

[return to updates](#)

AMERICAN MOON



by Miles Mathis

First published March 2, 2020

In 2017, Italian director Massimo Mazzucco [released the film *American Moon*](#), proving once again the Apollo missions were faked. This film is basically a large expansion of the previous 2001 FoxNews film *Conspiracy Theory: Did We Land on the Moon?* Both use Bill Kaysing's book *We Never Went to the Moon* as a starting point, but *American Moon* takes it even further than Kaysing did, adding much new research to the argument.

Although I agree that we never went to the Moon, I have always found it curious that a Rocketdyne employee would blow the cover of the project, and that FoxNews would later give his argument legs. After watching *American Moon* twice, I think I have finally solved that problem. What I think we have here is a rather advanced example of controlling the opposition. All these people know that the American public already knows the Moon landings were faked. So they can only hope to control the response.

Here is the key quote that clued me in:

The reason I believe that NASA and the government faked the Moon landing was basically that it was technically impossible to do it, and they simply had to come up with some sort of alternative that the public would believe.



That is Bill Kaysing himself, at minute 24:00. The same quote is used in the FoxNews film as well. But that is misdirection, since that *isn't* why NASA faked the Moon landing. They want you to think that is why they faked it, because that is far less damning than the truth: they faked the entire Apollo program in order to steal hundreds of billions of dollars from the treasury, and therefore from you and your parents and grandparents.

As usual, they billed you for things they never delivered *and never intended to deliver*. The Apollo program was not a failure. Even as a fake, it was a grand success, since it did exactly what it intended to do from the start. That was to suck massive sums from the treasury, using a complicit Congress to do so. This was simply another gigantic conjob upon the American taxpayer.

Even Dave McGowan gets it wrong, in *Wagging the Moondoggie*. He argues the Apollo fake was meant to keep your eyes off Vietnam. I have seen the counter-argument as well: Vietnam was to keep your eyes off the Apollo con. But they are both wrong again, probably on purpose. BOTH Apollo and Vietnam were suck-from-the-treasury projects, by which hundreds of billions of dollars were stolen from taxpayers for. . . absolutely nothing. The Vietnam War was just as fake as Apollo, but no one seems to see that to this day. And admitting the Apollo fake tends to keep your mind off Vietnam. The Apollo hoax stories, including McGowan's, tend to sell Vietnam as real.

But we don't need to go there in this paper. If we stick to the Apollo conjob, we can see that the point of all these films and exposés is misdirection. You never come out the end of any of them with the proper levels of anger. Somehow, they spit you out at the end just as complacent as you were going in. This is because the authors and narrators never stress the steal at the heart of it, and they never express the magnitude of the **crime**. They don't connect it to anything else, show the pattern, reveal the criminals, or suggest a solution. The entire history is sold to you as some sort of grand mistake or miscalculation, one you have at last seen through. But it never dawns on you that there is anything you could do about it, or *must* do lest it continue to happen again and again, to your and your children. They don't point out that the con continues on a daily basis, and that it isn't just your grandparents who were fooled by this.

They are even now stealing more billions from you to pretend to send people to the Moon *again*. See the [Artemis Program](#), which is already being funded with your federal tax dollars, allegedly to land people on the Moon by 2024. Its projected cost is \$35 billion, but of course that will skyrocket over the next few years, and I predict NASA will go 1000% over-budget at least. They have already requested

another 1.6 billion for 2020, and we are only two months in. Remember, Apollo cost around \$160 billion in today's dollars. Do you really think the fake will be cheaper the second time around?

Of course this entire program will have to be faked, since we don't have the technology to go to the Moon. You should know that, since the Artemis Program is a continuation of the private [Artemis Project](#) from 1994. It was going to land people on the Moon by 2002, but of course did not. Wikipedia admits none of this happened because:

low-cost access to space (possibly involving [single-stage-to-orbit](#) or [two-stage-to-orbit vehicles](#)) had yet to be developed.

That's right, and it has still not been developed. High-cost access has also not been developed, and is not close to being developed. The Artemis Project was a con on its investors, and so is the Artemis Program. Except that this time *you* are the investor being conned.

Also remember how much you have been billed for the Mars programs, which are also fake. Wikipedia conspicuously fails to tell us how much those cost, but the Curiosity lander alone cost around \$3 billion, not including mission costs.

Amazingly, we have confirmation of my thesis straight from *American Moon*, though it is buried. See minute 7:20, where we are supposed to be hearing an “actual recording” of a conversation between Kennedy and head-of-project Webb. Kennedy winds up the fake conversation by saying

But this looks like a hell of a lot of dough to go to the moon when you can learn most of what you want scientifically through instruments.

