

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.space.history/2006–08/msg00307.html>

---

- *From:* "Brad Guth" <[ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 18 Jul 2006 10:33:21 –0700
- 

polaris431 (Elijah Rosenburg),

The science of "photogrammetric rectification" has to include the whereabouts of Venus and that of any other sufficient source of an illuminated item, plus even those few brightest of stars that simply couldn't have been entirely avoided by the unfiltered Kodak eye, as much it has everything to do with the various shadows, the less than half waning crescent amount of Earth and of those raw illumination spectrums that should have existed upon our naked moon at the time of each Apollo mission. Of light and shadows is 100% replicated science that has proven itself time and again, whereas it's of what you don't see that's as important as for what can not be seen.

Scott Hedrick and the countless likes of Sam Wormley and David Bacque have each known all the right dates, and they've also had the world's best solar system simulator with full 3D, correct albedo and starshine renderings from any desired perspective you can think of, as being at their disposal. NOVA, GOOGLE, Smithsonian, National Geographic and many others have such impressive computer driven simulators to work from. As such they each need to go fish, or go suck another rotten egg for all I care. In other words, for decades these capable simulators have gotten good enough that you simply don't have to actually go to that physically dark moon in order to know of exactly what's within that crystal clear black sky to look at, and as to knowing for absolute mathematical certainty to what extent and saturation degree of such items would have been easily photographed at any given time and from any given location upon our moon.

Even though we the public and as consumers being taxed upon taxed to death have paid for everything of the very best that has been at their disposal, and even though this supercomputer or better yet a GOOGLE replacement that's more than capable of hosting various 3D astronomy and space exploration simulations should have nothing to do with national security or any other honest considerations other than for expanding our scientific expertise. However, it seems as though we the public are not being allowed access to what's been bought and paid for multiple times over, and at least technically available for decades.

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

No wonder Venus and of what has been discovered about Venus is being ignored and banished, and it's looking as though China is going to beat us to the moon and most likely establish the one and only LL-1 platform, and all of that's simply because they've gotten smarter than us.

This latest update effort has been recently corrected for those of us thinking that we've been snookered, but good. Unfortunately, my unintentional errors in math, frequent dropping of letters and of reverse syntax probably isn't helping those unable to think for themselves. Sorry about that.

Sam Wormley; How far away (angle in the sky—elongation) from the Sun would Venus have been during each of the Apollo landing, Brad?

Just for his lordship's benefit, I've included some of those numbers within the following wall of my newest and hopefully improved dyslexic words, as having started those roughly half way down this contribution are of my best estimates as to the angle of Venus from the sun, or from one mission as having been nearly blocked by Earth. Of course, you folks having access to nothing but the very best of solar system simulators and of those spendy supercomputers that we'd bought just for you, thus each and every one of you folks have always known the truth, didn't you.

Unlike most others that have been pecking away at the NASA/Apollo butt, I've never once insisted that our spendy Third Reich Apollo missions hadn't gotten a little of something at least robotic into orbiting and otherwise into having impacted that moon. I'm just having my say that it didn't quite go down according to the extent and way that we've been informed. Instead being almost exactly what many of us outsiders have been saying all along. However, I actually tend to believe that achieving LL-1 is what had been briefly accomplished in person, although there are many arguments from others sharing their expertise and thoughts that our Apollo missions could not have gotten that far, and having lived so entirely unscathed as to be telling us about it.

Obviously this argument shall remain as an all or nothing fiasco, much like our fully perpetrated cold-war(s), and now much like that absolute oily and otherwise bloody mess of Iraq that has since gotten others (namely Jews) back into their Muslim butt kicking mood. And here I'd thought WW-III was still years away.

The likes of our warm and fuzzy "George Evans" is another one of those mainstream collaborators that doesn't believe in the regular laws of physics, nor in the fully replicated science of others, and it seems that most of you folks still can't make your PC/internet search for much of anything that even our George fully intends to either exclude or summarily trash anyway, that is unless it 100+% supports by every

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

possible interpretation as to suit each of their status quo perverted mindsets.

