

Richard C. Hoagland and Dr. Edgar Mitchell Debate

Art Bell Show Wednesday, May 15, 1996 1 AM to 4 AM PDT

Transcribed by G. Varano, Part 4 of 6

AB: Back now to our debate. Gentlemen, can either one or both of you explain any way that these structures, as you have described, Richard, could be possibly be a natural phenomenon. They would have to be unnatural by definition, wouldn't they?

EM: Let me jump on this. I think I can bring us closer to agreement here and put it on a different level so that we may not be as far apart as Richard perceives we are at the moment. So let me... He gave me a good lead here just before we broke. In my own book, I take on the establishment, as well. And it's a slightly different approach, and that's what I want to make a comparison with right now, to see if it can bring us closer to agreement. I suggest that the common phenomenon that all humanity has experienced in one way or another, our inner experiences, and we have all these words, ESP, psychokinesis, etc., etc., that apply to this. Our scientific for a long time, or at least in the last century, has said that this is not valid phenomenon, it isn't real, it's imagination. On the other hand, all of our cultural traditions said, "Oh yes, it's very real." But we attach a supernatural or unnatural explanation to it, a divine explanation, a satanic explanation and so forth. I've denied that those are appropriate ways to approach it. It is real, and it's also natural. And so I spend a lot of my time and a book exploring the idea that these are very natural phenomenon, and that there are explanations within physics. It turns out that the physics of the last couple of decades centered around non-locality, does offer some very nice explanations for how all of this can come together in a natural model of how the universe functions. Now I would like to take this same comparison to what we're talking about on the moon. There may indeed be anomalous behavior that we're experiencing and observing here in the photographs taken on the moon. I don't that there's anomalous, but Richard is claiming that there is and that he's observing it from looking at those photographs.

RH: Well, Richard and colleagues.

EM: And colleagues. Ok. Colleagues, right. There is certain evidence that simply doesn't fit with our model of how the moon is put together. Now what's coming out of this is ...

RH: I'm so glad to hear you say that, Ed.

EM: If there is an unnatural explanation, by that, what we mean is that it's not just a part of the physics we understand. I want to make my position very clear. I agree with Richard and many other folks, that we're not the sole intelligences, creative intelligences in this universe. That earth is not the sole repository of life, nor creative activity. And my position is this is throughout the universe. We must look at the universe in the way that allowed intelligence and life like we experience it, to have arisen everywhere and not just here on earth, and that requires a very marked change in the way we understand the physics, the chemistry, the whole structure of the way the universe is put together. And that's what I'm suggesting here, in the way we look at this problem, that what Richard and colleagues have suggested seems to require an unnatural explanation for what they are observing, that is, a structure, and when you say structure and unnatural, then you have to ask the question, "But created by whom, when, from where, how did it get there, and so forth?" That is a very difficult set of questions to answer...

RH: to the present day.

EM: It's much easier, I think, and much more credible, to approach the problem to say, "We have an anomalous phenomenon here, and maybe there is something about the physics of the situation that we don't quite understand." Now that's the approach I took in my book with regard, in the last 25 years, with regard to the phenomenon I have been looking at, and others have been looking at. And I think we have discovered in the mechanism of non-locality which, interpreted other ways, says that the universe is interconnected and that part of Newtonian classical physics is not correct, that you can get explanations through quantum physics and non-locality that satisfy the situation. I'm suggesting the same thing here, that I would much prefer to look at this as anomalous phenomenon to see if we can find something in the physics that, even though it may be a bizarre physics, something in the physics that satisfies the problem, without at the moment having to go to extraterrestrials or some other unnatural explanation as having created this effect because that is a far more difficult, requires some far more difficult explanations than just looking at bizarre physics. Just like on your Cydonia on the moon, I mean, on Mars, the [McDaniels Report](#) suggests one of two things: It's either bizarre geology that we don't understand or perhaps it's extraterrestrial or rather it's an unnatural structure. I'm suggesting the same thing here, that there may be an unnatural physics involved, and I find that a much more easily addressed subject than an unnatural resolution of the problem. So go ahead, Richard.

RH: Hmm. Art. Art.

AB: Yes, sir.

RH: I think we're making a little history tonight.

AB: Well, that may be.