Why do I say that is fake? Because the voice is not Kennedy's voice. Not even close. Did they think we wouldn't notice that this guy has no Boston accent? So they have dubbed Kennedy's part of this conversation in later. Why? Because someone is telling you what I am telling you. This mission wasn't about American pride or a space race or anything else. It was about spending money from the treasury. So some rogue part of US Intelligence later released this fake conversation to make that point. But Mazzucco doesn't stress that part of it, nor does he point out the voice isn't Kennedy's.

At minute 26:00, Mazzucco shows a composite of the top people who have promoted the Moon Hoax argument, and it includes Kaysing, Ralph Rene, Bart Sibre, Dave McGowan, David Percy, Jarrah White, Mary Bennett, James Collier, Aron Ranen, James Fetzer, Ronnie Stronge, and Rick Shaddock. That list makes me very uncomfortable as well, since most of those people throw up huge red flags. Note the names Percy and Bennett for a start. Big peerage names. Fetzer I have previously outed. McGowan misdirected mightily on the Manson murders. So, again, we seem to have a lot of people attempting to control the response here. They don't seem to care if you think the Moon landings were fake, but they don't want to stress the criminal element of it. They don't want you to realize the crime is massive, ongoing, and preventable. They don't want you coming to the realization the magnitude of this conjob, *added to all the other current conjobs*, demands an immediate revolution tomorrow morning.

At minute 29:00 Mazzucco introduces the Moon Hoax debunkers as “people who are absolutely convinced we went to the Moon.” But again, this is misstating the case, probably on purpose. Mazzucco goes on to prove beyond any doubt that all of these people are paid liars. There is no possibility they actually believe what they are saying, and that includes MythBusters, Phil Plait, Jim

Oberg, Paulo Attivissimo, Jay Windley, and all the rest. So why not just say so? Mazzucco might say he is trying to avoid a lawsuit, but in the US you can't be successfully sued for calling liars liars. See Bill O'Reilly's lawsuit against Al Franken, which not only failed but led to a big payout *for* Al Franken.

You will say it is because it isn't Mazzucco's style. He figures he can make his point better with calm and reasoned argument, not with calling people liars. But that is just my point. By pretending that these debunkers are earnest but mistaken people, Mazzucco controls your anger and thereby your response. He wants you to believe they aren't lying straight to your face to protect the incredible crimes of their associates and families, they are just disagreeing with you on a question of fact. This is a go-to gambit in most modern debate: frame the debate from both sides as a *matter of opinion*, rather than one of fantastic levels of criminality.

We see this in almost every subject, for example the question of fluoride. That is always framed as, at worst, a heated debate or a matter of opinion, when it isn't. It is a matter of a heinous crime against humanity perpetrated by one side. Purposely poisoning the public water supply is not a matter of opinion and shouldn't even be up for debate. Any sane judge would decide the question peremptorily in a matter of seconds, and the question would be settled for evermore. Instead, we see both sides of the debate controlled by Monsanto and other evil entities, who also hire their own opposition, as predefined losers. These losers come in and make squishy appeals, instead of stating the case in the terms in which it begs to be stated.

In the next section, around minute 30:00, we are told the Russians wouldn't have blown the cover of the Apollo program due to detente, by which the US and the USSR were working together beginning with the Nixon administration. However, this is again misdirection, since the US and USSR were *always* working together. The entire Cold War was faked, including the Russian Missile Crisis, [Bay of Pigs](#), and all the rest. The US and USSR were pretend enemies in that period for the usual reason: to steal money from both treasuries.

You should already know this, since Mazzucco admits that during the 70s and 80s the US and USSR were linking their space programs in Low Earth Orbit. There are many other examples of US and USSR cooperation in these decades, which should seem strange given that Reagan was at the same time calling the Soviets the Evil Empire and asking for a trillion for the Star Wars program to counter their alleged aggression.

Remind yourself that the Russians and Americans were allies up to the end of WWII. And then remind yourself that there was no stated reason for their sudden dislike of each other beginning in the late 40s. Other than that the CIA willed it to be so. [The gay Nazis actors](#) were all on the beaches in Brazil, so we needed a new enemy to justify "defense" budgets. You can't justify trillion-dollar defense budgets without enemies, can you?