This next part is all about the no wonder that "GUTH Venus" and that of my "LSE-CM/ISS" plus anything else the least bit related are still officially taboo/nondisclosure, if not getting routinely stalked and wherever possible as banished topics. In which case, there's no further what if's, and's or but's about it, that's pertaining to our not having landed upon that physically dark and nasty moon of our's. Here's some new and improved numbers, and I've even fixed a few more of those pesky words and syntax for the old gipper that basically says that we haven't quite gotten ourselves around to walking upon that physically dark and nasty moon. Imagine (in jest), that for the very first and only time in recorded history, that we've been lied to by our government.

In the past, and as of lately, others and I've posted multiple example images that more than proves we're right, that the physics and replicated science of Kodak is 100% right, including the regular laws of physics as imposed by "photogrammetric rectification" are right, and that the replicated hard-science as what has been contributed from so many others is absolute proof-positive that a good many of the core members of this Usenet and of their kind have been nothing but a sorry borg like pack of incest born-again liars, exactly like our resident LLPOF warlord(GW Bush).

BTW; Venus is not a wussy pin-point of a star. Instead, Venus is terribly bright and represents many equivalent pixels worth of being an extremely vibrant item that's nearly impossible to avoid if you're into accomplishing all of those unfiltered Kodak moments from that 0.072 albedo of such a physically dark and nasty moon.

We see that folks here in Usenet naysay land, of having been imposing their denial upon denials, are still into avoiding the replicated hard-science of this and most any other original topic, as well as for the ongoing banishment as to avoiding whatever's the NASA/Apollo justification of their somehow having excluded Venus; Can anyone suggest as to why that is?

Even NASA's public solar system simulators manage to avoid or rather conveniently exclude that Apollo era of our viewing the lunar horizon relationship of folks having a good enough simulated look-see at Venus and Earth as would have been observed and easily photographed from the physically dark surface of our moon, as rather oddly having such simulator capability intentionally moderated in their favor of what's otherwise are spendy and do-everything else simulators. Gee whiz folks, I wonder why?

The topic(s) as contributed by polaris431 (Elijah Rosenberg); "A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification" is also getting rather unusually stalked

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

and bashed, and/or given the Usenet treatment of information banished because of the truth and nothing but the truth that it clearly represents.

In spite of all the incessant mainstream status quo flak, I believe that we village idiots are actually right, in that we each in our own way claim that our NASA could have easily proven damn near anything if they'd so intended. The reason(s) why the hard-science that's fully replicated as to "photogrammetric rectification", and that of my limited though more than sufficient expertise being within the realm of perfectly replicated observationology, as to the photographically recorded spectrums and of the various color saturation, such as based upon that very terrestrial like spectrum of xenon lamp rather than having to deal with the raw solar illumination, and of the various albedo and even starshine issues of so many other items that should have been unavoidably recorded by those unfiltered Kodak moments is all being rejected, is perhaps because they each contribute more of the same absolute proof-positive that we have not landed upon that moon, nor much less having walked upon that unfortunately radioactive and otherwise unavoidably reactive little naked moon of ours, that's actually offering itself as a worse than lethal environment of TBI(total body irradiation) gamma and hard-X-ray dosage than otherwise imposed by any portion of what our Van Allen belts represent.

The truth can not be told by these warm and fuzzy Usenet folks, of seemingly mostly Jewish e-spoofs and/or e-moles that like sharing as much of their PC malware/fuckware as they can get away with, and certainly it has not been otherwise the least bit topic constructive by way of their having shared in anything that's NASA official that'll ever accommodate the likes of external science (no matters how trustworthy or replicated) nor much less consider that of my expertise. They are not within this status quo or bust Usenet from hell as representing honest individuals willing to share and share alike in anything that might tend to prove that we've been lied to (AKA snookered by way of those of us having "the right stuff").

BTW No.2; some of those Apollo EVA shadows seem to indicate as though they've gotten well past the 9:00 AM mark (well past the quarter lunar day). Considering their typical arrivals being shortly after sunrise, and the extra length of a given lunar day; might we dare to ask if that's even possible as to having such unusually short shadows?

