



Financial Crisis Report

Written and Edited by David M. Miyoshi



Advancing in a Time of Crisis

Inside this issue:

1. Elucidating on the Israel and Hamas Conflict
2. Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?
3. America's Economy is Past the Point of No Return
4. Why Can't the U.S. Simply Pay Off the National Debt?
5. Did Putin suffer a Heart attack?
6. Who Controls Wars and Politics?

We are experiencing the most economically unstable period and socially erratic period in the history of the modern world. This period is being marked with extreme fluctuations in the stock, commodity and currency markets accompanied by severe and sometimes violent and deadly social disruptions including historic pandemics, conflicts, wars, riots and even regime changing coups. As is typical of such times, many fortunes will be both made and lost during this period. After talking with many business owners, executives, professionals, scholars and government officials from around the world, the writer believes that for the financially astute investor, this is a time of unprecedented opportunity given the global trade unbalances and distortions in the commodity and currency markets that exists. The *Financial Crisis Report* is a free compilation of the opinions of David Miyoshi as well as of those advisors he himself subscribes to (with appropriate credits given) on how to survive and even benefit during this historic time of crisis in the world. The writer receives no compensation of any kind from any advisors whose articles or ideas may appear in this report. The reader is welcomed to check on all sources of information mentioned herein. Because the opinions and observations of this writer and other advisors are provided herein without charge, the reader is

“The taxpayer: That's someone who works for the federal government but doesn't have to take the civil service examination” - Ronald Reagan

Elucidating on the Israel and Hamas Conflict



The Hamas-Israel Conflict Explained



Israeli missiles destroy a building in Gaza (Credit: Tasnim News Agency/ CC-BY-4.0/ Wikimedia Commons)

On October 7, 2023, the Palestinian militant group Hamas launched an unprecedented attack against Israel. The large-scale assault occurred in the early morning hours, just as Israelis were wrapping up the seven-day-long Jewish festival of Sukkot.

The following two articles describe and explain the current Hamas-Israel conflict. The first article is a simple and direct explanation of the Hamas-Israel conflict. It was published on Oct 12, 2023 by the Dogo News service and was written by Kavi Dolasia. The second article is a composite of articles by reporters versed in Middle Eastern affairs and delves into the question of who ultimately provoked the attack that culminated into the current conflict. This article takes a somewhat pro-Palestinian stance but appears objective in its observations and therefore. In my continued quest to discern the truth, I include this article for our objective and thoughtful consideration on the tried and true premise that there are always two sides to every story.

The multi-pronged strike was waged from the air, sea, and ground. The militants fired thousands of rockets toward Israeli towns. They simultaneously used bulldozers to break the 20-foot-high (6-meter) fortified fence between Israel and Gaza. Hundreds of Hamas fighters entered through the gaps in pickup trucks or on foot. Others stormed onto Israeli beaches in motorboats and through the smoke-filled air on paragliders. The militants killed about 1,200 people and took about 100 hostages.

I hope you find these articles at least thought provoking, if not informative.

D. Miyoshi



Hamas fighters breached the strong fence between Gaza and Israel (Credit: Israel Ministry of Defence Spokesperson's Office)

Elucidating on the Israel and Hamas Conflict

Within hours of the attack, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu declared war on Hamas. The country retaliated with airstrikes on Gaza, killing at least 765 people and injuring thousands. The town of Beit Hanoun in Gaza's northeast corner has been destroyed, and over 100,000 residents have been rendered homeless. They also cut off access to food, water, and fuel to Gaza's residents. Israel is currently gathering troops at the border in what appears to be preparation for a ground attack.

Where is Gaza?



The Gaza Strip, or Gaza, is the smaller of two Palestinian territories (Credit: Ecrusized/ Influenced by user Rr016/, CC-BY-SA-4.0/ Wikimedia Commons)

The Gaza Strip, or Gaza, is the smaller of two Palestinian territories. The narrow enclave is surrounded by Israel, Egypt, and the Mediterranean Sea. Measuring about 140 square miles (362 square km), it is one of the world's most heavily populated regions. Over two million people call Gaza home.

What is Hamas?

Hamas is an Islamist organization with a militant wing. The group believes Israel is an illegal state. Hamas wants to liberate the Palestinian territories and replace Israel with an Islamic state.

What is different about the latest Hamas attack?

Hamas has conducted numerous attacks against Israel since the 1990s. However, they usually involve throwing rockets over the Gaza border into Israel. Israel's missile defense system, nicknamed "Iron Dome," intercepts most, minimizing the impact on the country.

But the October 7 strike was different. It was very sophisticated and coordinated and required a lot of planning. This has led to speculation that another country helped Hamas. However, there is no proof of that yet.

What happens now?

The conflict is expected to escalate further in the next few weeks. The long-term strategies for both Hamas and Israel remain to be seen, but experts believe it is a no-win situation regardless of who prevails.

Tal Schneider is a political and diplomatic correspondent for The Times of Israel. He told NPR, "The war is not outside of Israel. It's inside Israel. I don't ever recall that in recent history. And I have to tell you, we [Israelis] are losing big time. They're [Palestinians] losing big time. It's a vicious circle of blood with no end in sight. A completely lose-lose situation. And it's just horrific."

[End of Article](#)

Who really provoked this conflict, Hamas or Israel?



A ball of fire and smoke rise from an explosion on a Palestinian apartment tower following an Israeli air strike in Gaza City, Saturday, Oct. 7, 2023. The militant Hamas rulers of the Gaza Strip carried out an unprec-

Elucidating on the Israel and Hamas Conflict

edented, multi-front attack on Israel at daybreak Saturday, firing thousands of rockets as dozens of Hamas fighters infiltrated the heavily fortified border in several locations by air, land, and sea and catching the country off-guard on a major holiday. (AP Photo/Adel Hana)

There are a myriad of explanations supporting who provoked this conflict and it's a fool's errand to try and ascertain which reply is correct.

The vast majority of the American mainstream media state that the Hamas attack of Israel was unprovoked by Israel.

In an effort to bring in both sides of the argument, here is a reply by pastor Chuck Baldwin that not only denies Hamas provoked the conflict but also denies that Israel is even a legitimate state.



Chuck Baldwin, pastor

“The current Zionist State of Israel is an atheistic, antichrist, pagan country masquerading (with the help of misinformed evangelicals) as a “Jewish state.” Roman generals/emperors Vespasian and Titus destroyed the Judahite nation in 70 AD. (Actually, God destroyed it; the Romans were only His instruments.) Netanyahu and his fellow Zionists are among the most vile, wicked imposters that the world has ever known. And the Zionist State of Israel itself is the modern world's most notorious terror state.

Understand this: Israel is NOT a victim. The victims are anybody who stands in the way of a “Greater Israel”—especially the poor Palestinian people living in Gaza and the West Bank.

Everywhere you turn in the Western Media, you hear about the “unprovoked” attack of Hamas against Israel. Unprovoked? Are you kidding me?

Pastor Baldwin goes on to cite other reporter's articles that deny Hamas provoked the conflict and insists that Israel provoked it.

“It's clear by now that whenever you see the word “unprovoked” being forcefully repeated in a uniform way across the entire political/media class, whatever they're talking about was definitely massively provoked.

We saw this exact same thing when Russia invaded Ukraine; from

the very beginning western politics and media were saturated with the word “unprovoked”, bashing the western public in the face with that message over and over and over again despite the obvious and undeniable fact that the war in Ukraine was most definitely provoked.

As Noam Chomsky quipped last year, “Of course, it was provoked. Otherwise, they wouldn't refer to it all the time as an unprovoked invasion.”

And the same is of course true of the latest Hamas offensive. There are all kinds of arguments you could legitimately make about it, but one argument you definitely cannot defend is that it was unprovoked. As Palestinian-American writer and comedian Amer Zahr put it on Twitter, “75 years of ethnic cleansing. 15 years of blockade. Confiscation of Palestinian lands. Pogroms on Palestinian towns. Desecration of Palestinian sacred sites. Daily raids into Palestinian homes. Constant humiliation of a entire people. Nothing about today is ‘unprovoked.’”

Calling Palestinian violence against Israel “unprovoked” is easily even more ridiculous than calling the Russian invasion unprovoked, because the abuses of Israeli apartheid are so well-known by the general public at this point. Multiple mainstream human rights organizations have accused Israel of administering an abusive apartheid regime which treats Palestinians as lesser people. Palestinians who live in the open-air prison known as Gaza are deliberately subjected to undrinkable water, food shortages, energy shortages and bombing campaigns. Those outside Gaza are subjected to racist, violent policing and land seizure and live under a different set of laws than Jewish Israelis. The entire people were forced out of their homes to make way for a new state for reasons that had nothing to do with them, and any attempt to resist this has seen them killed as “terrorists”.

Of course, the attack was provoked.

The real war in Palestine is the war that the Israeli government has been waging against the Palestinian people since December of 1947. If you really want to understand the reality of the situation in Palestine, you must read the blockbuster book *The Ethnic Cleansing Of Palestine* by noted Israeli historian Ilan Pappé.

Here are admissions by Israel government officials saying that Hamas was provoked into starting the conflict.

An Israeli lawmaker told Al Jazeera on Saturday Oct 7 that his party had been warning that Israeli policies toward Palestinians would “erupt” into the violence that Israel is experiencing in the wake of Hamas' assault.

The comments were made by Ofer Cassif, a member of the Knesset and the leftist Hadash party, which holds four seats in the 120-seat Knesset.