In the next section, Mazzucco tells us that 400,000 NASA employees failed to talk for 40 years because they were compartmentalized. Meaning, they didn't know and never figured it out. I don't buy that. I think the answer is behind door number three, as usual. The correct answer is that Modern people are liars and pussies, and it is fantastically easy to find 400,000 of them in the US. We have a population of over 300 million, and of that total, far *more* than 400,000 are capable of lying straight to your face on any given subject. They have no regard for the truth or for honor, so they will sell out for a very low sum. Most of them will lie for free, since it gives them a thrill. Mazzucco says the question was framed wrong, and he is right. . . but he continues to frame it wrong. Both he and the debunkers feign surprise that 400,000 liars could be found. The debunkers say it isn't possible on the face of it, which is

absurd; and Mazzucco counters that they didn't need to lie since they were so ignorant. But I start with a different assumption, based both on my experience with real people over 50 years and on my internet research over the past 20. That is, I am surprised not when people lie, but when they *don't*. The number of scrupulously honest people as a percentage is not that high, and among NASA employees is probably minimal. The higher up the hierarchy they are, the lower that percentage is, due to the fact that you don't rise in this society by being honest or having scruples. You rise by doing what you are told and keeping your mouth shut. You know that as well as I do, so I don't know why I have to say it.

All Modern arguments about everything, pro and con, proceed on this basic dishonesty. And in this case I don't mean dishonesty regarding specific facts, I mean a fundamental dishonesty people have regarding themselves. They are fooled by the lines of the debate above only because they can't admit to themselves that people are liars, and that a meaningful percentage of people are *pathological* liars. Meaning, those running this world are not only liars, they are addicted to lying and lie even when the truth sounds better. Their entire lives are wound up in fantastic lies, and depend on huge webs of these lies. But for some reason your average reader can't admit that, and prefers the fiction that people are basically honest. So he falls for the idea that it would be impossible to hire 400,000 liars. He even falls for the idea that it would be impossible to hire a few hundred people to stage a mass murder event. While the sad truth is, a person with enough money could hire most of the 300 million Americans to lie about any given fact. And, in fact, it has been done. Is being done. Most Americans are caught up in the American lie because they have been paid to do so. They have been given a job and a car and a house and other perks to keep them quiet: to keep them from stating simply and directly the truths they know. This is how the revolution is squelched. Most people accept the tribute with the understanding they will keep quiet and not make trouble.

As proof of this, go to minute 35:00 in the film, where Mazzucco tells us the employees at Grumman were building the lunar module in their factories in Long Island. He implies that because they were independent, they didn't know the whole project was a fake. But Mazzucco later shows you the lunar lander was held together with scotch tape. So do you really believe these people couldn't figure out they were part of a fake? They were so ignorant they thought scotch tape would survive a Moon landing? No, they knew exactly what was going on, and they have kept quiet from sheer embarrassment more than anything. Or, the upper levels kept quiet because they profited fantastically from the con, and the lower levels kept quiet because if they had made a peep they would have been fired and blackballed. So they are all liars and/or pussies one way or the other.

Plus, we must assume that some few of these people did quit and did talk, paying the consequences. But do you think their stories were published by the *New York Times*? Of course not. Their stories were squelched by the controlled media, and the only stories that were allowed to proceed were these controlled opposition stories we have encountered. So when the debunkers claim no one has talked, they are lying again. There are a few honest people who do talk, but the debunkers always overlook them. The debunkers even overlook Kaysing, for Pete's sake. They say that no one talked, but Kaysing was an employee who talked.



Now we are up to minute 39:00, and the bozos at MythBusters make their first appearance. Adam Savage holds up a little plastic orange reflector and says, “What's this?” He says it is a retro-reflector. But most of us would simply call it a reflector. It is a reflector for a fence post or a bicycle, like you put between your spokes. Do you think they just took a big plastic bicycle reflector and threw it on the surface of the Moon? These guys really make my stomach turn, and it is because the show is such an insult to anyone with basic intelligence. They treat their audience like a cast of idiots. Since Mazzucco pretty much proves that point, I won't beat it to death, but he doesn't mention something even more important. I can get you in most quickly by reminding you of Adam Savage's full name: Adam **Whitney** Savage. His father is **Whitney Lee Savage** and his mother is Karen Haagensen, both from prominent and famous families. Although the name Whitney is in the given name position with his father, *all three* names are surnames—as is common with these people. Geni scrubs his maternal side, but we do get the names Slack (Slecht)*, Samuels, Wills, **Chamberlain**, Austin, **Grant**, Rogers, Gale, Seager, Abbott, **Key**, van der Water, and Ritter on his paternal side. This links us to actor John Ritter, among many other people, including *all* US Presidents. Geni also scrubs the Whitney line, but this leads us to. . . the Vanderbilts. Savage links to the Vanderbilts further back as well, through the van der Waters. Another scrubbing in Adam Savage's genealogy is on the name Knight, which they list as Kight and then stop altogether. But since she also links us to the Newtons, **Carsons**, Jeffersons, and **Franklins**, we can walk around this wall. Dorothy Payne Whitney married an Elmhirst, son of a Knight, in 1925. This also links us to the Swifts.

