

---

Subject: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 18:12:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i don't want this to turn into a argument, just a discusstion.

i dont think anybody has landed on the moon, due to the fact the suns radiation would kill them.  
there are many more facters.

What do you think?

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 19:34:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.redzero.demon.co.uk/moonhoax/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 19:49:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

There's a reflector array on the moon which was placed there in -69. Even now as we speak the moon's distance from earth is being calculated by reflecting laser rays from the "mirrors". Most observatories around the world are capable of doing this...this conspiracy theory is a bit too old and has been busted hundreds of times already.

The radiation isn't any stronger on Moon than in space, your theory would also mean that spacewalks are impossible, let alone going to space in the first place. The thing is, radiation is blocked by equipment such as spacesuits and the shuttle.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Dogg](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 19:53:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Sat, 29 July 2006 14:12i don't want this to turn into a argument, just a discusstion.

i dont think anybody has landed on the moon, due to the fact the suns radiation would kill them.  
there are many more facters.

What do you think?

Wouldn't the radiation kill the space walkers, shuttle riders or Space Station orbiters in the last 47

years? Or do they wear ozone generators in their suits and craft? For that matter, where there are holes in the Ozone already, wouldn't there be a circle of death where those holes hit the surface!?!?

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 20:12:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The astronauts did receive a small amount of radiation from the Van Allen belts and their time on the moon, but it was VERY small and they felt space travel was worth the risk of possibly developing cancer.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [bu11c3nts](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 20:48:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hmmm, that's interesting...

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [PaRaDoX](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 21:41:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Lol@cancer

I went to vanderbilt space center and they do sun research and they said that the astronauts go up when the radiation is lower due to the orbit of the sun and moon or something of another im sure you can find the infos here <http://www.mc.vanderbilt.edu/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 22:37:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

This is so stupid, it offends me that in this age someone can still think the Moon landings was a hoax. :/

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Sat, 29 Jul 2006 22:43:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Havent you ever seen Family guy, The moon landing was recorder in a recording studio.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 01:58:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Fact.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 13:29:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Kamuix wrote on Sat, 29 July 2006 17:43Havent you ever seen Family guy, The moon landing was recorder in a recording studio.

Or, was it?

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [csskiller](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 15:34:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Apparently none of you have played area 51 (or just failed to notice it). Anyways a little easter egg is in it and as you explore Area 51 you see a recording studio where the moon landing was recorded, even with cardboard backgrounds!

Seriously does it really matter whether or not we (as humans) made it to the moon or not?

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 16:57:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

yes

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 17:55:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

csskiller wrote on Sun, 30 July 2006 11:34Apparently none of you have played area 51 (or just failed to notice it). Anyways a little easter egg is in it and as you explore Area 51 you see a recording studio where the moon landing was recorded, even with cardboard backgrounds! I have played that game, even if it was only demo (and it did not include the recording studio) and I found it to be quite confusing when trying to find out who is on my team and who am I supposed to kill.

Anyway, is it a good game overall or is it confusing? Or is it as good as Killzone?

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 20:42:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I personally don't think it happened. Sometimes governments have to do things to keep a certain level of status. It was a bad time with Vietnam and America needed something other than the killing and horrid footage from the media. They needed to show hope for the future and that the human race was above barbaric acts. So they created a idea, announced the idea and set for it.

Whether or not they started with the set or they just couldn't do the real thing, I think they made a facsimile in order to better the moral of the country. Whatever did happen, it happened on December 27th just a few days before Christmas and it made everyones year a little brighter.

In todays world I think the moon could be reached briskly, but not in 1968.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 21:20:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If you still believe we didn't land on the moon after reading this website, then you are a disgrace to humanity and should kill yourself immediately, or at least castrate yourself to avoid any accidental passing-on of your genetic material.

