

The Valensole Questionnaire

By Luis Schönherr

BECAUSE of the implications of the Valensole incident I suggest that the investigators should clear up the following points:

- 1) When (date and time) did the GEPA investigator begin the investigation? When did he arrive at the landing site? Was he on the scene before the "hundreds of people" arrived who "manfully trampled down the fields of lavender" (see *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* September/October 1965, p. 9) and, as I am tempted to add, also probably obliterated the imprints and other traces of the landing?
- 2) Is the depth and area of the imprints made by the 'legs' known? Have casts from the imprints been made? By duplicating them on the spot one could at least get a rough idea as to the weight of the object.
- 3) Why did the witness fill the hole left by the object?
- 4) Did the witness have the impression that the object was resting mainly on its central support, the legs merely acting as stabilizers, or did it seem that the legs themselves were strong enough to support the whole object?
- 5) Did the investigators examine the hole before it was filled in? Could they say
 - a) What were its exact dimensions?
 - b) Could it have been caused by high pressure?
 - c) Was it created by excavation? If so, did the investigators look for the soil from the hole. Was it spread around the hole or along the trajectory of the object? Was it found in another place?
- 6) What was the diameter of the central support?
- 7) Have the soil and plants (roots) at the landing site been thoroughly examined? Did they show anything unusual when compared with samples of the safe species taken from another area?
- 8) Has the landing site been tested for radioactivity? As there have already been cases of radioactivity, and as the witness himself exhibited an apparently intuitive fear of harmful influence, such a test should have been obvious. If no geiger counter was available, it could at least have been tried with a piece of film (a dentist's X-ray film would certainly been available).
- 9) Was there any sound while the object rested on the ground?
- 10) Is a drawing of the object available? Did the investigators induce the witness to try a sketch?
- 11) According to the GEPA report, the witness approa-

ched the object "calmly and without overmuch concern" (*FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* Nov./Dec. 1965, p. 5). Aimé Michel wrote, however, that "he approached cautiously" because "his first thought was that he had bagged the people who were spoiling his lavender" (*FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* Nov./Dec. 1965, p. 7). Did the witness tell different versions to Michel and GEPA, or must the investigators be blamed for this contradiction?

12) According to the report from *Le Petit Dauphinois* (*FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* Sept./Oct. 1965, p. 10), the witness saw one being outside the object and the other inside it. GEPA, however, reports that he saw both of them beside the object.

13) Has an attempt been made by the investigators to ascertain whether or not the witness has any previous interest in UFOs, or theories on the subject?

14) The investigators imply that the contact was attended by certain effects on the physical as well as on the psychological constitution of the witness. They suggest a sort of post hypnotic suggestion, and even a 'psychological conditioning'. Can the investigators accept full responsibility that the above conditions weren't already present before the sighting took place and could therefore not have been its cause?

15) The witness states that the beings "were communicating.....by means of inarticulate sounds which did not seem to come from what for them took the place of a mouth".

- a) How did the witness get the impression that the voices did not come from the mouth?
- b) Was it because the voices came from another direction? If so, from what direction did the voice come?
- c) Did the witness get this impression because he could not observe any movement of mouth or facial changes while they were speaking?
- d) What was the volume of the voice relative to the distance? Loud? Weak?
- e) Did the volume of sound change when the beings turned their faces away from the witness?
- f) Did the beings wear any devices, apparatus etc., on their bodies? Or were they wearing close fitting overalls which couldn't have concealed a device?

16) How did the witness get the impression of a sur-

WIRE-LESS TRANSCIVER FOR ASTRONAUTS

In a big spacecraft of the future one may find astronauts talking through their hats or helmets . . . using a tiny communications system built into their headgear.

The two-way radios would permit twelve or more astronauts to carry on six individual conversations at one time. A seventh channel would allow any member of the spacecraft crew to cut in on all conversations to relay an emergency message.

America's Air Force Systems Command Research and Technology Division has awarded a contract to the aerospace division of the Westinghouse Defence and Space Centre to design and build the equipment for study.

