

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 6 of 6

AB: Now. Richard, you were developing a...

RH: We're also going to have a copy of the [transcript](#) of tonight's program posted at the [Enterprise Mission](#) web site within the next day or two.

AB: Well, that'll be quite a job.

RH: Well, we have transcribers, even now!

AB: All right. Anyway. You were developing something in...

RH: Yeah. This is really interesting because Ed is coming closer to saying, if I'm not misunderstanding you, Ed, that you believe that Roswell probably occurred and we're not that far from a smoking gun.

EM: Yeah. Let me put this in context because this comes right out of my book and my thesis of what we're talking about. There is a reality. In the Newtonian sense, there's a reality out there. In our particular universe, we not only have a reality, we know about something, and we know about things, not directly, but we know about things, how we organize information about them. So we don't know what's out there automatically. We don't know our universe automatically. We only know our universe through the clues we gather. Now that pertains precisely to the problem we're talking about, Richard.

RH: Uh-huh (affirmative)

EM: Our universe exists and we know about, or we are learning about it. So what is the evidence that we use to know about that reality. We gather it through our physical senses. It turns out, we also gather through our non-local or intuitive information capability. So, we have to say how we know reality is really a consensus mechanism. You and I are sitting here trying to find areas of agreement about our experience and about what we've observed, to come up with an explanation that satisfies both of us. We can only describe our meeting of the minds here in some statistical sense, in that we don't have a complete meeting of the minds, but we're trying to communicate to get a better meeting of the minds, and our probability of agreeing with each other is rising by the moment, as we reach these areas of consensus. See, what we're saying on the Roswell incident, for me particularly, is that I've been very skeptical over the years, however...

RH: As have I been.

EM: And we are finding more and more evidence to confirm that a real event that must be labeled as extraterrestrial that the evidence to support that theory of it is getting very solid...

RH: I'll stop you there. That evidence, Ed, at the moment, consists solely of a wide variety of eye-witness testimony, 300 plus witnesses, conversations that people that you and I know and value highly have had with people that we know and value highly, that kind of thing, but not one shred of physical proof.

EM: Not in the public domain.

RH: In the public domain. All right. Now, have you seen any proof in the private domain that you would find interesting.

EM: No. All I have seen in the private domain is, again, evidence from individuals who claim to have seen that, and I tend to give credibility or more credibility to their testimony because I find them credible individuals.

RH: So this is your belief in their integrity.

EM: That's right.

RH: And in their veracity.

EM: Exactly.

RH: And in their inability to be confused or misled. In other words, you believe they're telling you a valid story from their perspective.

EM: From their perspective.

RH: All right. Now this provides an interesting database because if we take this as a given, that Roswell did happen. An alien spacecraft fell out of the sky in '47, was picked up by the military, the Army Air Corps at that point, and classified, and an assiduous effort made to vacuum all physical evidence and to intimidate witnesses for 50 years. This says two stunning things we need to think about. One is, our government is capable of taking extraordinary precautions to keep us from knowing we're not alone, number one. The same government, Ed, that sent you to the lunar surface. That's the most important part of this conversation because if they would lie to us about the one thing, why would they not lie to us about the other.

EM: Let me interrupt you at this point, Richard. There's two things here. I think we can't say, as a given, that the scenario you created about Roswell is the correct scenario. We can say the evidence...

RH: No, but you're saying there is an increasing probability...

EM: ...is getting closer to our accepting that that is an event.

RH: All right, and I'm saying that if that curve is rising, and you're assuming that it may be true, then the motivation behind a cover-up of such a stunning event, which certainly would be a watershed in science and human history, if they would lie to us on that score, why would they tell us the truth that they found ruins,

EM: The same people probably would not, and here is something else we must think of. It is not a single government...

RH: But in the law of [the space act](#), and it says they are the same people.

EM: No.

RH: That NASA is to be considered a defense agency of the United States.

EM: But in practice that is not what happened.

RH: That's your representation ...

EM: Well, since I'm a part of it, I can say that the part I represent did not operate under those rules.

RH: All right. That's an important statement because you don't know everything that went on in NASA.

EM: Absolutely. That is correct. I don't know everything that went on in NASA, but I do know that many or most of the people operating in the lunar mission are not the same people that we accuse of the military cover-up having to do with the Roswell incident.

RH: Ok. We...

EM: We have two different portions...

RH: Ok. We agree on that. All right. And as Art can tell you. On this show, I have said over and over again that most of the system is honest. It's become a mantra.