Elucidating on the Israel and Hamas Conflict

“We condemn and oppose any assault on innocent civilians. But in contrast to the Israeli government that means that we oppose any assault on Palestinian civilians as well. We must analyze those terrible incidents [the attacks] in the right context – and that is the ongoing occupation,” said Cassif, who is Jewish.

“We have been warning time and time again... everything is going to erupt and everybody is going to pay a price – mainly innocent civilians on both sides. And unfortunately, that is exactly what happened,” he added.

Since the Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu came into power at the end of December 2022, violence against Palestinians has significantly risen, mainly due to an escalation of Israeli raids in the West Bank. Settler attacks have also been on the rise, and Netanyahu’s governing coalition made expanding settlements a top priority with the ultimate goal of annexing the West Bank.

Gaza has also been under an Israeli-imposed land, sea, and air blockade since 2007, and Israel frequently bombs the besieged enclave. The last major bombing campaign took place in 2021, when over 250 Palestinians were killed.

“The Israeli government, which is a fascist government, supports, encourages, and leads pogroms against the Palestinians. There is an ethnic cleansing going on. It was obvious the writing was on the wall, written in the blood of the Palestinians – and unfortunately now Israelis as well,” Cassif said.

Cassif also urged for de-escalation on X, writing that those calling for the destruction of Gaza “are only encouraging another blood-bath.” He also strongly denounced the Hamas assault, calling the actions “horrific crimes that the mind does not tolerate.”

From inside Gaza, journalist Efrat Fenigson reports:

Apparently Israeli Defense forces that were supposed to be around Gaza were placed around the West Bank because of security concerns so the Gaza envelope was left unoccupied with military.

A year ago there was a military operation in Gaza to prepare for such events, and ongoingly there are trainings for these kinds of scenarios. This raises serious questions about Israeli intelligence. What happened?

Two years ago there was a successful deployment of underground barriers with sensors – to alert terrorists breaches. Israel has one of the most advanced and high tech armies, how come there was zero response to the border and fence breaching??

I served in the IDF 25 years ago, in the intelligence forces. There’s no way Israel did not know of what’s coming. A cat moving along-

side the fence is triggering all forces. So this??

What happened to the “strongest army in the world”?

How come border crossings were wide open??

Something is VERY WRONG HERE, something is very strange, this chain of events is very unusual and not typical for the Israeli defense system.

A point about the situation in Israel in the past few years – those who follow me know, that there’s a general sense of insecurity in Israel, there’s political and social instability, public funds are being misused on agendas such as Covid, climate, judicial reform, abolishing cash and more. The current government is highly corrupt in my view, while the previous one was no better.

I don’t care about having a popular opinion, I care about exposing evil forces – wherever they are:

To me Chuck Baldwin, this surprise attack seems like a planned operation. On all fronts.

This is a failure to protect the people of Israel, for sure, perhaps the biggest failure since the Yom Kippur war exactly 50 years ago, if not bigger. – by the way – is it a coincidence it’s exactly 50 years ago, almost on the day? The Yom Kippur War was on Oct. 6th 1973.

If I was a conspiracy theorist I would say that this feels like the work of the Deep State.

It feels like the people of Israel and the people of Palestine have been sold, once again, to the higher powers that be.

Michael Hoffman is America’s preeminent Christian scholar regarding Talmudism and Judaism. He puts things in perspective when he writes:

The Israeli government and military, together with the US government and media, exhibit no concern for the human rights of Arab civilians and no interest in the Palestinian “right to self defense.” Equal protections for all people are inconceivable to those who are under the influence, if only indirectly, of an ideology of contempt, as disseminated in the hate speech of the supremacist Talmud Bavli:

“If a gentile strikes a Jew he is liable for the death penalty.”

—BT Sanhedrin 58b.





Elucidating on the Israel and Hamas Conflict

“If a Jew kills a gentile the Jew is to go free.”

—BT Sanhedrin 57a.

“Non-Jews are uncompassionated by nature and attacks on them curb their evil inclination.”

—Torat Hamelech (21st century Israeli settler-rabbinic text based on the Talmud and distributed to members of the Israeli military).

“If a Jew needs a liver (transplant) can you take the liver of an innocent non-Jew passing by, to save him? The Torah would probably permit that. Jewish life has an infinite value. There is something infinitely more holy and unique about Jewish life than non-Jewish life.”

—Chabad Rabbi Yitzchak Ginsburg, Jewish Week (New York), August 26, 1996. (Italics added).

What motivates Israeli war crimes and dehumanization of the Palestinian people?

Hate speech taught in the Talmud, in the Birkat Haminim malediction, in Maimonides’ Mishneh Torah and Guide of the Perplexed, in the Tanya of Chabad-Lubavitch’s Rabbi Shneur Zalman, and in the books and teachings of the modern Talmudic gedolim such as Ovdia Yosef, Yitzhak Shapira (Torat Hamelech), and Rabbi Saadya Grama, (“Romemut Yisrael Ufarashat Hagalut, —“The Superiority of Israel and the Question of Exile”) — are largely excluded from the study of what motivates Israeli war crimes and dehumanization of the Palestinian people.

These teachings of contempt do real world harm to the captive civilian population of Palestine who are regarded as little better than demons by the Kahanists and Chabadniks in Netanyahu’s cabinet, in the military and among the settlers (one of the latter was Meir Kahane’s follower, Baruch Goldstein, who machine-gunned to death 40 Palestinians at prayer in Hebron in 1994).

Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, in a March 10, 2019 post on the social media platform Instagram, boldly articulated the unmistakable racist-supremacist mentality when he wrote, “Israel is not a state of all its citizens,” but rather “the nation-state of the Jewish people and only them.” A law to that effect has been passed by the Israeli Knesset (parliament).

This Israeli apartheid doctrine has been verified in lengthy and detailed documentary reports by Amnesty International and Hastings College of Law: “Israel’s Invasion of Gaza in International Law” (2009).

—as well as by Human Rights Watch, “Israeli Authorities and the Crimes of Apartheid and Persecution.”

These studies are mandatory reading for all fair-minded people who want to learn the truth behind the Israeli media hype.

Where was Prof. Hanson’s outcry when “thuggish killers” of the Israeli army and settlers this year pulled Palestinian elderly, women, and children out of their homes and beat and killed them, and robbed them of their land? The Talmud teaches they are only semi-human (nefesh-deficient), and Hanson shamefully reflects that teaching in his writing.

This year Netanyahu’s genocidal cabinet member Bezalel Smotrich called for the Palestinian village of Hawara to be annihilated. Netanyahu’s genocidal Minister of National Security, Itamar Ben Gvir, is a follower of Rabbi Meir Kahane, who advocated the mass expulsion of Palestinians and the killing of those who would refuse. The Israeli government has enabled a reign of terror on the part of the so-called settlers —to steal ever more Palestinian land and water, and kill civilians with impunity.

Gaza was invaded by the Israeli military in 2008-2009, with massive loss of civilian Palestinian life. The West forgets everything that the Israelis have perpetrated against the Palestinians and then highlights the terrorism of Hamas in a historical vacuum, lacking all context. It’s a rigged propaganda game and one that only has cachet in Europe and America. The Third World doesn’t buy it and the Third World is the demographic future.

The “state of Israel” was founded by terrorists such as the future Prime Ministers Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, using terrorism to accomplish the creation of “Israel.”

Hoffman’s last paragraph above is proven beyond any shadow of a doubt in Pappé’s book *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*.

Now, even Republican Senator Marco Rubio (FL) is calling for the “complete eradication” of the Palestinian people.

Dear God in Heaven, please deliver us from these hate-filled, racist warmongers!

More evidence of the blasphemous/supremacist/warmongering nature of Israel’s leaders is what Rabbi Chaim Richman said this past Monday:

"I just want to say this to our Christian friends ... just to call it as it is and say it straight out, you guys are worshipping one Jew, that's a mistake, you should be worshipping every single one of us because we all die for your sins every single day," Richman said, blaspheming Christ. "And that's exactly what's going on here. We're all God's



Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

first born and we're dying for your sins right now, because the Jewish people in the land of Israel are the bulwark against the Orcs, okay? The orcs are coming not to a theater near you but to your home!"

"This grotesque supremacy is expressed by Rabbi Chaim Richman, a former director of the Temple Institute - one of the extreme Jewish groups whose mission is to build the third temple," Keith Woods noted on Twitter/X. "Groups like this are responsible for rising tensions in the holy land, where they have forced Muslim and Christian worshippers out of their holy sites. Supremacists like this have the support of the Israeli government."

In the days before the war broke out, video after video was going viral of Jews in Israel spitting on Christians and attacking them in the streets for preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ and Netanyahu's top police official, National Security Minister Ben Gvir, defended their vile acts as "not criminal."

(Source)

But evangelical Christians have been ignoring the truth about Zionist Israel—and about what God's Holy Word really teaches about Israel—since 1948.

What evangelicals further choose to forget is that many of Israel's Palestinian victims are Christians.

I've (Chuck Baldwin) been to Israel and Palestine. I preached in two churches there: One was in Bethlehem, and the other was in Jerusalem. Over 95% of the Christians in attendance at these services were Palestinians; they were not Israelis.

And I've got to tell you that the Palestinian people I met were among the kindest, sweetest, most humble, most gentle and most Christ-like people I have ever met—anywhere!

Yet, Christians in America cheer and applaud when the atheist State of Israel rapes, pillages, plunders, tortures, bludgeons and murders their Palestinian Christian brothers and sisters.

So, what does the Hamas/Israeli war portend for Bible prophecy? Absolutely NOTHING!

