

LUIS SCHÖNHERR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

As we have now received replies to our contributor's questions, we reprint the article which first appeared in the March/April issue of the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW.

BECAUSE of the implications of the Valensole incident I suggested 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 same 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 approached 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 surprising 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?

PERSONAL COLUMN

(Rate : first three lines 5/-, extra lines—or part—5/- each)

UFO BOOKS FOR SALE OR PURCHASED. Lists 4d. Write : Miss S. Stebbing, 87 Selsea Avenue, Herne Bay, Kent.

UFO DETECTOR. Swiss precision made unit, very sensitive. Gives loud, and visual signals. Airmailed : US\$10.00 or equivalent. Assembly kit : US\$5.00. Blue print only : US\$2.00 (Details free), PERRIN, Box 16, 1216 COINTRIN, Geneva, Switzerland.

"SPACELINK", articles, news, comments. 9/8d. post free, quarterly. "UFOLOG", monthly sighting sheets, 12 issues 10/6d. post free. F. W. Smith, 4 Connaught Road, East Cowes, Isle of Wight.

URGENTLY REQUIRED : All issues of Flying Saucer Review, Vol. 1 to Vol. 11, clean. Send bids to B. KENT, 2130 Wenman Drive, Victoria, B.C., Canada.

Together we harmonise and become one. Who are we? We are UFOLOGISTS EXTRAORDINARY. Contact: "Lochryan-Bay", 119 George Street, Whithorn, Wigtownshire, Scotland.

WANTED : Copy of Vol. 11 No. 4 Flying Saucer Review in clean condition. Write W. A. Colelough, East Lorn, Aboyne, Aberdeen-shire.

A TENTATIVE REPLY TO LUIS SCHÖNHERR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

We are grateful to Monsieur G. C., the French Magistrate who investigated the Valensole case on behalf of the French Group G.E.P.A.,* for preparing this reply specially for FLYING SAUCER REVIEW.

(1) The dates of the various steps taken by me at Valensole are: Monday September 6, 1965, Thursday September 9, Friday September 10, Tuesday September 28. I examined the landing site on September 6, that is to say more than two months after the events. Several hundreds of visitors had already been there and their trampling around had almost completely effaced all the traces.

(2) Herewith the information that I have managed to secure from a person who is absolutely reliable and who had visited the scene of the landing on the following day, i.e. July 2, 1965:

"I was able to establish the existence, in a lavender field with light, freshly hoed soil, of some strange and more recent marks. These consisted of a shallow basin about 1 metre 20 in diameter, in the centre of which there was a cylindrical-shaped hole 18 cms. in diameter and 40 cms. deep. Also to be seen were four shallow grooves, each 8 cms. wide and approximately 2 metres long, which formed a sort of cross having the cylindrical hole as its centre. The earth at this spot was densely packed".

(3) I did not put this question to the witness. Moreover, it was not he who started filling in the hole. This was done by the trampling of the crowd. He no doubt wanted to finish filling it in so as to restore his field to its previous condition.

(4) It is difficult to reply with precision to this question. The witness simply declared that it seemed to him that "the machine was resting on six legs located underneath it, and on a steel-coloured pivot in the centre". When the machine took off, "it was this pivot stuck down into the ground that gave the initial thrust, making a dull noise, without raising any dust, and then the six legs began to rotate".

(5) I did not examine the central hole before it was filled in. (But see reply to this question under No. 2 above).

(6) From the width of the central hole, one can reckon it at about 18 cms.

(7) I did not carry out these investigations myself. I simply took some samples, which I sent to G.E.P.A.

(8) I did not carry out such investigations. The radioactivity of the soil was, however, studied by

specialists, but so far as I know, the results have not been given out.

(9) The machine emitted no sound while it was on the ground.

(10) A sketch of the machine had already been made by M. Masse and had been reproduced by various newspapers. In this connexion, see PHENOMENES SPATIAUX, September 1965, p. 7.

