

[return to updates](#)

# The Nuclear Hoax



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published January 24, 2016*

As usual, this is just my professional opinion, based on private research.

I have already written a shortish [paper on the Bikini Atoll tests](#), showing photographic evidence they were faked. Some have misread my arguments there, thinking I was implying that *only* the Bikini tests were faked, while the Trinity and Japan events were real. On the contrary. I never meant to imply that. I mentioned the Trinity tests in that paper only to show that the Bikini and Trinity stories contradicted one another. The wind we are shown at Trinity apparently didn't exist at Bikini.

At any rate, I thought my conclusion there made it clear I suspected all tests and events to have been faked. If that wasn't clear, I will clarify it here. **I suspect all tests and events were and are faked.** If they had any real events to show us, they wouldn't need to show us faked events.

What got me back into this topic was a chance return to the Wikipedia page for the [Lookout Mountain Air Force Station](#) in Laurel Canyon, which station played a prominent role in my exposé [of the Tate/Manson event](#). If you remember, that was a small military station hidden away in the hills of Los Angeles, which was built in 1941 to create government films. It expanded in 1947, year one of the CIA. It produced thousands of propaganda films, and this is admitted. It was said to have been closed in 1968, but we now know that was a lie. Lookout Mountain is thanked in the credits to *Return of the Jedi* in 1983, so it must have still been open then. They want you to think it was closed in 1968, so that you can't connect it to the Tate/Manson event in 1969. But the Wikipedia page has actually been rewritten in the past year to change the date of closing to 1968. When I was writing my Tate paper, I saved a copy of the Wiki page, and at that time the date of closing was listed as 1969, not 1968. So they have rewritten the Wiki page in response to my Tate paper. It is not the first time a Wiki page has been rewritten or scrubbed in response to my papers. The first instance happened many years ago, in response to [my paper on tides](#) on my science site. In that

case, they permanently deleted their page on Tidal Theory, and completely rewrote the page on Tides, deleting all the math I critiqued in my paper—although it is mainstream math and can be found in many other books and websites.

Anyway, I would have expected the Lookout Mountain page to have been completely deleted, but curiously it has *expanded*. Most of that expansion is misdirection, as with the changing of the date of closing, but not all the misdirection is successful. Several photos have been added, including this one:



Operation Greenhouse was the nuclear test series from 1951 at Enewetak Atoll. Don't you find it strange that this event is a **motion picture** with a **script**? I can understand recording the event, but *scripting* it? Why would you need to script a nuclear test? Remember, you normally script a fictional event, not a real one. Real events don't need scripts. Once again, we see them placing prominent clues right in front of your nose. They should call this Operation Yeah Tell Me Another One, General.

If we go to the page for Enewetak, we find this photo:



That photo has the subtext:

**Filters are being removed from a US Air Force [Boeing B-17](#) drone after a flight through the radioactive cloud.**

What? You can't filter radioactive particles with some white sheet placed over the windows, or whatever is going on there. And if the plane is a drone, why use filters at all? The only reason to fly a drone through a radioactive cloud is to monitor the ion levels. But if you are monitoring ion levels, you don't need a filter, do you? You would need a filter only if the plane were manned. I suspect the plane *was* manned. Why? Because I see it sitting there. According to other stories at the time, drones were used only for "suicide" missions, since they couldn't be taken off or landed successfully. Pilots had to take them to altitude and then bail out, after which they could be flown by remote control. But since they couldn't be *landed* by remote control, they had to be crashed somewhere on purpose. In other words, used as a missile against an enemy target. This is the story we get from the death of Joseph Kennedy, Jr., remember, who is said to have piloted one of these missile planes in WW2.\* He and another pilot were to have taken the plane to altitude and then bailed. But the payload onboard exploded for some reason before they were able to bail, killing them both. I have shown that story is another hoax, but not because they could take off and land drones back then. It is a fiction because there is no way Kennedy would be chosen for that mission. It is also an obvious fiction because the plane was followed by a film crew. There would be no reason for a film crew to follow such a mission, unless they were there to film the explosion, as alleged proof of Kennedy's death. But the part about these planes requiring pilots for take off and landing is true. The B-17 required precise eye and hand coordination in the cockpit for a successful landing.