Since the moon itself has to be that of a rather physically dark composite of mostly basalt plus whatever else had been solar and cosmic deposited, and otherwise offering a relatively nonreflective surface (of an especially lower albedo via sunrise and even of a few days thereafter), yet never once was there a sign of any secondary shadows within a given solar generated shadow, of ever having offered any hint whatsoever of an earthshine generated shadow. Considering the relatively good DR(dynamic range) of what that unfiltered Kodak film and of what the extremely good optics had to offer, and of how little

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

else was getting reflected off the physically dark lunar terrain; is zero earthshine actually possible?

Of less than a half illuminated Earth is worth roughly 32 fold brighter illumination from that amount of earthshine than is offered by a full moon as depicted here on Earth, and if that bluish illumination source doesn't manage to generate a worthy secondary shadow within a deep shadow, then I obviously don't know of what else would.

From being situated on the moon, as in no matters what, you simply can

not avoid having the best ever look–see at Venus, not even if you're one of the all–knowing Gods and wizards of Apollo, or otherwise rated as smart enough to being involved in most everything else that's connected with our NASA (supposedly our NASA doesn't hire the likes of the dumb and dumber, although we'd certainly elected one messed up warlord).

According to various solar system simulators that all agree with one another, at least three of those Apollo missions and especially of Apollo 16 had the best ever viewing of a sufficiently nearby and otherwise bright crescent Venus, such as being merely 0.578 AU nearby, whereas Venus having been on their last day of EVA was I believe rather nicely situated just above their lunar sunrise horizon, as being available at nearly 30 degrees below the sun (2.5+ days past sunrise). The Apollo 14 mission of February 5/6, 1971 is when a better than half illuminated view of Venus was situated behind though I believe unavoidably showing itself as just below Earth. As of their initial encounter of the July 20, 1969 timeline is when our supposed Apollo–11 landing was shortly after sunrise and Venus was also representing a good crescent of being somewhat less than looking half illuminated and unavoidably situated quite a few degrees off center from Earth at roughly 44 away from the sun, and if Earth was at nearly  $90^\circ =$  Venus at  $46^\circ$  away from Earth, thereby nearly impossible to have photographically avoided from day one (especially within most any wide angle shot). After all, folks, that pesky vibrant orb of Venus is simply so much so unavoidably brighter than Earth, and as for being such, isn't that representing the best ever good news in town, or what?

In a few other dyslexic words; If you can manage to photograph the extremely low albedo of that physically dark lunar terrain (especially representing an even darker albedo of photographic saturation that has to be the case if it's shortly after sunrise), plus that of including the 0.36 albedo crescent Earth, how absolutely simple could it have been to having included a photographic shot or two that would have easily included Venus, or otherwise how difficult as having to avoid that rather pesky 0.8 albedo of Venus. After all, albedo is albedo because, an unfiltered look–see at Venus isn't exactly representing itself as any less than pin–point speck of some distant star, now is it.

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectification 5n

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

According to Wikipedia:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image:Transit\\_diagram\\_angles.png](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image:Transit_diagram_angles.png)

When Venus is passing nearby Earth and the moon is situated on the opposite side, Venus as viewed from the moon is not likely ever going to remain as entirely hidden by the large blocking disk area of Earth.

The Apollo 14 mission timeline of including February 4 is when Venus was along side and otherwise just slightly below, whereas February 5, 1971 is when a slightly greater than half illuminated view of Venus was only 0.775 AU and situated as though behind though I believe unavoidably showing itself as depicted in most any simulator edge-view that'll depict Venus as residing just below Earth, and February 6 headed just to the other side and still hanging a bit low, whereas any good solar simulator worth it's salt would put it exactly wherever it had to be and even establish the proper albedo as a relative brightness of Venus in direct relationship to that of our otherwise less than half the albedo worth of Earth. Being days past lunar sunrise (sunrise = 12.2 solar degrees/day) means that a crescent Earth would have been photographed as measurably depicted as being less than half illuminated.