(11) My report to G.E.P.A. reproduces the statements made to me by M. Masse. It is however possible that the witness made more complete statements to M. Aimé Michel. But on this point, here is a summary of the statements made on August 18, 1965, by the witness, to certain Valensole people in whom I have absolute confidence. I learnt of these statements subsequently to G.E.P.A.'s publication of my own enquiry.

... "I got to a point 7 metres from this machine, by **skirting round** the vineyard that adjoins my field and then making for the machine, which I could see at an angle. From the moment that I started out from the heap of stones, **I knew that it wasn't with men that I had to deal** and I watched them the whole time as I was moving across. Both these beings were down on the ground. They were squatting down. One had his back to me and the other one was opposite him, and it seemed to me that they were looking at a lavender plant. When I had got to a distance of 7 metres from them, the only facing in my direction caught sight of me..." etc.

We thus have three statements by the witness, which all agree in the essentials but diverge on a few points of secondary interest.

As regards the route taken by M. Masse from the moment that he left the heap of stones and earth (see FSR November/December 1965, p. 7) it seems to me improbable that he would have gone through the vineyard. More probably he skirted right round the vineyard without leaving his own lavender field. On this point, I enclose a plan of the area, with exact measurements.

As regards the preoccupations that were engaging the mind of the witness while he was moving across the space in question, I suppose that they must have been various and that they must have been changing rapidly as he got nearer.

At first—despite the strange character of the scene that met his eyes—he may perhaps have been saying to himself: “Haha! So *that’s* how my lavender plants are disappearing!” But I imagine that his attention must have soon been directed on to those two extraordinary beings whom he could see more and more clearly.

But why did the witness give differing accounts?

I should say, rather, not different accounts, but different *replies*, according to the manner in which he was interrogated. I recall, so far as I myself am concerned, having asked him if he had not been afraid when perceiving the strange craft at a distance, for it occurs quite commonly in fact that witnesses do not dare to approach flying saucers on the ground. To this he replied that he had not been afraid and that he “had advanced at an unruffled pace, empty-handed, across the young lavender plants with which his field is covered”. (“Empty-handed”, i.e. without any tool of any sort, such as a shovel or pickaxe, which he could have used as a weapon should the need have arisen.)

(12) I declare likewise, on this point, that my report to G.E.P.A. agrees with the statements made to me on September 6, 1965, by M. Masse. But in order to answer this question more fully, I quote for you, hereunder, the beginning of the statement made by the witness on August 18, 1965, to the Valensole people referred to me by above:-

“When you questioned me on July 2, 1965, I did not reveal to you all that I had seen, for it was so extraordinary that I feared I might be taken for a madman and locked up. Having regained my confidence later, I have now fully made up my mind to describe to you everything that I saw in the course of the morning of July 1, 1965. . . . Contrarily to what I had said, the distance from the machine to which I got by skirting the vineyard was 7 metres . . .” etc.

Having decided—at that time when he made his statement to the Press (and, in particular, to the *Petit Dauphinois*) at the beginning of July—to say as little as possible about it all, the witness, in my opinion, knowingly and as it were instinctively—in accordance with a process that is very familiar to us—had falsified the facts somewhat so as not to be drawn into saying more than he wanted to say. Thus it was that he had spoken of one occupant down on the ground and one other visible in the machine. From August 18 onwards he rectified his story and has never varied it any more since then: namely that he saw the two little beings on the ground and that they both climbed back into the machine after striking him with a temporary paralysis.

(13) I put the question to the witness and to his wife. They both replied that they had never taken any interest before in matters concerning flying saucers. Mme. Masse did however show me that she possessed some old copies of reviews relating to UFOs (*Ouranos* in particular), which had been given or sent to her by M. Aimé Michel—but, naturally, long after the events had occurred.

(14) In my opinion, and in the unanimous opinion of the various people to whom I listened at Valensole and at Digne, the chief town of the region, the odd behaviour of the witness is the **consequence** of the phenomenon, not the cause of it.

