

## Did NASA fake the moon landing? If so, how can you tell using the images?

It's primarily a question about why NASA and the astronauts they trained - to their level of understanding - are telling so much blatant nonsense about space. The rest follows from that assessment.

You don't need to have been in space to know a few very important things about it, because you use "space" on different occasions here on earth in your daily life. Take the double walled thermos you use to carry your hot coffee to work every day for instance. It stays hot, because you have a little bit of "outer space" around it, a vacuum! the best frickin insulator you can get.

SPACE IS NOT COLD. Temperature is a property of matter, no matter, no temperature, full stop. SPACE IS THE ULTIMATE INSULATOR. The only way to lose heat in space is radiating off heat, but not conducting off heat, so wrapped in a thermal blanket which you can get at any "out doors" retailer you could float happily and comfortably warm in outer space - well, except for minor details like lethal radiation and pressure issues....

But NASA doesn't seem to know that and therefore doesn't keep their astronaut actors from telling nonsense stories like not having been able to sleep in the LEM, because it was so damn "cold" - which would be equivalent to telling somebody not to have been able to take a nap in his car parked in a shadeless parking lot in southern Florida - because of the frickin cold! The parking lot on the moon kicked that experience up a notch to 273F: *"Aldrin tried to curl up on the floor of the LEM, only to discover that he was too "Elated" and also too "cold" to sleep during the astronauts schedule seven-hour rest period before lunar take-off As he reported afterward, "The thing which really kept us awake was the temperature. It was very **chilly in there.** ..." Harry Hurt from Apollo 11*

Next thing NASA misses to teach their actors is a little bit of seamanship. This is a space "ship" after all, and they happily use nautical language because that's what the audience of this spectacle expects. They just didn't bother to get the details right: M.Collins, "navigator" on Apollo 11: *"...swinging the sextant around until it points at where it thinks Menkent is. Aha! There it is, in plain view, and it's a simple task for me to align the **cross-hairs** precisely on it and push a button at the instant of alignment. "*

A sextant is an instrument that uses mirrors mounted on a calibrated movable leg. The essence of the instrument is to superimpose one object over the image of another thereby measuring the angle between them, or between object and horizon - which horizon exactly in space? And there are no crosshairs in a Sextant! it's completely worthless in space. This from a chief navigator! That's like a concertmaster of an orchestra telling the audience that the clef tells him the rhythm, when in fact it gives him the tonality - for the modern a-tonal piece they are about to play. Just gibberish.

Talking about navigating: It seems NASA made their actors watch a lot of Star Trek to get them in the mood for acting out space travel, and in Star Trek space ships orbit planets nose first, because that's how an audience whose acquaintance with Newton is generally by name only, expects a vehicle to behave. ". . . *and there we were — two dead vehicles captured by gravity in a **vertical position going around the Earth.***" Lovell and Aldrin after detaching from Agena

Newton would beg to differ though, because an object does keep attitude relative to space and not relative to the body it orbits. Keeping attitude relative to earth means "re-orient" in space and that needs acceleration, it needs firing booster rockets, which is never mentioned! and that's not called being in orbit, that's a flight. The sequential sunrises the astronauts are always raving about would only be possible to observe in flight, not in orbit, because half the time the nose were the windows are would be oriented away from sun and earth.

*"The Control Room people exhaled with an audible sigh. Conrad reported that his instruments showed Apollo 12 to be in a 170 by 61.8 mile orbit. Earth radar refined this to 168.8 and 62.7 miles (nautical)."*

Of course, an audience who doesn't know Newton from an apple has no chance of catching the nonsensicality in this statement. A radar beam at the distance of the moon has spread to almost 3000 miles which makes it impossible to pick out the speck of an orbiting capsule at 60 miles distance from the surface of the Moon as it appeared on the CRT, the cathode ray tube of the operator on earth. It would have made **a blip about .003"** away from the background bounce that represented the Moon. Good luck Mr. operator!

Why all this nonsense?

And we haven't even gotten into the images. In our days of Photoshop proficiency a ten year old can pick out the fakes in seconds. It's so ridiculously amateurish it's offensive, what with shadows in all directions cast from one light source, shadows missing, absent exhaust craters in the powdery dust of the moon surface, plastic antennas still intact after going through the "hell" of reentry, creases in a pressurized spacesuit, vehicle parts superimposed on range finding cross hairs of the camera (how do you get that?) and on and on.....

Here's one of the most offensive to anyone who's little more awake than brain dead. Collins again in "'Carrying The Fire" claims that the picture is of the Sea of Tranquility and shows the landing zone. The shadow in the lower left corner is supposed to be from the engine shroud whose diameter is 8.5 feet as it orbits 79 statute miles above the Moon. Commercial airliners ten times as large do not cast definitive shadows from 30,000' and yet here we have an astronaut putting his name under the lunatic - as it were - claim that a nozzle casts definite shadow on a surface 79 mile away! What a wondrous placed that moon is....



When your boys come back from a weekend where they were supposed to do Boy Scout stuff, and of course what they did was getting wasted in clubs, but what they give you is fake Boy Scout stories, you will know - and you will not ask them if they had been doing Boy Scout stuff, what you will ask them is: why are you lying to me?



.....you don't need to have a PhD in psychology to read that body language!!