

Re: Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005-12/msg00890.html>

- *From:* "Brad Guth" <ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 27 Dec 2005 10:50:45 -0800
-

ISS,

Have you noticed how all of the Usenet folks and spooks are so deeply focused upon those supposed surface images that oddly do not match up with images obtained from orbit. Oddly there's not a fly-by-rocket word of such hard-rocket-science upon such absolutely nifty AI/robotic technology to being touted, much less forking over any film footage of prototypes to being shared. It's as though the smoke and mirrors of whatever's fly-by-rocket is just perfectly fine and dandy spookism as is, without a shred of evidence or even the slightest observational demonstrations, as in having shared nothing whatsoever. The same goes for our NASA/Apollo of supposedly deploying our robotics and of our supposed real thing that's still so totally fantastic nearly 50 years after the fact. I guess I didn't realize that our NASA was God, if not better than any God.

<http://www.enlight.ru/ib/tech/vtm/vniitm.pdf>

A bit more extensive (47 page) rover and probe info summary. However, as usual having excluded all fly-by-rocket technology of the essential R&D plus trial & error proof-testing that would have insured the likely possibility of their safely deploying via soft-landing such rovers without having to involve impacting the lunar surface. What we need is a similar 47 page summary report with hot links to their actual film footage of the all essential R&D proof-testing of such prototype AI/robotic fly-by-rocket landers.

Soviet Moon Images: http://www.mentallandscape.com/C_CatalogMoon.htm

This being a wee bit of a large/extensive site to download is why I haven't managed to obtain a full look-see. However, of what I've seen thus far is perfectly fine and dandy of what's obtained from orbit, but otherwise sucks as for representing disinformation once upon the deck.

Zond-7: "It shot 35 pictures with the SKD camera and 300 mm objective, on 5.6 × 5.6 cm frames of color and panchromatic film."

Not knowing their applied optical spectrum filters, of what's still most interesting about Zond-7 is that it robotically had photographically outperformed even our Apollo orbital images by way of capturing a full Earth depicted above the moon that's representing itself as a relatively dark reddish/brown surface. If Earth is typically worth 36% albedo, and if the moon being supposedly of a 12%

Re: Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..

average albedo, then where's the problem of other images having included the likes of folks subsequently recording the likes of Venus, Jupiter and even a somewhat dim Mars above the lunar horizon, then of course the Sirius star system which must have been in hiding (WMD stealth mode) as never to being seen. As with our surface obtained images having those white moonsuits, providing an albedo standard of roughly 80% (perhaps 85% if squeaky clean) is exactly the same as for the white spacecraft item as having been typically seen within many of the Russian images of the extremely bright/reflective contrast of their moon which simply can not be the case unless they'd landed on some other moon by mistake.

Here's just some of the officially NASA/Apollo certified as good and perfectly believable shots of the moon from the safety of their potentially robotic orbit as being several hundred km off the deck, showing us of all things, good old mother Earth and the extremely dark albedo of our moon within the very same solar illuminated frame. Take most any image; such as AS11-44-6554, AS11-44-6639 or AS11-44-6648, and there's certainly lots more of what's believable from orbit, as from where these came from.

<http://www.lpi.usra.edu/resources/apollo/catalog/70mm/magazine/?44>

At the very least, the supposed Luna-16 recovered and photographed samples looked somewhat as a dark reddish/brown. However, I had no idea that once actually upon the surface is when all such colors and even the 12% albedo contrast vanishes into less than thin sodium, argon and a radon composite of lunar atmosphere, with the terrain becoming a very thin and light grayish layer of mostly portland cement and cornmeal like, having a 55+% albedo.

As I've said before, there's no doubt in my mindset that we've robotically orbited our moon, having taken sufficient images by camera/film and via the very best video cameras of the day, of which entirely proves that other significant objects besides Earth could have and should have been capably included as above the horizon within a few of the supposedly surface obtained images.

Personally, I have no doubts whatsoever that these terrestrial rover prototypes existed and were fully R&D demonstrated as scaled in mass in order to simulate operating upon the moon, as well as I have no doubts whatsoever that their fully scaled and thus full mass worth of the actual landers along with their robotic rovers were sent to the moon with every intentions of their getting those machines safely deployed, just like we had been doing everything we could for making our robotics plus manned landers and rovers get safely onto the lunar deck. Too bad there's still no viable way of folks seeing any fly-by-rocket demonstrations as to demonstrating how it's possible to safely manage soft landings upon the moon, or even safely upon the local parking lot.