Which leads us to the 275 Savages of the peerage, who re-entered it in around 1615 by marrying the **Manners**, Earls of Rutland, and becoming one of the first baronets. We just saw the Manners in my last paper. Funny how that often happens. I say re-entered, because the le Savages had been in the peerage back to the time of William the Conqueror. They actually came over from Normandy with him. The second baronet jumped up to Viscount and married a Darcy, daughter of the Earl Rivers. His son became the Earl Rivers when that line died out. He married a Parker whose mother was a **Stanley** of the Lords Monteagle. The 4th Earl Rivers had only daughters, but his daughter married a Nassau, Earl of Rochford. The Savages also connected themselves to the Barons Langdale in those years, which connected them to the Rhodes/Rodes. The Langdales soon married the Vavasours. The Savages also connected themselves to the Howards, Earls of Berkshire, the O'Briens, Earls of Thomond, and the Brereton, Barons of Leighlin. This connected them to the Gorings, Willoughbys, Cecils and Nevilles.

But most interesting to our current quest is [John Savage](#) listed in the peerage, b. 1853. . . **from Morgan County, Ohio**. This links us to our Adam Savage, since his Savage line at Geni goes straight back to Jackson County, Ohio, in those years. Jackson and Morgan counties are both in the southeast part of the state. In fact, Adam's ancestor [Adam Savage](#) died in Meigs Country, OH, in 1849. His siblings were Asahel, Dorcas, and Lovinia. His niece was named Zilpha. Getting the picture? John Savage of

the peerage had a son named George who married a Davis, linking us to Campbells and Condons. Savage's daughter then married a Hardesty, son of a **Parrish**.

OK, what about Jamie Hyneman, the other talking head on Mythbusters? Well, his parents are scrubbed on his Wiki page and everywhere else, never a good sign. He has degrees in literature and Russian linguistics at Indiana University, meaning he was probably tapped for Intelligence. Maybe that's why he wears the beret. A green one would be too obvious, but a black one hides the baldness just as well. He ran a diving charter business in the Caribbean for several years early on, which points in the same direction. Agents often get early assignments in low-level smuggling. He worked on *The Matrix*, where his fellow techie was. . . Adam Savage. His middle name is **Franklin**, possibly tying him to Adam Savage by blood. That is just what we would expect here: secret cousins. The first thing I would ask Jamie: what is your mother's maiden name?

Also worth pointing out is that the creator of MythBusters is Peter **Rees**. Does that name look familiar? It should, since we just pulled it apart in [my recent paper on Princess Diana](#). Trevor Rees was her fake bodyguard, actually MI6 cousin. [Peter Rees is listed in the peerage as well](#). You will say that is Baron Peter Rees, the British politician, but it isn't. He is listed separately.

Also worth noting are the names of other MythBuster presenters: Scottie **Chapman**, **Grant** Imahara, Christine **Chamberlain**, and Kari **Byron**. You will tell me Grant's real first name is Masaru, but that begs the question: why change it to Grant? Remember, Adam Savage is also a Grant. Byron and Chapman are big peerage names. In fact, the Byrons of the peerage link us directly to the Stanleys and other names we saw above, meaning Kari Byron may also be a cousin of Adam Savage. Same with Christine Chamberlain. See above, where we found Chamberlains in Savage's recent lines. So. . . this is the same old Phoenician Navy messing with us, as usual. Mazzucco forgets to mention that.

Given that, let's dig on Philip Cary Plait—the Bad Astronomer—for a moment. Turns out he was President of the James Randi Educational Foundation, which pegs him as a spook without further research. James Randi is a fake name, his real name being Randall James **Hamilton Zwinge**. Oh my god, I didn't know that until today. A Hamilton and a Zwinge! Hamilton is a top peerage name and Zwinge is Jewish. Zwinge is a village in Thuringia, which of course has a **Phoenix** as its symbol. His mother is a **Paradis**, which is another red flag. He is married to. . . **a man** about 60 years younger.



