

1998 04 20 Monday Wayne Green We Never Went to the Moon

AB: "All right, um, before we jump back where we were and I begin taking calls, there are a couple of things:

... um, it's ... it's ... it's more serious than that. I ... long-cherished beliefs ... hah-hah ... long-cherished ... yeah, I thought we went to the Moon. I still think we went to the Moon. And if I were to find out we didn't go the Moon, it would be more profound than just a ... the crumbling of a long-cherished belief.

I'd cry! I mean, I ... I talk to people who believe in conspiracies. I talk to people who believe NASA's lying to us. *I don't wanta believe that!*

I DON'T WANT TO BELIEVE THAT!

And I don't know that I do (!)

I, of ... I listen!

This is an open forum and I am fascinated by these kinds of things and I listen.

But if I really believed that, you know, the people who lead us, or the cabal who supposedly secretly leads them, was doing this to us, I don't know that I could handle it. How 'bout that?

I'd just cry. I mean, everything I know and cherish and have believed all my life *is a lie (!)*

That one just doesn't go down so easily!

I don't wanta believe that about my own country.

I don't wanta believe these things.

I really don't.

So, you know, it's more serious than just, ah, *a belief crumbling ... it's everything I know and hold to be true suddenly being wrong and a lie (!)*

And I just ... I don't know that I would digest that, ah, very well at all."

* * *

2001 02 15 Thursday Richard C. Hoagland Moon Landing Debate
Wayne Green

AB: “From the high desert and the Great American Southwest, I bid you all Good Evening and/or Good Morning, and Welcome to the Program, which I’m going to try to get underway quick, because we have a lot to do. I’m Art Bell.

And from Guam in the West to the U.S. Virgin Islands in the East, South into South America, North all the way to the Pole, and Worldwide on the Internet – this is Coast to Coast AM and I’m Art Bell!”

* * *

AB: “And, oh my, a ride it’s going to be!

How many of you saw the ... the Moon Show questioning whether we ever went to the Moon at all?

They said: ‘Why, they believe the whole thing was staged ... here in the high desert,’ they say. ‘At Area 51,’ they said. And gave a whole litany of reasons and some fairly convincing video evidence that my pixel people out there – when picking apart UFO photographs – would’ve ... I’m telling you they’d have a field day with some of this stuff. It was fairly convincing!

I have always laughed: ‘Ah, hah, hah, hah!’ at the notion that we never went to the Moon. I still *think* we went to the Moon, but no more: ‘Hah, hah, hah!’

I’m a little concerned at some of what I saw and I would imagine many of you who saw it also would have some concerns.

In a moment, we’ll explore all of that.

Richard C. Hoagland, a one-time advisor to NASA and a sidekick for Walter Cronkite ... science advisor, actually, and author and many other things, will be here.

But so will Wayne Green, who has staunchly over the years always said: ‘We never went to the Moon!’ To which I’ve always replied: ‘Hah, hah, hah!’

We’ll see.

* * *

AB: “Ah, that’ll be appropriate for what we’re going to do right now.

As I said, the [television] program at least wiped the smile ... took away the snicker from my face.

Here is, ah, Richard C. Hoagland. Hi, Richard. Good Morning!"

RCH: "Good Morning, Art. I'm having a real flash of *déjà vu* here."

AB: "God, it's great to have you back on!"

RCH: "It's great to be back on with you running the helm!"

AB: "Oh? Well, thank you.

Richard, I know that you saw the program on FOX tonight too."

RCH: "Yes. In detail. Taped it."

AB: "Good. So did I.

I ... I've gotta say ... as I said, it took the smile off my face, Richard. Ah, the cross-hatch marks ... they were just ... I'd love to take things kind of point-by-point, but you know, they ... they made a fairly good case *that we never went to the Moon! That the whole thing was staged!*"

RCH: "Well, the thing that impressed me, first of all, was that FOX would actually put a program like this on the air."

AB: "Yeah."

RCH: "On the network."

AB: "Even ... even going way out on a limb and virtually almost accusing 'murder(!)' I mean ... the ... well ..."

RCH: "Yeah, when they got to the Grissom part I must say that, ah, there were overtones of some of our own investigation.

But ... but let's look at the Big Picture:

This is now 2001. It's the spring of 2001. We are coming up, you know, Steve Bassett's Disclosure curve – something is coming down the road a few months from now I absolutely can ... can feel it in my bones that somethin' big is gonna break."

AB: "Well, we've been thinking that though for a long, long time."

RCH: "Well ... we will see. Time will tell ..."

AB: "Yeah, we'll see. You're right, you're right ..."

RCH: "... when it's that year."

AB: "... we'll see."

RCH: "No, if ... if that was gonna happen, what you have to do is to get certain people in the agency ... in NASA, who have been sitting on extraordinary evidence of ruins on the Moon and on Mars ... God knows where else ... where else (!) out of the 'Hot Seat.' And the way you do that politically, is you put up a 'straw man' conspiracy, which is so easily disassembled and deconstructed. And then, you know, you watch ... FOX will have a Part 2. And we'll have a vigorous rebuttal of what we saw tonight."

AB: "Well, they probably ought to because, of, the rebuttal they had on tonight with a NASA guy wasn't worth a ..."

RCH: "... was ... did not really ..."

AB: "Wasn't worth a hoot!"

RCH: "Well, it wasn't ... it didn't take point-by-point, which I intend to do. And by the way on the Enterprise Mission website, we have a detailed refutation of the whole Moon hoax idea."

AB: "Is it up there now?"

RCH: "It's up there now."

AB: "All right. We've got a link on our site right by Richard Hoagland's name. You can go ..."

RCH: "*Who Mourns for Apollo?*"

AB: "And it's point-by-point?"

RCH: "Point-by-point ... we missed a couple things – like the cross-hatches on the photographs we didn't get in. But we ... Mike Bara and I were working for the last several days knowing this was coming, we wanted to get something very substantive up. And we're going to do a series of articles in the next few days ... !"