<http://epizodsspace.testpilot.ru/bibl/gubarev/hronika/foto.html>

Notice how their terrestrial photograph offers a terrain that looks

Re: Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..

exactly as though it's situated upon the dark and nasty moon. Notice how the wheels from the terrestrial R&D prototypes are not sinking in because of the unit having been scaled in order to represent itself as though being upon the moon. Supposedly upon the moon, notice how slight of depth the extremely fine lunar soil represents itself, and how gosh darn surface clean, smooth and nicely reflective for as far as their camera eye could see.

http://www.anoca.org/lunar/lunokhod/luna_17.html

<http://selena.sai.msu.ru/Home/Spacecrafts/Lunokhod1/lunokhod1.htm>

Luna 17: notice the open mesh wheels that probably couldn't manage to spread and share the mass of the fairly massive robotic rover at not much below 200 g/cm². That's not half bad lunar surface tension capability for having to support a $5700/6 = 950$ lunar kg upon such a thick layer of what should have been extremely dark micro-dust as supposedly upon a multi-billion year coated lunar terrain that should have become meters deep in places, limited to perhaps as little as a dry quick-sand capable of sustaining all of 5 g/cm². However, as for a load shared upon 8 modus wheels of 51 cm diameter offering perhaps at the very best upon average 600 cm² of accommodating individual surface contact/support each, thus $600 \times 8 = 4800$ cm². $933,000/4800 = 194$ g/cm² seems a wee bit on the hefty side of what yet another nifty Rusky cold-war method of spookology and by their usual smoke and mirror tricks of disinformation infomercials managed to have pulled off.

Lunokhod 2 / Luna 18 lander and rover together weighed 1814 kg
Lunokhod 2 Rover itself represented $5,750 \text{ kg}/6 = 958$ kg lunar mass upon 8 wheels of a solid tread, although somewhere I've seen a few 6 wheeled versions (of somewhat larger diameter wheels as quite possibly prototypes) which only seems to beg yet another question or two.

<http://selena.sai.msu.ru/Home/Spacecrafts/Lunokhod2/lunokhod2.htm>

Notice how their obviously terrestrial photograph of the rover profile was situated upon a relatively dark test soil, and then once supposedly situated upon the moon the actual lunar soil is suddenly of a fairly light contrasting substance that's in places reflecting at nearly 65%, with the majority of their lunar soil depicted as nearly or above 55% albedo, without hardly a meteorite or secondary impact shards of dark lunar basalt nor any other significant local items of any dark substances in sight. There even a white item of roughly 80% albedo as offering a good optical albedo reference.

<http://pages.preferred.com/~tedstryk/lunokhod2.html>

Notice how never once was there a video including any significant portion above the horizon. Apparently those USSR cameras were so terribly crude that they couldn't adjust their frame by frame exposures or having pointed them so as to have easily recorded a couple of other planets and the likes of the Sirius star system as they should have appeared above some portion of the extremely dark and nasty lunar horizon, as could have been easily camera/image recorded.

Re: Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..

Notice how undusty (little if any fine power of carbon/soot, salts, iron, titanium and of local basalt shards as having essentially no depth to that substance) but rather more or less as though a terrestrial heavy looking soil plus common terrestrial sand like, along with a lunar terrain was offering such a terrific amount surface tension capability which was traction clumping as good if not better than upon Earth.

"Ruskies in space #3"

<http://www.modernman.com/forums/DCForumID24/785.html>

Notice how they have terrific passive images of their technology which seems as though having taken absolutely no actual fly-by-rocket deployment R&D, therefore not having any film documenting of their prototype landers being capable of safely arriving, as in real action footage of prototypes that could have easily been scaled down by simply excluding internal batteries, instruments and other excess inert mass in order to have matched lunar mass for simulating on behalf of accomplishing their terrestrial trial and error runs. It's called fly-by-rocket research, engineering and actual field drop proof-testing.

Notice how each of their landings were entirely rocket thrust crater or blast-zone free, and otherwise how totally dust free their landing sites and explorations were managed. Almost as though having been placed by a crane or helicopter and cable lift instead of having used rocket thrust.

Notice how the very best images of their supposed fly-by-rocket lander is that of line-drawing and/or of an artist conception, and otherwise never once sharing any link to any actual film footage of their prototype technology in action. Perhaps that's because insufficient reaction wheels simply were not available at the same time, as well as sufficiently modulated rocket engines were not exactly available or at least not sufficiently developed for actual AI/robotic usage.

—
Brad Guth

• **References:**

◆ **Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..**

◇ *From: ISS*

- Prev by Date: **Re: Space food a la carte – BBC**
- Next by Date: **Re: Space food a la carte – BBC**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..**
- Next by thread: **Re: Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..**
- Index(es):

◆ **Date**

Re: Lunochod 1 and 2 mission photos..

◆ *Thread*