



Re: Paracelsus C anomalies caused by impact rebound?

From: "fran ridge" <skyking42@gmx.com>
To: spsr@utsi.edu
Cc: LUNASCAN-PROJECT@yahoogroups.com
Date: Jul 8, 2016 7:43:09 AM

I have to hand it you, Greg. Out of all our Listmembers on Lunascan and SPSR you're the only one who is involved in a discussion. My Lunascan team has communicated earlier, but I expected more from SPSR after all the stuff on Mars, etc.

Greg Orme wrote:

You could show whether craters that size have central peaks and if so how large they should be. If the crater is too small for one then that is evidence against a natural origin.

My response:

Maybe you missed all the email responses, Grag, but we already covered that. Small craters just don't have central peaks. 30-50 km craters sometimes do, but smaller ones all over the lunar surface do not. What more do you want? Besides, Paracelsus C isn't in a crater, or one that would qualify as such. It is a ver small shallow basin. You can argue all day about whether it's a crater or a basin, but nowhere on the moon is there a feature that small with a central peak, let alone two. And nowhere on the moon is there a central peak that is shaped like that. And I'm surprised you missed the right-angled wall to the left. That's right down your Mar's alley.

Gred wrote:

It may also depend on the velocity of the meteor, I don't know. If it is large enough then you have to explain why someone would remove the central peak so smoothly then replace it with these objects. Alternatively whether they could be constructed from that central peak material. The central peak seems to be gone as if it never existed, if these objects can be differentiated enough from the central rubble then that is hard to explain naturally.

My response:

Greg, you're the oner who has to explain that. I never suggested it. And yes, it IS hard to explain. That's the whole point. If YOU can explain it or offer a plausible hypothesis, I'm open.

Greg:

Calling these cylinders exposes your hypothesis to more objections, this happens with Mars objects as well. For example there is a formation called the square mesa that is not really square, it calls into question why someone would go to all the trouble of building it without getting the angles right. Someone capable of traveling from another star would be able to work out right angles. If however Mars was terraformed then someone might well have no need for exact angles, there may not have been a local government planning it all. But this is nonetheless a problem for Mars.

Response:

Well, Greg, if calling them "triangles", "squares", "hour-glasses", "bones" makes you feel better, that's fine. But all my life I have used the escalation of hypothesis in my work. But sometimes you can arrive at a hypothesis quicker than at other times, and I'm just defending a position of what I see. I HAVE looked and I HAVE tried to come up with something more plausible, if for no other reason than to protect my credibility, but after 6 weeks I have drwan a blank. If I didn't feel safe with my presentation I wouldn't have submitted it to NASA. Depending on what LRO's John Keller tells me, we go to phase three, and that's to ASU's Paul Davies, the very person with LRO who suggested we look for such things.

Greg:

But someone coming to the Moon and going to all the trouble of making these things should be expected to make a significant shape. To me they look random with some similarities to a cylinder or bone shape. There is no erosion which would change them away from a symmetrical shape, or if there is you should explain it. I'm sure someone in the mainstream would be thinking these things, sometimes they don't say anything because they don't want to get into an argument with someone when they aren't being paid for it. But their silence should not be interpreted as consent.

Response:

What kind of significant shape do you suggest, Greg? One that says "Hey, look, we're here!" "Or one that looks like a king's palace? Or the Pentagon? The moon is a dangerous and very inhospitable place, for Earthlings or Aliens. Everything needs to be underground except what has to be left above. (BTW, if WE built structures anywhere on the moon and there was a asteroid impact on Earth that wiped us all out eons ago, would these artifacts be considered "alien"? I have NEVER referred to these "structures" as "alien", even though Davies always refers to such potential finds as such).

You think they look random? I have sat on the phone with people for hours looking at the "structures". NOBODY thinks they are random or natural. "We don't know what they are, but we sure know what they are not!" The bone shape you see is what we believe is a tubular shape with regolith ramped up. The one thing that sticks out the most on both objects is the material that runs up to them and proves that these objects did not land there or strike there but were put there and re-inforced, just as one would expect.

Greg:

If they did make it on site then it is likely to be from a kind of cement, something to stick the rock pieces together. I would assume they could find or make metal more easily, such deposits might be in the crater from a metal rich meteor.

Response:

Maybe if we look nearby in other M frames we'll find a Lowes or a Home Depot. <GRIN>

Greg:

But if a central peak should have about this volume of material, as in these objects, then that would be pretty hard to differentiate from an unusual central peak.

Response:

I gotta hand it to you. If you found a huge rock sticking in the ground on Earth in an area about the size of a football field, your first thoughts would be that it was the top of a mountain peak.

Greg:

Also if it is not artificial, and you think it is, then it can be a red herring. An accumulation of evidence that is not real can send you in the wrong direction. I can imagine there being something artificial on the Moon, but there are serious problems I see with these objects.

Response:

If they are NOT artificial, then they are natural. Somebody will have to prove that too. NASA may already have the answer. After all the images sat there at ASU for five years. But maybe, out of a hundred thousand images, some student on the ASU/LROC team looked the M frame just as Greg Orme did, and wrote it off.

The answer, the only answer, may be that we have to send an unmanned rover there to find out. If they ARE artificial, who would NOT want us to go?

Fran

On Fri, Jul 8, 2016 at 1:57 AM, fran ridge <skyking42@gmx.com> wrote:

Greg,

You missed the most important part of the information regarding central peak formation.

You suggested:

If you drop something into a pool of water, you will get a rebound effect in the middle where the object was dropped, and then waves will spread out around it. This rebound effect in the middle is the same phenomenon that causes central peaks in craters.

Response:

The difference is just the scale: An impact that forms a >~15-km-diameter crater on the moon will cause the rock to act like the liquid to the point that you get the rebound effect and form a central peak. Smaller craters on the moon will not have central peaks, and larger craters above ~120 km will form a peak-ring. The transition diameter for these features -- a simple, bowl-shaped crater; a "complex" crater with a central peak; a peak-ring crater -- is inversely proportional to gravity. So, on Earth, the transition diameters are smaller -- you only need to get a ~3-4-km-diameter crater before you can form central peaks. On Mars, the transition diameter is around 6 km. To a lesser extent, target material strength will affect the transition diameter, as well. But in the end, the central peaks are formed by rock rebounding, being pushed back up by the strength of the underlying rock after the initial impact event. Central peak formation happens within minutes of the impact itself, even in craters 10s-km across.

The Paracelsus C objects are too small and within too small an area to be parts of central peaks. Also, the ramping evidence precludes an upheaval or rebounding effect.

Fran

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 at 5:25 AM

From: zzgorme <gregorme@gmail.com>

To: "Ananda Sirisena" <anandals@aol.co.uk>

Cc: "fran ridge" <skyking42@gmx.com>, SPSR <spsr@utsi.edu>, "Peter Ness" <peter.ness.planetslab@gmail.com>, "Malcolm Smith" <malcolmdsmith@hotmail.com>

Subject: Re: Sizes of objects in Paracelsus C

My understanding of the central peak is like dropping a stone in water, sometimes there is a rebound in the center giving this peak. Because the shock wave is circular it forms a crater with this peak in the dead center. That's what the physicists in this link say as well.