<http://www.badastronomy.com/bad/tv/foxapollo.html>

In short, there is OVERWHELMINGLY abundant evidence that we DID go to the moon and that the footage and pictures we've seen would have been impossible to reproduce in the 1960's technology. People a lot smarter than you figured out how to get up there and land on the moon. Just because you're not smart enough to figure out how they did it, doesn't mean it didn't happen or wasn't possible.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 21:27:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I never actually even got close to thinking they did not land on the moon in 1969, I was just screwing around

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sun, 30 Jul 2006 23:44:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I knew someone who said that Blackhawks were really UFO's flying in and out of Ft. Rucker.

Heh, she's 70, though, so...

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 01:29:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dogg wrote on Sat, 29 July 2006 20:53help-linux wrote on Sat, 29 July 2006 14:12i don't want this to turn into a argument, just a discusstion.

i dont think anybody has landed on the moon, due to the fact the suns radiation would kill them. there are many more facters.

What do you think?

Wouldn't the radiation kill the space walkers, shuttle riders or Space Station orbiters in the last 47 years? Or do they wear ozone generators in their suits and craft? For that matter, where there are holes in the Ozone already, wouldn't there be a circle of death where those holes hit the surface!?!?

NO, we are protected from radiation by the earth magnetic field. spacewalkers are protected by that.

The ozone layer does not protect us from radiation, it protects us from ultraviolet rays? i am not certain.

anyway a contry didn't know about the hoax and though it was posiible, so on their spacecraft the put a 6 feet lead sheet around it. to protect it from radiation, well you could imagine what happend on take off.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 02:28:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

THE MOON LANDING IS FAK!1111oneone

THATS Y WE SPEND BILIONS OF DOLARS ON IT LOLZ!11

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

i read tha website and had to double post.

Quote:

The answer is: The Moon itself. Surprise! The lunar dust has a peculiar property: it tends to reflect light back in the direction from where it came. So if you were to stand on the Moon and shine a flashlight at the surface, you would see a very bright spot where the light hits the ground, but, oddly, someone standing a bit to the side would hardly see it at all. The light is preferentially reflected back toward the flashlight (and therefore you), and not the person on the side.

that is wrong in 2 ways:

1) when the light hits the dust it will be disperst being thrown in all directions.

2)It the person standing near it **\*WOULD\*** see it. and it would not be a bright spot.

\_\_\_\_\_=====\_\_\_\_\_

Quote:

Now think about the sunlight. Let's say the sun is off to the right in a picture. It is illuminating the right side of the lander, and the left is in shadow. However, the sunlight falling beyond the lander on the left is being reflected back toward the Sun. That light hits the surface and reflects to the right and up, directly onto the shadowed part of the lander. In other words, the lunar surface is so bright that it easily lights up the shadows of vertical surfaces.

WTF, this is complete BS. someone explane.

\_\_\_\_\_=====\_\_\_\_\_

Quote:

Of course a flag can wave in a vacuum

their is **\*NO\*** atmosphere so nothing to propel it. and there is enough gravity on the moon to hold it down. so what made it wave?

Quote:

Bad: When the movies of the astronauts walking and driving the lunar rover are doubled in speed, they look just like they were filmed on Earth and slowed down. This is clearly how the movies were faked.

not bad, if you watch James Bond, diamonds are forever. you will see a part were he breaks into a base where they are filming a moon landing. the astronoughs were moving slow just like the video of the landing.

i cannot say for certain that their has not been people on the moon but please make some better "anti-conspiracy" sites.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [xptek](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 06:07:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

help-linux wrote on Sun, 30 July 2006 22:29  
that is wrong in 2 ways:

1) when the light hits the dust it will be disperst being thrown in all directions.

2)It the person standing near it \*WOULD\* see it. and it would not be a bright spot.

their is \*NO\* atmosphere so nothing to propel it. and there is enough gravity on the moon to hold it down. so what made it wave?

Do you have any reputable references to back the above claims?

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 06:35:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sun, 30 July 2006 17:20If you still believe we didn't land on the moon after reading this website, then you are a disgrace to humanity and should kill yourself immediately, or at least castrate yourself to avoid any accidental passing-on of your genetic material.

<http://www.badastronomy.com/bad/tv/foxapollo.html>

In short, there is OVERWHELMINGLY abundant evidence that we DID go to the moon and that the footage and pictures we've seen would have been impossible to reproduce in the 1960's technology. People a lot smarter than you figured out how to get up there and land on the moon.

