

The Fake Blue Origin



by Miles Mathis

March 31, 2022

I am about eight months late getting to this one, but I kind of figured all my readers already knew it was a big fat fake. It is very obvious. Plus I was busy with more important things. But then I reminded myself that I am not just writing for old readers, I am writing for new readers—who are arriving at my site in droves every month. [As we have seen](#), both my sites are superviral and still growing fast, despite heavy interference from Google and other government agencies, including the Air Force. They are blocking searches, but aren't having much luck blocking word of mouth. They will have even less luck in the near future, as my [Solar Cycle predictions](#) continue to hit.

Anyway, the reason we all knew it was fake without a second look is that it includes the booster rocket returning to Earth and landing backwards. Every real scientist or person with any knowledge of physics knows that is impossible. Rockets were never engineered to fly backwards, and nothing has changed in the past 40 years in that regard. What changed is that they developed CGI in the meantime, so it is now fabulously easy to fake things like that. But there are further problems, since CGI, though good, is still in its early stages. So it is easy to spot if you know what to look for. The first thing to look for, of course, is objects breaking the laws of physics or the laws of current tech (or the laws of perspective). If we see objects doing impossible things, we know they are fake without further argument. That is what is happening here. In fact, it is a perfect test for those scientists you may know. If you have any scientists in the family or in the office, ask them what they think of these rockets landing backwards. If they try to tell you it is no problem, you have them pegged. You know they are either agents of some sort or are being paid to sell this fake for some other reason. There is no third possibility. Well, I guess there is one third possibility: they are very dim and you should never listen to them again on anything important. Let them take their pick.

That's really all you need to know, but I will continue just for fun. I encourage you to start by studying [the films, which are a dead giveaway](#). They shouldn't fool anyone, despite all the money they spent on CGI. They are up at Youtube, NASA, and everywhere else, so they aren't hard to find. I suspect that someday they will have to lose these tapes, like they did with the Apollo missions tapes, saying the dog ate them or something, but for now they are up unedited in all their sloppy glory.

Here's a still from a 2017 test flight:



Notice the dummy in the window. You can tell it is a dummy at a glance, since the hand looks plastic and stiff. So compare to minute 11:36 of the Bezos flight in 2021:



Go watch that sequence and tell me what the problems are.

Problem number one: Bezos doesn't move much, does he? You can see someone in that window, and although we hear lots of cheering and congratulations, he appears to be dead or comatose. Not a twitch. But if we look more closely, we see that thumb sticking up stiffly, just like the dummy and in the same exact position. And finally, you may have forgotten to ask yourself why that window is fogged, while the other one isn't. Sort of conflicts with the whole point of a window right: you can't see through it. But they don't *want* you seeing through it, because if you did you could see that was just a dummy, not Bezos or anyone else.

Here's the same dummy at take-off:



Again, doesn't move much, does he? And the head is always conveniently out of shot. But the glass was not fogged at take-off.

Here's something else you probably didn't key on in the story. The kid who flew as the fourth passenger was chosen by lot, and his dad paid around \$25 million for that seat. As we now know, the whole thing was fake, so none of that is true. So why choose him? To insert markers: he was 18 and his name was Oliver Daemen. Aces and eights, and Daemen=Demon. The usual Phoenician jokes and clues.

Another clue to the nature of this fake is the female passenger Mary Wallace Funk. Not only is Funk a Jewish name, my guess is she is a cousin of Bezos (real name Jeffrey Preston Jorgensen), who is also Jewish. Her middle name is also a big clue, since of course the Wallaces are big Scottish peers, related to the Stuarts, Douglasses, Campbells, and everyone else. Think George Wallace and William Wallace, who probably links her to Mel Gibson. Her family was from Olney, IL, where her father Lozier Ray

Funk had been the head of Normal University. Born in Bluffton, IN, he was also a Swank through his mother. He married Virginia Shy and was a freemason. His niece Mary Jane Leist married James Tudor. Mary Funk came out of Ft. Sill in Oklahoma, where she was no doubt AF Intelligence. At age 82, she was far too old to be chosen for this flight, but since it was fake it doesn't really matter, does it? I guess someone thought they needed a woman in one of the four fake seats, and she was Bezos' favorite auntie or something. Who knows?