Unlike yourself, I'm using the likes of free solar system simulators and of otherwise taking advantage of whatever's online, whereas yourself having access to that spendy CRAY supercomputer or of having something better to work with, will have access to not only far better numbers but also very realistic 3D animation that's quite accurate.

BTW No.3; it's impossible that most others within the supposed know (such as yourself) haven't known about all of this relationship of our Apollo missions in association with our physically dark moon of 0.072 albedo and that of that unavoidable 0.8 albedo of Venus, as well as Kodak couldn't possibly have not known about this entire part of our perpetrated cold-war as being the ultimate ruse/sting of the century from the very get go.

If those moon surface shadows are depicted as being properly quite long (shortly after sunrise), whereas then you'd have to think a bright crescent of Earth would have to be offering somewhat less than being half illuminated and as being the expected norm, and for otherwise representing a fairly good amount of bluish earthshine.

Are short shadows even possible?

In the well proven science of "photogrammetric rectification", how can the Apollo view of Earth be represented as a given illuminated percentage that's ever of being anything but something less than 1/2 Earth, as for offering such a nicely solar illuminated crescent orb, whereas those solar generated shadows upon the moon as having been indicated as sometimes having been depicted as being rather short, as though suggesting our moon as having gotten itself well past the 1/2 phase as viewed from Earth? In other words, how the heck did some of

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

those Apollo EVA shadows get to being so short?

Besides our moon being physically nearly sooty dark as coal, and otherwise getting itself instantly double IR hot by each minute of the day, and otherwise a bit more than subfrozen by way of whatever's fully shaded and especially by night, whereas our moon has also been quite unavoidably worse off in sharing worthy amounts of gamma and of the unavoidable secondary/recoil hard-X-ray dosage than any of those bad and lethal zones identified within the Van Allen belts. Physically our moon has been essentially offering itself as that of a solid form of a nasty Van Allen zone, that's basically naked and w/o magnetosphere and thereby damn lethal as all get out.

Which means that far too many folks are either more dumb and dumber than merely pretending at their being dumbfounded, or otherwise as merely that of absolute certified liars. Such as this following example lie as offered by "Scott Dorsey".

Scott Dorsey; Ektachrome doesn't even have the range to capture sun-lit landscapes all by themselves...

Besides all of the hard-science proof that's easily replicated from Kodak and from any number of other independent sources, whereas even those phony NASA/Apollo EVA images is what more than proves this pathetic "Scott Dorsey" statement about Ektachrome film is simply another scripted from of their damage-control and outright lies upon lies.

BTW No.4; There's also more than a sufficient number of peer qualified astrophysics and/or of perfectly good orbital software (including those offered by NASA) that'll prove that I'm sufficiently right as rain about the location of Venus in relationship to that of our moon and that of Earth, and that I'm right about more than a few other interesting items that should have been unavoidably photo recorded. So lo and behold, with a little expertise and a good simulator at hand, it seems that we don't actually have to go there, now do we.

I've asked of the pro NASA/Apollo folks to take this next friendly tidbit of info, and shove it!

Photoshop for Astrophotographers

<http://www.astropix.com/PFA/SAMPLE1/SAMPLE1.HTM>

Dynamic range is the amount of difference between the brightest and darkest ... Kodak's Ektachrome 200 is an excellent choice for deepsky because there will be more contrast, not only between faint parts of the nebulosity, but also between the faint nebulosity and the sky background.

In a few other words, the the "D-Max" of Kodak Ektachrome offers far better DR(dynamic range) than most any color print film that's good enough for 8 f/stops.

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

"Kodak's Kodachrome has a D–Max of about 3.7, which is almost twelve stops"

I'd previously arrived at 11.7 ~ 12.96 stops, although that's somewhat unavoidably limited by whatever the lens introduces, thus you might count on roughly 7+ f/stops unless using the Carl Zeiss quality of lens along with a polarised element, by which shouldn't have any difficulty pushing and/or allowing that Ektachrome range of contrast to offering better than 9 usable f/stops, 10 maximum upon being properly scanned = 1023:1, and if that were properly PhotoShop extended = 2047:1.