EM: I don't consider the system honest. I consider whatever it is. It's got leaks and holes and problems and people, dishonest people throughout, just like it has honest, wonderful people. The system is what it is, so we can't classify it that way. But, we have to be very specific about the instances that we're..

RH: Maybe I should be more focused. I should say most of the people operating within the system are honest.

EM: Yeah, but it is the system with its own rules and regulations, and, just as you pointed out from the 1958 document that you read from, parts of that are in the writing, but that does not mean that it's being operated on, or in some cases, it may very well be operated on...

RH: And that's what we have to discern. In fact, we have a legal team that came out of our Houston trip that have now taken on the assignment of finding the presidential finding, if stuff related to Apollo and the lunar experience has been classified, it would have to be under the law unto the act, between the President and the administrator.

EM: Yep.

RH: And just like with Iran-Contra, what I've tasked these lawyers to find is the piece of paper in the bureaucracy which gives this government the right to keep this from us.

EM: Sure.

RH: I don't know if we're ever going to find that, but at least we've got some people now who, these are very high-priced Texas lawyers. They are willing to do this pro bono because they think that it's important that we know.

EM: Oh, I agree that sort of evidence needs to be there. I think there are so many holes in that approach that we have to go far beyond what you're suggesting, to make that sort of case. However, if you have the time and the effort and the inclination to do it, I'd say, "Go do it, for heaven's sake."

RH: Well, it's not me. It's these people who volunteered their time to do it, and it's one of the ways you chase down...

EM: Absolutely.

RH: That's how we found Brookings.

EM: That's good detective work.

RH: All right. Let's go back to Roswell because the other thing that your assignment of an increasing probability that it really happened indicates is that travel between stars, visits by E.T. is much more likely than we would have ever imagined under any previous scenario.

EM: Oh. Absolutely. I think the modern evidence permits that to happen pretty well.

RH: Ok. This is crucial new evidence because it means, instead of an isolated solar system, a la the '50s perspective...

EM: Yep, or even the '70s

RH: Or the '70s where the interstellar distances were called God's Quarantine Regulation. We have a physics and technology which makes it, if not easy, at least, reasonable to propose...

EM: Quite plausible.

RH: Plausible that beings and craft and commerce and other stuff can go between the stars. Under that model, Ed, this is the part that Art was flagging, why is our ancient artifacts in the solar system hypothesis improbable, a priori? If travel is easy. If people want to go and explore like you guys did, why should it be so amazing to consider that, maybe, we're not the first to explore our own backyard, and somebody else did it and left stuff that we would then trip over millions of years later.

EM: I don't have any quarrel with that at all, but we're arguing apples and oranges here.

RH: No, because you said it was a low probability event, if I can could be right on...

EM: No, no, no, no. You're misunderstanding me...

RH: And what's your basis for saying it's a low probability event.

EM: I'm saying, our knowledge of it is low probability of...

RH: Ok. I didn't

EM: I didn't assign any probability, at all, to the event itself. That's why I had the preface to this whole conversation. It is our knowing that is the problem. I will totally agree that our evidence and our knowledge about travel that seems to exceed speed of light. It probably doesn't, but it seems to us to do so. We're starting to know how to do that. And if it's true, that has been available all along also, but our knowledge of it has not been.

RH: You know what this is sounding ...

EM: The probability of our knowledge base, not probability of reality.

RH: This is sounding more and more like hyperdimensional physics.

EM: No. We don't even need that. We don't need it. That's another portion of the issue. All you need to do is apparently from modern studies, or what's being proposed, is modify the local characteristics around, of the space, around the spacecraft, and it gives the appearance of high-speed travel.

RH: Ok. We can argue the details, later.

EM: Yeah, we'll talk about that later.

RH: So we're really looking at that. In your view, we're looking at the uncertainty of our knowledge vs. the reality itself.

EM: Yes.

RH: Ok. And it ...

EM: The only thing we can know is about our knowledge. We have to hang on to our knowledge.

RH: Ok and where you're coming from, you see, I have a four year advantage, I and this team, and we've been looking intensively at this model for four years before tonight's conversation. You have come to this database very recently, and you're coming on the curve at a much earlier point, where we all started from, which is, "Come on, guys, this can't be real." And we've had four years of time to work on this that you have not yet had.

EM: I'll grant you that, and then I will say there's another phenomenon here.