The transceivers would be completely self-contained and would allow astronauts to move about freely in the spacecraft without any connecting wires. The system would also contain an audio control centre which would relay messages from astronauts outside the spacecraft. The design of the exceptionally light transceivers incorporates all the present trends in micro-miniaturisation.

Voice and Vision Ltd.

prising agility when the beings returned to their machine? Usually small men are more agile than bigger ones, or at least that is the impression their movements tend to create: was there anything peculiar in the way the beings moved?

[Mr. Schönherr's dismay at some apparently glaring omissions is understandable, and even if it should serve no other purpose, the foregoing questionnaire is of the utmost importance as a model of what is required at an investigation.

I do feel, however, that our contributor should bear in mind the inescapable fact that UFO investigators and groups are amateurs, that their time and funds are usually very limited, and invariably the first they hear of a new case is the report given out on radio, or on television, or in newspapers. Then, especially if it is a

startling case like Valensole, the hordes descend and the damage is done before the would-be investigator obtains leave of absence from his employment. This is why investigators have to rely mainly on interrogations long after the event, and it is little wonder that small contradictions creep in. (Aimé Michel pointed out small discrepancies at the beginning of his article The Valensole Affair.)

Concerning question No. 10, it should be noted that a drawing was obtained. The object shown in miniature on the sketch on p. 7 of the November/December 1965 issue of the REVIEW is an exact replica of the object drawn by M. Masse, and published in the GEPA bulletin.

As for the apparent contradiction in question No. 11, could not M. Michel's questioning have been more persuasive—and successful—because he himself is a native of the region and speaks the same 'fine old Provençal' tongue as does M. Masse?—EDITOR.]

Canadian Fireballs

By Richard Hunt

Our contributor was born in Thorpe Bay, Essex, studied at the Royal Academy of Music, and emigrated to Canada in 1956. He now teaches music in Montreal

ON April 1st, 1965, the *Montreal Gazette* carried an item on a "silver ball" seen over British Columbia and other areas. Later, the *Montreal Star* said this "fireball" had been identified as "one of the heaviest meteorite showers in Canada since 1913". Then (still April 1st), the *T.V. News* stated that a satellite was about to fall back in the area about this time. Smelling a rat, I sent for local newspapers and acquired a selection of clippings which cover the whole incident up to the time of the aerial survey, I have summarised the incident for the record.

From *Kamloops Daily Sentinel*, of April 1, 1965, we learn that R.C.M.P. and civilian researchers, led on by the smell of sulphur fumes, were attempting today to locate the remains of brilliant balls of fire that lit the skies and landscape across British Columbia and parts of the U.S. Wednesday night (March 31).

The flashing, streaking objects were reported from Kamloops in the south-central B.C. interior, across the Okanagan and the Kootenays in the south-east of the province and as far north as Fort St. John, B.C., and as far south as points in Washington and Idaho states.

In some cases, observers reported the brilliant objects were accompanied by rumbles which shook houses, rattled windows and made lighting fixtures swing. A weather observer at Revelstoke said a "meteorite" which passed over that central B.C. community was accompanied by "ten minutes of thunder which shook the buildings."

Most observers reported the phenomena as of brilliant intensity and changing colours—ranging through red, orange, yellow, white and brilliant blue, and of duration lasting from 3 to 25 seconds.

The pilot of a commercial airliner over Euphrata, Washington, reported the object made the cockpit of his DC-3 as "bright as day" as it swept north-northwest.

Elmder Devore, news director of radio station CJDC, at Dawson Creek, said he saw it begin as a small, falling star.

Its colour was yellow.

"But it gradually increased in intensity and lit up the city," he said. "Then it changed to white and remained white until it struck the ground, then turned blue and disappeared."

A police matron at Lewiston, Idaho, reported seeing the bright flash of the object as it moved across the sky at about 9.50 p.m. Witnesses in the Edmonton area reported similar sightings at 10.45 p.m. A brush fire was reported at Anglemont.

The major impact of the shower was said to be concentrated