AB: "Well, that's fine, but Richard you missed the most important thing in my estimation of all they talked about – and we'll get to some of the other stuff – the cross-hairs that were etched in the camera lenses."

Um, I mean, look Richard, let's settle ..."

RCH: "Well, we ... we see those differently."

AB: "Let's you and I settle on one (1) thing. Were those faked pictures, yes or no?"

RCH: "Well, I think they were faked ... yes."

AB: "You think they were faked?"

RCH: "Well, let's say they were *altered*. Faked is different from altered."

AB: "Okay, it occurred to me: 'Maybe the cross-hatch that was supposed to be across the American flag was removed so you could see the American flag. That ...'"

RCH: "Well this ... you gotta go to the PR [public relations] Department, because the ... the ... the sequence of these images and the model we went to the Moon is, you take film to the Moon, put it in the cameras of astronauts, they take pictures, film comes back to an aircraft carrier in the middle of the Pacific [Ocean], picked up ..."

AB: "Yes."

RCH: "... is flown to Houston, went to the NASA photographic laboratory run by a guy named Dick Underwood ..."

AB: "And?"

RCH: "... in Houston ..."

AB: "Yeah ... and ... and what is done there?"

RCH: "And then, prints were prepared. Because the originals were not prints, they were *slides* – Ektochrome-type slides."

AB: "Okay, but at any stage from 'snap' to, ah, development all I care about is did they modify these photographs? Is that ..."

RCH: "Well, then ..."

AB: "Is that hard evidence they changed the photo?"

RCH: "Well, wait, wait, wait ... Then the sequence is that some of these prints and inter-negatives go over to the Public Affairs Office."

AB: "Yes?"

RCH: "And they send them out to *Life Magazine*, *Time Magazine* ... remember it was a lot of print back then, 'cause television was not as big as it is ... as it is now.

So they were preparing hard copy for the *print media* – basically color magazines like *Life*.

The guys who were preparing these prints for press distribution were not technical. They weren't scientists, they weren't engineers, they were ... they were PR people."

AB: "Yeah, I've got that."

RCH: "And since Ken Johnston reports that he actually saw it ... saw airbrushing of photographs, it is reasonable on the model that we went to the Moon and these photographs were altered for 'cosmetic purposes,' so that the little cross didn't cross the American flag.

In other words you have to look at how NASA's PR was running in these years, and they wanted nothing but pristine National Geographic-type pictures for their best astronaut images."

AB: "That's the only reason I can imagine they would alter these photographs."

RCH: "That is ... well, no, no, there's one other reason.

And the other reason is the investigation we've been conducting for the last, you know, ten (10) years or so, which is that NASA went to the Moon, found *stunning stuff* (!), and they had to hide what they found."

AB: "So in other words, you think ..."

RCH: "... all that!"

AB: "So in other words, your position is you think the photos are fake. You agree with that ..."

RCH: "No, no, no, no, no! I said '*altered!*'"

AB: "Well ..."

RCH: "The difference between '*faked*' and '*altered.*' Altered is ..."

AB: "Okay ... all right, then your position is that we did go to the Moon ..."

RCH: "... changed certain details."

AB: "... we did go to the Moon, ..."

RCH: "Yep."

AB: "... but you think, ah, they were altered for a) cosmetic reasons and b) to take out all the signs of prior ..."

RCH: "No, no, no, no, no!"

I think these alterations – which are so stupid – were deliberately done in the same vein that your now series of books put out by the astronauts has some very bizarre pictures in them."

AB: "Yes."

RCH: "That are first-person accounts which we look at as whistleblowing."

AB: "Yes."

RCH: "We've never done a show following the Collier debate that I did in '97 [1997] as to what has happened since this has all hit the fan. Since the idea that we found ruins and NASA's covered them up on the lunar surface ..."

AB: "Yes, yes, yes!"

RCH: "... and has been in public domain."

AB: "So Richard, you believe the ruins that they found ..."

RCH: "Yep."

AB: "... were airbrushed out just the way the crosshair on the flag ..."

RCH: "We have first-person testimony ..."

AB: "... or the crosshairs on the equipment was airbrushed out.

All right. Ah, I wanta bring on with us ..."

RCH: "... from some of the NASA employees that was done."

AB: “Okay, I wanta bring on somebody else: Wayne Green, ah, has been for years now ... he’s been tellin’ me we never went to the Moon. Right, Wayne?”

WG: “Heh, heh. Well, I ... I think I’ve mentioned it a few times.”

AB: “Mentioned it a few times. And I’ve always laughed at you: Hah, hah, hah!”

RCH: “Hi Wayne!”

WG: “Hi there!”

AB: “So, ah, let’s discuss this crosshair thing a little bit. Wayne, did you hear what he just said? He said: ‘Yeah, they were altered.’ He agrees ... I mean, ...”

RCH: “I mean, there’s no question, because physically the way the little reticles – which are what the crosses are called – were on an aluminized plate at the back of the Hasselblad, so the light came in the lens, went through the plate, and struck the film. And the idea was to put the crosses on for calibration.

Well, there’s no way with that geometry you can get an object on the lunar surface photographed with a cross behind it! It had to have been altered on the Earth in the, ah, darkroom.”

AB: “So ... airbrushed. You’re saying ‘airbrushed.’”

RCH: “No, I’m saying ... ‘airbrush’ is a general term ...”

AB: “Wayne ...”

RCH: “This required a much more precise technique.”

AB: “Wayne, you agree with that. I mean, the evidence was I think overwhelming to even the average person that obviously the photographs have been changed.”

WG: “Um ...”

RCH: “Some photographs. They showed what ... two (2) or three (3)?”

AB: “Yeah, I ... I ...”