Just because you're not smart enough to figure out how they did it, doesn't mean it didn't happen or wasn't possible.

I totally agree with that, thats why I said eailer, I get offended when people dont think it happand, thats just acting stupid. :/

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 11:16:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

xptek wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 07:07help-linux wrote on Sun, 30 July 2006 22:29  
that is wrong in 2 ways:

1) when the light hits the dust it will be disperst being thrown in all directions.

2)It the person standing near it **\*WOULD\*** see it. and it would not be a bright spot.

their is **\*NO\*** atmosphere so nothing to propel it. and there is enough gravity on the moon to hold it down. so what made it wave?

Do you have any reputable references to back the above claims?

Not about the flag but the light i do:

as you will know already the only light that will travel back to you if you shine it on a mirror is a laser and it would have to a 90o angle exactly all the way round.

anything else will not come directly back to you.

i am sorry to offend anyone but i am a strong believer that it did not happen.

untill i get proven otherwise, i don't believe.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [Dogg](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 15:19:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 07:16xptek wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 07:07help-linux  
wrote on Sun, 30 July 2006 22:29  
that is wrong in 2 ways:



1) when the light hits the dust it will be disperst being thrown in all directions.

2)It the person standing near it \*WOULD\* see it. and it would not be a bright spot.

their is \*NO\* atmosphere so nothing to propel it. and there is enough gravity on the moon to hold it down. so what made it wave?

Do you have any reputable references to back the above claims?

Not about the flag but the light i do:

as you will know already the only light that will travel back to you if you shine it on a mirror is a laser and it would have to a 90o angle exactly all the way round.

anything else will not come directly back to you.

i am sorry to offend anyone but i am a strong believer that it did not happen.

untill i get proven otherwise, i don't believe.

So a powerful telescope show the remains of the lander and various things you can see up there...also...all fake and all the worlds governments that have this technology are a part of the cover up to make the US look great?!?!?

Damn we pwn the world!!!!

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 15:40:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

how do you know it is a telescope? how do you know there isn't just a faked picture in front of it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 16:33:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You're 15, right? When I was 15, I thought the same, and I was fooled by a stupid "documentary" on FOX. That shows you how much I paid attention to the world around me. In other words, take a few years to develop your brain and thought process. Learn science, and then rethink your position on this and several other issues.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 17:31:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 05:16  
untill i get proven otherwise, i don't belive.

That's the problem, we have given you proof, you just don't WANT to believe it, therefore you are not even considering it as proof.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 17:44:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 12:31help-linux wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 05:16  
untill i get proven otherwise, i don't belive.

That's the problem, we have given you proof, you just don't WANT to believe it, therefore you are not even considering it as proof.

I think the problem lies deeper this then, its not about weather we can prove it to him, its just that hes just missing commen sense that most people have.

When I was younger then you, I could understand that we landed on the moon and so on.. why is it so hard to believe.

Can I ask you someteing please, do you believe in god`?

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 17:45:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The lunar landing area has been "lost", they could never show proof of the landing through a telescope. I dont belive for many reasons, not because of lighting or images over camera markers. Not even because they can't show proof on the actual moon.

Also, no the fox special is not what swayed me.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 17:50:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

IWarriors wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 13:44 Can I ask you someteing please, do you believe in god`?

Are you asking warranto that? Because if you are... he's Roman Catholic, and if he doesn't believe in God... he's one messed up Catholic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 18:58:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 12:50 IWarriors wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 13:44 Can I ask you someteing please, do you believe in god`?

Are you asking warranto that? Because if you are... he's Roman Catholic, and if he doesn't believe in God... he's one messed up Catholic.

No no, asking Linux, but anyone can reply aslong they beleive in god but not the moon landings. .

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 19:07:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The moon landing site is too small to be seen with a telescope.

THE LINK I FUCKING POSTED Why don't we just point Hubble or some other big telescope at the moon to show the moon landing sites? Wouldn't that settle the argument once and for all?