It merely provides another opportunity for Israel to do what it's been doing for over 70 years: expand its territorial borders off the bloodshed, violence and death of the Palestinian people.

End of Article

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



THIS IS A VERY LONG ARTICLE BECAUSE IT DEALS WITH A VERY LARGE CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE OF LONG AGO.

IT'S AN ISSUE THAT I HAVE PERSONALLY QUESTIONED FOR OVER 50 YEARS BUT STILL DON'T HAVE A DEFINITIVE ANSWER IN ANY CASE HOWEVER, I WANT TO WRITE ABOUT IT. SO HERE IT IS:

What is more impressive –

That we WENT to the Moon; or

That we did NOT GO to Moon, but made everyone BELIEVE we did?

The following is a direct transcript of the YouTube Video entitled "Moon Landings – Greatest Hoax?" You can go on Google and find it under that title and view it yourself. It's rather lengthy at 52 minutes but is quite informative. The video takes a more or less neutral position questioning whether the US went to the Moon, or they actually did not go to the Moon but instead made people think they did, which would be perhaps the greatest hoax of all time.

In subsequent newsletters, I will present separate articles that support the critics who contend that the US did not go to the moon and after that an article supported by NASA that professes that we did go to the Moon.

It should be noted that as the years go by, the number of critics who believe the US did not go to the Moon are steadily growing. At this current stage, it is estimated that about 25% of the US population either doubts or believes the US did not go to the Moon. In countries outside of the US, it is estimated that perhaps upwards of 75% of the people believe the US did not go to the Moon.

The brilliant astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson said that NASA had the equipment and plans to go to the Moon so it would be easier to go to the moon rather than to fake it. That's a good point.

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

As for me, I believe the Apollo 11 astronauts were put into orbit, as NASA has consistently accomplished since John Glenn's flight. But my question remains how did the Apollo astronauts fly through the Van Allen Radiation Belts without ill effects? And after those missions, why has NASA kept the various Space Shuttles in orbits that are well below the Van Allen Belts?

Professor Van Allen, to which the Van Allen Radiation Belts are named after, said that the radiation levels in the Belts are many times more deadly than a human could possibly endure even for a short period of time. NASA says the astronauts were protected by the metal sheeting of the shuttle and only had to endure an hour or so going through the Belts. But the level of radiation Professor Van Allen said exists in the Belts does not make this claim very plausible. Until NASA can convincingly answer how the astronauts penetrated the Belts without any effects, I will have a lingering doubt that the astronauts landed on the Moon.

So, for your reading consideration here is the transcript of the video "Moon Landings – Greatest Hoax?" I hope you find it informative as I have.

D. Miyoshi



50 years on, the feud continues as a surprising number of people still believe that we never landed on the moon. The question lies at the heart of one of the greatest conspiracy theories of all time. A theory born from an era of global suspicion, political mistrust and fake news.

When put to the test, can we unlock the scientific truth and once and for all put these conspiracy theories to rest?

I don't know.

In the 21st century, one of the greatest achievements in history still remains a source of controversy.

Did the Apollo moon landings really happen? Or were they the biggest hoax of all time?

Trevor Weaver has dedicated years of research to the Apollo missions and was once a supporter of the Moon landings.



"We didn't go to the moon and that is an established fact. NASA provided all the topographical data. They had all the photographs, all their massive models, to Stanley Kubrick, so they could actually fake moon scenes.

Could the Moon landings actually have been faked by Hollywood director Stanley Kubrick.

The history books say otherwise. That Apollo 11 astronaut Edwin Buzz Aldrin spent three days travelling to the moon and was the first to follow Neil Armstrong's historic footsteps.

The astronaut Buzz Aldrin who allegedly walked on the Moon with Neil Armstrong said:

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



"I'm totally in favor of freedom of speech. But I think, people need to be responsible when they think about, intentionally for their own benefit, misleading the young people who are the future leaders of our world."

Moon conspiracy theorists have been a small but persistent and vocal group over the years. Often confronting and accusing astronauts of lying. In 2002, when conspiracy theorist Bart Sibrel Buttonholed Buzz Aldrin, his temper got the better of him.

Sibrel: "You're the one who said you walked on the moon when you didn't. Calling the kettle black have you ever thought of saying it misrepresented.....?"

Aldrin: You get away from me.

Sibrel: You are a coward and a liar and a thief.



Aldrin's punch of Sibrel stirred a generation less trusting of traditional media who were more open to believing fake news and theories spread on the Internet and revived the Moon landings hoax theories.

Trevor Weaver, Author of "Man on the Moon: Fact or Fiction" said



"NASA never realized that we would have something called the Internet. It's only now when all those videos are available that people can see what the problems are."

Robert Massey Deputy Director Royal Astronomical Society said:



"I think the propagation in so-called fake news, the spread, which is very welcome of access to the Internet, means that we have far more sources than we used to. There is a real crisis and understanding the strength of those sources. People often have some kind of distrust of authority, governments and so on. And they assume that there's a some kind of plot to keep the information from us that actually the propaganda victory of going to the moon could be based on something that was entirely fabricated."

But if the Apollo missions were faked, it would mean NASA had managed to keep one of the biggest secrets ever created. Fifty years ago the Soviet Union and the USA were locked in a struggle for global dominance. Then on October the 4th, 1957, the Soviets launched Sputnik, the world's first satellite into orbit. A break-

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

through that hit America hard and made the race to space even more crucial.

Massey: “There's no doubt that the space race in the 1960s was driven by superpower rivalry. There was a degree of anxiety in the West about the advancement in Soviet technology within the West somehow have lost its leadership and needed to catch up.”

President Kennedy speaking:



“We choose to go to the moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard.”

At the peak of the Apollo program. NASA employed 400,000 people. But was putting a man on the moon so important that the United States government faked it? If so, a legion of NASA employees, not only participated in the deception, but they kept the secret from the rest of the world.

Massey: “That was such a seminal event that it wasn't just about the mission itself but the way that that influenced wider life, you know, people began to think, oh, we can do space travel, we can actually go to other worlds.”

On July the 16th, 1969, the three Apollo 11 astronauts prepared for liftoff. But while the world eagerly awaited for history to be made, one man was already skeptical.

During the 1960s, Bill Kaysing was the head of technical publications for Rocketdyne. The company that helped manufacture the Apollo rockets. Kaysing, who claimed he had access to some of its top secret documents questioned the competence of the Apollo project.



“I really believe that they weren't in the command capsule at launch. They did a little bit of a magician act with the astronauts. They went up the elevator, but they came down the elevator. In other words, they did not want to risk the lives of the astronauts in case the Saturn blew up.”

An explosive claim which Kaysing said the CIA tried to silence by making three attempts on his life. Like Kaysing, Marcus Allen, British publisher of Nexus, a magazine of alternative politics, history and science, also questions NASA's engineering capability at the time of the launches.



“The problem is the whole Apollo program was a complete fabrication, in order to be seen to succeed in the Cold War. The myth of Apollo is what is holding NASA back from future space travel. It's a tragedy. We didn't go the first time. We can't go now. We've never

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

been. They lied to us.”

But if NASA didn't put a man on the moon it would have had to fake the evidence and its own visual images have done the most to fuel conspiracy theories.

Allen: “Every photograph taken on the lunar surface is online. 5,771. Some of them are not particularly good, some are out of focus. Some are light struck. Some just don't show very much of interest and some of them are very good indeed. And it's the very good ones, I question.



I do not believe they were taken on the moon. They were taken here on Earth.”

Conspiracy theorists believe NASA faked all six of the Apollo Moon landings and point to these NASA photographs as proof.



Some of the most renowned claims suggest that areas lit from behind should be in dark shade, when in fact, they reveal full detail. In others, the shadows don't run parallel. Is this because they were lit by separate sources suggesting film lighting? Despite being taken in space, no stars are visible in any of the Apollo photographs. Gravity on the moon is 1/6 of that on Earth. But when archive footage is speed up, the astronauts appear to be running at normal speed in Earth's gravity. And with no atmosphere on the moon, why does the flag seem to wave in a breeze?

For the purpose of this program, we filmed an experiment on a lunar set built in the Trona Pinnacles in the Californian desert to challenge the hoax theories and put these claims to the test. By testing some of the most famous conspiracy arguments and addressing new evidence, can we put the Lunar Hoax theories to rest once and for all?

Astronomer Patrick Moore reported the mission live on British television.



“Ever since the dawn of human history we dreamed about going to other worlds and this was the first time it had been done. And of

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

course, it was an exciting time and also a very tense one.

Dr. Tony Cook, Physicist and Lecturer Aberysth University



“There was some amateur radio enthusiasts who built a very large dish. We were able to actually listen in to the astronauts talking from the moon surface. They didn't hear Mission Control. They were able to pick up just the astronauts by themselves.”

Ian Morrison witnessed the event from a unique perspective. A student at the Jodrell Bank Observatory telescope near Manchester England, he took advantage of the facilities and listened in to the mission of his own accord.



“I should say that we were not officially tracking the Apollo craft. We were doing this for fun, our own fun, and our own interest. We could hear the whole conversation of the astronauts all the way down to surface. They're obviously highly excited and it must have been wonderful as they sort of literally reached the surface.”

Moore: “Then the astronauts voice came through the Eagle hand landed event, Naturally, it was a matter of intense relief, and since

I'm on the air live, I had to watch what I said.”

Armstrong: “That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.”.

In 1969, the public had little reason to question mankind's historic first step on the moon. After all, the achievement was a celebration of technological supremacy. America had finally won the space race.