The reason they are telling you this B-17 was a drone is so you don't ask questions about that stupid filter. If they admitted the plane was manned, you might start to ask how radioactivity can be filtered in a cockpit like that. The short answer is, it can't. Radioactivity is very small ions, like alphas and betas. Betas are high energy electrons. Electrons are tiny, and cannot be filtered by screens. Neither can photons. The cockpit would have to be completely *shielded* all around. Shielded, not filtered. But if it is shielded, it can't be flown, since the shields would prevent all visibility. So the story fails both ways.



That is the next ridiculous photo we find. Here is the subtext:

**Major General [Leslie Groves](#) and [Robert Oppenheimer](#) at the Trinity shot tower remains a few weeks later. The white overshoes were to prevent the [trinitite](#) fallout from sticking to the soles of their shoes.**

I will give you a few moments to stop laughing. They are standing at ground zero a few weeks after the test, with no protective clothing except white canvas bags over their shoes. A 20kt bomb is supposed to have exploded just 100 ft above that point they are standing, and yet all we see is a little pile of dirt, not even scorched. Look at the ground. It is just cracked dirt. It should have been heated to extremely high temperatures and turned to magma or aerosoled. We are told they are wearing the medical booties to prevent trinitite from sticking to their shoes, but do you see any trinitite? Trinitite is supposed to be a kind of glass, created by taking the dirt and rocks to high temperatures. Do you see anything that resembles glass there? I don't. It just looks like cracked clay, as in any normal desert. And does glass stick to your shoes? No. If you brought the desert floor to extremely high temperatures and then allowed it to cool very fast, it would be the opposite of sticky. It would be very hard and non-porous, again like glass.

We are told the desert sand was largely made of silica, but from the photo above, we can see that isn't true. They are standing on cracked clay, not sand.

And why no hole? Remember, all the faked photos we see of these events include a giant column and mushroom. Where do you think the column and mushroom come from? We are led to believe they come from an uplift of sediment on the ground. Where else would they come from? Well, if you uplift a huge column of sediment on the ground and broadcast it into the sky, then there will have to be a huge blast crater or hole. Instead, we see just a miniscule pile of dirt here.

You will say, "Why expect a crater? Do you know what nuclear bombs detonated 100 ft. up do to the surface below them?" No, and neither do you. All we can ask for is consistency—which we aren't getting with these stories. For example, in the Baker detonation at Bikini, which was only about 13% stronger than the Trinity blast, we are told it created a crater in the ocean floor 2000 ft. wide and 30 ft. deep. And that was with the ocean as a buffer. Baker was detonated halfway down to the sea floor, we are told. So there was 90 ft. of water between the explosion and the created crater. But Trinity was only 100 ft. off the desert floor, with nothing but air between. And yet we are told it left a crater 30 ft. wide and 5 ft. deep. Again, that's 2000 ft. wide for Baker versus 30 ft. for Trinity. It looks to me like they just didn't want to dig a big hole at the Trinity site, so they blew it off.

However, as we can see from the photo above, there isn't a crater at all, not even one five feet deep. Oppenheimer and his pals are at the base of the shot tower, which was the tower on which the detonation took place. They are staring at one of the four legs, and the guys behind them are staring at another.



Do you see any crater between them? I don't.

Finally, we are expected to believe these guys are just hanging out in a highly radioactive area with no protective clothing, at a time when there would still be fallout from the sky? I will be told the fallout ends after two weeks or something, and that the ground is also not radioactive after a few weeks. But that contradicts all the other stories we have been fed. Like this one: on the Bikini Atoll page, we saw the natives being taken back ten years after the last blast [in 1968], "based on scientific advice that the radiation levels were sufficiently reduced". However, in 1982, a French team found that radiation levels were still not safe and the islanders were again removed. That's 24 years after the last blast. And yet we see Oppenheimer himself standing at ground zero in a suit and tie just a few weeks after the Trinity test!



AFTER TEST

Here's another picture of ground zero. That isn't from some family's vacation, that is a government photo from soon after the test. It is one of a few published on the Trinity page at Wikipedia. Not only does it not match the previous photo, but again, there is no hole, no scorching, no glass, no evidence of a 20kt explosion 100 ft above that. I have seen more damage at the beach caused by schoolchildren making sand castles. And who are these bozos? They look like a couple of bums. Is that the sort of photo you would expect to stand as proof of the Trinity test on a huge mainstream website 70 years after the fact? You would expect either a fleet of 5-star generals and other bigwigs, or a cadre of men in lead suits. You would not expect a couple of guys who appear to be looking for old tires. Again, the joke is so in-your-face you just have to laugh. We can all this one Operation Sure-It-Did.