RH: Because Ed and I are much closer than I would have imagined. I'm delighted to hear this commonality because if you start with a premise that there's something interesting to explore and men of integrity and women of integrity pursue that path, ultimately you will find out what anomaly you're dealing with...

EM: Absolutely. I don't disagree with that at all.

RH: ... and that's what I want to find out. And what I would like is Ed's commitment on air tonight to help us, and there's a lot of us out here, geologists, chemists, optical physicists, a wide range of experts, to which his expertise would be invaluable. If he would offer to be a kind of a grounding, ironic for an astronaut to be a grounding, for us to bounce ideas and data off as we pursue the search for what it is that's showing up in this wide variety of pictures, I think we have made some significant progress tonight.

EM: Well, Richard, I am never loathe to investigate anomalous phenomenon. Sometimes I don't have enough time to investigate all the ones I want to look at, and if you have indeed really turned up a very strange and bizarre set of events that are not explainable, sure I'm intrigued. I'm always intrigued by that. What I am turned off by is jumping to conclusions that, when there's a more obvious way to go.

AB: All right. Gentlemen, I want to jump in and ask a question. Richard, in the facts that you sent to me earlier today, you said Dr. Mitchell, on his previous appearance emphatically claimed that he was not precluded by NASA from discussing anything, that he either saw or experienced during his Apollo 14 flight. You, in fact, did say that, Dr. Mitchell, correct? All right, Richard says the [NASA Space Act](#) itself, in light [Brookings](#) strong recommendation,

says otherwise, that you were, in fact, barred from discussing many things that you would have seen and done. Is that correct, Richard?

RH: Well, let's not be unclear on this. I have in my hands a copy of [Public Law 85-568 from the 85th Congress HR 12575](#) published July 29, 1958 called An Act, which is the enabling legislation which created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This is the document which basically brought into being the agency which employed Ed Mitchell to go to the moon back in 1971. And there are several interesting sections to this. This entire document is up on the [Enterprise Mission Web Site](#), which can be reached through the [Art Bell Web Site](#) on the Net. On page 4, there is a section titled "Functions of the Administration," meaning NASA. And it says that section 203, "The administration, in order to carry out the purpose of this act, shall 1. plan, direct and conduct aeronautical and space activities, 2. arrange for participation by ? committee, etc., 3. provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning its activities and the result thereof." Now, that's the part that we always quote because it's the part that the American people have as their guarantee that everything that NASA found, it got to see. All right? Unfortunately, as we look through the act, we have found that there are other interesting sections that are not as generally well-known. For instance, there is a section on page 8. Well, let me start with page 7. This is section 206, subsection A, "The administration (meaning NASA) shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress, semiannually and at other times as is deemed desirable, report to its activities and accomplishments." It then says, section D, "No information which has been classified for reason of national security shall be included in any report made under this section unless such information has been declassified by, or pursuant to authorization given, by the President." So there's a caveat there. Now..

EM: Let me jump in there, Richard, because we're spending a lot of time on details here. Let me just cut across that. There are some valid areas of technical development that I'm sure military and security people which they came out of the NASA program. By and large, those are very, very limited, but I can think of some. For example, the development of computer technologies was certainly not released to all nations of the world, and it was classified in some way. But, we're talking about discovery here. What is really the issue of going to the moon and the data that we recovered. Scientific data in this sense was not classified. We were not under any restriction on what we reported. Yes, there was a time delay between the live voice circuit and what went out on the air. I think most of that was designed to keep four letter words, because sometimes we spoke a lightly gruffly, four letter from getting out without censorship, but the content of what we were reporting, the content of what we were doing was not, in any way, classified. We were not briefed on anything concerning scientific research. It was not even discussed about extraterrestrials. Good Lord, we would have loved to have been able to discuss something about that, or to have had something to discuss. It simply wasn't there. Technical information having to do with national security, military operations, the sophistication of our equipment, yes, there might have been some classified stuff, but, by and large, at NASA there was very little.

RH: Let me make another couple of points here from the Act. Further down on this page 8 relating to security, section 304, and this again is on the web site for those who want to read it. "The administrators shall establish such security requirements, restrictions and safeguards, as he deems necessary (Notice the assumption that it's always going to be a "he," 1958, all right) in the interest of the national security." Ed, we have a study from Brookings that was commissioned in '59 and was delivered to the Congress in '61, which we call the Brookings Report, which is a several hundred page document with a section related to specifically to the implications of NASA's confirmation of extraterrestrial intelligence, either by means of radio or artifacts, and they claim that you might find them, NASA might find them someday, from the perspective of '59 on the moon, Mars or Venus. There, then, is another sections

of Brookings related to the recommendation that consideration be given to withholding such a discovery from the American people for reason of fear of social dislocation or social disturbance. The Act itself...