If only it was that easy! The biggest problem with this is that they simply are not powerful enough. The lunar landers are very,very,very small in astronomical terms and they're pretty far away as well. There isn't a telescope in existence that could take a picture of one.

There are lots of mathematics we could show to demonstrate this, but's it's very complicated and we don't fully understand it anyway. But here's our abridged dumbbed-down version.

Size of Lunar Module. Let's be really generous and say 10m square.

Distance between Hubble and Moon. About 350, 000km.

This works out as an visual angle of  $(10m)/(3.5 \times 10^8m) * (180/\pi) = 1.6 \times 10^{-6}$  degrees = 6 milliarcseconds.

The WFPC2 'telescope' on Hubble has the following resolution: 800x800 pixels of a 35 arcseconds field of view with a pixel scale of 46 milliarcseconds. Actually resolution in practice is a little below this.

So what does this all mean? Well, roughly speaking, it means that the lunar lander would have to be 15 times larger before it would even cause a dot on a Hubble picture.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [mision08](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 21:28:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wow, first the sun does not revolve a damn thing from our prospective. Maybe it revolves some extremely large and distant mass but it is irrelevant to us. If the moon revolves the earth and the earth revolves the sun, seems like there would be a window of opportunity to land without radiation killing the astronauts. Or we would be dead here on earth. If the Lunar landing was to raise morale of the US population, what was the agenda for the Cosmonauts?  
Oh, and I like the map. It's fun, but it's important to hit the ground running. Take out the WF or strip with an infantry rush. At least I think that's Lunar Landing.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 22:41:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I would think a site of such historic meaning would be found, if not by NASA, then by an amateur.

They can read pack of cigarettes, read the years off of discarded pennies and find the titanic under 12,500 feet of water with 1985 technology but they cant find a craft on the moon at the point at which was highly calculated and spent months and months picking out.

A primitive computer flew from the earth to the moon and found the exact spot set in its memory, but we can even begin to find said location.

Kinda seems far and fetched to me.

Other note:  
Keep in mind, in 1985 this was your Internet:

[http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/thumb/7/7c/Acoustic  
\\_coupler\\_20041015\\_175456\\_1.jpg/785px-Acoustic\\_coupler\\_20041015\\_175456\\_1.jpg](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/thumb/7/7c/Acoustic_coupler_20041015_175456_1.jpg/785px-Acoustic_coupler_20041015_175456_1.jpg)

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 22:56:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oblivion165 wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 18:41 I would think a site of such historic meaning would be found, if not by NASA, then by an amateur.

They can read pack of cigarettes, read the years off of discarded pennies and find the titanic under 12,500 feet of water with 1985 technology but they cant find a craft on the moon at the point at which was highly calculated and spent months and months picking out.

A primitive computer flew from the earth to the moon and found the exact spot set in its memory, but we can even begin to find said location.

Kinda seems far and fetched to me.

It's not about finding it, we know it's location very precicely. It's just that we can't see there from earth.

Quote:

Other note:

Keep in mind, in 1985 this was your Internet:

[http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/thumb/7/7c/Acoustic\\_coupler\\_20041015\\_175456\\_1.jpg/785px-Acoustic\\_coupler\\_20041015\\_175456\\_1.jpg](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/thumb/7/7c/Acoustic_coupler_20041015_175456_1.jpg/785px-Acoustic_coupler_20041015_175456_1.jpg)

Discovery already flew in -84 and now we just launched it successfully again in 2006. What's your point?

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 23:09:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The satellites that can see that closely are not orbiting around the moon, they are orbiting around the Earth. They are too far from the moon to get pictures at the resolution required to see the landing site.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 23:19:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 19:09The satellites that can see that closely are not orbiting around the moon, they are orbiting around the Earth. They are too far from the moon to get pictures at the resolution required to see the landing site.

Yes im aware, however there is equipment that could be used not just orbiting satellites.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [pirkel123](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 23:20:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You Naysayers are insulting these men.