Also remember that the Trinity test was said to have been on July 16, 1945. Hiroshima was August 6, 1945, three weeks later. Not only does that make no sense as a matter of testing, it makes no sense given the state of the war in July. The testing of important devices normally takes much longer than that. You don't just test something once and then put it into use three weeks later. Even with something as relatively insignificant as new cosmetics, they test them over months or years on many subjects, and then wait to monitor after-effects. They don't just rub the lotion on one guinea pig, go "Oh, he didn't die immediately," and put the lotion on the shelves the next week. So this rush to drop a bomb tested only once should look very suspicious to you. It should look even more suspicious given that Japan was already beaten. It is not like they were about to attack the mainland US and we had to blast them as protection. We had been blasting the Japanese mainland since early March, and they were not able to stop us. According to the

mainstream story, Tokyo was firebombed March 9, killing 100,000 people. From March to July, we firebombed 66 other Japanese cities, causing another half million deaths. How many US cities did the Japanese bomb in that period? Less see. . . oh that's right, zero.

We are told the bombs were dropped to prevent more loss of life on our side, but that is just more misdirection. The Japanese weren't attacking us at that point. Why would they? Put yourself in their shoes. If your homeland is being bombed to pieces, you are going to pull back and put everything you have left on preventing more attacks at home. You aren't going to send your forces out on offensive missions, you are going to keep them at home in a defensive posture. The only way we were going to lose men at that point was by flying them over Japan or sailing them near her. If we didn't want to lose men, all we had to do was stay away. Whether or not the Emperor "unconditionally surrendered" is beside the point. The point is he wasn't capable of doing us any harm, surrender or no surrender. He was beaten, and whether or not he said "Uncle" was meaningless. It was certainly no justification for continuing to bomb him.

In short, you can rest easier on this matter, because there is no chance we dropped any nuclear bombs on Japan. It simply didn't happen. Japan knows that, Russia knows that, and the only ones who don't know that are the citizens of the US, who have been propagandized into a state of mass idiocy. The whole nuclear scare wasn't used mainly to keep the Russians at bay (since the Russians also never had any nukes). It was used mainly to keep US citizens in a state just short of panic for 70 years, and to keep military and Intelligence expenditures absurdly high.

In this same line, you should find it very curious that the bomb tested at Trinity was a plutonium device, like Fat Man allegedly used at Nagasaki. The bomb used first at Hiroshima was a uranium bomb, so *it was never tested*. Why would you choose to first drop the bomb you haven't tested, instead of the bomb you *have* tested? It makes no sense. This also makes no sense:

**After the war ended, it was not expected that the inefficient Little Boy design would ever again be required, and many plans and diagrams were destroyed.**

What? Do you know how much the Manhattan project cost? Around 25 billion dollars. Does it make any sense that they would spend billions to build a successful nuclear device and then destroy the plans and diagrams? Actually, this story reminds me of the story they told a few years ago, when some retired NASA investigators were looking for the original NASA footage of the Moon landing. They were told that NASA had lost it. As it turns out, [NASA had actually erased and reused the tapes in the 1980s](#). I am not joking. To explain it, we are told NASA was facing a major tape shortage at the time. Oh, well, I guess that makes it OK. We only spent around 100 billion on the Apollo project, so who expects to have any permanent record of it? Word of mouth is good enough. Besides, they probably needed the tape space to record *Battlestar Galatica* episodes.

But there is more. Concerning the failure to test the first nuclear device allegedly used in war, we are told:


**There were several reasons for not testing a Little Boy type of device. Primarily, there was little uranium-235 as compared with the relatively large amount of plutonium which, it was expected, could be produced by the [Hanford Site](#) reactors.<sup>[14]</sup> Additionally, the weapon design was simple enough that it was only deemed necessary to do laboratory tests with the gun-type assembly. Unlike the implosion design, which required sophisticated coordination of shaped explosive charges, the gun-type design was considered almost certain to work.**

The things they expect you to swallow! Please read the last two sentences closely, since the second contradicts the first. In the first sentence, the weapon design is simple, and the only thing that needs to be tested is the gun-type assembly. In the second sentence, notice that this reverses: the gun-type assembly is certain to work, so it is implied it doesn't need to be tested. But the implosion design is now sophisticated. *Your brain is being stirred!* In truth, neither statement is to the point. This weapon was alleged to be a first of its kind, as we know. It was alleged to be the first nuclear explosion invented and the first to be used. It cost huge amounts of money and allegedly required

the coordination of the top physicists in the West, including several stolen from Germany. So how could the weapon design be simple? It didn't just require "coordination of explosive charges", it required the first chain-reaction fission explosion, which up to then was just theoretical. The idea that this would never be tested in the field is ludicrous.