RCH: "I looked, ah, Art, at hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds. I have found two (2) or three (3) that were altered this way. And they're all photographs that have been published, not photographs that no one has ever seen before. The ones we got directly from NSDC – hundreds and hundreds – never have I seen an example of this. That photograph or two (2) they showed were photos that appeared in, you know, spreads in *Life Magazine* and *National Geographic* ..."

AB: "All right."

RCH: "... with cosmetic [unintelligible]."

AB: "That's good enough. Wayne, do you have any answer for that?"

WG: "Ohh (laughs), I was kinda disappointed in, ah, the program in some ways ..."

RCH: "Why?"

WG: "But I ... I thought that particular part made good source."

AB: "Yeah, that's a good question: Why were you disappointed?"

WG: "They didn't make much of a fuss over the lack of stars in any of the photos – even the photos supposedly taken of the Earth."

RCH: "Yeah, but Wayne that is a *ridiculous argument*."

WG: "Okay."

RCH: "Art, let me put this to rest once and for all! Okay?"

AB: "Well, put it to rest, Richard."

RCH: "Okay, Wayne, do you know anything about stellar and photographic magnitudes?"

WG: "Yes."

RCH: "Okay. You know that there's a ... a ... a ... a scale of numbers?"

WG: "Um-hmm."

RCH: "And you can put brightness of celestial objects on this scale and rank them in terms of brightness."

Um, on this scale, for instance, the Sun is minus-twenty-seven (-27). The Moon is about minus-thirteen (-13). Sirius, the brightest star in the sky is about minus-one point-four (-1.4).

So if I'm taking a picture of a brightly lit surface – the Moon – even though the sky is inky black and there's no atmosphere, *the stars are so damn dim by literally factors of millions* – and I'll go through the numbers if you want me to, Art?"

AB: "No, you know what – stop Richard! No, no ..."

RCH: "There's no way you can take a ..."

AB: "... stop ... stop ..."

RCH: "... picture ..."

AB: "Stop right there!"

Look, I've got modern equipment. I've got high-sensitivity, ah, CCD, ah, camera hooked up to a third generation night-vision in order to see the stars. *I agree with that!*

If you should go out and shoot the Moon at night, ah, even with a good new camera, you're damn well not going to get stars. Ah, even now here on ... on Earth."

RCH: "Yeah, and the photographs taken by the astronauts were taken on the *day!* They were taken with a bright, sunlit landscape!"

AB: "Wayne?"

WG: "Um-hmm."

AB: "Ah, so?"

WG: "Yeah?"

AB: "I kind of agree with that."

WG: "Okay."

AB: "What about you?"

WG: "Ah, what about the, um, the moon rocks? Ah, we did that on your program."

AB: "Oh, well that's a different ..."

WG: "Remember the fellow that called in, who, ah ..."

RCH: "So we've left the stars now?"

AB: "Yeah, we're just with the stars. I mean, do you generally agree with that assessment of, ah, the way a camera would have operated certainly then and even now?"

WG: "Well, the testimony that I've heard from the astronauts in near-space, ah, say that the stars are *incredibly bright* once you're outside of our atmosphere."

AB: "Yeah, that's to your eye though. And they certainly would be, ah, to ... but, ah, if you included an object ..."

RCH: "And it disappears ..."

AB: "... if you included an object like the Moon, which would be very bright, then you wouldn't see the stars."

RCH: "You're ... you're on a bright, sun-drenched surface ..."

AB: "Yeah."

RCH: "... even though it's the Moon. And the fact that there's a black sky is what fools all of these amateurs, who've never taken a picture, into not understanding the simple physics that you cannot take with a ... a small latitude film, which the color film was ... You cannot take a picture simultaneously of a very, very, very dim object – a star – and a very bright object – a sun-drenched landscape ..."

AB: "All right, I ..."

RCH: "... and have the two (2) come out."

AB: "... let's leave that. Let's go ahead and leave that."

RCH: "In fact, the key reason for most of these websites and most of the argument that there are no stars on the Moon and *it's a stupid argument!*"

AB: "All right. It's a stupid argument.

Let's move on to another one. (WG laughs).

What about the shadows ...”

RCH: “Well remember, Wayne, I was Walter Cronkite’s science advisor ...”

AB: “Right.”

RCH: “... I watched ... I lived every single microsecond of all these missions. I literally sat surrounded by forty-two (42), forty-five (45), a hundred (100) monitors. I was ... you know there were my colleagues, who said: ‘The guy never goes home!’ and it was because it was the experience of a lifetime!”

AB: “Well, you know, Richard, they made the same argument you did. They said: Ninety-nine point nine percent (99.9%) of NASA would never have known!”

RCH: “Yeah, but I’m not NASA! And it’s now thirty (30) years in hindsight and I was there and I’m here now. And I looked and I analyzed with a team of experts ranging from geologists to ex-NASA people to photographic people. And I can say absolutely we went to the Moon, NASA covered up extraordinary discoveries, and this Moon hoax nonsense is a ... is a blind alley! It is a ...”

AB: “All right. All right ...”

RCH: “... wonderful diversion!”

AB: “... here’s ... here’s another one. Let’s take ’em as much as we can point-by-point.

I thought the shadows were very convincing.”

RCH: “No, the shadow argument is stupid, because it ...”

AB: “Okay.”

RCH: “... implies that the lunar surface is as flat as a billiard table. In fact, the lunar surface is as hummocky and as lumpy and as rolling as any landscape you’d find on Earth.

And if you have two (2) rocks sitting on two (2) different levels on a hummocky surface, *the shadows will not be parallel!*”

AB: “All right. Ah, Wayne?”