# Neil Armstrong - Apollo 11 - July, 1969

# Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin - Apollo 11 - July, 1969

# Charles "Pete" Conrad - Apollo 12 - November, 1969 (may have been scheduled to land again on Apollo 20)[2]

# Alan Bean - Apollo 12 - November, 1969

# Alan Shepard - Apollo 14 - February, 1971

# Edgar Mitchell - Apollo 14 - February, 1971

# David Scott - Apollo 15 - July, 1971

# James Irwin - Apollo 15 - July, 1971

# John Young - Apollo 16 - April, 1972 (also on Apollo 10, without landing)

# Charles Duke - Apollo 16 - April, 1972

# Eugene Cernan - Apollo 17 - December, 1972 (also on Apollo 10, without landing)

# Harrison Schmitt - Apollo 17 -

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_lunar\\_astronauts](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_lunar_astronauts)

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 23:23:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Scythar wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 18:56Oblivion165 wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 18:41I would think a site of such historic meaning would be found, if not by NASA, then by an amateur.

They can read pack of cigarettes, read the years off of discarded pennies and find the titanic under 12,500 feet of water with 1985 technology but they cant find a craft on the moon at the point at which was highly calculated and spent months and months picking out.

A primitive computer flew from the earth to the moon and found the exact spot set in its memory, but we can even begin to find said location.

Kinda seems far and fetched to me.

It's not about finding it, we know it's location very precicely. It's just that we can't see there from earth.

We have the technology, just excuses not to.

Quote:

Other note:

Keep in mind, in 1985 this was your Internet:

[http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/thumb/7/7c/Acoustic\\_coupler\\_20041015\\_175456\\_1.jpg/785px-Acoustic\\_coupler\\_20041015\\_175456\\_1.jpg](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/thumb/7/7c/Acoustic_coupler_20041015_175456_1.jpg/785px-Acoustic_coupler_20041015_175456_1.jpg)

Discovery already flew in '84 and now we just launched it successfully again in 2006. What's your point?

The point is that in '85 they could find the Titanic with that level of technology.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 23:26:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oblivion165 wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 16:19: Yes I'm aware, however there is equipment that could be used not just orbiting satellites.

No. There isn't. Even the Hubble telescope doesn't have the resolution to do it.

The wavelength of visible light is around  $550 \times 10^{-9} \text{m}$  (i.e. very very small).

The diameter of Hubble's mirror is 2.4m.

Highest ever physically possible resolution =  $1.4 \times 550 \times 10^{-9} / 2.4 \text{m} = 3.2 \times 10^{-7} \text{radians}$

At a distance of 350,000km this works out as about 124 metres. This is roughly the size of a football field.

Even if the Hubble telescope had the highest possible resolution, it still couldn't see the landing site from Earth!

Keep your eye on the SELENE project, however. It's a Japanese project, part of which is taking close pictures of the moon's surface at a resolution where we CAN see the landing site in order to map the entire moon.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [PaRaDoX](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 23:33:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

lol... this is funny I don't see how you people can think it was fake.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 31 Jul 2006 23:53:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 17:26Oblivion165 wrote on Mon, 31 July 2006 16:19Yes im aware, however there is equipment that could be used not just orbiting satellites.

No. There isn't. Even the hubble telescope doesn't have the resolution to do it.

The wavelength of visible light is around  $550 \times 10^{-9} \text{m}$  (i.e. very very small).

The diameter of Hubble's mirror is 2.4m.

Highest ever physically possible resolution =  $1.4 \times 550 \times 10^{-9} / 2.4 \text{ m} = 3.2 \times 10^{-7}$  radians

At a distance of 350,000km this works out as about 124 metres. This is roughly the size of a football field.

Even if the Hubble telescope had the highest possible resolution, it still couldn't see the landing site from Earth!

Keep your eye on the SELENE project, however. It's a Japanese project, part of which is taking close pictures of the moon's surface at a resolution where we CAN see the landing site in order to map the entire moon.

Wait.. you mean there is actually a project to develop something to take pictures of the moon? Pff.. this is just an excuse developed by the American Government to pay off the Japanese by falsifying pictures of the moon landing.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 01 Aug 2006 00:11:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.redzero.demon.co.uk/moonhoax/SELENE.htm> Unfortunately it won't put an end to the hoax theories, that we can guarantee. Here's what the theories will be couple of years time. Yes, they're that predictable.

