

## Re: Bad News for 'Moon Hoax' Buffs

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/11141.html>

---

**From:** Mark Martin ([qed100\\_at\\_hotmail.com](mailto:qed100_at_hotmail.com))

**Date:** 03/21/05

Date: 21 Mar 2005 10:01:08 -0800

tj Frazir wrote:

- > 1 . *there was no moon trip to see live on TV.*
- > 2 , *I saw it too.*
- >
- > *Dirt wount fall faster than a man in a sute on the moon. Evrything*
- > *will fall the same speed.*
- > *They dropped a rock and hammer then the dirt on his shoe as he jumps*
- > *flys up and hits the ground 2 seconds befor he did.*
- > *I saw that live and knew that was not the moon. The laws of*  
physics
- > *dont care what nasa lies about.*

(\*yaaawwn\*) Post a link to the vodo, will ya for a change? Everything will fall with equal acceleration vertically. I challenge you to show that the scattered dust was imparted the same VERTICAL speed as the astronaut. In fact it cannot have been; the bottom of the astronaut's boot is in the way. All the dust you see has had some portion of the scattering energy puped into a horizontal component. Thus, the dust's initial conditions aren't equal to those of the astronaut. Of course the dust makes it back to the ground earlier.

- > 3 ,, *any idiot that thinks they shine a laser at a 14 inch target*  
on
- > *the moon in 1969 and the beam gets back to earth at the same place*  
is
- > *wrong.*

This has been rebutted adequately all too many times.

- > 4.. *the rocks nasa found on the moon that fell from space cant be*  
> *stopped by 2 inches of dust.*

The rocks which are resting plainly on the lunar surface didn't, in most cases, fall from space; they aren't meteorites. They are EJECTA from powerful cratering due to other ateroid impacts. They didn't impact the ground with nearly the velocity you claim. As for the lack of drag-tracks by the stones themselves, do you seriously think that

all the surface dust present today has been there, in that state, since before the rocks came to rest in their present locations? The lunar environment isn't as inert as all that. Dust is created from time to time by pulverisation of rock in asteroid impacts. It's also ground finer with time by way of thermal stresses. Ruts cut into soil years ago can be erased by the scattering & settling of soil. No big mystery here, unless you oversimplify your picture of how things work, which is what you do on a second by second basis.

> 5. *A 22000 pound thrust rocket in space has a partial plume beam  
> blasting into the moon at sonic speeds. A rocket 3 feet above the  
moon  
> will blow a hole in the moon.*

No. The rocket exhaust will scour the dust off layer after layer, leaving a bowl with a very shallow slope.

> *A rocket in space 3 feet from a 4 inch steel plate will meltblast  
and  
> burn steel.*

Uh, so? Did the LM's land on any steel plates?

> *Air stops a partial plume but in space particals set in motion out  
the  
> rocket will stay in motion .*

And what makes you think it didn't stay in motion? The cabin films clearly show the dust spraying away in long, straight spokes.

> *The rocket will dig into the moon long befor it hits te moon.  
> 6. show us one thing on the moon.  
> I can see 200 feet frames show me a frame with appollo in it*

"200 feet frames"? What the hell are you talking about? Do you mean that you've pictures of the Moon with a resolution of 200 feet? Whatever it is you're blubbering, to see Apollo hardware from near Earth would require a telescope with an effective aperture of close to a hundred feet, and that's just barely what's needed to image a descent stage. The experiments & footprints would still be grossly unresolvable. Only very recently have any astronomical instruments become available with synthetic apertures of that magnitude, and they aren't being used to peek at the Moon.

> 7. *Moon dust is high static dust the sun charged and stepping in  
threw  
> to neg and pulling the foot out and moving it over the ground will  
> charge the boot ad all the dust that flipped over will fly up .  
> One giant step and he should look like he rolled in coal.  
> he needs a shield wipper because it will be a great colector of  
charged*

> *dust.*

Charged dust will only be attracted to surfaces which also have [opposite] charge. Did the astronaut suits get dust on them. Of course they did. They have dust on them to this day. But they didn't necessarily carry opposing electric charges. What makes you think that the suits wouldn't have acquired the same charge as the soil? The suits' boots, of course, were made with high temperature rubber on the soles. They were well insulated.

> 8.

> *nasa lander is the dumbest piece of crap ever built by anyone. Some  
> powerful moron dictated what will work and it is still stupid to  
thrust  
> to the side and push against a wall while standing on a surf board  
that  
> will slide away from the wall. It fell on its face every time and  
still  
> will.*

So... if I've a spacecraft moving in a vacuum, the best way to impart sideways motion \*isn't\* to have sideways thrusters? You're such a moron tj. Side thrust on a LM was in no way similar to a surfer riding a wave on a board.

> 9.. *nasa found the hoover rock on the moon .  
> and then years latter it got put back beside the iron seat in  
the  
> white house back lawn.*

I haven't the slightest idea what you're blubbering about this time.

> 10. *USSR got one probe to send back a pic before it landed and the  
dust  
> swallowd it.  
> 11 ., the batt went dead .,the solar collector got dust all over it  
. .  
> The solar pannel has no wipper.*

That's just a baseless assertion by you. Back then the U.S.S.R. was lucky if half their stuff worked in space. The probe of which you rant was really, really early in the pioneering days of space exploration. It was a feat just for the device to work as long as it did, even without positing suffocation by a mountain of dust.

> *The laser reflector was charged by the sun and all the magnetic  
crap  
> will dump 4 inches of dust on it when they take off because its a  
dust  
> magnet with no wipper.*

sci.physics: Re: Bad News for 'Moon Hoax' Buffs

Now you see– this is the sort of crap that tells all about you. Even given that an object on the moon has a static charge, it's only going to be at the object's surface. The dust is also charged only at its surface. Dust would accumulate by electrical attraction only 'til the charge difference is quenched. A single particle layer of dust is all you'd get. No four inches, bub.

- > *There is no sand on the moon.*
- > *Its a big granet rock with impact blast .*

\*burp\*

–Mark Martin