Mankind's first steps on the moon have become the epicenter of hoax theories. Conspiracy theorists claim NASA faced a formidable challenge with its primitive 1960s technology. Just 14 months before the Apollo 11 mission, Neil Armstrong test piloted a prototype lunar Lander. The result was disastrous.

Unfortunately, it went out of his control and luckily he was able to eject before it crashed in flames.



Kaysing: “ If they couldn't get a simulator to work on earth, how in the world could they get the actual lunar module to work on the moon?”

Moore: “And that was when I knew, there was no provision for rescue. Had they made a faulty landing, they couldn't have got back. That would have been too ghastly to contemplate.”

Conspiracy theorists question not only the technical capabilities of the landing craft. But also the computing power that guided it.

Trevor Weaver, Author “Man on the Moon: Fact or Fiction?”

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



“They didn't have the technology to do it. The risk is too great. They could not afford to risk failure. They wouldn't allow themselves to rely on science and technology to get them there.”

Pat Norris is a former space system and software engineer hired by NASA to analyze the challenges of navigating to the Moon and back.



“In the 1950s, computers didn't really exist, but by the mid 1960s computers were available that were powerful enough to do the calculations needed for such a complicated mission. Of course, by comparison with today's computers, they were very primitive.”

While these advancements should surely encourage a new line of missions, conspiracy theorists argue that this is enough to question if we ever could have gone in the first place.

Allen: “We're talking about the mid 1960s here when computers occupied rooms.




The sort of computing power that you have with a mobile phone today would be greater than the computing power that was alleged to have been used to land man on the moon.”

Norris: “One of the reasons that we had difficulty in navigating close to the moon was that the computers available weren't able to provide a sufficiently detailed mathematical model of gravity. Perhaps there wasn't enough information, but even if they had enough information, the computers probably wouldn't have been able to cope with it. They were adequate for the mission at the time, but only just.”

Unlike modern day PCs, the Apollo computers didn't have to store files or process images. Most of the number crunching was done at Mission Control and the information transmitted back to the astronauts.

In their attempt to disprove the missions, conspiracy theorists have analyzed the footage of the Moon landings frame by frame. One of the most famous pieces of footage in history is Buzz Aldrin's dance across the moonscape.



Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

Aldrin: "Near the end of the 2 1/2 hours in front of the television camera, I did have an opportunity to prance around and hop and demonstrate different methods of moving around. The movement, because of the restrictions of the space suit was basically like being in slow motion."

The famous Luna walk shows Aldrin experimenting with the restrictions of the space suit.

Conspiracy theorists have claimed that the footage was actually filmed in slow motion in a studio. And that the astronauts were supported by wires to replicate these movements on the Moon.

Weaver: "The astronaut is dangling on a wire. To take off, if you like, the difference between the earth's gravity and the moon's gravity. The wire was between the backpack and the body. The problem is, the astronauts tended to rely on this wire so you see lots of jerky movements."

Dr. Emily Brundsen, Astronomer, University of York Said:



"Astronauts were wearing pretty big and bulky spacesuits and the weight distribution isn't the same as you or I walking around on the surface of the earth here. The astronauts had to really cope with that and work out if they're top heavy, how to move around such that they weren't going to fall over all the time and be unbalanced. You can see that astronauts really adapted really well to that and started to kind of develop this new walk."

While the exact conditions of the moon couldn't be replicated on Earth, NASA introduced methods to adapt the astronauts. One of their favorite methods was parabolic flight or as the astronauts called it, "The vomit comet." By climbing and diving in a series of arcs, an airplane could simulate 30 second windows of reduced gravity.



The session served as R&D tests for the space suits and gave astronauts their first taste of lunar gravity.

If, as the conspiracy theorists claim, NASA faked the Apollo missions, then it also had to fake the photographic evidence.

Allen: "I was trained as a photographer in London back in the 1960s. I was familiar with the camera that was used, the Hasselblad camera and also with the film that was used Kodak Ektachrome transparency material. I was familiar with the technical side of it and the more I looked at the photographs and the more I started to doubt whether what we've been told had happened and actually happened the way we've been told."

Also siding with Allen, American conspiracy theorist Ralph Renee raised a different technical question. Could the gloves the astronauts wore on their pressurized spacesuits have actually worked on the moon?

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



“What I do is I put a vacuum in this chamber I created and I have a glove inserted inside of it and it was to prove that the flexibility they shown in their suits and gloves are impossible. Right now I can put my hand in there and I can move it every which way I can grasp, I make a fist, I can lift up, down, but as soon as I throw this switch here, I evacuate the chamber. As air is sucked out of the machine, the vacuum makes it more and more difficult to move the glove. And this glove doesn't want to move, right? Can't bend it backwards. I can hardly force it down. I mean, how could you pick up small screws and bolts like they've shown them to do. Or trigger a little tiny trigger on a camera with the glove doing this?”

If it seems impossible to operate a camera properly in pressurized gloves, how could these perfect pictures have been taken?

Trained aerospace engineer Jay Windley has extensively researched the moon landing conspiracies and was present at the experiment on the moon set to refute these theories.



“This is a Hasselblad EL500 camera manufactured especially for the lunar missions. It attached to the space suit via this bayonet. The camera would have a framework surrounding the bottom and rear of the camera. And it would slide down onto the control unit here so that the astronaut could work with his hands without worrying about the camera.”

Lunar cameras didn't have a viewfinder because the astronauts helmets prevented them from looking down and framing the shot.

Aldrin: “Basically, you could just sort of point that camera at what you wanted without having to really look through a viewfinder.”

But according to conspiracy theorists, this was a problem that couldn't be solved.

Allen: “We have to focus it, set the shutter speed, set the aperture by hand, wearing armored gauntlets. You can't see the shutter button on a Hasselblad, its on the front of the camera. You didn't know if you'd taken a photograph because you can't hear anything in space. And you can't see the counter dials on the side of the camera. So with all those restrictions, we have some of the best iconic images ever taken in the 20th century. I don't believe it.”

Jay Windley investigated how these design features on the Hasselblad would have been operated by the astronauts.

Windley: “The Zeiss biogon lens here has been fitted with these little paddles to allow the astronaut to manipulate them with clumsy fingers. You just push it in either direction. The shutter release, normally a very small button, has been made especially large so that it can be pressed with an Astronaut's glove. The focus ring has been fitted with stops that correspond to near, medium, far and Infinity. So, we didn't have to pay attention to whether he was 8 feet or 9 feet away from a subject. You wouldn't have to very carefully measure it.”

Richard Underwood was responsible for teaching Apollo astronauts the art of lunar photography.

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



“Even in the early days before they went to the Moon, I would say, you know when you get back from this journey, you will be a national hero. But your photographs, if they're good, they'll live forever. I would tell them you're only key to immortality is the quality of your photography. Nothing else. Forget all the other stuff.”

The astronauts were told to take their lunar cameras everywhere they went and practice.

Underwood: “They took them home to photograph their friends and family and barbecues and sporting events and all other types of things. They knew that camera very, very effectively.

Aldrin: “All of the crew members understood pretty well how to operate this and the film turned out to be very, very versatile in coming up with just outstanding results.”

But these outstanding results led to one of the most famous photographic anomalies. The strange case of the lunar shadows.



Kaysing: “The shadows are one of the strong proofs that we never went to the moon. If you examine pictures offered by NASA as genuine, you find that in many cases the shadows are not parallel. Well since the sun was the only source of light, all shadows on the moon should be exactly parallel, but they aren't.”

Because the lunar shadows fall in different directions, some conspiracy theorists claim that they were created by separate artificial light sources.

Renee: “There's only one sun. There are not two, but these shadows are anomalous. And that sometimes they are diverging from objects and sometimes converging and it can't be. You can go any place on this planet when the sun's up and you look at 2 objects and that sun shadows are parallel.”

But according to physicists, there are reasonable explanations for why we find that shadows aren't always parallel.


Cook: “There's lots of different things which can make shadows go in different directions. I mean obviously you have shadows pointing away from the sun. But if your camera is a wide angle camera, you will get a respective effect on the shadows.”

The effect of converging shadows is a well known optical phenomena in photography. This effect is created where there is a single light source for both the moon and the Earth. This source is the sun.

Cook: “If you have bits of topography on the surface like troughs, they can produce shadows which appear to be at right angles to the main direction of the sun.”

But if we look at the photos, Aldrin appears to be brightly lit up. Shouldn't the astronaut's body be in darkness?


Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?




Allen: “ He is standing in a pool of light. It's a spotlight. It's not the sun. This is taken here on Earth under controlled studio lighting conditions. In a whacking 12K Areis spotlight.

Cook: “On the moon, you're not just illuminated by the sun shining towards you and casting a shadow behind you. But there's also a huge area of the lunar surface around you. And that provides back-light to any subject on the moon surface. You can also get reflections of light on bright objects like spacesuits if they're fairly close to whatever they're illuminating.”

And specifically the light bouncing off the highly reflective lunar module. In these pictures you can clearly see where a pool of light appears.



If you look at pictures where the astronauts are away from the module. The surface appears evenly lit.



Another cause for suspicion among conspiracy theorists is Apollo's symbolic highlight. The American flag.

Renee: “Wherever there's an American flag, it's always brilliantly lit up. Even if it's on the shadow side and on the shadow side, that should be really dark black. But they had little spotlights, obviously because that's the only way you can do it.”



Cook: “The flag they took to the moon was made of nylon which is fairly translucent material. It lets light through, so I wouldn't expect to see one side bright and one side dark here.”