- RCH: "And on our website you will see demonstrations ... examples of photographs where that geometry obtains."
- AB: "Okay, fair enough. Wayne, ah, do you have any argument on ... on the shadows?"
- WG: "Oh, sure. Ah, I found it interesting when the two (2) shadows of the, um, what was it ... Aldrin and, ah ... oh, the other chap [Armstrong] there, ah, crossed each other. But more interesting was that the shadows taken with the Sun higher on the Apollo 11 trip, ah, where the Sun was much higher were much *longer* than the shadows on the *previous* [sic] trip, when the, ah, shadows were shorter."
- AB: "Richard?"
- RCH: "Well, the only mission we ever landed first was Apollo 11."
- WG: "Um-hmm."
- RCH: "That was the first mission on the surface. And the Sun angle was about eleven degrees [11⁰]."
- WG: "Right."
- RCH: "There was no *previous* mission."
- WG: "Okay."
- RCH: "The previous mission was Apollo 10, which did not land – was prohibited from landing. The mission before that was Apollo 8 ..."
- WG: "Um-hmpf."
- RCH: "... which did not land – went into orbit."
- WG: "Okay."
- RCH: "So the first landing, and they only stayed about twenty-some (20+) hours which was, you know, less than one (1) Earth day. And the Moon ... the Sun moves because of lunar rotation ..."
- WG: "Um-hmm."
- RCH: "... about thirteen degrees (13⁰) per day so it was higher on the second day than the first day, but there were no pictures taken outside on the

second day because the lunar EVA [Extravehicular Activities] was done the night of the first landing.”

WG: “Um-hmm.”

RCH: “And they left the next morning.”

WG: “Have you read, ah ...”

RCH: “... for MI-6 Do we continue?”

AB: “No, you may stop right there.

Um, let’s ... let’s move on to ...”

WG: “Well, I think according to the chap from NASA that was on there ...”

RCH: “[unintelligible], he was a PR [public relations] guy.”

WG: (laughs).

AB: “Do you believe the ‘chap from NASA,’ as you put it, didn’t do such a hot job?”

RCH: “Well, he didn’t have editing time! In other words, you don’t know what was on the cutting room floor ...”

AB: “That was ...”

RCH: “... what evidence, what kind of specific refutation.”

AB: “That’s true.”

RCH: “The way this was edited was definitely, overwhelmingly one-sided.”

AB: “Okay.”

* * *

AB: “Um, here’s a point I thought was very well made and that was the radiation. That, ah ... ah, in fact, during one (1) of the missions we had one of the largest Sun eruptions we would ever have. And, um ... ah, it would’ve excited the Van Allen belts to the point that, ah, they would’ve been cinders virtually.

And ... and ... and we ... there’s been nothing. Ah, they haven’t ... no ill health, no problems. ...”

WG: "How did the film get through that?"

AB: "These are good questions.

There was a wafer-thin ... (WG laughs) ... a wafer-thin covering and they showed it – almost aluminum foil – ah, certainly not, you know, inches of lead or anything like that, or three feet (3 ft.) of lead, Richard?"

RCH: "Okay. On the Enterprise website as part of our discussion on this, we have a technical document from NASA, called *Technical Notes TN D-7080 Apollo Experience Report: Protection Against Radiation* by Robert English, Richard Benson, J. [Vernon] Bailey, 'C. Brown' [actually Charles M. Barnes] from the Manned Spacecraft Center in March of 1973."

AB: "Which says basically what?"

RCH: "Basically that is was a **non-problem**.

And the reason was that they ... the solar flame problem is separate from the Van Allen problem. The Van Allen belts were high radiation belts trapped by the Earth's magnetic field – basically close around the Earth – about twenty-five thousand (25,000) miles out.

The reason it was a non-problem is that we zipped through them in less than an hour, or twenty-five thousand (25,000) miles per hour (mph). And they counted ... the NASA engineers counted on the *speed* of going through the radiation to minimize the overall dose, which was about one (1) rad, if I remember the numbers correctly.

When they came back from the Moon – remember, they're accelerating under Earth gravity ..."

AB: "Yes."

RCH: "... so they fell back through that radiation belt at very high speed and spent very little time. Radiation is not the amount of radiation – it's the amount of radiation times the exposure time."

AB: "Yes! Oh, yes indeed! The totality of it, ah ..."

RCH: "Yeah, and in terms ..."

AB: "... that's an interesting argument."

RCH: "... and ... and ... and in terms of the Apollo 16 mission, that flare ... I was in Houston during the flare, and if I remember correctly, ah, there was very little concern, because it wasn't really that big a deal. It was ... it was, ah ... it was *persistent*. It was long over time, but the actual peak radiation – and I was charged with the Cronkite people to actually look into the radiation with some solar astronomers, and I got into a whole brou-ha-ha on ... with one (1) guy, who wanted to be on the air and it was a whole ego thing. It was very ..."

AB: "Yeah."

RCH: "... very disturbing for me at the time. But I was vividly immersed in all that.

And we were very lucky ... during the entire Apollo experience, we didn't have a major flare that would have really killed them outright."

AB: "All right."

RCH: "Now there were two (2) astronauts, if I remember correctly, who have died of cancer. Ah, Jack Swigert on ... from Apollo 13 ..."

AB: "Yes?"

RCH: "... died of cancer."

AB: "All right. So ... so there might have been, in fact ..."

RCH: "So ... you've got ... you've got long-term, you know, effects and this was kind of the price that they paid."

AB: "All right, I'm with you, but the high point of your argument was we went through the belt very quickly ..."

RCH: "Very quickly!"

AB: "... and sure they got radiation, but, ah, not enough to do ..."

RCH: "And the film! Let me get to the film."

AB: "Well, before ... yeah, okay ... all right."

RCH: "This is the thing that I know most about that I've never talked about."

AB: "The film? All right."

RCH: “Everybody’s who’s written about this – and I don’t know whether, Wayne, you’ve been involved in this, but nobody seems to realize that NASA issued a special Top Secret contract to EG&G [Edgerton, Germeshausen & Grier, Inc.] back in the mid-sixties (1960s) ... in sixty-five (1965) ...”