Plus, if these things didn't need to be tested before the first use in war, why did the later bombs need to be tested by the hundreds, blowing the shit out of large parts of the world? As usual, there is no coherence in the story being told us.

Then there is the big difference between the Gadget and Fat Man. The Gadget is what was exploded at Trinity. Fat Man exploded at Nagasaki 24 days later.



Amazing, isn't it, that they could refine their tech that much in just three weeks? I will told that second picture is just the bombshell, but since the diameter of it is only 60 inches, the Gadget we see in the first picture wouldn't fit inside it. The gadget inside Fat Man would have to be smaller and simpler, while supplying the same output. Well, that begs the question: if Fat Man was already built and was smaller and simpler, why was the Gadget so large and complex? They were built at the same time. Although we are told they had been working on this for years, in truth they had been working on it for only *one year*. The first enriched uranium didn't arrive at Los Alamos until June of 1944. You can't work on a uranium bomb without any uranium. Plus, all this contradicts what we are told on the Trinity page about the building of Jumbo. Jumbo was the container built in case the Trinity Gadget failed to detonate properly, so that the plutonium could be saved. They didn't have enough for a second test, you see. So how did they have enough for the Fat Man?

I will be told that by July they did have enough for a second detonation. But here is what it says at Wikipedia concerning that:

**By the time it [Jumbo] arrived, the reactors at Hanford produced plutonium in quantity, and Oppenheimer was confident that there would be enough for a second test.**

This is the explanation for why Jumbo wasn't used at Trinity. But this indicates that at the time of the Trinity test, they weren't sure whether the new plutonium would be used in a second test, or in a bomb headed for Japan. They also weren't sure the amount of plutonium was sufficient. Oppenheimer having to say he was confident indicates there was a big question mark there. Regardless, this certainly indicates that Fat Man had not been filled at that time. Are we to assume it had been already been built empty, just in case the Trinity test was successful and Truman ordered an immediate delivery to Japan? Even if they had enough plutonium from Hanford to fill

Fat Man, they would have to ship the plutonium in, fill the Fat Man, calibrate it, load it, and so on, in less than three weeks. In fact, we are told they did it in about nine days, since Fat Man left Kirtland on July 26. It strains belief that all this would be so rushed, since 1) it makes no sense to rush work on such a device—it should be extremely **dangerous** to rush work on such an important device, 2) there was no rush. Japan had already been defeated and there was no reason to bomb them at all, much less to bomb them with the first nuclear devices.

As more evidence in this direction, you may not know that before the Trinity test was run, a “rehearsal” was run two months earlier. In this rehearsal, 108 long tons of high explosive were detonated in the same place. Curiously, this conventional explosion was spiked with radioactive isotopes and gamma producers, and they admit that.



That is the conventional stack of explosives. You may want to ask yourself how a conventional explosion is a “rehearsal” for a nuclear explosion. Since nuclear explosions are sold to us as completely different in kind from conventional explosions, the latter cannot be a rehearsal for the former. Do you rehearse a mile swim by running a mile? No. You cannot learn anything about a nuclear explosion by running another conventional explosion. The only way to *rehearse* a large nuclear explosion is by running a smaller nuclear explosion.

The spiking with radioactive isotopes is another obvious clue, since they are trying to make the conventional explosion *look like* a nuclear one. But who would they be fooling with that? They can't fool themselves, because they are the ones who spiked the punch. They can only be fooling you.