M. Masse was regarded, in particular, as a perfectly well-balanced man. It remains regrettable, however, that the witness had refused to submit to a psychiatric examination.

(15) (a) I got the witness to explain this point. He meant to say that the sounds emitted by the two beings did not appear to be articulated by this hole which they had in the place of a mouth, but that the sounds resembled a sort of gurgling coming from their throats.

(b) Of no interest.

(c) The witness noticed that the eyes moved.

(d) and (e) These questions were not put.

(f) On this point, here are the details that I was able to obtain: the two beings were clad in greyish-green overalls, apparently one-piece. On their left side they had a sort of smallish case, and on the right they had another case, this one being larger. The witness was able to perceive quite clearly that the entity who had immobilised him then put back, into the case carried on the left side, the object that he had aimed at M. Masse. These cases seemed to be fastened on by a belt. I did not put the question regarding any instruments that might have been concealed under the clothing.

(16) I questioned the witness on this point. here is his reply:

“The distance separating the little beings from the machine was very small. I was not able to establish the length of their stride, but their agility was remarkable”. I am unable to give any further details beyond that.

Translation: G. Creighton.

*The Secretary of G.E.P.A. is M. René Fouéré, 69 Rue de la Tombe Issoire, Paris 14e France. M. Fouéré also edits the G.E.P.A. bulletin *Phénomènes Spatiaux*.

VALENSOLE — FURTHER DETAILS

By Aimé Michel

YOUR contributor Luis Schönherr is quite right ; many questions about the Valensole case remain unanswered. I did not make a report, having studied this landing merely from the point of view that interested me. The only things of mine published in the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW were a few reflections.

Here are the answers to some of the questions that have held my attention :—

7) I have examined carefully some samples from the plants over which (so the witness says) the craft flew as it took off. The roots show nothing particular under the microscope. The plants themselves show—on each plant—one or two sprigs (sometimes more) that are desiccated, exactly similar, so far as one can see, to twigs that have been dried naturally by great heat or by the autumn. These twigs crumble to dust between the fingers. On August 8 such plants as these, with desiccated twigs, were found over a distance of about 100 metres *beneath* the trajectory of the alleged take-off. The non-desiccated twigs (of these plants that had the desiccated twigs) showed nothing particular. This phenomenon of desiccation could be seen over a width of 2 or 3 metres. A more precise estimate than this would signify nothing for it was in any case difficult to see : the gendarmes didn't notice it. You had to be used to lavender to distinguish it. I intend to make a fresh examination of the plants this spring, to see whether there is not some delayed effect.

8) Yes. No radioactivity. Don't forget that Valensole is very near the Cadarache atomic plant. It was easy to do the test, accurately. Negative

9) No.

10) M. Masse made a sketch which was widely publicised, and the small version in the diagram on page 7 of the November/December, 1965 issue of the *Review* is a fair replica.

11) Traduttore traditore. Masse told both of us (GEPA and myself) that he approached without any fear, calmly, without apprehension, but hiding among the vines in order to be able to take by surprise those whom he thought to be lavender pilferers. Where is the contradiction ?

12) There are certain contradictions between, on the one hand, what the newspapers said, and on the other, the statements of Masse to the Gendarmes, to GEPA, and to myself. I don't

know the source for the report in the *Dauphiné Libéré* (NOT *Le Petit Dauphinois*, which went out of existence 22 years ago). But the statements made by Masse to the Police and GEPA and myself are identical.

13) Yes! He had not. Masse does not read books and (this is confirmed by neighbours and acquaintances) had no interest or curiosity in that direction, or indeed in *any* direction, apart from lavender, hunting, and fishing.

14) I have stated clearly in my article that the physiological and psychological effects began three days after the sighting. Until then, Masse used to sleep for 4 or 5 hours in the 24. On the fourth day, he slept almost 24 hours, only being awakened by his family to eat something.