AB: “Yes.”

RCH: “... to develop an extraordinary colored film to take to the Moon.

And I was personal friends with the inventor, the developer of that film, who was a man named Charlie Wycoff, who was the chief film, ah, guy ...”

AB: “Can ...”

RCH: “... at EG&G in Boston.”

AB: “Can ... can we get that film today?”

RCH: “Ah, you can get a version of it from Kodak.”

AB: “All right, ah ...”

RCH: “They have finally put ...”

AB: “Right.”

RCH: “... a version on the market.”

AB: “All right, ah, Wayne, are you aware of that?”

WG: (laughs). “No, I was going by the information from, ah, the Percy book which said that they looked into the film thing very carefully ...”

RCH: “No they didn’t.”

WG: “Well, that’s what they say.”

RCH: “Yeah, but he’s an agent. C’mon, guys!”

WG: “I don’t know that he’s an agent.”

RCH: “[Unintelligible] that makes it very interesting. What is Percy and his colleagues’ agenda in writing that book?”

AB: “All right, gentlemen, hold on. We’re at the bottom of the hour. We’ll come back and we’ll do more.”

* * *

AB: "Richard C. Hoagland and Wayne Green are here. We'll be right back.

* * *

RCH: "We went to the moon, guys!"

AB: "All right. The film, ah, just any ... any further comments, Wayne? I mean, he's saying that this kind of film existed then and exists now. You disagree?"

WG: "Heh! I don't have any further information other than that ... what was it? M-3 agent?" (WG laughs).

RCH: "MI-6"

WG: "I love that!"

AB: "MI-6."

RCH: "Yeah, now look ..."

WG: "Yeah, MI-6 ... anyway."

RCH: "... this film ... I fell into something extraordinary at a very tender age. I was what? Twenty-three (23), twenty-four (24), back then?

And I was given rolls of this incredible superfilm and Charlie told me to go around and take as many pictures under [the] most bizarre conditions I could think of that were possible."

AB: "Um-hmm."

RCH: "Which included, you know, looking directly into the Sun and photographing detail and deep shadows. *You can't do that with a normal film.*

And then I would take it back to EG&G and he would develop it. I took some to the Cape [Canaveral *aka* Kennedy] and I actually photographed the, um ... ah, lift-off of ... of Apollo 8 with this film, 'cause I wanted to test it and see if we could see detail in those incredible ..."

AB: "Right."

RCH: "... flame plumes ..."

- AB: "Right."
- RCH: "... from those five (5) incredible engines."
- AB: "Right."
- RCH: "I was able then at CBS [Columbia Broadcasting System] expense [to] get a chopper [helicopter] to go from New York to Boston to the lab ..."
- AB: "Um-hmm."
- RCH: "... get the film developed, bring it back so we could put it on the air for Cronkite, and we could see the details of the nitrogen shock diamonds in the middle of the flame plume! While we also could see the crystal clear landscape of the Cape and the Saturn V, the blue sky, and the seagulls, and all that!"
- AB: "Well ... well ... well, all of that's great ... okay ..."
- RCH: "But no stars!"
- AB: "All of that's great ..."
- RCH: "No stars, because there does happen to be scattering of the sky over the Cape during ... during the time they launched the mission."
- AB: "Ah, Wayne, what was the most important piece of evidence that 'we didn't go to the Moon' in your view *that they didn't put on the show?*"
- WG: "Well of course I had some extra information from one of my, ah, 73 *Magazine* readers, who was the head of their, ah, data processing in, ah, subsequent years."
- AB: "Who said what?"
- WG: "And he said that he was looking through one of their closets there, ah, for, ah, some tape to use, and he found one and put it on, and it was the entire Apollo 11 trip – *only the tape was dated five (5) months before the trip.*"
- AB: "So you would think that would be the most important ... you know, it's funny, Wayne, so many times I've heard you say: 'It couldn't have happened! The ... the space- ... spacesuits could not have fit through the [unintelligible] ..."
- WG: "That's true."

AB: "... you know, the measurements and everything."

WG: "Yeah."

AB: "I thought that would have been the most important and convincing to you."

WG: "Well, that ... that's key.

Also ..."

RCH: "Wait, wait, wait! Somethin's getting' lost in that."

WG: "One of the things that they did not put on the show that I think would've been very compelling was a demonstration in the laboratory of what happens to dust when you evacuate all of the air. And it turns to like stone. And, ah, you can bounce a steel ball off of it. And you cannot make a footprint or a tire print.

And tire prints ..."

AB: "You're saying the footprints ..."

WG: "I love the tire prints ..."

AB: "Okay, so you're saying the footprints and the tire prints could not have been made?"

WG: "Not ... not on the, ah, there shouldn't be any dust where there's no, ah, ox- ... where there's not air or anything like that."

AB: "Richard?"

RCH: "Well, this is again incredibly controversial, and I've seen studies where they actually have duplicated the lunar surface conditions, because you have ultraviolet ... you have charging of the surface ... you have particles that repel each other that don't cement in a vacuum in the way we simplistically thought a few years ago. So you gotta do a complete simulation and that's a lot of money and no one frankly wanted to pay all that money, because ... *they went to the Moon!*

Let me go back to another point.

Ah, we talked about the radiation problem."

AB: "Yes."

RCH: "There was another astronaut who died of cancer, and I just remembered when I went to get a cup of coffee during the break, and that was Alan Shepherd.

So you've got twelve (12) guys actually go down to the lunar surface. Two (2) of those guys, you know, of the eighteen (18) that went into lunar orbit ..."

AB: "But Richard, there ..."

RCH: "[Unintelligible] surface [unintelligible] ..."

AB: "I hear ya! I hear ya! But the show made exactly the opposite point, saying that there were no, ah, overt problems, ah, at all."