Bob Monaghan recently had this to say:

[http://groups.google.com/group/rec.photo.equipment.35mm/browse\\_frm/thread/ca278ccafdf6d316/82bbe950330f1dd4](http://groups.google.com/group/rec.photo.equipment.35mm/browse_frm/thread/ca278ccafdf6d316/82bbe950330f1dd4)

Film Film Dmax Contrast [n.b. 4096:1 is 12 stops]

Vericolor 5072 (neg–pos) 3.9 D 8000:1

Kodachrome 25 3.8 D 6300:1

Kodachrome 64 3.7 D 5000:1

Ektachrome 64 3.7 D 5000:1

Ektachrome 100GX 3.8 D 6300:1

Ektachrome 100plus EPP 3.8 D 6300:1

Fuji Velvia 50 RVP 3.8 D 6300:1

Fuji Velvia 100 RVP100F 3.8 D 6300:1

Fujichrome EI 100 3.6 D 4000:1

in short, lots of us work with films which have 12 or more stops of dynamic range.

<http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/byauth/vitale/digital–projection/>

In photographic reality of what Kodak's Ektachrome film can manage, I've stipulated that at best a 1023:1 or 10 f/stop range is obtainable (PhotoShop pushed to 2047:1), and as such being more than sufficient for having recorded other planets and a few of the brightest of stars while including the physically dark lunar terrain.

So, exactly whom's into kidding whom?

Which only means that you folks are either playing this game as though dumbfounded or that you're actually certified liars (I think it's a little of both), as well as for that of our incest cloned "Scott Dorsey" that's into continually lying his mainstream status quo worth of NASA's infomercial–science as based upon their own conditional laws of physics, and of their otherwise mutually having accomplished boat–loads of the usual disinformation sucking and blowing each of their infomercial butts off.

Scott Dorsey; Ektachrome doesn't even have the range to capture sun–lit landscapes all by themselves...

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

Besides all of the available hard–science proof that's easily replicated from Kodak and otherwise obtained from any number of other independent sources, whereas even those NASA/Apollo EVA images is offering us more than what proves this statement of his is simply another mainstream formulated damage–control lie, just like all of the butt–ugly lies of his close friend and resident LLPOF warlord(GW Bush).

In addition to there being a few other items of somewhat keen photographic interest that would only benefit the NASA/Apollo argument, how about you folks show us an official NASA/Apollo image as having included that of our physically dark moon, and if need be to include the less than half crescent worth of mother Earth, along with that of the good old and unavoidable Venus as being situated somewhere in that crystal clear blackness between Earth and otherwise above all of that physically dark and nasty lunar terrain, or perhaps you can simply shut the hell up.

Remember that modern solar system simulators that can run on a MAC or PC format can easily prove as to exactly where the sun, Earth and Venus was located at any given time, in specific 3D relationship to any camera that's situated upon the moon, and as for such as Venus being unavoidably viewable by those of our rad–hard moonsuit astronauts as supposedly having been accomplishing all of those unfiltered Kodak moments that were not only double IR immune but of fully rad–hard film to boot, that which photographically should not have had any problems whatsoever in their having quite nicely recorded such Kodak moments as for those frames having an unobstructed look–see at good old Venus.

Since a perfectly good view of Venus would have been so often unavoidable in at least three of those missions, and otherwise rather easily included within frame and offering way more than sufficient saturation for most any given photo opportunity pointed as even half–ass in the right direction, and thereby having extensively proven to a nearest absolute matter of fact that we'd walked upon that moon. Therefore, why the heck do you folks suppose that our NASA which badly needed all the credit it could get for each and every positive worth of PR and science achievement award, had instead intentionally avoided and/or having erased/eliminated Venus from each and every one those Apollo missions?

Why wouldn't they bother to have included Venus and a few other items unless they hadn't actually accomplished what we've been told?

–

Brad Guth

.

Re: A scientific approach to proving whether man landed on the moon – photogrammetric rectificati0n