

Richard Hoagland and Ken Johnston

The former NASA scientists and engineers and other researchers said today, that suppressed NASA and Soviet photographs show apparent lunar ruins that may have been created by another civilization."

RH- I can't help thinking there's something radically wrong with this Republic ... where a group of scientists who were willing to come forward and talk about a problem with this government, can not get coverage on most of the news outlets in the country ... after they spent a lot of time and effort and put in a two hour major presentation - which was carried *live* to the rest of the world.

KJ: Well, good-morning Art.

I'd like to kind of clear that up just a little bit.

I was working for one of the prime contractors for NASA at the time. That was Brown-Root and Northrop. It was a consortium between the Brown-Root Corporation and the Northrop Corporation at the Lunar Receiving Laboratory.

They had the contract for the processing of the lunar samples and my particular function was a supervisor of the data and photo control department, which handled all of the photographic, as well as written documentation about the lunar samples.

KJ: And I kind of stood there a little bit concerned, but she went in the back, and the next thing I know I'm being ushered in the back and introduced to Richard.

Long story short: After the seminar, we made arrangements for them to come over to my house the next day and take a look at some of the data that I'd maintained - about 500-1000 photographs in my own personal collection.

And I explained to them that I had put a complete set of all the photographic data from the Apollo missions, at my college alma mater - back home at Oklahoma City; at Oklahoma City University.

AB: Alright. Ken, what do you think. First of all, did you have in that collection - photographs, that are now not available from NASA?

KJ: Well, from what I understand from the photographic experts, the prints that I have and the negatives and the film strips that I have - these were made off of the first generation, the originals.

And the data they are able to extract from it and things that we can see in those is so far superior to anything they've been able to get from other repositories, that I guess the answer is "yes", there's a lot of things in there that you can see that you wouldn't ordinarily be able to find on material that you would get from other sources.

RH: The first thing that I wanted to do of course, was to check with the official sources - with NSSDC, our friends here in Washington - that we went to a year ago and had the two-day meeting. We took eight people into the lab and spent two days looking at the photographic processes and the archiving and the record-keeping, and why were there duplicate numbers of the same frames that were different.

You know, the so-called 4822 problem and all that.

Rh-And the first thing we found, Ken - and I don't know whether you realize this - is that the numbers on the photographs you have, are not the same numbers that are now out of the archive in Washington, here.

RH: Yes, in other words, there seem to be what we would term, "foot-dragging" - in the extreme.

And this is - this is a part of the pattern that we have noticed. I have not seen any overt examples, that I could put my finger on, in this lunar work - of outright retouching or air-brushing or faking of pictures, or destruction of data.

What I find, is a pattern of deception, a pattern of losing information, of mis-labeling it, of publishing catalogs where the photographs appear black.

When you order the picture, the picture is stunning and very good.

In other words, I see a pattern of - of trying to deter people, trying to dissuade people - from getting access to the data.

But, if you're persistent and you will not be deterred, ultimately the real data can be found.

And this gives me reason to believe... that someone, somewhere in NASA, realizes that someday this is going to come out.

RH: And you know that the major crime is not the crime.

It's always the cover-up of the crime.

AB: Sure.

RH: So this looks like plausible deniability, because at any point that we get in the process and find real data, someone can always say, "Oh, they ran out of ink", or "Oh, they had somebody in from the temp office who filed it wrong that day."

You can never pin them for the mistake.

KJ: The more and more I've been exposed to looking at the data, and realizing - actually without the aid of any kind of instrumentation, you can actually see some of the anomalies on just the raw film and pictures itself.

One of the most striking things I have found, and one of the comments that one of the analysts was making is - if you really want to see what somebody doesn't want you to see on the Moon, look in the visor of the person being photographed.

And it was a rather unique experience. We started looking at that, with magnifying glasses and looking at the reflections on the curvature of the face masks of the astronauts on the lunar surface.

And there's some rather striking pictures that show what appears to be constructed structures, ladders, portals; some very, very interesting things in the visor in a number of pictures.

Part 2 of 4 (Second Half-Hour)

KJ: And the answer is, yes we did. You have to understand that I had kept these pictures for my own personal self - which were about a thousand pictures, inside of a plastic [album] - where I could flip through them.

Occasionally, someone would show some interest, and I'd flip through them and, you know - good little soldiers, we looked at them and we saw what we were told we were going to see.

But, when Richard and his team came over, and we took a serious look at it, and got out some loops - it was amazing the things that they had seen on some of those eighth to tenth generations that just stood out blatantly right on the pictures that I had.

AB: Alright, a fax: "Please ask Ken" - and I think you just answered it - "if he knew there were artifacts and/or structures or anything anomalous in the photos he possessed, before he met Richard."