I am not making this up, though they may be. Randi has been a con-artist all his life, and admits it. He is a founding member of CSICOP, which is uncomfortably but not accidentally close to PSYOP. It claims to debunk pseudo-science, but actually does the opposite, debunking the truth in order to protect the web of lies that currently poses as science. **Just like MythBusters**. It was started by the usual

Jewish/spook suspects, including Paul Kurtz, who comes out of Columbia University. Kurtz also started the Council for Secular Humanism, which is also misnamed. They have very little concern for humans, secular or otherwise, being mainly concerned with their own profit and hegemony. To advance these causes, they must continually undercut all religions, not just Christianity, but Islam and Judaism as well.

Randi also helps us peg the MacArthur Foundation, which gave this obvious agent a large grant in 1986, which he soon pissed off in lawsuits with Uri Geller and others. This is just more proof the MacArthur grants are nothing more than advertisements and promotion for the families and their worthless children.

I have previously shown that most of Randi's debunking was staged itself, on a par with the more recent practice of one magician blowing another magician's cover. It used to be thought this would be counterproductive, but it is now known audiences find this just as entertaining as the magic itself, or moreso (see *Breaking the Magician's Code* on **Fox**). They admit Geller's fame was only increased by Randi's attacks, and this was no accident. It was all part of the act, sort of like Andy Kaufman's later double-crosses. But Randi's fame and the prominence of CSICOP was useful in other ways, since their fake authority was later used to blackwash real research, such as that of Jacques Benveniste. Although Randi knew less than nothing about science, for some reason he was called in as an expert witness in the case of this respected French immunologist. "Fraud expert" Walter **Stewart** was also part of Randi's team, and they, at the behest of *Nature* editor John Maddox, proceeded to make a shambles of the scientific process, successfully slandering Benveniste in the process. He never recovered. See my [paper on Gerald Pollack](#), where I hit this incident. It is perhaps the low-water mark of Maddox's career, though nothing in it could be called high-water, or even medium water. Despite that, he was elected to the Royal Society in 2000. He was also knighted, telling us what to think of both of those "honors".

Penn and Teller have said they would not be here if not for Randi. True, since they are also agents, paid to debunk the truth. See their infamous *Bullshit!* show debunking 911 Truth. Penn Jillette is not only a Penn, as in William Penn, he is a fellow at the fascist Cato Institute, which is really the Koch Institute. He has a Geni page but it is empty. Ethnicelebs admits he is a **Parks**, Noftal, **Clarke**, Cook, Parsons, **Rhoades**, Jenkins, Penney, Thistle, Gillespie, and Miller. Other even more more obvious names are probably scrubbed, since several lines are blanked. He is descended from Captain Cook, and collating all these names tells us Jillette is also Phoenician Navy. In the peerage, the Cooks are baronets, related to Case/**Chase, Murray**, Hood, **Fox-Strangeway**, Marjoribanks, and **Windsor** (Earl of Plymouth).

But let us return to Philip Plait. Through his middle name he is related to the Carys of the peerage, who are also baronets. They are related to the Montagus, which means—surprise!—Plait is also related to the Presidents of the US. Also related to Charlton Heston, since the Montagues and Charltons are closely related. Charlton took his first name from his grandmother's maiden name, remember? His real name was John Carter, like John Carter of Mars.

The Carys are also currently Viscounts. See for example Lucius Plantagenet Cary, Sandhurst and Scots Guards, who now lives in Bel Air, CA. He is also a Mackey, a Molyneux, a Berry, a Butler, a Southey, and a **Fox**. As you see, the Fox links us back to Penn Jillette. One big happy. These Carys, Viscounts of Falkland, are [also related to the Chapmans](#). See Scottie Chapman of MythBusters above. What is her real first name? It isn't available.

The Carys in the peerage are also related to the Roches, see [Cynthia Burke Roche](#), daughter of Baron Fermoy. This links us to the Gills and Spencers, and therefore to Lady Diana. It also links us to the Pagets through the O'Gradys. The Roches were really FitzMaurices and FitzEdmunds. Through these families we link to everyone, including the Hamiltons, linking us back to Randi. The Carys have actually been related to the Spencers back to the 1400s, at which time they were also related to the Fulfords, Beauchamps, and Beauforts (Dukes of Somerset). Think spook Benjamin Fulford.