If you still aren't clear on rockets flying backwards, go to minute 6:30 and I will walk you through it. We see the booster just apparently falling very fast, with no rocket plume. So ask yourself this: why is the rocket falling straight backwards? It's not even pointed on that end, is it? Shouldn't that flat forward edge be heating up from friction? Remember the shuttle tiles? Nothing like that necessary now, I guess. I will be told there is a parachute, but what about before the parachute opened? The booster is allegedly falling from 340,000 feet, so it should have an incredible terminal velocity and momentum. Far higher than the shuttle, in fact, since this booster should be in freefall, with no wings or angle to the Earth. Plus, the engines have to be open down there, since they are said to be used in the final stages of landing, so the engines are open to the atmosphere, with no shielding. The friction and heating on the forward edges of the engine would be incredible, and it would be guaranteed to cause uneven forces, since the engine is not symmetrical. That is why the forward part of a rocket is smooth and pointed, remember? Logic 101. Plus, it looks like there is only a single small parachute, and that would never work at these speeds and conditions. It would be ripped to shreds upon deployment. We see new stabilizers and brakes deploy on the back end of the booster, and the stabilizers make some sense. But the brakes look like simple scoops, which do not. You would never use closed scoops (ring fins) at those speeds.

Here's another problem: this landing allegedly took place in West Texas, which is conveniently open. But I am from West Texas, so I know there is a bigger problem: wind. West Texas is very windy, so there would be crosswinds here. These crosswinds would wreak havoc on this falling booster, and it would most likely come crashing down in some sort of tumbling spin. No governors could hope to control that because they couldn't predict upcoming forces. You can't make corrections afterwards because they are too fast and too chaotic.

We even saw proof of those winds in the faked take off, where they made a nod to real conditions by showing the plume on the ground all blowing off quickly in one direction.

When they switch to a ground shot at minute 7:15 and the engine is turned on, it all becomes a very obvious fake. The fast change in perspective at 7:20 makes no visual sense, and we have big continuity errors in mapping right there. The landing gear doesn't deploy until far too late, either, so that is another big error.

But the worst error is that we are supposed to believe the final slowing is caused by that single central engine alone. That would be like trying to land the Eiffel Tower upside down on its point. We are shown absolutely no reason for this object maintaining vertical stability during landing. If I were faking this, I would have at least shown some thrusters working on the four landing legs, but they don't even bother with that. That also wouldn't work, but at least it would be a distant nod to real physics.

I remind you they had the same problem with the lunar lander, which they solved in the same way: ignoring it. Remember Ralph Rene pointing out this problem in the FOX special on the moon landing? There exists footage of NASA testing four thrusters spread wide to keep the lander from spinning at landing (tilting and falling over), but they never accomplished it. They destroyed several landers and

almost killed a test pilot, but we have no indication of a successful test. In the Apollo footage, the problem is solved by ignoring it. We don't get to see the landing from the outside, so we aren't sure how it was accomplished. It just was. But here, we do get to see the landing from outside, and they just skip the problem. They pretend pencil-like objects just fall straight down and don't require any stabilizers at landing. They obscure this with the usual camera tricks, clouds of dust, and dirty lenses.

Also notice the voice-over at this point: someone, maybe Bezos, is yelling like a caveman, saying "Dude, let's go to the moon! Who wants to go to the moon with me?" So they are just spitting in your face.

If you are a new reader, I should tell you that all this also applies to Elon Musk and all his Space-X fakes.

So why is Bezos allegedly spending a billion a year of his own money on this? Well, first of all, he isn't. He is spending whatever it takes to create the the little capsules and the CGI sequences, and even that is probably underwritten by the infinite budgets of the Pentagon. But as for the reason he is doing it, I assume it is to back up and support some upcoming major fake from NASA, the money for which will be coming from *your* pockets in the form of taxdollars. He has been working on his Blue Moon lander since 2019, so when he finalizes the CGI for that, NASA can use the video tech for its own fakes. In fact, NASA is already spending your taxdollars on this very fake, see the [Artemis Project](#). Its stated goal since 2018 has been to land a woman and a person of color on the Moon. For this worthy endeavor you have already paid around \$20 billion, and that will double by 2025. Expect this to go way over budget like everything else of this nature, and I would expect the actual fake event to take place around 2030, with a price of over \$100 billion. By 2030 CGI will have been improved to the point it may actually look as real as a *Star Wars* movie, except that you will have paid about 200 times as much to watch it, and it will be about as exciting as the current Supreme Court hearings. But you will then have a woman of color bouncing around in a fake spacesuit in Nevada-sold-as-the-Moon, and with your 2030 vaccine-damaged-brain you will just clap and move on, waiting patiently to be taxed for the next fraud.