining the moon somehow apply, FINE, what is it that I own on the sun exactly that you want me to hand over since all I have is the ability to create transient controlled switching in nonlinear plasma with light? (note I would have a number of patents on the technique and IP related, and copyrights on software and such)

Nope, it wouldn't be easy for anyone arguing along the lines you propose – and anyone who wanted to have me give them a pie of the sun I controlled on the sun, would have to show what it was exactly I was to hand over – because I wouldn't hand over the IP. Hell the plasma that the structured laser pattern is made in changes from moment to moment. So what are they talking about? THEY brought the suit, if they don't know what they want or can't defend it, then that's their problem not mine.

And if they tried to argue that I had to turn over the IP and software – they'd have to start at the beginning all over again. Who are they and what right do they have to tell me what to do with my software and IP?

Sunlight has been imported to Earth for billions of years unnumbered by the treaty and humanity has made use of sunlight its entire tenure on Earth without reference to this treaty. Therefore, the products of the sun, and the body of the sun itself is not a celestial body covered under the terms of the OST.

Are asteroids covered? If so, then that means meteorites as well, and the US can't legally own one.

Claims of sovereignty are controlled. If the US claimed to own the entire sun, that would not be allowed.

Read it – for yourself.

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

<http://www.unoosa.org/pdf/publications/STSPACE11E.pdf>

Well, asteroids are not explicitly mentioned in connection with natural resources. Celestial bodies are mentioned with respect to sovereignty claims, ownership claims, the placement of military forces, the placement of weapons, and so forth.

Natural resources discovered on the moon is the only thing covered in the treaty at present. So, asteroids and planets are not explicitly covered except by returning any part of a celestial body to Earth you have to claim it in some sense before selling it or using it. Ditto with making use of resources in situ – on mars for example.

There is a claims body established in the treaty, but that is to settle competing claims between member states. Its up to each member state to apply the treaty to its citizens activities, and if another member state objects to the way that state is using the treaty it is up to the objecting state to bring action to the claims commission. The claims commission then must investigate and make a decision, and then all parties must either abide by that decision or bring suit to have a hearing and show cause why the decision should not be upheld.

If I were operating in the US and someone complained in China say that my solar operations were killing their export market for steel, impoverishing a poor country, while enriching a rich one, and wanted to stop me under the terms of the treaty, they would bring a complaint to the claims commission against the US. The commission would investigate and rule. If they ruled against me, the US would either accede to the ruling and tell me to comply with the ruling, or object and argue against the ruling. At some point lets say the US tells me I must comply with the ruling. Okay, I'm going to continue to operate while all this goes on. I'm also going to ask what it means to comply with the ruling. And anything I don't like – I'll force the US government to bring suit against me in a court of competent jurisdiction while fully complying with all things I don't mind. I will then question the right of the US government to impede the operation of a free US citizen under the terms of the treaty. I would then question the parties bringing the lawsuit as being the right parties. I would then question the US interpretation of the commissions findings. I would then question the right of the US parties to interpret the findings. I would then question the right of the commission to make its findings. I would then question the findings themselves. I would then question the right of the complainant to bring a complaint. and so on.

Meanwhile I would continue operating.

And I would mount a PR campaign asking America if China has the right to use the UN to reign in its best technology – and what sort of US government kowtows to China and the UN?

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

And I would quietly approach the Chinese mining interests and see if I could cut them into a deal they can live with.

Like I said, i don't see it as being a huge ass problem – the technology is the problem at present.

The cool thing about this process described here is that it does not require massive amounts of people or equipment to be supported from Earth. One launch one payload – and bam – you've got something huge on your hands. This makes it ideally suited for early stage development of off world resources.

The more likely answer: you're wrong.

About what?

In a law abiding society that doesn't happen.  
This is a law abiding  
society. So, it won't happen.

<Guffaw>

When making plans one has to make reasonable assessments as to what is likely and what is not likely. It is likely that laws will be abided by...

What fucking planet do you live on???

Earth

and that as citizens of the US, we can count on those laws being applied fairly. Guffaw if you like, but I truly believe this and trust this.

Wow. I can't wait until you get mugged.

??? You are confusing orders of concern. I do not see any reason to fear legal action from anyone that would successfully stop an operating intelligent plume should one ever be established along the lines I

Re: Solar Shell

Re: Solar Shell

envision. So, I'm not going to lose a lot of sleep over the pointless hand-wringing that passes for analysis in your world. Should the PR spin get too far out of hand – and should nutjobs like the ones you mention become security threats to our operation – then, obviously I would take all appropriate legal action to secure the operation against illegal activities by these crazy people.