The guy caught in the biggest lies in the film is Paulo Attivissimo, so let's look at him. He is the one that is audacious enough to tell an audience that the use of scotch tape on the external seams of the LEM was sensible, since such adhesives were more efficient than rivets in a lunar environment. This is my favorite part of the film, and I was laughing out loud for many minutes. But they make researching Attivissimo very hard to do, since a search on his name at either Google or Duck [takes you to Italian sites](#). However, since I read a bit of Italian, I quickly found his mother is English, though they refuse to name her. He was born in York and has English citizenship. From his work on Moon debunking, we are led to believe he has some background in science, but this is not the case. His degree was in languages, and he first worked as a broadcaster for Radio **Luna** Pavia. Luna means Moon, so we have either a very large coincidence there or a signal. As a broadcaster he worked under the fake name John Sinclair. Or is his *real* name John Sinclair? Since Paulo Attivissimo looks like a fake name, I would guess the latter. Google translator keeps telling us his name is Paulo "Very Active", since that is what his last name means. So his mother's name is almost certainly Sinclair, at the very least. Just so you know, there are around 1,300 Sinclairs in the British peerage, including 54 baronets and 35 lords listed. Also 22 earls, five barons, and three viscounts. They are related to the **Hamiltons**, **Marjoribanks**, Gordons, Barclays, Khans, Beaumonts, Forbes, Erskines, **Manners**, **Grays**, Sutherlands, Maitlands, **Stewarts**, MacDonalds, Morrisons, Goldmans, Reeves, **Murrays**, Grahams, Keiths, **Stanleys**, Spencers, Kennedys . . . basically everyone. So this guy looks like yet another cousin. Those names link us to James Randi, Adam Savage, Penn Jillette, Phil Plait, and everyone else we have looked at above.



He was born the same year as me (1963) but looks twenty years older, so the lies must not be agreeing with him. That photo is dated 2011, which means he was just 47 then. Here are two pictures of me

dated 2010 and 2011:



And here I am now, at age 56, almost ten years later:



You will say I shouldn't gloat, but I'm gonna. These fuckers have stolen everything else from me, so I am here to show you what they couldn't steal. They couldn't steal the light in my face, which I still have to this day. In my opinion, that confirms all I have been saying for years more than anything else.

They say that honesty doesn't pay, but in some ways it does, visibly. I have been claiming that your life imprints on your face, and here is my proof.

Attivissimo's blog is called *Il Disinformatico*. No, seriously. That means Disinformation or the Disinformer, if it isn't obvious. Unless he has a recent ancestor named Disinformatico, I can't figure out how to make sense of that. He might as well title his blog "I am lying straight to your stupid American face".

At minute 1:19:00, Mazzucco is asking why the LEM didn't leave any blast crater, and he shows an animation of the **Phoenix** Probe on Mars, which allegedly landed in 2008. Since that is an animation, it proves nothing. So Mazzucco shows the "actual photo" sent back from Mars, showing the surface underneath the lander. Unfortunately, he never questions if this "actual photo" from Mars is like the "actual photos" from the Moon, i.e. faked. It looks just as fake to me, and given the track record of NASA, why believe anything they say?

At minute 1:25:23, Mazzucco uses a fake film of the Space Shuttle to confirm that hypergolic fuel is visible. This doesn't mean he is wrong about that specific point, but it is curious nonetheless.

I was also disappointed that Mazzucco didn't include one of my favorite disproofs of the LEM ascent. For we have to ask who is filming it rise. We are told robotic cameras were set up by the astronauts before take off and that they were controlled remotely after that from Earth. But to capture the rise, they have to pan up at the exact right moment. This would be impossible to achieve, given the signal delay from Earth. To make this more believable, they could have set the camera farther away, where it could have captured the ascent without a perfect pan. But they didn't.

So the lack of a flame under the LEM is actually the least strong evidence from that series. The entire sequence is ridiculously naive, and wouldn't look any more believable with a flame inserted. This is because the LEM doesn't rise smoothly like it would if propelled by rockets. It explodes off the stand in an absurd lurch, and then rises in a herky-jerky manner, as if it is being raised by hand with strings—which it obviously is. Beyond that, the model doesn't even match the LEM we see in other images. They didn't even bother to give the scale model they are using here the detail of the larger models. It doesn't even appear to have any footpads. The sequence is a joke in all ways, and hardly needs any commentary. You can simply ask the audience to watch it. If they don't break into nervous laughter, you will know they are blind. If NASA had been smart, this is the first film they would have claim to have lost. Even more amazing is that NASA didn't improve the sequence in subsequent takes. The one from Apollo 17 looks as naive as the first one.