RCH: "Yeah, but in the long term twenty (20), thirty (30) years out they died of cancer. This is the exact ..."

WG: "Well, that percentage of people are gonna die ... die of cancer."

RCH: "One (1) ... one (1) out of nine (9)?"

WG: "On the average."

RCH: "What are the cancer statistics? I think I asked Collier this and he didn't know."

WG: "It's about thirty percent (30%)."

AB: "You mean in ... in the end? People who ..."

WG: "In the end, right."

AB: "Yeah ... right. Okay.

Well, maybe that's about right. I ..."

WG: "It used to be about ... less than one percent (<1%)."

AB: "A lot of people die of cancer."

* * *

AB: "Um, gentlemen, I'd like your own answer, ah, to this question – and short as possible:"

RCH: (laughs). “[Unintelligible].”

AB: “The one ... the one ...”

RCH: “Gosh, it’s sounding familiar!”

AB: “The one laughing knows who it’s directed to.”

(RCH, AB, and WG all laugh).

Um, my question would be – and I think it’s a good one – *‘Why the hell haven’t we gone back to the Moon?’*

I mean, we’ve got water that may ... may well be on the Moon. I think they’ve just about conclusively proven that. We could actually have a base there.

It is strange is it not that all these years have gone by and we haven’t gone back to the Moon! (?)”

WG: “I think this also helps explain why they’re covering up what they’ve, ah, spotted on Mars, because if they let out that they’ve spotted, ah, artifacts there that need to be looked at more carefully, there’s gonna be a big outcry: ‘Let’s go send somebody up there to look at it ... *and they can’t do it!*’”

AB: “Richard?”

RCH: “Well, I have a very different take. I think we haven’t gone back to the Moon because we were shocked with what we found. We came back home with our tail between our legs and they’ve been spending fifty (50) [sic] years hovering in their Brookings closet, trying to figure out how the hell to tell us that we’re not living in the Solar System the way they thought they ... they ... they were living in before we actually went on these various journeys.”

AB: “So in other words, Wayne thinks we haven’t gone back ’cause we never went in the first place. And you think we haven’t gone back because they were so damn shocked at what they found!”

RCH: “Well look at what happened on both sides of the Iron Curtain in the wake of the Apollo missions. The FBI – and this I have absolute sworn testimony from engineers that were part of the vast four hundred thousand (400,000) infrastructure that built the Apollo program ... the FBI went around to all the subcontractors and anybody who had a key piece of the

Saturn V, *they took the blueprints and destroyed them (!)* so we could never build another vehicle to go to the Moon!

The Russians went even further. They literally took sledgehammers and acetylene torches to their boosters and their lunar vehicles ...”

AB: “But ...”

RCH: “... and there’s only bits and pieces of scrap metal ...”

AB: “... but ... but Richard ...”

RCH: “... after the Soviet lunar program.”

AB: “Okay ... okay, but Richard, why would the godless Soviets care one (1) whit whether there were things on the Moon that would destroy our paradigms and religious beliefs?”

RCH: “Well, because it’s more than religion. It’s economics, it’s control issues, it’s power, it’s, ah ... we were at the height of the Cold War, you know? Um, I’m sure some day we will get declassified documents. We actually had more from the, ah, KGB than we’ve had from our guys, indicating that there was a tremendous fear of what was found, *and we basically came home in shock.*”

AB: “Okay, Wayne, why do you think all these, ah, things were so summarily destroyed?”

WG: (laughs). “I don’t know.” (laughs more). “Other than, ah, they just knew that they couldn’t get out there, and I don’t think they had any other choice on it.”

AB: “All right.”

* * *

AB: “Ah, this is for both of you: They, ah, postulated all of this was done at Area 51 – if you did it right, there is so little difference between what ... what ... what they showed of the landscape and so forth ... and what we have out here that it’s pathetic. I mean, you could ... I guess the question for both of you: ‘Could it have been faked? Could it have been done at Area 51? Is that possible?’

I’m not asking you what you believe. I’m just asking you if it’s possible. Richard?”

RCH: “Well, given enough money and enough secrecy, I suppose anything is quote ‘possible.’”

AB: “Well, they had a lot of money!”

RCH: “Well, all we have is about twenty billion dollars (\$20,000,000,000) ...”

AB: “Yeah.”

RCH: “... in ... in constant dollars in sixty-nine ('69), which is forty billion dollars (\$40,000,000,000) now. So ... yeah, you had a lot of money.

I go back to all the little things we found on the actual evidence – the data that came back, which is evidence of lunar ruins taken by handheld Apollo astronauts, using Hasselblad cameras. How do you explain that away? How do you explain the little things that were carefully placed almost in time capsules for some future generation to trip over and reconstruct what we really did discover on the lunar surface?

This idea that it was done at Area 51 is fashionable, because it's a place that, you know, no one even admits exists. And you can't get into it. You can't see what's there.

The Soviets released some satellite imagery, which was very provocative, but that proves nothing! I mean, this show went to the height of lunacy (pun intended) of claiming there were breezes that were waving the flag!”

AB: “Oh, yeah, the flag ... the flag!”

RCH: “It was obvious the astronauts were vigorously trying to insert the damn pole in the ground and they had one shot of the flag sitting there with no astronaut touching it and it was absolutely motionless.

I happen to know that the flag was a two, ah ... ah, part affair. It was a bottom pole and then a top pole that fitted into it, and then the flag stuck out on a wire at right angles – a stiff wire – and when you wagged it back and forth, because of inertia and lag, it made it look if you were wiggling it as if, yes, it was blowing in the breeze!”

AB: “Yeah, I ... I absolutely agree with you!

And ... and here's another thing ... we ... we ...”

RCH: “But you see when you do a show that puts up fake ‘straw men’ and doesn't destroy the mock argument, it undercuts the validity and the seriousness of the entire operation.”