But why does the lunar flag wave around if there's no wind on the moon?

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



Allen: “The stage sets were very hot because when you film in slow motion, you need more light because each frame has been exposed. They were running 144 frames per second, so they needed very, very strong lights. Therefore, it would probably be very hot. Probably they had some cooling.

Is this waving flag the ultimate proof the landings were faked in a studio with no atmosphere on the Moon.



The planting of the Apollo flag has caused some controversy.

Allen: “If you look at how the flag swings the edge of the flag is acting like a pendulum. If you know the length of the pendulum, you know the time of the swing. You can say where the gravity is and it was on Earth.”

So how could the flag flapping on the windless moon be explained?

Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin may not have been thinking about

that question as they prepared for the historic moment.

Aldrin: “Putting the flag on the moon was really a symbolic highlight of the mission. It was one that we had not really rehearsed. Neil knew where the flag was stowed. We brought it out, then we had to put the two pieces together.”

The astronauts had to drive the flagstaff into the hard lunar surface with a twisting motion. A horizontal aluminum rod kept the flag suspended.

Windley: “And this caused the free end of the flag to flip up and back in response to that. Also, this is an aluminum tube very similar to the ones used on the Apollo mission. It's very springy if I cause it to spring and then let go of it we see that this motion continues long after I've let go of it.”

Cook: “Once it's in the surface, then those oscillations gradually dampen away overtime the vibrations going down the flagpole and then it's pretty much stable after that.”

Conspiracy theorists point to another strange anomaly. One that can't be explained by lack of atmosphere. As the 16 ton landing craft touched down, its powerful rockets would be expected to blast away the top layer of dust exposing the rocky lunar surface. But footprints were visibly photographed beneath the spacecraft and there seems to be no dust on the landing pads.



Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

Mark Yates, Physicist and Collector of Apollo Mission Artifacts said:



“One of the problems that was encountered, of course, was Lunar dust. The moon was covered with it. And in fact, prior to landing, it's an unmanned Landing, one of the concerns was the fact that lunar surface might actually be so dusty that any spacecraft that would try to land on it might actually sink in. And if it wouldn't support an unmanned probe, certainly it wasn't going to support a manned one.”

Ralph Renee devised an experiment to illustrate his notion that the rocket powered Lander should have left a crater. If a garden leaf blower, which is dramatically less powerful, can move dust with Earth's gravity, why didn't a rocket which produced 10,000 pounds of thrust?

Renee: “They didn't move dry dust. They didn't move little rocks. They didn't move anything, so the demonstration is to show that this stuff will disappear immediately. And I'll even be able to get some kind of a hole.”



If Renee is correct, the lunar surface, like the gravel pit would show visible signs of disturbance.

Renee: “But when it actually landed, the dust was all still there. Now, how can that be? You know, if you blow dust away, it goes away like I just did here. I swept the ground.”

Cook: “Some people think that when you land on the moon, you should get a very big crater underneath the rocket nozzle on the lunar module. And that's not the case, because when they were coming in, they'd already throttled down to at least about 1/4 of the maximum thrust. And just above the surface, they turned off the rocket motors. So an exhaust was actually pretty feeble when it lands on the moon surface. If you look at the pictures, you can see a very slight depression underneath the rocket nozzle where dust and a little bit of soil has been readily blown away in different directions around the lunar module.”

And a closer inspection of some of the photographs reveals that the landing did in fact disturb a very fine layer of dust but not enough to cover the landing pads.




But the NASA images from the mission aren't the only proof of the module landing on the surface. Satellite images taken of the lunar surface in more recent years could suggest more compelling evidence of the Apollo landings. The Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter is a robotic spacecraft launched by NASA in 2009 to orbit the Moon.

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



Yates: “Using some very high resolution cameras and being relatively close to the moon surface it’s actually been able to pick out each of the six Apollo landing sites. And not only the descent stages where they landed at locations of the flags, the experiments, the three Rovers that were left on the last three missions.”

But some argue that these satellite images aren't as detailed as they expected when they were taken in 2011.



Allen: “The Lunar Orbiter was deliberately flown over what is purported to be the Apollo landing sites and from a height of 12 miles you are not very far at all, what do you see?”



A couple of pixels! If you looked at these images without NASA putting on a whacking grey error, you wouldn't know what you're looking at.”

While satellite images of the equipment left behind may not be detailed enough to persuade some, there are other markers of man-made interference in the images.”

Norris: “I have to say, what you see is just one or two pixels, but you don't get a sharp picture, a nice clean picture of the lunar module. But the LRO pictures do show some discoloration of the area where the module took off. So that that seems fairly consistent with what NASA said.”

Alongside the lunar reconnaissance images, evidence from other missions have also been able to confirm the Apollo landing sites.

Yates: “Of course, we've also had the Chinese and the Japanese with their own lunar missions. They are able to image the areas in which the landings took place and there are evidence of soil disturbance. So we do have that third party verification that the landings themselves took place.”

There's one more big question conspiracy theorists ask about the Apollo 11 photographs. With no weather on the moon, you would expect a spectacular view of space, yet there are no stars in the Apollo photographs.

Cook: “Some of these conspiracy theories, they think that if you go to the moon you should be able to see stars because there's no atmosphere there. So space should be nice and black, so you should be able to see lot more stars than are shown in the color photographs.”

Bill Kaysing is convinced this was a conscious decision on NASA's part.

Kaysing: “If you were to talk to Aldrin or Armstrong or any of the

Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

other Apollo astronauts, they would actually not respond in any way to questions regarding stars.”



British reporter at official debriefing of Apollo 11 astronauts: “When you looked up at the sky, could you actually see the stars and the solar corona in spite of the glare?”

Neil Armstrong: “We were never able to see stars from the lunar surface or on the daylight side of the moon but, I, without looking through the optics.”

Moore: “I honestly knew the answer when he said that I knew the answer. Of course, the point is that your eyes weren't adapted to that.”

The human eye reacts to light by opening and closing the iris. In bright light the iris becomes smaller. In the dark it widens. On the moon, the eye, like the camera aperture, can't adjust to the brightness of the lunar surface and the darkness of space at the same time.

Brundsen: “If you increase the aperture you increase the amount of light going in and if you increase the exposure time you also increase the amount of light going in. Now, if you were to do that on the moon, to get the stars, then that would mean that the foreground would just be completely washed out and overexposed. When really what the astronauts were trying to take pictures of was themselves and surface features of the moon.”

Cook: “If you imagine going, let's say, to a football stadium and all

the lights are turned out and you look up at the sky, you can see lots of stars and if you can imagine some person turned on the floodlight, he would drown out pretty much all the stars.”

With the powerful light, even our own television camera can't adjust to the extreme contrast to see the stars in the sky. On our moon set, Jay Windley puts this theory into practice in the hope of disproving one of the conspiracy theorists recurring arguments.

Windley: “We're going to find out that if we use an identical camera loaded with identical film and we shoot pictures of the night sky we won't get stars. OK, I'm going to take a shot here. You'll notice here I'm not using any sort of a viewfinder. I'm just aiming.



Will this experiment be enough to invalidate the conspiracy theorists claims? The morning after the shoot, the negatives are developed at a professional processing laboratory in Los Angeles.

Windley: “In our experiment in the desert, we shot a variety of photographs using different film formats Like the Apollo astronauts, we had to guess at our focusing distances and our exposure settings and because we had no viewfinder we had to guess at the direction the camera was pointing. And you can clearly see that even with those handicaps we were able to take quite usable photographs. You can immediately see that there are no stars in this photograph even though the stars were very bright during our experiment. They're simply too dim to be registered on film at the exposure levels that we used to take these photographs.”

Our experiment demonstrates that the stars could not have been seen in the photographs taken on the lunar surface. But this explanation



Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

doesn't satisfy magazine publisher Marcus Allen. He believes it's impossible that any of these photographs could survive a journey to the moon and back in the first place.

Allen: "Photographic film cannot withstand the vacuum of space. So how did they get all these fantastic photographs we've been shown forever about our Apollo astronauts on the moon, when the film was not in a pressurized environment, let alone radiation protection."

Conspiracy theorists believe this is their Trump card. Not only would it destroy film, it would kill the astronauts.

The Earth's magnetic field protects our planet from solar rays. But beyond this zone, deep in space is where conspiracy theorists believe astronauts would be vulnerable to radiation's deadly effects.

Kaysing: "The moon is irradiated by the sun, constantly with terrible heat. And of course there's cosmic radiation, and then there are micrometeorites that travel 60,000 miles an hour that would go right through the camera, the film and of course the astronauts themselves."

After leaving the Earth's atmosphere, the astronauts rocketed through the Van Allen belts.



Renee: "Van Allen, said it was a sea of deadly radiation. You would pick up a death dose just about the time you got through the Van Allen shield you'd be cooked and you'd be dying."

These radioactive belts form a thick ring encircling the equator, thinning out around the North and South poles.



Renee: "Until they get an engine that will lift the life capsule surrounded by 6 feet of water or equivalent mass of lead, they don't even dare go through the Van Allen Shield."

Weaver: "NASA knew it was dangerous. Don't you think that when they went through the Van Allen Belts, they would have said. How are you feeling guys and the effect you're still feeling OK? Surely you would say this because if there were in any way incapacitated, it would be a disaster."


Cook: "When NASA designed the trajectory to go through the Van Allen radiation belt, it was done so the astronauts would go very, very quickly through there so they wouldn't get a very high dosage and they also picked a part of Van Allen radiation belt which the levels of radiation were quite weak."