At minute 2:23:00, Mazzucco uses film from Chernobyl as proof that radiation must strongly affect film, especially contrast. But he does not consider the possibility that film was exposed to radiation *later* and on purpose. To what end? To confirm the reality of the event. And why would they fake the event? Same reason they faked the earlier Three Mile Island incident and the more recent Fukushima disaster: to spread fear and to confirm the existence of dangerous nuclear chain reactions, *and thereby nuclear weapons*. If these "accidents" do nothing else, they confirm to your average citizen the reality of this technology. The reality of nuclear weapons has been a centerpiece and capstone of deterrence and international defense for many decades, and much of the money spent on defense in recent times has gone to this technology, including ICBMs, nuclear submarines, super expensive jets with nuclear payloads, and so on. So the last thing the governments of the world want is people questioning the existence of nuclear chain reactions and nuclear weaponry. The only high-profile proof of that technology since Nagasaki has been nuclear tests, [which I have shown are faked in film studios](#), and

these nuclear accidents. That is reason enough for you to doubt the reality of these accidents. Other reasons can be easily had by studying closely the reports of those events, which as usual make no sense and are contradictory in a thousand ways. But that too is a subject for another paper.

But I will get you started with a small thing for you to think about in that regard. The photographer of these photos from Chernobyl is given as Igor Kostin, and he makes a short appearance in the film. His father was a banker in Romania. Igor was in the Soviet army until 1959, when he was recruited for the Soviet national volleyball team. He later became Chief of Construction in the Construction Bureau of Kiev. He then became an anchor at the Kiev Television Station. After that he became a war reporter for Novosti (APN), the Soviet news agency in Moscow, for which he covered Vietnam and Afghanistan.

In 1986, he covered the immediate aftermath of Chernobyl, shooting from a helicopter which flew right through the toxic smoke above. The levels of radiation were high enough to ruin almost all his film, so he of course got the same dosage. Nine days later he returned and allegedly re-entered the rubble of Reactor 4 along with liquidators. These liquidators were issued suits, but the photographers were not. We are supposed to believe that only *after* this re-entry, he became aware of the danger, including the orders to evacuate 50,000 people from the area. Did that stop him? No, he made many more incursions in to the zone of alienation (danger zone) to record the deformities of animals born there, and so on. So here's a question for you: why did Kostin never suffer any ill effects from his exposure?

For confirmation Chernobyl was another fake, see [this 2019 article](#) from Mental Floss, admitting the Exclusion Zone shows no signs of radioactivity at all. Animals and plants are thriving there, tourists are taking selfies there, and so on. We were and still are told that humans cannot live there for another 20,000 years, but wildlife hasn't got the message. [This reminds us of Bikini atoll](#), which was also supposed to be a lifeless desert for centuries. It isn't.

At minute 3:23:00, Mazzucco says that “astronauts are some exceptional people, courageous, and motivated by a deep sense of pride, which comes from constantly putting their lives at risk in order to advance the progress of science”. What? Did Mazzucco just miss watching his own film? We have seen that the astronauts of the Apollo program were the opposite of exceptional and courageous, since they helped perpetrate one of the greatest crimes against the American taxpayer ever. This is what I mean by refusing to state the case as it demands to be stated. Get it through your head: astronauts are not heroes. They are another class of conmen, working for the man to scam you over many decades. That is what all Mazzucco's evidence proves incontrovertibly, and there is zero good evidence to the contrary.

At minute 3:30:00 we are told Bart Sibrel produced a documentary called *Astronauts Gone Wild*, in which he asked astronauts from the Apollo missions to swear on the Bible that they went to the Moon. We all know that Aldrin slugged Sibrel, but that isn't the question here. The question is how did Sibrel score interviews with these guys. Do you think you could get all these guys on your camera, to do or not do anything? How did he even know where they were, or what their schedules were? To me this looks as staged as anything else. Supporting this assumption, [we find](#) that Sibrel's family just happens to be from the same part of Ohio in the same years (1840s) as Adam Savages' family. Sibrel is also probably Jewish, which ties him to the rest of these people once more. [See his youtube channel](#), which not a lot of people know about. It is very strange. He pretends to be an evangelical Christian, but is not convincing at all. He appears to be blackwashing Christianity with his antics. His channel is called End Times Radio, which is enough confirmation of that by itself. He calls himself Brother Bart. He sells the Sabbath as being on Saturday, which is more confirmation. He has a short film called “Israel

1988". There is also a video of his first baptism in 2018. Since he is now in his 50s, I believe, this of course means he hasn't been a Christian up to this time. Otherwise he would have *already* been baptised as a baby. Which again indicates he was and probably still is a Jew. More indication of that is that in the baptism video, the preacher who performs the baptism admits that Sibrel is "shaking everyone's hand as if he has been a longtime member". Meaning, he isn't. He just got there and nobody knows him, which means to me the whole thing is being staged. More indication of that is that he says he is 48 in the video, but that doesn't seem right. He has been around far too long for that. *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Moon* was from 2001, 19 years ago, and he looked older than 31 there. Plus, he looks much older than 48 in the video. He looks very different than he does in his Moon stuff, being a lot fatter and having no hair at all.