KJ: Well, the answer I just gave, is no - I really didn't have a chance to pay that much attention to it. I guess when they came over and we started looking at them, and they started pointing out some of the features - I was taken aback, because here I had them in my possession for - well - eighteen to twenty-some odd years, and really never seriously set out and looked at them.

They were just great pictures of the lunar surface, as well as orbital shots and the astronauts in them. These were men that I'd worked with and knew quite well - when I was one of the consultant test pilots with Grumman on the lunar module.

I never considered that there might be something there that I wasn't told to see.

AB: Hiding in plain sight.

KJ: Absolutely.

RH: Art, this is very important, because a lot of people don't understand. They almost say: "Look Hoagland, if you're right, this stuff should be like New York City. Everybody should have seen it. You can't be right, because all of NASA can't be in on the conspiracy. You have to be 'out to lunch'."

And what Ken has just described, is a crucial piece of information and perspective. We tend to see in life, what we expect to see.

AB: That's right.

Nobody had time, in the system, to look at and question details and photographs, when the official interpreters were telling them: "This is what you're seeing."

And it's that process of expecting to see what you expect to see, which I think accounts for the fact that you only require a tiny handful of people at the top - to manipulate a system.

So, everybody else, as honest as they are, and as hard-working, as motivated as they are - they just don't see it, because it's not blatantly obvious.

It requires an educated eye, to understand how to look at these photographs, to start with.

RH: We now have ten different versions of this one crucial frame, and they are all masquerading, Art, under the same frame number!

And for that reason alone, there should be a major inquiry!

Well, here we have, for this one frame, ten times the number of images - all masquerading under one frame number and nobody has to be a rocket scientist to realize, "There ain't something right with all that."

We now have a second frame from the Zond-3 mission, on July 20, 1965. And remember - the first Zond frame showed this 30-mile high dome-like protrusion of the lunar limb.

This second frame shows a twenty-some mile "Tower" - very massive tower - which is farther to the north, on the limb of a photograph taken a few seconds earlier. It's in this 28-frame sequence that we can't get our hands on, out of Moscow. KJ: Yes, I did and that was one of the most fascinating things I ever saw, when Richard showed them to me, because clearly - there's a dome on the rim of the lunar surface with the sun coming up behind it - and there's this huge chunk. It literally shows that it has been battered and beat, but it's still pretty much intact.

KJ: I'd like to interject here. We put together the greatest minds - the brightest, the youngest, and the sharpest - that we could to get to the moon; and right after Apollo 17, we turned around and we started laying everyone off.

Right after Apollo 11, it was no longer research and development. It was routine flights to the moon; and Grumman laid off 30,000 right there. You had Ph.D's selling papers there in Houston.

And basically, once we got there and grabbed the data, and got back - they dismantled the whole system that got us there.

KJ: And basically, once we got there and grabbed the data and got back, they dismantled the whole system that got us there.

AB: That's right. That's right. We went and we've done nothing since, and it's a puzzle to many people.

AB: Hmm. So, you had engineers. You had Ken, who was a photo-documentation supervisor with all of the photographs; first generation copies - right, Ken? - coming through you?

KJ: They would be the copies right off the first generation - positive transparencies that were taken.

RH: Now, see - this is a very important piece of information. When NASA sent the Apollo crews to the moon, for some reason - and we have our suspicions - but we don't have a memo describing why there wasn't any negative film sent.

In other words, they didn't send a roll of film - that when you bring it back and you develop it, you get a negative from which you can make the paper prints.

AB: Right.

RH: They sent transparency film; reversal film - slide film, really. Ektachrome-X , rated ASA 64, in 1969. And then from those transparencies, something called an inter-negative had to be made.

And from that inter-negative, you'd make your prints - so there was a two-stage process.

So, Ken's prints, actually, were not second generation; they were third generation - from the original data. And in that intermediate step, in that second generation process - is where we believe, that some interesting "hanky-panky" went on. Because...

Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

RH: Well, if you take a reversal film, and you expose it - if the moon was as advertised, alright? Even if you stop - if you open the lens wide and you had a time exposure of let's say, several seconds - the sky should still be absolutely black.

A vacuum is a vacuum is a vacuum.

There is supposed to be no air on the moon, you know, except for maybe light scattered in the lens, from the surface or the spacesuits - which would cause a kind of a greying-out.

That sky should be beautiful, velvet black; as black as the blackest night you can imagine.

AB: Yes.

RH: In fact, when you start looking at Ken's prints - which, now remember - are third generation from the originals, taken on the moon - there is a beautiful, very slight, bluish haze in the sky.

AB: A bluish haze?

RH: A very deep, deep, deep...