EM: Well, that may be true, Richard. I don't have any problem with the fact that it's written in the record.

RH: What I'm saying is that the act itself provides in law the mechanism for the administrator, for whom you work, for whom you sign documents, to restrict dissemination of this information if it ever came to pass. Now, the problem that I'm having is that we're all lawful individuals. We all presume we operate under the law. If this, in fact, was a reality, then sitting on the radio this morning you could not, in conscience with what you have signed, admit to the presence of remarkable anomalies there in consonance with the administrator's classification, if that ever came to pass.

EM: Well, you're stretching it way out of context. Let's say that at the time that was done it was undoubtedly considered a prudent policy to write such a thing into effect. In practice, what has happened, however, is that I know of no administrators since that time who have really considered extraterrestrial intelligence, or anyone at NASA at that level of operation that gave it practical consideration of something that needed to be done. As far as operation as crews, people on the job doing it, it had utterly no effect on us whatsoever. And I have signed nothing suggests that I am aware of that, or that I am required to be circumspect in what I say. It simply doesn't exist. That is ..

RH: Ed, I am quoting..

EM: ?...theoretical structures, and that quote of yours has virtually no practical bearing on what we're talking about.

RH: I am quoting from the law, the enabling legislation on page 11 in section I, it says, "The administration (meaning NASA) shall be considered a defense agency of the United States." Now we have always operated on the assumption....When I was with PBS, I absolutely would have sworn on a stack of Bibles and Korans that NASA was a civilian agency for space exploration of the government of the United States. Literally, a few days ago, when I read this carefully, I was stunned to see in the language the actual act says that NASA shall be considered a defense agency of the United States. Now, what that implies...

EM: I'll have to admit that's an interesting bit of language.

RH: Isn't it? Now, what that implies is that, in consonance with Brookings, if, not you guys, let's take the astronauts out of the equations for a minute, because as I said at the top of the show, there are absolutely physical models in which you could have landed in the middle of this stuff and not seen it. I really firmly believe that. So let's take you out of the equation. If there were people in NASA who knew there were interesting things there, and they were specifically looking for further information, and the landing sites were chosen so they could get it, maybe, without your knowledge from the films, from the seismic data, whatever, the administrator with this language can classify all of that and Golden, to this day, does not have to tell us unless Bill Clinton says, "Dan, we want to finally now go public."

EM: In principle I think you may be right, if that language that you've just read ...

RH: It's on the record.

EM: ? ...however, in practice, that simply is not the way it happened. That isn't the way sites were selected. That isn't the way mission were chosen. That sort of knowledge that you're talking about might have existed, simply didn't exist. How would it have existed in the first place. Simply didn't exist. It didn't operate so what we're getting awfully close to in this discussion is some more of the great conspiracy theories which we hear a lot of floating around the country at this point, which simply don't hold water. They should be looked at. I don't want to dismiss them totally out of hand. Yes, there are people within government who might hold that point of view, but frankly in this particular area in going to the moon during the Apollo program, during the entire NASA program, that sort of conspiracy and that sort of cover-up simply did not happen. However, it is quite clear that many within the military and within the intelligence establishment would very much like to have operated under those rules. We didn't, however.

RH: All right.

AB: Gentlemen, I've got to break in. We've got one more hour if you can both give us one more hour?

RH: Oh, why not, Art.

EM: Ha, ha. We've ruined the night already...

RH: It is dawn here on the east coast for both of us.

EM: Might as well stick with it.

AB: Yes. All right. Very good. Gentlemen, stand by.

This transcript is Copyright 1996 The Enterprise Mission. All Rights Reserved. Copying of these HTML documents are prohibited under the law. Permission is hereby granted to link to the Hoagland/Mitchell Debate Web Page. (www.enterprisemission.com/debate.html) There are hyperlinks within the transcripts that point to other images and files within The Enterprise Mission site.

| [Back to Mitchell Page](#) | [Prev Segment](#) | [Next Segment](#) |