NASA claims the astronauts endured only a brief exposure, penetrating the thinnest section of the belts in one hour.


Cook: "The Van Allen Radiation Belts is a zone of radiation around the earth. It's shaped a little bit like a doughnut with two centers in it."



Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



It's got a very strong nasty area around here, so you can see that's a darker area and that's the inner belt and an outer belt over here. Which is a little bit more benign, and the Apollo astronauts were sent on a trajectory which avoided the inner belt.



So they were at a relatively safe part of there and they went through fairly quickly so they didn't hang around inside the banana radiation belt for very long.”

But once they passed through, they faced an even greater danger.

Renee: “So here we have these clowns running around in a tinfoil craft stopping solar radiation.



And I'm not talking about the light, I'm talking about the radiation from the solar storms.



Cook: “There's always risk in space. For example, you can have solar storms where you can get massive doses of radiation being flung out from the sun.”

These eruptions from the sun can knockout satellites and electricity grids on Earth. But they can also be detected by an early warning computer system.

Yates: “If there was some form of solar storm, big radiation discharge that the astronauts could actually be exposed to an acceptable and unacceptable hazard which would be a real risk. So there were solar scientists actually monitoring the solar activity to make sure that they weren't about to launch into a potential problem.”

Just three months after the Apollo 16 mission, NASA admitted that a violent solar flare



Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?



hit the moon's surface. An eruption so powerful it could have killed the astronauts had they been there.

Allen: "The point is, the American Apollo astronauts did not have protection against these levels of radiation. And we know that because NASA now admits, as a result of the Orion craft which is Apollo 2.0 that the levels of radiation are such that they have to find out means to protect them before they can send humans through these levels of radiation. But they sent the Apollo astronauts so what's the problem? The problem is they didn't send the Apollo astronauts."



President Kennedy: "I believe that this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal before this decade is out of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to the earth."

Norris: "Those are the words of President Kennedy in 1961. There were three parts of that sentence. There was get humans to the moon before the decade is out and safely and safely was only one of the three. And there were a number of occasions during the course of the Apollo program when particularly the phrase before the decade is

out kind of took priority over safety. Sometimes they have to take some risks in order to keep to the schedule."

The astronauts could only rely on their spacecraft to survive a solar flare.

Cook: "By studying the disc of the Sun, you can make predictions about when these are going to likely happen and avoid those times. And even if there was a storm, if the astronauts were in the command module, you could rotate the command module so you've got a lot of the fuel, the oxygen and the water in between the astronauts and the direction the radiation's coming in. And if we're on the surface, then you could potentially go and hide behind a rock. Or you could even launch off from the surface before the nasty bits of the solar storm arrive."

For conspiracy theorists, radiation is the final nail in the coffin. They believe the astronauts could never have survived a trip to the moon and back. But could the objects they returned with also be the key to unlocking secrets from the lunar surface itself and provide a definitive answer to the question, did we really land on the moon?

Conspiracy theorists believe that the moon rock from the missions was just another part of NASA's carefully engineered deception.



Allen: "Werner von Braun and a few guys from NASA went down to Antarctica. What's he doing in Antarctica? Finding moon rocks."

Weaver: "It's quite possible that these earths lying rocks have been





Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

doctored to give the semblance of moon rocks.”

Massey: “It would be really, really tough to fake these things. It would be really hard now and certainly 50 years ago the idea that you would spend resources on producing some kind of secret lab rather than actually sending people to the moon to bring them back.”

Allen: “But how many people have actually examined the moon rock and can confirm where they came from? There's a great deal of doubt about it.”

In total, the Apollo missions brought back over 382 kilograms of lunar soil and rock. These samples were distributed to laboratories all over the world. At the independent Barclay Geochronology Centre in California, geologist Paul Renne has been studying lunar rock samples throughout his career.

“The spherules that we've been analyzing are tiny balls of glass. So they're like magma that we find on the earth in that sense. But they've cooled very, very quickly and so they form a essentially uniform glass sphere.



Using a laser heating system to release gases locked inside these spherules, Paul Renne looks for evidence of cosmic radiation to uncover clues about their age and place of origin.



Renne: “The lunar materials that we've analyzed and that others have analyzed show evidence of having been bombarded by cosmic radiation that which we don't see on Earth because we have an atmosphere that really shields them very effectively.”

Renne has determined these spherules date back 3.9 billion years. This finding eliminates the possibility that they originated on Earth.

His main interest is these tiny glass spirals from the moon's surface. Created by the intense heat of a meteorite impact.

Renne: “So the earth, with its very dynamic environment does not tend to preserve these glassy objects. Whereas the Moon being essentially dead from a thermal point of view does tend to preserve these things. The results that we obtained are absolutely definitively proof of a lunar origin. I can say with utmost assurance that they're derived from the Moon.”



But it's evidence the astronauts left behind and not what they brought back that may offer the clinching proof. Each successful Apollo Mission set up a range of experiments and 50 years after Apollo 11 the Lunar laser range is still in use.



Did We or Didn't We Go to The Moon?

Aldrin: "There were two major experiments. One was a series of corner reflectors to reflect laser beams from the Earth sent to the moon that then because of the geometry of these corner reflectors would send the beam back in exactly the direction that it came from."



But conspiracy theorists believe that these experiments were taking place before the Apollo missions.

Allen: "You don't need retro-reflectors to fire a laser. It was being done by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1963. They were firing lasers at the moon. There were no reflectors there then. Then nobody had landed them and they were getting a signal back."

If this had already been achieved without a reflector, what was the advantage of NASA placing these on the lunar surface?

Weaver: "There are no lasers there. NASA only did the reflector business so they could prove they went to the moon. It was just another part of their ploy."

Cook: "You send a laser pulse from the earth with a very powerful laser pointing from a big telescope at a location on the moon and it reflects a lot of that light back to you. So it's fairly directional, it comes straight back to it doesn't get scattered, and by measuring the time difference between when you send the pulse and when you get the received pulse back, you can work out the distance to the moon very precisely to literally centimeters."

The reflectors placed by the Apollo 11 crew allowed scientists to achieve greater accuracy about the Earth's position in the solar system.

Cook: "Pretty much anybody in the world with a big telescope, the powerful laser can bounce without getting permission from NASA lasers off those reflectors and measure the distance to the moon. So that proves to me, that the astronauts went there and they left these laser reflectors at these different locations."

If NASA had faked this, surely the Russians would have exposed the legitimacy of this half a century ago.

At the height of the space race, the Soviet Union and East Germany also had the technology to listen in on the Apollo missions. And yet conspiracy theorists ignore the eavesdropping power and silence of America's arch enemies.

Allen: "They weren't at war, but this was as close as they could get. Any form of fraud on the part of either party would have been exposed by the other party very quickly."

Weaver: "If the Russians said publicly it was a fake they would need evidence, otherwise it would just be sour grapes. But they had no evidence because NASA had everything."

But even with no doubt raised by the Russians 50 years on, perhaps all great human achievements are destined to attract skepticism and controversy.

Yates: "There will be landings. There will be men. There will be women on Mars soon. I hope that we don't see the same pattern of conspiracy theories surfacing simply because it'll be a one of the biggest, if not the biggest achievement of mankind."

Weaver: "We got to the moon with basically 1960s technology. Now with our technology, with advanced computers, etcetera, it's still

America's Economy is Past the Point of No Return

going to take them 25 years just to get back to the Moon. Now really there's something wrong there.”

Norris: “When you see real conspiracy theories that become public, whistleblowers give away the secret after a few years even though there are only a small number of people involved, some people seem to feel that conspiracy has kept its secret for 50 years even though 10s of thousands of people were in on the secret.”

For all the effort it would take to create and hide a lie of such magnitude it would have been far easier for NASA to build a rocket and put man on the Moon.

This is the end of Video transcript


The last verse in the video that “it would have been far easier for NASA to build a rocket and put man on the Moon” is extremely debatable. We need to consider what Dr. Werner Von Braun, the designer of the Saturn Rocket which made the Apollo projects possible, said on film that the Saturn rocket needed to be 3200 times larger to get a man to the Moon. Dr. Braun recanted this statement before the launching of Apollo 11. Why would he say this and why would he be so massively off on his calculations?

It begs the massive question, did we or didn't we go to the Moon?

The next article I will present on the Moon landings will be in support of the Hoax supporters.

D. Miyoshi

America's Economy is Past the Point of No Return



In September 2023 the gross federal debt of the United States surpassed \$33,000,000,000,000 (i.e. 33 Trillion Dollars). Although this debt affects each of us, it may be difficult to put such a large number into perspective and fully understand its implications. I have added an infographic at the end provided by Peter G. Peterson Foundation that presents different ways of looking at the debt and its relationship to the economy, the budget, and American families.

This \$33 trillion gross federal debt includes debt held by the public as well as debt held by federal trust funds and other government accounts. In very basic terms, this can be thought of as debt that the government owes to others plus debt that it owes to itself.

America's high and rising debt matters because it threatens our economic future. Some say America has now gone past the economic point of no return.

The coronavirus pandemic rapidly accelerated our fiscal challenges, but despite that, we were already on an unsustainable path, with structural drivers that existed long before the pandemic.

Let me take some figures from *the Common Sense Show* of Dave Hodges to reveal how this debt level now affects us on a personal level.

The Federal Reserve has announced that \$2 trillion of the debt will come due in 2024. How will this affect businesses and jobs?