\* The Japanese have been paid off by NASA to fake their photos. Well, we all know they're shifty foreigners with no morals, don't we? They'll do anything for the mighty dollar.

\* NASA sneaked faked landers up there during the last five years in preparation for the Japanese photos. Don't bother asking about where the money came from to do this, or how they managed it all in total secrecy.

\* What we can see aren't the Apollo sites, but alien bases that NASA are pretending are theirs. And if you join up all the dots on the photos it spells out a Masonic chant in ancient Greek.

---

---



Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 01 Aug 2006 00:37:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

bah, and here I thought my sarcasm would be unique.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Fri, 04 Aug 2006 02:26:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Sun, 30 July 2006 20:29Dogg wrote on Sat, 29 July 2006 20:53help-linux wrote on Sat, 29 July 2006 14:12i don't want this to turn into a argument, just a discusstion.

i dont think anybody has landed on the moon, due to the fact the suns radiation would kill them. there are many more facters.

What do you think?

Wouldn't the radiation kill the space walkers, shuttle riders or Space Station orbiters in the last 47 years? Or do they wear ozone generators in their suits and craft? For that matter, where there are holes in the Ozone already, wouldn't there be a circle of death where those holes hit the surface!?!?

NO, we are protected from radiation by the earth magnetic field. spacewalkers are protected by that.

The ozone layer does not protect us from radiation, it protects us from ultraviolet rays? i am not certain.

anyway a contry didn't know about the hoax and though it was posiible, so on their spacecraft the put a 6 feet lead sheet around it. to protect it from radiation, well you could imagine what happend on take off.

Maybe my question has already been answered, but... what country are you referring to? And also, my guess is that unless they're using some really awesome rockets, a 6-foot lead sheet around it would most likely cause the rocket to fail to lift off, unless it was assembled in pieces in orbit.

And I'll also point out that we're not entirely protected from radiation by the magnetic field; we're also protected from radiation via radio waves created by lightning. There was a show on the Discovery channel recently (past 2-3 weeks) regarding that, though a brief google search yielded limited results. Apparently, there's an empty radiation belt around Earth that the military had detonated a nuclear bomb in, filled it with radiation, and then the radiation had been cleared within a short time, and that was all linked to radio whitenoise caused by lightning strikes.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Sn1per74\\*](#) on Fri, 04 Aug 2006 03:26:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Reading this makes me laugh . Why would they lie about something like this? And if it was a lie don't you think Neil Armstrong would have told someone it was a hoax?

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 04 Aug 2006 16:18:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Careful there.

Why would they lie?

Two large reasons.

It had been promised by the President that they would be on the moon before the decade was up. (First moon landing July 20, 1969. 6 months shy of missing the deadline)

The reason for the promise came because the Russians (ie. Communists) put the first man in space.

Conclusion, they were not going to be able to put a man on the moon by the deadline proposed by the President, and if Capitalism were to fail in this, it would give Communism a large boost.

Now, before people start accusing me of something, I DO NOT BELIEVE THIS. But, to answer the question of "why?", I give this answer.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 04 Aug 2006 18:57:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, if some random fucktards like you can "see right through this hoax", then wouldn't the commies do the same?

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 06 Aug 2006 06:16:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Funny; is anyone else's head bursting with myriads of parallels between just about EVERYTHING said in this thread and all the anti/pro-God arguments given in that religion thread?

What's REALLY funny is that most of the people who were attempting to refute the existence of God in that thread are now trying to prove the Apollo moon landings with the same type of arguments we Christians used to DEFEND God (and, of course, vice versa).

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 06 Aug 2006 06:36:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That is the biggest load of crap I've ever heard.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Sun, 06 Aug 2006 11:08:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Sun, 06 August 2006 01:36 That is the biggest load of crap I've ever heard.

Indeed, please move the mouse pointer over the delete button for this topic and click!

There is enough stupid stuff on the net then have some here too.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 09:55:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ehheh, found this...

