



The new moon mission is a mystery

The dangers of the Van Allen Belt from today's NASA perspective

NASA would soon like to realize a new moon landing with an ORION capsule under the ARTEMIS program. This mission was also suggested by Donald Trump, among others. The planning dates have now been pushed back from 2023 to 2026.

Since around 2016, NASA scientists have repeatedly stated that, for this mission to be successful, the fundamental prerequisites for manned space flight beyond the Van Allen Belt must still be worked on.

These statements should actually arouse astonishment, because the general world opinion is that such missions have already been successful 6 times. But now it is explained that there is still no solution for such a trip, because either the risk is not known or the opinion prevails that the radiation there is dangerous for people without measures yet to be found. It is not entirely clear whether this only refers to the radiation within the belt or generally outside the protected environment of the earth.

Because this is apparently unclear, an unmanned advance mission should first measure the corresponding radiation levels before sending people there. This statement has been confirmed by several NASA scientists.

This raises the question of why NASA has not been able to answer this question for a long time, even though it carried out several such missions 50 years ago. The following oral NASA explanations can be found on this question:

1. «Yes, we had this technology, but it was somehow destroyed. We have to tackle the problem again from the beginning.»
2. “Yes, we had this technology, but the knowledge about it is no longer available. With the knowledge we have today, we primarily want to minimize the risks.”

What are the consequences of this statement

For the question that was not asked and therefore not answered as to why this risk is higher today than it was then, only non-binding statements are conceivable, that one simply does not know the considerations and precautions of the time and one is simply much more cautious today.

But if people had simply been carelessly sent into space at the time without knowing the risks or had misjudged them, this action by NASA would have been irresponsible. If the risks had been misjudged at the time, why didn't the astronauts have any health problems? And why would you do so much basic work today when the result of Apollo is already known?

With this really unconvincing argument, the overall question of the credibility of the Apollo mission is therefore raised again.

So the scientists don't believe in the harmlessness of the radiation values that are calculated today, but they do believe in a successful Apollo mission? If this had been a scientific mission, one would certainly have kept all the findings and artefacts (including, for example, the space protection suits) in safes or museums. This therefore seems to be a further indication that the Apollo mission was not at

all scientific, but exclusively a political-strategic mission. But then the dozens of inconsistencies about the technology and the images of the time, which are repeatedly questioned, appear in a completely new light.

Should it turn out in the end that the whole Apollo mission was just a staging, and that you just did NOT act irresponsibly, but in the best sense of the state raison d'être? For the good of the nation with a lie? As has happened so many times in the world? The "explanations" of these inconsistencies, which are repeated mantra-like by so-called "fact checkers", also stand there stupidly in the room. The science that didn't say anything, the media that roared hooray and suppressed the skeptics as cranks, yes, the whole of society, which (also for this reason) firmly believes that everything went right on the Apollo mission, they all look stupid. And last but not least, the American government is seen as a liar. Official apologies are then announced. The assumption is that they would cope better than our society.

Do we have to live with a big life lie?

One can assume that the scientists at NASA have a very good idea of the consequences of their statements for the myth of Apollo. However, it is also understandable that the individual NASA scientists do not feel compelled to unmask or uncover US State Secret No. 1 and therefore cannot be expected of them either. The NASA leadership also seems to have neither the desire nor the power to confront the government with this. It is still fully dependent on government contracts. That is, it would only be up to politicians to clear up this old story of lies. It is extremely unlikely that the respective US President has not had any knowledge of this state secret since then. But it is also unlikely that a US president would reveal this secret unnecessarily as long as a majority of his own people undauntedly believe in this ancient story, which has increased America's glory in an incomparable way.

On the NASA side, one could now wait and see what the results of the unmanned mission would bring and communicate: "Yes, we were too careful, it would have worked, it must have worked because we've already done it" or, in the other If you just take some precautions that represent credible protection and act as if you had used them for Apollo and just forgot about them. Or you can just delay and delay the new moon flight. There is no rush and no more pressure, the glory of the first moon landing has long been dry.

What can we expect from science and the media, what do we have to contribute ourselves?

Because scientists can only work with facts - and this includes the unhindered and unembellished presentation and dissemination of all facts - such facts come to light. It is up to us, the audience, to recognize them and to draw the conclusions that can be derived from them. Our media are therefore also asked to conduct discussions with competent partners at an appropriate level.

It seems, however, that hardly anyone in this country is interested in correcting this historical myth, because this would cause the masses to shake their stable worldview. We of the '68 generation, in particular, largely perceived this event as a glimpse into the might of science, and with it, like a salvation, America's reputation was restored. We Swiss, in particular, were particularly proud of our sun-wind sail by Professor Geiss from Bern. At the time, neither the media nor scientists viewed this event and its repetitions with the necessary skepticism. The shame of being accused of being naïve and stupid now threatens us all. The young generation is perhaps more open-minded with the broad experience of fake news and no longer simply believes everything that is written and said. Unfortunately, this topic is hardly relevant to her anymore.

Actually, the arrogance with which some publicists in this country sweep all enlightening facts and discussions about Apollo into the big sack of conspiracy theories is unbearable. Due to the fact that

this presumed fact of fraud is not likely to be accepted by the general public, all relevant references come to nothing. From this one could conclude that the media tends to print what the majority of us want to hear and it is less about the best possible truth. That would be exactly the narrative that the real conspiracy theorists want us to believe. For this reason, it is partly understandable that these are also popular.

There is a risk of uncertainty among large parts of the population

Should a broad educational campaign regarding Apollo be started or should the American government unexpectedly question the authenticity of the Apollo mission, there is indeed a risk that a large part of the population will be alienated and no longer know what else to believe.

A broad discussion at a competent level would be important

It therefore requires the so-called «different view» in journalism in order to get closer to the truth. They don't always have to be right a priori. But we as readers must have the opportunity to deal with a contrary, different point of view. However, we must also take the trouble to study this other view closely. Large letters and quick conclusions are usually not very helpful. The facts are extensive and complex and hardly any of the individual facts can constitute proof on their own. It is only the amount of facts and indications that create a believable overall picture.

Here is this other view: www.nomoonlanding.ch