If interest rates rise (the Federal Reserve has announced plans to raise it) small and medium sized business will no longer be able to obtain capital at affordable rates to continue to operate their business. People with adjustable mortgages will not be able to afford



America's Economy is Past the Point of No Return

their homes and buyers will not be able to buy new homes. Black Rock, Vanguard, State Street and other institutionalized funds will come in with their government preferred rates of 2 and 3 percent and buy up the housing market. It is projected that institutional ownership of home mortgages will increase from 5% to 60%. There are estimates now that say 95% of the current market can't afford to buy a home. This is very dire.

For years economists have warned that when a country's overall debt comes to a level of 90% of its GDP (Gross Domestic Product) it's in very serious economic straits and will not likely recover. This conclusion is simply because no country in the past has ever recovered from that amount of debt.

So, what is the GDP of America compared to its debt? The GDP to debt ratio of America is now 100 to 120. In other words, the debt is 20% higher than the GDP. Thus this is 30% over the 90% level of no return. In practical and historical terms this means the government, as we know it, will cease to exist in the form it currently is.

Looking from the top down, the debt to GDP ratio is unsustainable. America is at the point where it can't pay the interest on the debt. This is why Moody's downgraded the USA a whole grade in terms of creditworthiness. Now, they are simply waiting for the patient to die after it's been taken off life support. The government can't print money because that'll bring hyperinflation which will crash the system even quicker. So, the government is trying to draw the process out by making sure we the people don't get money. The slower death will destroy the corporate ability to hire employees and pay employees to be productive and expand their market. This is a slower death than hyperinflation which will kill the corporations and devastate the economy even sooner. So, the chosen strategy is to keep it going as long as they can and keep this facade up as long as they can. Dave Hodges believes that at one time the government was hoping to get to the presidential election, but he now thinks they will not be able to keep the economy going until that time. Hodges thinks we don't have even nine months remaining.

In 2024, the projections are that we will see 5000 jobs lost every month beginning in the spring. Soon thereafter, we will see 20,000 jobs lost every month because interest rates will skyrocket and we will not be able to monetize the debt.

Thus, companies will cut back on jobs and people will go on salary and work longer to keep up with payments. These companies will decrease wages, regular benefits as well as medical benefits.

Currently, we have record bankruptcies, Once the 2 trillion-dollar debt kicks in, there will be even more Chapter 11 cases filed like what Bed Bath and Beyond has done.

The companies will abandon their commercial retail and industrial sites and Black Rock, Vanguard and State Street will purchase wholesale and convert into 500 square feet living accommodations for people who can't afford to stay in their houses. This will become part of the United Nations Agenda 21 plan devised back in 1992 and

is the start of the forced Smart 15 Minute City, an urban planning concept where neighborhoods provide residents with the basic things they need — shops, schools, parks, leisure options, health care — within a 15-minute radius by foot or bike.

This economic breakdown is like a reverse pyramid collapse except that instead of collapsing from the bottom, it is collapsing from the top albeit it the very top will be the unscathed benefactors and will be enriched by it all.

Dave Hodges estimates that 65% of Americans will be wiped out within 6 months to a year from now. He bases his estimate upon the published data that 80% of Americans don't have over \$1,000 in savings and that 65% are having trouble living from month to month. And the only reason they can make it now is the \$1.2 trillion in credit card debt that they have accumulated.

This economic crisis is now filtering down to the banks themselves. In the first week of October, 55 bank branches closed. The biggest ones were Bank of America and Wells Fargo. At that rate 220 bank branches a month will close. The banks are having to cut their costs, just like the corporations. And if you will remember the Dodd Frank Law of 2010, the banks are allowed to keep your money in a crisis.

Also, we will see entire divisions of the federal government simply roll up and fold or become shells of themselves. However, the IRS will retain its recently hired 87,000 agents so that they can extort money from the people.

And finally, we need to recall what the Federal Reserve's Janet Yellen advocated in a recent message, to empower the government to tax "unrealized income." What is that? Let's say you bought a house years ago for \$150,000 and now it's worth \$800,000 on the market. The IRS would claim that you have now benefited from \$650,000 of unrealized income and should be taxed on that. Of course, they will probably allow you to amortize this over a four-year period and make installment payments of the tax, but you can see the enormous negative effect this will have on one's lifestyle.

These government efforts are all in concert to get we the people to believe in what Klaus Schwab, chairman of the World Economic Forum declared, "You will own nothing and be happy". Dave Hodges likes to revise this slogan to say "You will own nothing and they will be happy."

In closing, let's now take a look at the Peter G. Peterson Foundation infographics depiction that shows the scale of America's 33 Trillion Dollar debt.



America's Economy is Past the Point of No Return



\$33 TRILLION IS ROUGHLY THE VALUE OF THE ECONOMIES OF



COMBINED

AND AMOUNTS TO



\$252,000
per household

or

\$99,000
per person in America.

IF EVERY U.S. HOUSEHOLD CONTRIBUTED \$1,000/MONTH toward paying down the national debt it would take over

21 years.



\$33 trillion is enough to cover a public four-year degree for every graduating U.S. high school student for 103 years.

Within 10 years, the federal government will spend **more on interest payments** than it traditionally has on research and development, infrastructure, and education — **COMBINED.**



WE'RE NOT INVESTING ENOUGH IN OUR FUTURE.



But we are spending nearly **\$2 billion per day** on interest payments on the debt.

Why Can't the U.S. Simply Pay Off the National Debt?



The infographic contends that there still is time to adjust course to save the economy. Dave Hodges believes from a practical, realistic, and historic perspective, it's too late to change course. In time we will see who is right.

The following article explores the challenges both the government and the people have paying off this national debt.

D. Miyoshi

Why Can't the U.S. Simply Pay Off the National Debt?



This is a simple question that begs a relatively complex answer. It's much like asking the middle level American family why it doesn't just pay off all its accumulated credit card debt.

I will attempt to answer the question with points made in a very informed answer recently posted on Quora by James Marshall, an ac-

countant, analyst, hotelier, sci fi geek and philosopher.

The US Federal debt is money that has been spent in the past on government goods and services that was not raised through taxes and other government charges but was instead raised through government borrowing.

When the Federal government runs a budget deficit, it means it will cost the government more to run the country than it expects to receive in revenue from taxes and charges in the coming year. To make up this shortfall, the government must borrow money and/or print more money. If the US government simply printed all the extra money it needed to fund its deficits, then it would likely lead to hyperinflation, as there would be more money going into the economy without corresponding growth. Hyperinflation will decimate an economy.

Instead, the government primarily relies on debt to fund its shortfalls. The US Federal government does this by issuing bonds that investors invest in. The government gets the money it requires from the investors and spends it on government services, and the investor gets a return on their investment in the form of interest payments. If the investor decides they want their money back at some point, they don't get the money from the government, they just sell their bonds to another investor.

A little over half of the current US public debt is owed to US investors, with the remainder owed to foreign countries/citizens/organizations. (as stated in a contemporary article, in 2023, that debt number has ballooned to \$33 trillion).

The problem with government debt is that the more total debt grows, the more of any given year's budget must be spent on interest, and the less money will therefore be left over to spend on local government services. As demand for local government services remains high, governments tend to keep borrowing more to fill the gap and the cycle continues. Eventually, governments can run the risk of going bankrupt and their economy collapsing. This has happened in some countries (the question remains will it happen to the US, which is currently the world's largest economy having the world's reserve currency).

Reducing debt can only happen in two ways: debt is forgiven, or debt is paid back. The people who are owed money by the US Federal government are unlikely to forgive the debt, so we are left with paying it off. This can only happen if the government starts spending less than it earns in revenue (i.e. by running budget surpluses). This could begin to happen as soon as next year's budget if the voting public would accept it.

The problem is the public has become accustomed to the current level of government services and benefits, and nobody wants to give up what they already have. No one wants to pay more tax either.

Whilst there are some government programs that some people would be happy to see cut, not too many people want to see cuts to big ticket items like social security, public schooling, roads, hospital,

Did Putin suffer a Heart attack?

healthcare, policing, defense etc. Whenever governments try to cut back in these areas, there is public outrage, and the government runs the risk of getting kicked out at the next election. This makes most governments reluctant to cut spending. Government spending also generates a lot of jobs and governments don't want to put people out of work (their goal is the exact opposite).

In the meantime, average Americans are working harder and harder for the benefit of more and more other people, including many foreign investors, who get the benefit of the American worker's output through interest on their investments in US government debt (currently, interest payments account for around 8% of federal outlays).

So, if the government debt were ever to be paid back, Americans would benefit by having more of their hard-earned tax money spent on local government services, and less of their money leaking away to foreign investors. Governments could then afford to cut taxes and/or increase government services such as improving infrastructure, building new schools and hospitals etc. This would have the effect of raising the overall standard of living for most Americans.

And if the American federal debt was paid off, the Federal government would invest its extra cash in the debt of other nations, many of which have excellent credit ratings. The extra income this would generate would allow the government to ease the tax burden on US taxpayers, yet still spend the same on government services.

To make it happen, voters have to accept some short-term pain for long term gain (i.e. pay higher taxes and accept lower government spending), and vote for the people who are genuinely committed to making it happen. But do people really want to bite the bullet and are their politicians who are committed to making this happen? I am not holding my breath.

You'd think that the Republican party would be better at reducing debt compared to the Democrats. However, that is not always the case. During the Clinton era, for example, US debt was reduced by almost 10%, whereas during the Trump presidency, US government debt almost doubled from \$16 trillion to \$32 trillion. Maybe we can blame this on the RINO's?