WG: “I've heard that argument about the flag many times, but I've looked at the

videos very carefully ...”

RCH: “So have I!”

WG: “... and, ah ...”

RCH: “I’ve looked at the live stuff when it was being done.”

WG: “And I didn’t see any way that that flag could, ah, wave the way it did.”

AB: “Well yeah, but Wayne if there was a wire there and he was fitting one pole ...”

WG: “Um-hmm.”

AB: “... into another essentially, ah, there would have been motion. And if it was a wire ...”

WG: “Some motion, yes. But you notice that the flag almost doubled up on itself at one time there.”

RCH: “That’s because there’s no air (!) ... there’s no air resistance! You couldn’t do it on Earth because you’d have ... you’d have air resistance.”

AB: “Well, plus there’s this, gentlemen: I mean, the traditional view was there’s no air on Mars. So if you were faking the landing, you ... I mean that would be one detail you definitely would pay attention to. You wouldn’t have the flag movin’ around in an airless environment, if ...”

RCH: “You think?”

AB: “... if you faked it, would you?”

RCH: “No.”

WG: “Ha.” (laughs).

RCH: “Look, this is an argument which I think is going to be with us for as long as there are people who were born after the lunar landings or didn’t pay much attention during the actual Apollo missions.”

WG: “No, I believed them at the time.”

RCH: “I believe them too, because I was there! I was close ... I was as close as anybody who was a non-astronaut could get.”

AB: "I believe them too."

* * *

AB: "What about Mrs. Grissom?"

RCH: "Well, what happened on Apollo 1 is a totally different discussion. And to bring it in as this show did and make overtones that Grissom died because he was murdered because he was gonna blow the whistle on the fake Apollo program ... no, I think – and I said it on your show before – Betty ... Grissom and, ah ... ah, her son said it (!):

'That we have evidence – independent evidence – that yes, the astronauts were ... were murdered. They were killed, but not to keep them from telling anything, *but to kill the entire Apollo program (!)*

There were forces in this country at that point that didn't want us to go to the Moon and didn't want to have the possibility of the confirmation with astronauts of what was photographed there by the surveyors and by the lunar orbiters. And they were trying to kill the entire Apollo program. And they came within a whisker of ... of ... of ... of doing it."

AB: "All right, but Richard in a way, ah, you're putting forth your conspiracy theory and ..."

RCH: "Of course!"

AB: "... and complaining about *their* conspiracy theory (AB snickers) ..."

RCH: "Yeah, but which is simpler ..."

AB: "... but agreeing with it in substance."

RCH: "Which is simpler? That you somehow convince four hundred million ... four hundred thousand (400,000) people to participate in a twenty million dollar (\$20,000,000) boondoggle that went nowhere OR that you actually spent all the money, went some place, found something extraordinary, which only a handful of people could have seen – the astronauts and the guys in the film lab – *and it died there!*"

AB: "I ... I ... I never have ..."

RCH: "THEY GOT THE FILM!"

The thing, boys and girls, is *we've got the film!*"

AB: "Richard, I have this old naïve belief that Americans, ah, working at NASA *never ever* would have for any reason killed our own in such a tragic way. I just ..."

RCH: "Who said it was NASA employees?"

AB: "Well, I mean they were the ones in control of every bit of equipment!"

RCH: "Not really.

The security around Apollo and around the unmanned missions is so incredibly lax. I mean, yeah we were in the Cold War, but it wasn't really taken seriously.

And again, I was there! I went ... I was able to get into places that you could never, you know ..."

AB: "I ... I appreciate that."

RCH: "... with just a network credential ..."

AB: "Yeah, I ..."

RCH: "... I could get into places ..."

AB: "I know."

RCH: "... that you shouldn't have gotten into."

AB: "I can believe that.

Ah, Wayne, you have any comment on the whole ..."

WG: "Well ..."

AB: "Grissom [unintelligible] fire?"

WG: "... I just keep hearing the opposite story, ah, at every turn. Ah, you know, I ... this fellow, who had that work that, ah, on the LEM [Lunar Excursion Module] said that he didn't believe that one person that worked at that company believed for one minute that we ever went to the Moon.

I talked to a fellow yesterday. He said that, ah, the daughter of the family next door, ah, had an uncle that was one of the astronauts. And he said: 'No, we never went there.' And, ah, so forth.

And I just keep hearing this from everywhere. And every bit of evidence adds up. Ah, if it looks like a duck, if it walks like a duck ...”

RCH: “Wayne, it doesn’t add up!

Show me a piece of evidence that adds up. This whole stars thing – you just dropped it! You went onto something else.”

WG: “Um-hmm.”

RCH: “It is the key argument: ‘Oh, we didn’t go to the Moon, ...”

WG: “No.”

RCH: “... because the Moon photographs don’t show stars! It’s an insane, stupid argument.”

AB: “Well, okay, but ...”

WG: “Okay, so I’m insane and stupid, but ...”

AB: “But ... but ...”

RCH: “No. The argument is insane and stupid.”

WG: (laughs).

RCH: “What is your position ...”

AB: “They said ...”

WG: “According to the fellow from, ah, NASA, anybody who doesn’t believe that we went to the Moon is a *nut!*”

AB: “Yeah, he did say that.”

WG: “And ... but that was his only answer. And he didn’t answer any of the other arguments.”

AB: “I think that you and Richard ...”

RCH: “Well, again, you know ...”

AB: “I think that you and Richard both agree ...”

RCH: “How do you explain away the fact that photographic film certainly circa 1969 could not take short exposures showing the lunar surface – well-focused and well-lit – and show stars in the same frame?”

It just physically could not happen!”

WG: “And how could you get that film – that sensitive film – through the Van Allen belt without fogging it?”

RCH: “No, no, no, you’re not ... you’re mistaking two (2) arguments!

Forget the sensitive film. The film by the way was radiation-hardened.”

WG: “How?”