Compare it to the way they now run drills for the newer faked events. Remember how there were all sorts of drills occurring on 9/11, simultaneous with the actual event? Same thing with the 7/7 events in London, where identical drills were happening on the same day. Same thing with Sandy Hook and most of the other “tragedies” you have been sold recently. There are always “rehearsals” just before or during the events themselves. We see the same thing with the Trinity test, which has this strange rehearsal two months earlier, with a conventional blast made to look like a nuclear blast. Why? Well, when you see pictures of the Trinity test, do you have any way to know whether they are from the event in July or the event in May? No. They are not time-stamped, are they? Do you know the difference between a nuclear blast and a large conventional blast, on sight? No. No one does, because there is no such thing as a nuclear blast. There are large conventional blasts and then there are faked nuclear blasts, pasted up in photo labs or faked in large film studios like Lookout Mountain.



They admit the plume from the rehearsal blast was visible 60 miles away, and Major Shields said it looked “beautiful”. Why no photos of it? Why can't we compare the two? Well, one reason is that they ran this rehearsal at night, at 4:37am. Why would they do that? Why would you want to be fumbling around with this stuff in the dark, out in the middle of the desert? See more below.


[Added later: I just tripped over the number 108 above. Why 108 long tons, rather than 100, 109, 110, or any other number? Because this number is another numerology marker. It has come up in several of my papers, both on my science site and on my art site. In accelerators, the proton has a mass increase limit of 108 times. I am the first [to have shown why](#). When I discovered that, my partner at the time—who was studying Eastern religions—said to me “Oh, that is weird. That number is very important in Hinduism”. Shiva has 108 names. There are 108 Mukhya Shivaganas. Buddhist rosaries have 108 beads. The number is also important in Judaism, which may be more to the point here. The number 18 is associated with Chai, and 108 is a low multiple of that, being  $6 \times 18$ . 108 is also important in the martial arts. It is a tetranacci number. It is the hyperfactorial of 3. Since Oppenheimer was Jewish and involved in studying or at least quoting Eastern religions, I take it that the number 108 was not an accident. Right after the alleged blast, he quoted from the *Bhagavad Gita*:

**If the radiance of a thousand suns were to burst at once into the sky, that would be like the splendor of the mighty one.**

Here is another paste-up:



That is from the Enewetok blast, during Operation Sandstone. But it is an obvious fake, since it has lines all over it. Look at the long vertical line in the lower half, to your right. Even worse is that the reflection in the water isn't in the right place. See how the reflection is leaning to your left? That is impossible, unless the ocean itself is tilted. The reflection should be directly between the image and the photographer. In other words, the two bright spots should line up vertically. Another problem is that they once again failed to fake a surge in the sea. I showed you this problem in my analysis of the Bikini photos. There should be a big circular tidal wave around the explosion, but there isn't. We see a lot of water moving up, but no water moving out. You will say there seems to be a partial surge, but that isn't a surge, that is the atoll itself.



Another problem is again those little clouds hanging around, not responding to the blast at all. You will say the blast is limited at that point to the mushroom cloud, but that isn't true. The explosion would travel quite fast through the air, much faster than the water spout could form. By the time the water spout formed to that extent, the shockwave in the air should have reached those nearest clouds and blown them away or at least stretched them, so they pointed at the event.

We also get this from the mainstream account:

**Observers watching from ships in the lagoon saw a brilliant flash and felt the radiant heat.**


If they felt the radiant heat, they also got a dose of radiation, since the two would travel together. We aren't shown what these observers were wearing, but in the Bikini publicity photos, one of the sailors was shirtless. The things they expect you to believe!

And what lagoon are they talking about? In the same atoll? Surely not. We are told the sound took 45 seconds to reach them, so they were about 15 km away, or 9 miles. Since the atoll is about 15 miles in diameter, they *were* in a lagoon in the same atoll! So go back to the explosion picture, above. The observers were inside that circle.

At the Trinity test, the soldiers were even closer, watching from only six miles away. We know those soldiers were unprotected, since we have seen the photos. They are in fatigues. If either of these blasts had been real, that would have been a very bad idea. And they should have learned their lesson from Trinity in 1945, not repeating it at Enewetok in 1948.



That's the Trinity photo again. So many things wrong there. To start with, the explosion is pretty pathetic compared the way they faked the later ones. Trinity was about 20kt, while Able and Baker in the Bikini Atoll were only slightly bigger at 23kt. And yet Baker is faked to look like this.



What a difference 3 kt makes, eh?