RH: Ok.

EM: And that is, as we become convinced about what we're looking at, we start to exclude the contrary data. I'm not saying you're doing that, but that's what we tend to do. And that is the reason that changing paradigms is so very, very difficult. We get locked into a way we look at things, and we don't consider the alternative. So, I'm coming to your phenomenon with fresh eyes but low on the learning curve. You're coming to your phenomenon with several years of experience but becoming locked into your belief system about it and not necessarily willing to look to other explanations.

AB: All right. I have a question for both of you. It has been 30 years since we've been to the moon. And I wonder, if you both were setting priorities, financial and otherwise, whether you both want to go back to the moon.

EM: Of course.

RH: Absolutely

EM: There are questions that have been raised, including the ones that Richard is raising here.

RH: Yeah.

EM: But the only way that they're really going to be answered is to go back and look at the evident all over again.

RH: Remember Craft ?Ericky?, Ed?

EM: Sure.

RH: Remember that incredible genius. You talk about von Braun so warmly, well Craft ?Ericky? ...

EM: Absolutely

RH: ...was about ten times warmer than von Braun and such a visionary genius, and if Craft were with us today, I know that he'd be shaking his head in absolute mystification as to why we have not utilized our industrial infrastructure and capitalized on the extraordinary economic and other resource potential of using near earth space, particularly the moon for 30 years, for three decades, for over a generation.

EM: I think he probably would, and the only explanation for that is that we've got so many problems right here at home we can't keep up with them all.

AB: If I were to ask the both of you why we haven't been back, I suspect I would get different answers. From you, Dr. Mitchell, because of priorities here on earth, money. From you, Richard, because there's something there they don't want us to see. Would that be about correct?

RH: The probability is high that that is what's going on for me, yes. And let me give you a data point, all right? We have found in the course of the political side of this investigation, now that the Soviet Union has fallen, and the KGB files of the Soviet lunar program, or the former Soviet program, have been unveiled, we found some interesting and remarkable anomalies in the Soviet program counterparting and pacing the Apollo program that really demand some further inquiry and explanation, like for instance, we're both in this all out race and yet one of the partners, or the protagonists, or antagonists suddenly stops racing when it gets some very clear new pictures from the moon, and I'm

talking, Ed, about the unmanned Soviet missions in the 1968 time frame, in the late '60s, late '68, just before Apollo 8, when the Politburo suddenly intervened and stopped the cosmonauts from going into lunar orbit, even before Apollo 8.

EM: Yeah. We obviously don't have time to address all of that.

RH: But these are anomalies that, I think, need ...

EM: There are anomalies all over the place, particularly when you're dealing with governments and structures the size modern major governments. There's data all over the place that absolutely doesn't fit anywhere. I totally agree.

RH: The more important...

EM: But I do resist these overall conspiracy theories that seem to be driving what you're looking at.

RH: But, Ed, you're claiming a major conspiracy with Roswell with an increasing probability, and if they would hide something of that seminal importance, what would they not hide?

EM: Oh, I agree that there are pockets of activity here and there and everywhere, trying to control things, but it is not at the level that it...It has effectiveness in some area, but that isn't basically the way government operates, overall, not in a democratic arena. It would in a totalitarian arena. That's absolutely true.

RH: We're going to have wonderful debates, I can see.

EM: Yeah.

AB: Ha, ha, ha. All right, gentlemen. We are, quite obviously out of time. It has gone better than I ever thought (laughter). For that I thank the both of you, and it has been my honor. It has been a great honor for me to have you both here so I guess that's it.

RH: Thank you, Art, for providing a platform...

EM: Well, we could pick up another time, Art, if you like.

AB: Let us do that since it has been so productive.

RH: What I would like to see is we're going to send Ed some more data, and particularly the geological analyses by people like Ron Nicks and other very qualified professionals in the field, and I want him to look it over, and when he deems it desirable we'll do this again.

AB: All right. Well, I'll sure go for that and it sounds like Dr. Mitchell will, as well, so gentlemen, I guess the sun is up. It's daytime there. Have a great day.

EM: You, too, Art.

AB: Goodnight.

EM: Goodnight.

RH: Say, "Goodnight, Art."

AB: Goodnight, Art. (Laughter) That's it, everybody. We have got to get out of here. I do want to take a moment to thank Richard Hoagland publicly, Dr. Edgar Mitchell, Apollo 14 astronaut, publicly. Thank you both.

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](#) |