RCH: “I’m gonna put up on the Enterprise website a series of articles on this; it is so outrageous.

And I ... I ... I ... I told Mike Bara when we put up tonight’s piece. I said: ‘One piece is not going to do it. This has been a thirty (30) year story building ...’

Do you know where I first ran into this story, Wayne? When I was with CBS ... with the network and had carte blanche to go anywhere in NASA and they actually liked me ...”

WG: “Um-hmm.”

RCH: “I went from Rockwell [International, Inc.] where we had built a whole Solar System to walk people through during the Apollo 11 landing. And a few days later we put everything together – hundreds and hundreds of tons of gear – and went up to JPL [Jet Propulsion Laboratory] in Pasadena.

I walked in the door and one (1) of the PR [public relations] people for JPL was squiring around a guy who was handing out leaflets claiming that the Apollo 11 experience, which was a week and a half old, never happened (!) It was a fake in a hangar somewhere in Nevada.

That is how old this story is. And why he was being given ‘red carpet treatment’ by NASA personnel themselves is a mystery that I now look back on and say: ‘Why the hell didn’t I ask that question then?’”

AB: “Wayne?”

WG: “Yeah? ... okay.”

AB: “So in other words, Wayne, you’re willing to do ... you’ve got a good open mind, and I know you do ... and you’re willing to look at evidence point-by-point are you not that would suggest we did go to the Moon?”

WG: “I ... I did not buy into this conspiracy theory easily. Ah, it took quite a bit of convincing. And quite a lot of evidence.

And, as I say, backed up by the, ah, information from one (1) of my readers. Backed up by this fellow that was [covering? – unintelligible] Anarctica ...”

RCH: “Evidence from one (1) of your readers? (!)”

WG: “Hmm?”

AB: “Yeah?”

RCH: “One of your readers? One swallow makes a summer?” [referencing their annual return to San Juan Capistrano ...].

WG: “Ah, this fellow was the head of, ah, information technology at NASA. A couple of years later he did a thesis on Apollo 11. So he was very, ah, very familiar with it ...”

RCH: “And in his thesis, did he claim that it didn’t exist? It didn’t happen?”

WG: “No, no, not at all.

His thesis ... he believed it. And then he saw the tape ...”

RCH: “Have you seen a copy of the tape?”

WG: “... ah, which was *automatically dated* by the computers ...”

RCH: “Have you seen a copy ...”

AB: “Yeah, that should have been on the show. I mean, where’s ... where’s ...”

RCH: “That tape exists ...”

AB: “Where’s the meat? Where’s the tape?”

WG: “Yeah.”

AB: "Where is the tape?"

WG: "Yep."

RCH: "See ... !"

AB: "Wayne ... ?"

WG: "I don't believe ... I don't believe he stole the tape."

AB: "Okay. I ... ah!"

RCH: "In my conspiracy theory, guys, in my conspiracy theory NASA itself has been spreading and fostering this rumor."

WG: "Well, there we go."

RCH: "Now wait a minute! Here's my evidence:

I walk into JPL and they're giving the red carpet treatment to the guy handing out leaflets claiming ...

It was the most bizarre thing you can imagine!

It made no sense and I had no context back then. I was so stupidly naïve. We all were!

I couldn't imagine that there would be a multi-level conspiracy so that down the road when it came out of the closet that NASA had suppressed evidence of artifacts, they could claim: 'Oh, no we didn't do any suppression ... any conspiracy. Look at this stupid nonsense that's been around for years that we never went. See how we destroyed that one!'

AB: "Well, you know, I ... I think it's interesting. There is one (1) thing you both agree on – **NASA lied.**

I mean, if I were to ask individually, ah, Wayne, NASA lied, yes?"

WG: "I ... I believe so."

RCH: (interrupting): "NASA lied! ..."

AB: "And Richard: NASA lied?"

RCH: "And they're still lying!"

AB: “And ... and they’re still lying you say?”

So you both agree that NASA lied. You just have different conclusions about ‘why.’”

RCH: “Well, I don’t think Wayne has actually looked at the evidence for the artifacts in spe- ... specificity. That he has had the time or maybe even the inclination.”

AB: “Well, you know what? I’d like to have Wayne take a look at your point-by-point refutation on the ...”

RCH: “Um-hmm.”

AB: “... on the website.”

RCH: “Yah.”

AB: “And, ah, and then the next time I have Wayne on – which will be shortly – I’ll ask him about that and the next time ...”

WG: “Oh, I’ll be glad to look into that.”

AB: “Okay. Wonderful!”

RCH: “Well, one (1) of the things we have on the web is a ... is another piece which kinda goes hand-in-hand with tonight’s piece. Let me go back one (1) here. Give you the title.

It’s called: *‘Alan Bean Shows Us the True Colors of the Moon.’* The, ah, the piece on the Fox thing is called: *‘Who Mourns for Apollo.’* And then there’s a piece on Malin’s [Malin Space Science Systems] *‘New Mars Face,’* which we will not have time to talk about tonight. And then below that on the Enterprise website, the, ah, *‘Alan Bean Shows Us the True Colors of the Moon.’*

Alan Bean has done a book, which was released, ah, in the last year and a half or so. ...”

AB: “There’s not going to be time for this.”

RCH: “I’m just stating.”

AB: “Just suffice to say people can go up and read it.

And Wayne will go up and read it. And then I'm gonna have Wayne on separately and I'm gonna have you on separately – very soon Richard – And we'll have lots more time to do all this.

I want to thank both of you ... you do agree on one (1) point at least gentlemen ...”

WG: (laughs).

AB: “Say ‘Good Night.’”

RCH: “Good Night, Wayne.”

WG: “Good Night, Art. I'm glad you're back.”

AB: “Thank you.

All right, we'll, ah, pick that up in other shows. I'm Art Bell. And this is Coast-to-Coast AM.”

* * *