

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.satellite-nav/2006-08/msg00082.html>

- *From:* "Brad Guth" <ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 21 Jul 2006 13:27:34 -0700
-

Sam Wormley wrote:

I said that you, Brad, haven't the foggiest idea where Venus is in the lunar sky... and that film used on the Apollo mission doesn't have the dynamic range to capture sunlit landscape and stars simultaneously. Which direction is Venus in the lunar sky, Brad?

It's somewhere above that physically dark lunar horizon, and at the time it was not ever entirely hidden by Earth, and it was especially damn bright to that unfiltered Kodak eye, by as much a three fold brighter albedo since there's hardly any moderation nor spectrum filtration afforded by that wussy lunar atmosphere. As I'd stipulated before, being unavoidably included in at least three Apollo missions.

I know for an absolute matter of science and of physics fact that Venus was not being nearly as stealth as were all of those WMD that your kind claimed existed. Of course if you'd dare, you could easily have proven that I'm wrong, but you can't.

I know for an absolute matter of science and of physics fact that Venus was not being nearly as stealth as were all of those WMD that your kind claimed existed. Of course if you'd dare, you could easily have proven that I'm wrong.

The truth and nothing but the truth is rather nuts these days, just like your resident LLPOF warlord(GW Bush) is far beyond nuts (more like 10+ trillion plus butt-loads of collateral damage and the nearly countless carnage of the innocent, insane).

With further regard to our having easily and rather unavoidably photographed a few sufficiently bright items other than the physically dark moon itself, and that of mother Earth that isn't half as humanly albedo bright as Venus and not a third as unfiltered Kodak moment bright, Brad Guth wrote:

: Eliminating atmospheric filtration, and the matter of fact that the

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification

: unfiltered Kodak film was extremely sensitive to such blue, indigo,
: violet, near-UV and even a bit of UV-a, by which the likes of the
: Sirius star system has way more than it's fair share of such photons.

kmmposting; Reference for that, please.

KODAK, NASA, ESA, team KECK and just about any other source that's
equally approved and replicated to death.

BTW; Where the heck is all of that sodium/salt and other bits of lead
and the unavoidable radium deposits from our supposed moon samples?

Why does Mars offer a good hundred fold more of those relatively dark
surface meteorites and loads of secondary impact shards to show us?

Why are those few and far between meteorites and secondary impact
shards upon our moon of such low contrast (0.55~0.65 albedo), and
otherwise w/o color?

Why is that highly reflective if not selectively retroreflective
moon-dust that's affording such a nice amount of surface-tension as
being of such terrific physical support of such good clumping
compression capacity and/or simply robust, and otherwise so unusually
shallow?

Since the GSO of what our Van Allen belt is worth $2e3$ Sv/year, as based
upon being shielded by 5/16" worth of 5086 aluminum, and since our
naked moon has always been measurably worse off; How the heck did they
do it?

: Where do you suppose all of that sodium/salt is coming from?

KMM; eh?

KMM, You've got to be absolutely kidding, as even our resident LLPOF
warlord(GW Bush) isn't that dumbfounded. The well documented and even
photographed 900,000 km comet like trail of solar wind extracted
element of sodium from our moon isn't hardly a secret. In spite of the
NASA/Apollo koran; that physically dark and nasty moon of ours is
still as salty as all get out.

Though otherwise "KMM" has provided nice infomercial-science links of
what we've all been informed of and thus knew about for decades, and
otherwise of those unfiltered Kodak moments of that guano moon that's
so lightly dusted in a thin layer of portland cement that's so bone-dry
clumping and otherwise selectively retroreflective under such nifty
xenon lamp illumination to boot. Thanks ever so much.

What's so complicated or otherwise taboo/nondisclosure about folks
sharing the truth and nothing but the truth?

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectificati@n

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification

What's so unusable about the regular laws of physics and of the sorts of hard-science that's fully replicated?

What's so unlikely about various individuals and/or of their governments as having made mistakes or simply having been dishonest, greedy and highly bigoted?

What's your all-knowing expertise or best SWAG of an answer as to each of those pesky "blue-screen" frames?

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/resources/apollo/catalog/70mm/magazine/?73>

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/resources/apollo/frame/?AS14-73-10182>

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/resources/apollo/catalog/70mm/magazine/?72>

What's your all-knowing best answers to their having photographed a greater than half Earth and of the highly reflective moon being well past sunrise, and otherwise that of an unusually slim crescent of Earth as photographed from the moon?

<http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/History/alsj/a17/as17-134-20384.jpg>

<http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/History/alsj/a17/as17-134-20387-cropped.jpg>

<http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/History/alsj/a14/20149603.jpg>

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/resources/apollo/frame/?AS14-66-9329>

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/resources/apollo/frame/?AS14-66-9331>

WHERE'S VENUS ?

On at least these three Apollo missions of A-11, A-14, A-16, and since you've all had access to the very best supercomputer and of the fully interactive 3D solar system simulator that'll fully render a very photographically realistic (AKA true to life) representation of nearly all there is as viewed from anywhere at any date and time: Where's Venus as viewed from the moon?

While you're at it with utilizing that absolutely nifty supercomputer of ours, and of that fully interactive 3D capable rendering software of that absolutely nifty solar system simulator of ours; where's the likes of Sirius throughout all of those APOLLO and of so many other robotic missions before and especially of those after having at least an extra 4 db or 16 fold better dynamic range to offer (these days a few of the 16 db capable CCDs are available as also having been in orbit and otherwise 100+% bought and paid for by public dollars as well as via tax-avoidance dollars (thereby same as public dollars)?

What's the unfiltered Kodak photographic recorded difference between that of using a xenon lamp spectrum and that of having to deal with the raw solar illumination spectrum?

With a view of Earth situated within the same frame; Why is that moon of ours such a deeply rich composite of golden brown tinted or coated basalts and of various other dark element deposits as having been viewed from orbit, and otherwise entirely of such clean portland cement and of somewhat lighter contrasting substances that's absolutely

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification

colorless and even somewhat selectively retroreflective as viewed from the surface?

BTW No.2; Ed Conrad (<http://www.edconrad.com/>) has been saying all along that man, or at least of something very human or perhaps ET like, is at the very least as old as coal, and that we haven't yet walked on that physically dark and nasty moon of ours. got it?

If walking upon that physically nasty and dark mineral moon of ours, besides being extremely electrostatic dusty as all get out (tens of meters in fluffy depth none the less), think Van Allen belt TBI dosage nasty, as in GSO times at least $10 = 2e4$ Sv/year while shielded by 5/16" worth of 5086 aluminum (~ 2 g/cm²). Gee whiz, folks, that's only worth 228 rads/hr. On a truly bad solar day you can go with another ten fold worse off, and if it's a totally passive solar day there's no chance in hell of that surface environment being less than 23 rads/hr by day and perhaps at best 2.8 rads/hr by nighttime/earthshine. Either way, you'd best have that personal cash of banked bone marrow standing by, and perhaps a few of those vital spare body parts just in case things get a little nastier than you'd planned on. Learn braille and get yourself a good dog, especially since you could soon become blind.

—

Brad Guth

.

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification