



Moonflights or moonlies



**A study from
R. Droz, dipl. El.-Ing. ETH,**

A historic event in human history happened over 50 years ago. But whether everything really happened exactly as it is in the books was doubted again and again. The longer people deal with it, the fewer emotional moments and the skepticism increases that here, as with many other earth-shattering stories, the truth was not always in the foreground

It is worth looking back at the time from a sober perspective and making comparisons with other narratives in recent world history. Lies have always accompanied world politics, because they are used by the powerful for their goals and are still relevant today. Sometimes they have been unmasked after months, sometimes it takes decades for better public knowledge to become established. No, the serious moon landing critics do not belong to the world conspiracy theorists, many are unbiased and independent scientists who understand physics, technology and mathematics and recognize possible connections with politics. The search for the truth is their motivation.

Here it is shown: For the staging of the main act of this spectacle, all that was needed was the strong political will of an injured superpower, a manageable team of clever specialists and an enthusiastic audience of millions. The media took care of the rest. Even if one takes the position that there is no absolute evidence to fake the moon landing, there is also no evidence to confirm a real moon landing. It just depends on the level of knowledge and trust in the sources of information that lead one to one conclusion or the other.

The question is simple: do we really want to know or is it enough to believe ?



7 theses for clarification

1. Everyone saw the takeoff and landing on Earth. Nobody except the astronauts was present at the moon landing. NASA is the sole source of all information.
2. 2. The lunar module could not be demonstrated in working order. This contradicts a professional approach that would have been necessary for a successful mission.
3. 3. The "evidence" for the moon landing that NASA always cites is not watertight.
4. 4. The appearance of the astronauts after their mission was anything but believable. In 1994, Neil Armstrong made a classified confession, and in 2022, so did Buzz Aldrin.
5. In 1969, the maneuvering technology was not able to dock 2 ballistic missiles to each other in the specified (given) time. Gemini proved that all of this would have taken much longer.
6. Some of the NASA image and sound documents are so inconsistent that the credibility of the entire mission is compromised.
7. NASA scientists now admit that the solution for a human to travel safely beyond the VanAllen Belt has yet to be found.

Indisputable fact. NASA serves America's glory and reports directly to the government. The government had good reason to require staging, and NASA had the ability to do so.

V02, V03, V04, V05, V06, V07

The first time a rocket motor has been shown to land a heavy device was in 2015 with Space-X.

Arguments and evidence are provided here.

Arguments arise from showing the videos.

A01, A02, A03, A04, A05

Arguments follow from Gemini's operational data.

Arguments are provided at 19 objects.

*B01, B02, B03, B04, B05, B06, B07, B08, B09, B10, B11, B12, B13
B14, B15, B16, T01, T03*

NASA documents.

Arguments result from the presentation of the video and from original

F03