If we keep listening, we find he is in the Worldwide Adventist Church and that he believes Ellen White is a prophet. All this is another huge red flag, since the Adventists were started by the obvious fraud William Miller, who predicted the second coming of Christ in 1843. If you check his page, you find no parents are given and no background. He popped up out of the Earth and immediately began being promoted by rich people for no given reasons. The main force behind the promotion of Miller was publisher Joshua Vaughan Himes, who, like others we have looked at recently, came out of the Christian Connexion. That is the splinter group led by Elias Smith, remember? Anyway, to cut to the chase, all these people were obvious spooks sent in to cause dissension and split various Christian groups into ever smaller factions, which could then be wiped out altogether. Note the name Vaughan, which is a peerage family that produces a lot of spooks. See for example David Vaughan Icke. As for Ellen White, she was a twin and a fraud. . . and a crypto-Jew. Her birth name was Ellen Gould Harmon. Gould is a Jewish name, she got it from her mother, so case closed. And yet for some reason, *Smithsonian Magazine* named her one of the 100 most significant Americans of all time. I guess that helps us peg *Smithsonian*. Gould claimed to have visions, and one the most important of these visions was that Papal supremacy would rise again, with the US government allying to the Pope to persecute Adventists. Has that happened? No. All these Adventist prophets batted zero on their prophecies, so why did anyone follow them? Because they were promoted by the rich and pushed hard as an early form of Project Chaos and the Theosophy Project.

Finding Sibrel involved in this just confirms he is a very low level agent and that this is his current assignment. Which indicates his previous work was also an assignment.

I encourage you to watch Sibrel's encounter with Armstrong closely. First, ask yourself why Armstrong calls him Mr. Sibrel. We are told Sibrel scored this meeting by falsely claiming to be someone else, and yet Armstrong somehow knows his name without being introduced. If I were Armstrong, I would turn and walk away as soon as I became aware of what was going on, but Armstrong doesn't do that. He politely stays and listens to Sibrel restate his spiel several times, as Sibrel gets ever more aggressive. Also study the actions of Armstrong's go-between, who makes a pathetic attempt to get between them, but then moves aside and lets Sibrel do his thing.

After the segment on Sibrel, Mazzucco abruptly ends the film, with no summation. So you leave the film on a big downer, with no call to action, no summation, no tying of the event to other events, and no idea what it all means. Mazzucco may claim you can come to your own conclusions, and that it doesn't take that much effort to do so. If it was faked, then it is clear that the \$150 billion spent on the Apollo projects was wasted. But it wasn't just wasted, as I have pointed out, *it was stolen*. Why is there no talk of restitution? When the Nazis allegedly stole paintings, there was later talk of restitution, and we have seen that happen in many cases. Paintings were returned or money was paid. So why not go to these military/space contractors and demand our money back? Most still exist in some form and

they have deep coffers. They are some of the richest companies in the world. More to the point, why not refuse to hire them for any more projects? Why is Trump being allowed to repeat this brazen theft a second time? If you know the Apollo project was fake, why are you allowing the same companies and families to steal from you in current projects on Mars, the Moon, and here on Earth? Why do you allow your government to subsidize SpaceX, which is even more fake than NASA and Apollo? Musk has already been awarded many billions in subsidies, and you as the American taxpayer are footing that bill. I say it is time to cut these people off at the source.

*Slecht=Schlect, which means “bad” in English. Does this link us to “Bad Astronomy” by Philip Plait? Plait has no genealogy posted, but my guess is he also has the name Slecht in his genealogy, since he is yet another cousin of all these people. That would make sense of the insensible: why would Plait name his site and himself this, opening himself up to such an easy joke? I suggest it is because he thinks the jokes goes both ways, and is better on his side. He knows his site isn't really Bad Astronomy, it is Slecht Astronomy, pointing proudly but secretly to his hidden name and thereby to the Phoenician Navy backing him up. His wink at them is worth all your jokes put together, since to him you are no one.