

Anomaly on the Moon

6 October 2009

To celebrate the fortieth anniversary of Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin's historic journey to the moon and the first lunar spacewalk, search engine giant Google launched an interactive three-dimensional atlas of the Moon into Google Earth 5.0 satellite imaging and mapping software. Last month Richard and Dorothy Buchli uncovered an unusual object while scanning through the images. The object was located on the Moon at North 19° 58' 48.31" and East 21° 11' 35.57". It is within the Sea of Serenity (Mare Serenitatis). The Sea of Serenity is close to several of the lunar landing sites. Apollo 17 and Luna 21 landed near the east border of the Sea of Serenity. Apollo 15 landed near the west border of the the Sea of Serenity. (Apollo 15 Lunar Module landed at North 26.13° and East 3.63° on 30 July 1971. Apollo 17 Lunar Module landed at North 20.19° and East 30.78° on 11 December 1972. Luna 21 landed at North 25.85° and East 30.45° on 15 January 1973.)

On 29 September 2009, Paul Thompson forwarded a copy of the image to me. I used sharpening routines in Adobe Photoshop to bring some clarity to the image. The result is provided below.



The original raw image is provided on the next page. According to the legend, the object appears to be around 700 feet across. To say the least, the object is a very unusual image and deserved further examination.

James A. Marusek
tunga@custom.net



Comments Received:

Although most Lunar Ascent Stages were deliberately crashed into the moon at known coordinates as seismic impactors, those from Apollo 11 and 16 were left in decaying orbits. This site should be compared with known impacts. A topographical analysis should be done (is this on a hillside?) because a strike from decaying orbit should otherwise appear oblong.

More importantly a surface structure (soil) analysis. Any strike on basalt will cause fractures and toss boulders some range. This could be a recent natural strike on brittle material, maybe of unusual size (heavy) and velocity (slow?).

-- Robert Redelmeier, Houston, Texas

I was able to zoom in on the coordinates that you put forth on CCNet this morning. I also have an enhanced image of the object. Clearly this has to be some kind of a hoax - most likely put forth by someone at google - and if it is, it's a very impressive one. Will be following to see what others come up with.

-- Kelly Morris, Bainbridge Island, Washington

Upon perusing Google Earth for the lunar object at N 19° 58' 48.31", 21° 11' 35.57" referenced by James Marusek in today's CCNet (8 Oct 2009), I came upon another, somewhat smaller anomalous object 13.11 miles to the southwest of the first (heading 247.82°), at N 19° 43' 03.22", E 20° 30' 43.40"; and two more about 60 miles to the east of the first (heading 109.71°): one at N 18° 51' 14.18", E 24° 20' 44.79" and another close by at N 18° 50' 39.22", E 24° 25' 25.95".

One supposes these to be crashed or abandoned space junk of some sort, although their size is quite surprising.

-- Burton Golden

Richard and Dorothy Buchli identified several other anomalies adjacent to this object within a corridor 240 by 80 miles.

I don't think we need entertain any ideas further than that it is an artifact of the mosaic which is used to create the image in the first instance.

The pdf Clark linked to emphasized everything BUT the actual visible mosaic 'joins' from the Google moon image. Once they're considered, as I have crudely attempted to emphasize with my limited image manipulation capabilities, it becomes quite clear that the "anomaly" aligns perfectly with the mosaic pattern, even down to the fact that the outer edges align with the mosaic joins. Another point I noted was that the elevation of the image center is around -2900m, that's MINUS 2.9km, so if it were anything 'real' it would be almost a 3 kilometer deep hole! - which is only 250m across! - yet remarkably well illuminated...

No mystery here, nor alien craft, nor men on the moon, nor strip-mining, nor

-- Dave Smith, PlasmaResources.com

The images are a result of damaged film/data taken years ago. I would not put any credence in anything of these images. Anomalies are a result of pixilation, stretched and torn film, and chemical stains.

-- Mark Marusak, Dynamic Imaging