But there are even bigger problems with that photo from Trinity. Look closely at the soldiers. Why are the nearest soldiers in black shadow, while the ones just in front of them are shadowed in light gray? It makes no sense. The sun doesn't cast a selective shadow. It is either black or gray, but not both. It's a poor paste-up, to make it look like a lot of soldiers are there when they aren't.



We have a similar problem here, since this photo is an obvious fake. Not only are these bozos much much closer to the blast, still with no protective clothing or even goggles, but again the shadows make no sense. The blast is brightly lit from the right, but the foreground characters are only *dimly* lit from the right. Besides, these are supposed to be professional photographers. They would have wanted the best picture of the blast, which would have been with the sun behind them, not to their right. They would have known that the sun rises in the east, and would not have positioned themselves to the south. The middle ground in the photo also makes no sense, indicating what we have here is only a studio foreground and a fake background.

I want to pause on what I said about goggles for a moment, since I haven't stressed it before. If these events had been real, they would have emitted a dose of gamma rays, which are a terror on the eyes. And distance makes less of a difference with gamma rays than with other particles, since gamma rays are photons. They travel the speed of light,  $c$ , which means they would travel the distance to these stupid photographers in about .00001 second. In that time, they would lose no energy, so standing back a few miles doesn't help. Gamma rays have such a high energy that most goggles wouldn't help. Closing your eyes wouldn't help, since the rays would go right through your eyelids like they weren't there. The photographers should be looking through double and triple shielded binoculars, like the guy on the turreted rig in the photo below. Instead, we are supposed to believe they are just standing there with their eyes open.



That's the only color photo of the event, said to have been taken by environmental physicist Jack Aeby. It is supposed to have been taken at f4. Since this was at 5:30 in morning, why didn't he open the lens up all the way, to f2.8, say? He wanted to be sure the shot was garbage? It looks like the film was ISO 1600, instead of 100, since why else would it be so grainy? His shutter speed was 100. What, he had never heard of a tripod? And why did the US government have to get its only color photo from an amateur? They couldn't afford to hire any professionals who knew how to use color film and tripods? C'mon, this story is such obvious bullshit. Operation Get-Outta-My-Face.

We are told,

**The photography group employed some fifty different cameras, taking motion and still photographs. Special [Fastax](#) cameras taking 10,000 frames per second would record the minute details of the explosion.**

If so, then why are all the images from Trinity the sort of garbage we have seen: grainy, blurry, shot from a distance, and in 7/8 shadow? Why is Aeby's pathetic photo still trotted out? Why are the films [of this quality](#)? That film is 24 frames per second, not 10,000. Or [this quality](#)? There we are told the camera was capable of 15 million pictures per second. If so, why are the films still crap, looking like balloon sequences pieced together in a lab? If that last link doesn't make you laugh, you really aren't getting the joke.

Remember, we saw precisely this same sort of misdirection with the later Moon landings and the Kennedy assassination. With the Moon landing, we had to watch grainy, ghosted second-generation images, filmed from flickering monitors. With the Kennedy assassination, we had to study Zapruder's shite film shot with a Bell and Howell Zoomatic, although we now know professional cameramen were standing curbside during all the action.



Why are those guys filming this family on the ground as Kennedy drives by? Is that the second coming of the Holy Family playing in the grass, that the cameramen should utterly ignore the President driving by and being shot, etc.?

At the Lookout Mountain page, we find this:



So it is not like the military didn't have any tech. They didn't need to be relying on amateur cameramen positioned 50 miles away. They feed you these garbage photos because it helps them hide. These ridiculous low resolution photos are harder to analyze, so they prevent analysis.

We find more problems with the alleged time of the Trinity test. We are told it was originally scheduled for 4 MWT. Since we were still on Roosevelt's war time in July, 1945, [sunrise in central New Mexico on July 16](#) would have been at about 6:07am. Why would you schedule an important test in the middle of the night? And if the test was scheduled for 4am, why were all these cameramen there? They couldn't have gotten any images, beyond the initial flash. But this is even more important, since we are told the detonation went off at 5:29 MWT. That's is still 38 minutes *before* local sunrise. Just check the charts. So how did they get all the daylight images above?



Are you telling me that is 38 minutes before sunrise? Wow, the Moon must have been really bright back then, before the astronauts landed and painted it black. Look at those amazing shadows the Moon used to cast in the old days!