<http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/one-giant-blunder-for-mankind-how-nasa-lost-moon-pictures/2006/08/04/1154198328978.html>

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 14:22:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20060814/ts\\_nm/space\\_tapes\\_dc](http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20060814/ts_nm/space_tapes_dc)

You can draw your own conclusions, but I thought this was quite interesting. The U.S. government just "misplacing" an important piece of history like that...

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 21:51:03 GMT

---

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[http://www.space.com/news/060813\\_apollo11\\_tapes.html](http://www.space.com/news/060813_apollo11_tapes.html)

Quote:“That’s the furthest thing from the truth,” Wood told SPACE.com. “There are no lost Apollo video tapes,” he emphasized.

[...]

Wood said he doubts the tapes have been trashed. On the other hand, there’s a 50/50 chance they were recycled.

“Since telemetry recording tapes back then cost \$90 to \$100 a reel ... well, that was back when \$100 dollars was \$100 dollars,” Wood said. A magnetic rehab center at Goddard, he said, may have wiped the tapes clean—a budget-saving measure for reuse of the recording tapes.

“What we’re hoping, though, is that somebody, maybe, might have saved some of them,” Wood added. “We want to interest people to see something better than it happened at the time.”

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 01:24:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Incontrovertible evidence that the moon landing was faked.

Even though we supposedly have a recording of Neil Armstrong's first words on the moon.

Draw what conclusions you will.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [sterps](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 06:35:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I used to think the moon landing was a hoax. But i dont now, especially after studying astronomy at university. You must realise, man has visted the moon more than once. Even if the moon landing was staged, they would had been there by now, especially with the technology they have today.

Quote:

NO, we are protected from radiation by the earth magnetic field.  
spacewalkers are protected by that.

The ozone layer does not protect us from radiation, it protects us from ultraviolet rays? i am not certain.

anyway a contry didn't know about the hoax and though it was posiible, so on their spacecraft the put a 6 feet lead sheet around it. to protect it from radiation, well you could imagine what happend on take off.

The magnetic field of the earth does protect earth from radiation from the sun, BUT, the atmosphere does also block most Ultra Violet rays from reaching the surface. This happens at the ozone layer in the stratosphere.

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 11:45:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hydra wrote on Tue, 22 August 2006 02:24Incontrovertible evidence that the moon landing was faked.

Even though we supposedly have a recording of Neil Armstrong's first words on the moon.

Draw what conclusions you will.

rofl

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 14:54:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

More proof!

They are making up more things, this time in regards to the moon's creation.

They are using moon rocks (which, as we all know were actually collected from Alien space ships in Area-51, which was proven to had just recently picked them up from the Nevada Desert), so that means that the data received from the instruments mentioned in the article must have been faked as well! It coincides with the data received from the "moon rocks", which means they must have been pointing the instruments at the earth instead!

Amazing that all these faked experiments continue to this day, just so the public remains fooled

that the moon landing actually occurred!

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 16:37:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i just thought something and want somebody to disprove it, there is alot of quartz(spelling ) in the big splash this quartz would have turned into "shocked" quartz.

why didn't it pick up any shocked quartz?

oh and that site had an error:(i am not to sure on this)

Quote:

Moon formed from the debris flung into space after a collision between early Earth and a Mars-size planet.

this was not a planet, i didn't orbit the sun?

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 10:45:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It was a great publicity stunt as a lead up to being a Super Power.

No one wanted to mess with a country who had technology to put a man on the moon.

There why, have we never put any more men on the moon since the 70s?

The answer is easy, we cant and never have put anyone on the moon.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 11:31:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why would we need to send another man on the moon? If we really really wanted to go on the moon and/or needed to, robots would probably be used. Why would we risk sending men when we've already done it before? or why would we waste money to prove conspiracy nutjobs wrong.

---

---

Subject: Re: Luner-Landings - What do you think.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 18:17:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If we faked it and it was so obvious that we faked it, the Soviets would have blown the whistle on the whole thing. Just because there's a motive to fake it doesn't mean it was, in fact, faked. We really DID figure it out.

---