

# Webb

(January 2022)

There was much excitement lately about the launch of the Webb telescope, but when looking at its specification I find that it will in fact bring only quite marginal benefits, if any, despite all the hype:

It will only see in the very near infrared, plus visible red and part of orange, and its maximum resolution will be the same as that of other telescopes. For example, images of Earth from the reference location of the telescope would have a resolution 2,500 times lower than the satellite images you are used to.

It will collect 6 times as much light as the Hubble telescope, which is great but Hubble is a relatively small telescope, and it won't see the higher orange color, nor the yellow, green, blue, violet, and ultraviolet that Hubble could see.

It will still not be able to see even the closest star as anything larger than one pixel, without any detail, let alone its planets. To be seen as merely two pixels across (not much of a resolution) that star would need to be 40 times its actual probable diameter. The most distant star in our galaxy is 25,000 times the distance and so will appear 25,000 times smaller, and that's only in our galaxy. In the closest galaxy, which is so close that I can see it with a naked eye but is still 600,000 times the distance to the closest star, you wouldn't see anything larger than one single pixel that would not be larger than 1,000 times the orbit of Pluto, or 10 million times the diameter of Sun, which itself is 100 times the diameter of Earth. The most distant observed galaxy is at 5,000 times the distance to the closest. However, I am quite sure they are thinking of finding life therein.

Quite depressing is that incessant undeserved self-glorification of all space projects since the last manned mission to the moon half a century ago. It is as if employees of all the space agencies needed justification, however futile, for the continuation of their employment. At least telescopes are not as arrogantly pretentious and pointless as the cretinous projects of colonization of planet Mars by humans, all at our expense, by the way, including that of the poor. They will claim of course that a marginally useful telescope is good for the starving masses of the world, although they will not tell us in which fashion. I would venture, though, that the telescope is good for those who will have the privilege to play with it in secret and in addition will be paid by us for their amusement.

I am sure the telescope will be said to greatly help in the fight against global warming, which by the way was somehow rechristened "*climate change*". I wonder why the name was changed. Have they lost confidence in their own theory? If not, why change the name? What to think of the validity of a theory that was built upon the assumption of warming but has changed its name to reflect both warming and cooling?

M