I will be told 5:29 would be twilight, since it isn't fully dark right up until official sunrise, of course. But we are supposed to be a full 38 minutes before sunrise here, and it wouldn't even be legal to shoot a deer then. And if human eyes don't like twilight, cameras like it even less. With that little

light, there is no way you could shoot at 100 and f4, for instance, as Jack Aeby was said to have done. Plus, these cameras should have had filters on them, to protect the film from radiation. That dims the light even more, of course. So none of the story we have been sold makes any sense.

I will be told these guys are being lit by the explosion, not by the sun, but we can see that isn't true, either. If they were lit by the explosion, their shadows would be right behind them. But we can see the shadows are to the *left*. Plus, the detonation only "lit the mountains for one or two seconds". This is minutes after that.

The length of the shadows actually proves this is not at sunrise, much less before sunrise. The seated soldier in the middle of the photo above is about ½ inch tall on my screen. His shadow is 1.5", giving us an increase of 3 times. [Which means the sun is about 18 degrees above the horizon.](#) That indicates a time of about 8am. We can call this Operation My Watch Has Stopped.

William Laurence, the *New York Times'* spook on the ground at Trinity, wrote of the event this way:

**A loud cry filled the air. The little groups that hitherto had stood rooted to the earth like desert plants broke into dance, the rhythm of primitive man dancing at one of his fire festivals at the coming of Spring.**

That loud cry should have been the cry of hundreds of idiots having their eyes blasted into permanent blindness by gamma rays and the fertility in their testicles permanently blighted. Conveniently, that didn't happen.

Also strange is that in the movies of the pre-event, we see many signs telling the soldiers to keep quiet about what they are about to see. Why? The test was not a secret. How could it be? It could be seen for hundreds of miles, over most of New Mexico. It was in the newspapers in the west later the same day, and of course they were bragging about it within a matter of weeks. Hiroshima was only 21 days later, and the full nature of the test was made public at that time. So why all the warning signs to the soldiers on the ground? I suggest they were being ordered to keep quiet about the fake. Many probably knew or intuited this explosion wasn't a nuclear explosion, and that is what needed to be kept secret. This also explains why all these soldiers had no problem hanging out near the event with no protective clothing. They knew you didn't need protective clothing around a conventional blast. Once you know what was really going on, the films from the event begin to make sense.

As back-up for the Trinity story, we are told some fallout reached as far away as Indiana, ruining Kodak film there. Interesting that film was ruined in Indiana weeks later, but cameras only a few miles away were unaffected. In other words, fallout ruined film thousands of miles away, but gamma rays spared all the local cameras. A miracle really. Let's call it Operation Horse Hockey.

Here's a funny story that I take straight from the Wikipedia page:

**I was staring straight ahead with my open left eye covered by a welder's glass and my right eye remaining open and uncovered. Suddenly, my right eye was blinded by a light which appeared instantaneously all about without any build up of intensity. My left eye could see the ball of fire start up like a tremendous bubble or nob-like mushroom. I dropped the glass from my left eye almost immediately and watched the light climb upward. The light intensity fell rapidly hence did not blind my left eye but it was still amazingly bright.**

The intensity falling rapidly would have nothing to do with it. Your eyes would either be destroyed in the first two seconds or they wouldn't. But just ask yourself if the story makes any sense beyond that. This guy takes a welder's glass but only covers one eye? How stupid are we supposed to think he is? He was a lawyer, not a welder, so if he took the trouble to find and bring with him the welder's glass, why would he use it on only one eye? If we are prone to believe anything about this story, we must assume he was advised by the scientists to buy the glass and use it. So he either would do that or would not. In no case would he use it on one eye only, since that would just be asking for a dose of extreme pain and permanent blindness. The only way to decode this fake story

is to see that he wants to give you accounts of *both* the intense light and the bubble. He therefore makes up an asinine story that will allow him to do both, seeing one with one eye and one with the other.

I could go on indefinitely exposing these nuclear tests, but I am quickly tiring of it. Like the rest, it is really too easy and gets boring after a few pages. I may come back to the subject later, but for now I need to switch to something else.

\*In fact, it was the B-17 that was used in these missions. See [Operation Aphrodite](#). Some readers have already written in to tell me these planes *could* be taken off and landed by remote control, but if so, why would pilots have been used for take-off? Why have Kennedy fly this plane to altitude when it could be done without him? Also notice that it is admitted Operation Aphrodite was completely unsuccessful, with no planes hitting their targets.