You know, looking at it with a bright light - just holding the print at the right angle - and I started to think:

"Wait a minute. Why is this sky not black?"

"Why does it have any haze at all?"

Because the photos were not over-exposed.

They were very well exposed; they were perfectly exposed.

They were - I mean these things have been sitting in archives for 30 years, and they were better, in terms of quality, than the photos we were seeing right out of the lab at NSSDC, just a few months before.

RH: No. And not even foreseen.

Now, here's where the "hanky-panky" comes in.

If we have the original transparencies - not the prints that Ken has ...

AB: Right.

RH: But the transparencies - it's my bet that we would have amazing detail in the sky that you could look at, by simply looking at a bright light; that those photographs were exposed to record the glittering glass domes, structures and ruins that are sticking up above the horizon.

That in fact, that was why NASA went with the transparency film; that they had a special film built, which had an ultraviolet-sensitive layer that would record that information even better than conventional Ektachrome-X film.

And that in the laboratory, by putting a filter in the optical enlarger when you made your inter-negative, they could remove almost all trace of that "offending" detail.

So, in essence, they had an almost fool-proof scheme, for taking pictures of real data on the moon, and giving to the American people and the press - and the world - a false, distorted version of the Moon that really is.

Richard Hoagland and Ken Johnston

Part 3 of 4 (Third Half-Hour)

KJ: Well, for most of it - in the early 60's - we were putting in anywhere from 12 to 14 hours, 7 days a week.

It was - back in Bethpage, Long Island, at the final assembly plant for the Lunar Module, that we had one guy who had been doing that for like three years; Came in - clocked in - turned around - had a heart attack, and died.

Alright, as we go back to our two guests, this report of coverage by KABC Television in Los Angeles, tonight at 11:30 - actually, after we went on the air:

Female anchor:

"Well, the man that once said he found a human-like face - in a photograph - on Mars, tonight claims he spotted signs of an ancient civilization on the Moon.

Richard Hoagland held a news conference displaying magnified portions of pictures taken by the Apollo astronauts on the lunar surface.

Now he sees a Grecian-like temple, a mile and a half-high formation - and what he calls a glass dome.

Apollo 12 astronaut, Alan Bean, said: "Not true". He took many of those photos; says he doesn't see any signs of civilizations or little Moon condos, or anything else."

Other anchor: "Maybe he needs new glasses."

We have a film, that was released by NASA in 1969 called, "Apollo 12: Pinpoint for Science", which was the half-hour official NASA "PR" film on the Apollo 12 mission.

... RH: And the procedure was, that they would take the photos the astronauts had taken on the Moon - the still photos - they would make up prints; they would rush them over to this production house - I think it was in Houston, run by Ken Grimm, at the time; And they would put them on what's called an Ocks-Ferry animation stand.

And they would point a 16-millimeter camera at them; and they would pan the stills. And they would make their film from the film of the stills that the astronauts had taken.

On Apollo 12, the astronauts did not take any 16-millimeter motion picture film on the surface, outside the Lunar Module. They took Hasselblad stills - from still cameras mounted on the chest of their spacesuits. And then those were used to make up the film, as part of the elaborate production process when they came back.

Well, we noticed when one of our colleagues - the same gentleman who drove his equipment 10,000 miles from California - from Los Angeles to Goddard - when we put one of these original films, which is now 30 years old - it's faded; it's brittle; it breaks in the projector, in the Telecine - when we put it on the instrument and had him look at it, there were some remarkable peculiarities about this official NASA-released film.

And what I did was - I had him make a videotape copy of the film through this very high-quality electronic system which he's developed, based on German engineering, for the Hollywood film industry out in California.

State-of-the-art, Art, Okay?

AB: Yes.

RH: And I had him send it to me, and I put it through our computer process - which is able to take still frames, digitize them, enlarge them, and then using a variety of algorithms to enhance them.

And on those frames from NASA's own film, we have photographs of Alan Bean standing in front of stunning, geometric, tiered, recessed, buttressed lunar ruins - over and over, again.

AB: Well, then, what do you make of his statement?

RH: Let me get back to the statement, in a minute. Let me complete this thought.

What is really important, is that this film, "Pinpoint for Science" - was an official release document from NASA. It's all over the world. It's in libraries in every country. Every NASA Center, every major city should have this film.

We have photographs of Alan Bean standing in front of ruins on the lunar surface.

AB: So, somebody ought to put that photo up in front of him and say: "What about this?"

RH: Exactly!

And until he is confronted, face-to-face, with this photo and asked: "How can you say it's not there, when it's there on official release prints - that NASA sent all over the world and **all we've done is go back to the original NASA film and simply turn up the contrast?"**

That's all we did.