Consider if I built an actual,  
honest-to-Odin nuclear  
bomb in my back yard.

That is illegal in the law. So, expect folks to  
come knocking with  
handcuffs and warrants. There is presently  
no law relating to mining  
the sun.

And there wouldn't be, because....

Laws are made in response to things that actually happen.

Sometimes. Banning the cloning of humans happened before humans were cloned.

Human reproductive technology has a long history of highly emotional developments, since humans have a special emotional attachment to their reproductive functions. Even so, before laws were passed there were mammals that were cloned, so my point stands. In the less emotional world of metals mining, I doubt you could get headlines, let alone concerted legal action. Sorry. I don't buy it, and I'm not going to worry too damn much about it.

The Earth is a celestial body and its not covered under the treaty.  
The Sun ISN'T MENTIONED AT ALL! Its not covered.

It is a "celestial body." Below is a link to the full text of the treaty. Search it for "comet." Or "asteroid." Or "planet." Or "meteoroid." See what you find.

<http://www.unoosa.org/pdf/publications/STSPACE11E.pdf>

## Re: Solar Shell

I gave the reference before you did – I read the treaty. It talks about making claims on celestial bodies like claiming sovereignty – but lesser claims, claims of using resources, cannot apply to the sun since the use of sunlight is permitted both in space and on Earth without recourse to the treaty. Therefore the treaty does not apply to MY use of the sun in the way I've proposed – returning metals to my lands for sale on Earth.

Having said all that I will say, that if I were to personally claim ownership of the entire Sun and decided on my own to shut it down to build the shell I describe, without taking care as to what this might do to the good people of Earth, I would say the good people of Earth would have grounds to object –

I would say this objection would come in the form of an easement claim on their normal use of the sun, not imminent domain.

Furthermore, I would say that they would also claim damages should I be so foolish as to interrupt their natural enjoyment and use of the sun.

On this basis I could be stopped and asked to restore the sun to its former condition, and pay restitution to everyone that lost a sunny day, and for any practical losses they may have, plus damage to send a signal to any future person that turning off the sun isn't something the good people of Earth would like.

So, this means I won't do that. Not without taking care to make sure that the conditions that occur on Earth and that have occurred on Earth since the earliest days of humanity, were maintained indefinitely in the future.

HOW that is done would be up to me. But, certainly I would take care to avoid a legitimate lawsuit from the good people of Earth and their rightful use of the sun that they have always enjoyed since humans first came down from trees.

Then, go here, and see if the sun is somehow excluded from the concept of "celestial body:"

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Celestial\\_body](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Celestial_body)

You are making an argument against my position. If someone brought suit to enforce this treaty, I would not agree with this argument, nor would I have attorneys agree with this argument, and I would argue in a different way. As far as dictionary definitions go, each treaty has its terms and conditions which can vary from every day usage. Terms

Re: Solar Shell

are defined in a well written treaty. Lacking clear definition reasonable adversaries can argue about terms. I argue that if the sun is a celestial body covered by the treaty, then the treaty should be rejected on its face as tortuously interfering with the right of the good people of Earth to quietly enjoy and make use of the sun which has been their right for all time before the treaty. I would ask that the treaty be struck down and that a new treaty be written if needed, or more reasonably ask the court to rule that the sun is not covered under the treaty since solar resources have been used for a long time and will likely continue to be used for a long time.

No, you won't make any progress with me that way either.

I have an easement established by a long history of use, to use sunlight irrespective of the treaty. That means I can use the resources of that celestial body we call the sun, regardless of any treaty promulgated at any time. So, to the extent the treaty applies to the sun, it is null and void by this easement – and because it is not covered by the treaty, then ANY resource I derive from the sun, I have rights to.

Now, if I were arguing the other side, not my case, but the other side, I would say that everyone has the same easement rights to the enjoyment of the sun, so anyone can establish use of it – which is fine by me – if all they're saying is I can't shut the sun down without taking care of making sure sunlight arrives on Earth uninterrupted. But if they say I've got to share my technology and use of the sun, I'll point to my patents and such – and say not till those expire son. Then, once they expire, I'll say there's only one party that has the long decades of experience needed to mine the sun safely, and that's me! lol.

.