

The Apollo Hoax FAQ (is not spam) :-)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2004-07/2917.html>

From: Nathan Jones (*NJ_at_Physicist.edu*)

Date: 07/28/04

Date: 28 Jul 2004 13:32:12 -0000

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

Hash: SHA1

Before we proceed with the FAQ let's pull the "teeth" of the shills and spoilers perhaps better defined as "Information Luddites" of usenet who yelp like pups that this FAQ is spam. And dear reader, make no mistake, this FAQ is attacked most un-scientifically at what seems is every opportunity.

Here is how you determine whether any given message or substantially similar message is spam. You use the Breidbart Index. The Breidbart Index is a measure of the quantity and "breadth" of any posting across all groups to which it has been sent. The Breidbart Index is defined as the sum of the square roots of how many newsgroups each article was posted to. If that number approaches 20 then the posts may (or may not) be defined as spam. For example, five identical posts to nine newsgroups each (5 times 3) has a Breidbart Index of 15. If such postings are repeated within any 10 day interval then the threshold of spam begins to come down too. Read it for yourself at the usenet abuse faq at <http://spam.abuse.net/spam>

Typically this faq is only posted by its author once to three news groups (cross-posted) yeilding a BI value of less than 2. This faq could be posted to all three groups ten times and still not reach the spam threshold.

Of course if miscreants repost this faq in such a way that causes spam then that is their problem not mine and complaints must be made about them and not me.

THE APOLLO HOAX FAQ version 5.0 – July 2004

By Nathan Jones.

Subject: (1) Forward and Intent

In recent years there have been many criticisms and refutations made in various media of the Apollo record, the so called proof of the Apollo space missions that allegedly landed astronauts onto the surface of the Moon during the period 1969 to 1972. The criticisms and refutations by authors

such as David Percy, Ralph Rene, the late James Collier, Bill Kaysing and others take the form of analysis of the photographic record and video footage shot by NASA astronauts and questions about the viability of other aspects of the operation such as the flight worthiness of the Lunar Module (LM) and the radiation risk posed to astronauts who venture outside of the Earth's protective shield – the Van Allen belts.

Critiques of the Apollo record have sprung up all over the internet in various websites and in the form of books, television documentaries and video presentations such as James Colliers "Was it only a Paper Moon?".

Counter claims (debunking arguments) made by so called "skeptical-bunkies" have also appeared in websites such as