Realistically paying off all that debt isn't going to happen anytime soon. The last federal budget surplus happened in 2001 and amounted to \$128 billion. At that rate it would take 250 years to pay off the current level of debt. Finding ways to cut more out of the US government's \$4 trillion federal budget is very difficult, and sadly something that few political candidates seem willing to take on.

In a nutshell, this is where we are today. And as for the mid-level American family who is burdened with heavy debts, they need to see the benefits of paying off those debts as soon as possible to avoid the possible fate that may befall their own country if it fails to pay off its own voluminous national debt.

D. Miyoshi

Did Putin suffer a Heart attack?



As reported on *Now This News*

10/25/23

Unconfirmed reports began spreading online on Monday Oct 23, 2023 regarding the health of Russian President Vladimir Putin. The rumor, first published by Sky Australia and numerous other foreign outlets, said Putin suffered a heart attack before being resuscitated and that the incident caused widespread concern about his health in the Kremlin. And while, two days later, on Oct 25, 2023 those rumors are still just that — rumors — the surrounding conversation has at least gotten loud enough to actually compel the Kremlin to publicly deny them.

While there's still a lot of uncertainty about Putin's health IRL, this week's headlines do raise the interesting question of what Russia would look like if the president were to suddenly die. And how would a post-Putin Russia handle the war in Ukraine and relations with America? NowThis News spoke to Michael Cecire, a senior policy advisor with the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to answer a few of our most burning questions.

First, let's talk about who could succeed Putin if he unexpectedly died. The most important thing to understand is that, inside the Kremlin, there are three main factions: the security officials, the oligarchs, and the legal/politician types. These three cliques work almost like political parties, warring for influence and Putin's ear. And historically, the security agencies, like the GRU and FSB, have always had the most power in Russia, so they're the obvious choice.

"It's safe to say that succession is unlikely to be straightforward. That doesn't necessarily mean that it can't be relatively peaceful, but there is hardly a clearly designated heir apparent to Vladimir Putin," Cecire said. "It's also worth noting that two of the strongest power centers previously in Putin's inner circle, Wagner loyalist-turned-insurrectionist Yevgeny

Who Controls Wars and Politics?

Prigozhin and Chechen strongman Ramzan Kadyrov, are now dead and reportedly in grave physical health, respectively.”

And what about the ongoing war in Ukraine? Would removing Putin increase the likelihood of peace or cause further instability? According to Cecire, a new leader could, at the very least, be tempted to reduce the scale, ambition, and/or commitment to the war — if only for a short time.

“This has been an unquestionably and objectively ruinous war for Russia, and a powerful threat to Russia's economic, social, and even political stability,” Cecire told NowThis News. “So at the very least, new leadership would certainly have to be tempted to end or at least cut back its commitment to the war both as a resource-revitalization case and to differentiate themselves from the Putin regime. That said, the tendencies of imperial strategic culture in Russia are powerful and longstanding, so it is unlikely that Russia's broader territorial appetites would be curtailed so much as temporarily withdrawn to win concessions from the West and allow for regeneration.”

A third question is how a sudden lack of Putin could affect Russia-U.S. relations. Cecire said it's likely the leaders of a post-Putin Russia would try to mend fences with the West — out of economic self-interest, if nothing else. “There will be strong factions in the West, particularly among certain business elites, that will be eager to see the restoration of something approaching a status quo ante in relations with Russia,” he said.

However, the sheer scale of the humanitarian damage wrought by the Ukrainian invasion is already too great to be walked back. “While more peaceable relations would be a genuine opportunity for stability, there really can be no going back amid the wreckage of Russia's genocidal invasion of Ukraine and campaign of aggression throughout the region,” Cecire said.

If Putin actually suffered a heart attack, his long term health prospects would be considerably dimmed. Going forward, this would likely have serious consequences on the American-Russian relationship, mostly leading to a negative outcome. In due time we will likely know what really happened with Putin.

D. Miyoshi

Who Controls Wars and Politics?



To answer that broad question, I conducted a simple analysis using information from sources on the internet and from data supplied by Dave Hodges of the *Common Sense Show*. The conclusions I reach are admittedly broad generalizations, but the point is there are certain central players in America and the world who profit from war (any war) and who ultimately control politics.

Control of War:

We all know a modern war requires the utilization of three components, namely people, weapons and money. In an American war, we know obviously the people would come from the citizens of the country.

But where would the largest source of weapons come from. That would be the main weapons manufacturers in the U.S. which are Northrop, Raytheon, and Lockheed Martin.

The source of funding would come from the banks and their related financing entities which would be comprised of Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Citi Bank and JP Morgan, and their related entities.

Aside from advancement in the military, people involved in a war would not benefit from fighting in a war. But the weapons manufacturers make big profits by making the weapons for fighting the war and the banks (including international banks) benefit by financing the weapons manufacturers and the war profiteers. In fact, the weapons



Who Controls Wars and Politics?

manufacturers and banks make their biggest profits from the operations of a war (any war).

And so, it would follow that the owners of the weapons manufacturers and banks in America and abroad would greatly benefit from the operations of a war.

So, let's see who these owners are.

Weapons Manufacturers:

Northrop: owners are State Street, Vanguard, Blackrock, Bank of America

Raytheon: owners are Vanguard, State Street, Blackrock, JP Morgan

Lockheed Martin: owners are State Street, Vanguard, Blackrock

Banks:

Bank of America; owners are Berkshire Hathaway (Warren Buffet/Charlie Munger) Vanguard, Blackrock

Wells Fargo: owners are Blackrock, Vanguard, State Street

Citi Bank: owners are Vanguard, Blackrock, Berkshire Hathaway

JP Morgan: owners are Blackrock, Vanguard

Do you see the pattern?

Blackrock, Vanguard, and State Street are equity funds that together have controlling interests in almost 90% of the companies on the S & P 500 stock list. I covered Blackrock and these equity funds in previous newsletters of Aug 2022, July 2023, and Aug 2023.

Oh, and guess who oversees the cleanup of Ukraine after the war: Blackrock

So, who is the owner of Blackrock? It's Vanguard.

And who is the owner of Vanguard?

No one knows because Vanguard is a private company and is therefore not required to disclose its owners.

In the final analysis, perhaps this information helps to answer, at least partially, the how and why America's wars are waged today.

“In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.” Dwight D. Eisenhower Farewell Address 1961

Control of Politics:

Monopoly is defined as an entity or organization that controls more than 50% of an industry. The U.S. used to go after monopolies such as the Baby Bells broken up from Ma Bell. But today the US government loves monopolies.

Many of us can remember the movie in the mid 70's called "Roller Ball" starring James Cain as the super star athlete Jonathan E in the world's most popular sport Roller Ball. The plot of the movie involves 6 corporations controlling the entire world and the fanaticism of the fans who do not have much of a life except watching Roller Ball. The central theme of the movie is he who has the most money and rank controls the corporations and ultimately has the power to control the world. In the movie, Jonathan E has his wife taken from him by the leader of the corporations and Jonathan fights back for his personal freedom and threatens corporate control. This plot is accurately suggestive of where our society is now heading toward.

As in the movie, the real power in this world today appears to reside in the controller of Black Rock who controls the other entity funds Vanguard and State Street and who collectively controls 88% of the corporations in the S&P 500. The controller of BlackRock is Larry Fink, who I have written about in previous articles.



Who Controls Wars and Politics?



Advancing in a Time of Crisis



Larry Fink-BlackRock

BlackRock has more lobbyists in the halls of Congress than there are Congresspeople and BlackRock gets what it wants.... just as in the Roller Ball movie. And what BlackRock and the controlling corporations want is to control everyone in the world. This sounds like science fiction, but it is now more like social fact. It sounds like a conspiracy theory, but it is more like a conspiracy fact.

As in the Roller Ball movie, the control of the world and its activities is ultimately wield through the control of international banking. And this is precisely what BlackRock and the other funds have ultimate control over. Actually, I now believe they have control over who ultimately runs for the U.S. elections including those who run for president and they control who eventually wins. I know some will call me a conspiracy theorist but I think we should not be so naïve as to believe otherwise.

D. Miyoshi



Financial Crisis Report



David M. Miyoshi is a California attorney at law with a Martindale-Hubbell AV Preeminent Rating for Attorneys. He earned his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Southern California, a Juris Doctor degree from the University of California, an MBA degree from Harvard University and an International Graduate degree from Waseda University in Tokyo.

He is Managing Attorney of Miyoshi Law, an International Law Firm where he approaches legal issues through a commercial lens and is a trusted legal and business advisor to his corporate and estate clients. In military service in Vietnam, he led a Combined Action Platoon as an officer in the U.S. Marine Corps and received the Naval Commendation Medal with "Combat V".

He appears in 14 Who's Who publications throughout the world and is listed as a specialist in international business, real estate and estate planning.

Trust and Estate Corner



Often my clients, friends and associates inquire about trusts, wills and estate planning. Therefore, each publication of *Financial Crisis Report* at the end will feature a simple factoid on Trusts and Estate Planning. For more information you may consult my website at www.miyoshilaw.com

Periodically review the titling of your assets.

Once you have established a revocable living trust, be certain to periodically review how your assets are titled. If your assets are titled to you personally, rather than your trust, you have defeated the purpose of forming the trust in the first place.



Miyoshi Law

Phone: +1-310-378-0615
 Fax: +1-310-378-0000
 Mobile: +1-310-920-4872

e-mail: david@miyoshilaw.com
www.MiyoshiLaw.com
<http://about.me/dmiyoshi>