15) (a), (b), (c). I am an acoustic engineer. I think that at a distance of three metres an ear that has not been trained to it is incapable of establishing precisely from which point on an object 80 cms in height a sound can be coming. Masse noted that on the faces of these two beings, the spot corresponding to what in us is the mouth was marked simply by a very small round patch ; that the part corresponding with what in us is the lower jaw was very sharp, almost pointed ; and that, when they "spoke", the *whole* of that area remained absolutely motionless : the "hole" did not open, the "jaw" did not open. On the other hand, Masse did notice changes of expression on their faces, due to slight movements of the skin. He even avers that these expressions were very comprehensible, very eloquent. According to him, the two faces at times expressed mockery, but always benevolence.

(d) The word "gurgling" ['gargouillement' in French] implies an idea of *weakness*.

(e) When they turned their backs, they talked no more.

(f) Masse saw two instruments. The first one was the instrument pointed in his direction by the entity nearest to him, the instrument that paralysed him. Masse thinks the entity took it from its belt on the right side. But this opinion is based solely on the fact that the other entity was wearing on that side (the right) an instrument—the second instrument—which (apparently) it did not use. Masse thought it was a weapon. And as the second instrument was much bigger than the first one, Masse said to

me (I quote his exact words): "If they had used the big one, I wonder what would have happened. With that, they can stop an army". When I asked him why he thought it was a weapon, he was surprised, and agreed that, after all, he knew nothing about it.

16) Nothing special, except for "a remarkable agility", according to the purely subjective impression of the witness.

I understand very well indeed why Luis

Schönherr would like to put some questions. As for myself, I'm going to wait a few more months and then I shall go and spend a few days at Valensole with a friend who is a painter and sketcher, who will try to reproduce it all with the guidance of Masse. I think the study of landings should become our No. 1 Study. Every well observed landing teaches us something new.

(Translation : G.C.)

ARGENTINA 1963/64 — Part IV

by Gordon Creighton

IN the first three parts of this article I have surveyed the **major** UFO events in Argentina—and the occasional incident in a neighbouring country, as reported in Argentine newspapers—up to the early days of June 1964. Throughout the series I have had to ignore the more mundane 'fly-overs'; even so, demands on space have been so great that a fourth part is required to complete the amazing picture.

Metán-Tucumán road

The newspapers *La Crónica* and *La Gaceta* for June 14, 1964 describe how, at 9.30 p.m. a few nights before, three prominent Salta citizens—a lawyer, an engineer and a business-man—were travelling in a station-wagon along this road when a most peculiar rectangular UFO, reddish-orange in colour, dived down several times in front of them. The first time the UFO caused such tremendous condensation on all their windows that they saw very little of it, and had to stop and wipe the windows. But when the thing re-appeared they saw that it was some 16 feet high, 20 feet wide, and had what seemed to be "two big paddles" or "blades" that were revolving clockwise around it as it sailed along silently above the road. They had already noticed that some distance ahead of them there was a stationery rectangular dark red light which looked like a lantern, and to their astonishment they now saw the larger machine pick up this "lantern" (apparently about 50 cm. square) and vanish at high speed.

Commenting again on the case next day, June 15, *La Gaceta* reviewed the tremendous number of UFO sightings recorded in that same district over the past two years. According to the columnist, it was now clear that the area north-west of Tucumán, and south-east of Salta, (included the vicinity of Choromoro, on Highway 9, where this

particular thing was seen) is for some reason a region of special importance for the UFOs. Have they bases there or in the nearby high-altitude desert, the Puna de Atacama? Or are they interested in some local mineral deposit, perhaps uranium? The paper goes on to mention that there are wild rumours that the "visitors" have built a fantastic subterranean city beneath the Puna de Atacama.

Metán (Province of Salta)

According to the newspaper *El Mundo* of June 25, 1964, a flotilla of five discs was seen flying over the Metán district.

South Atlantic coast of Argentina

Under the headline "Sea Mystery: Bengal light, meteorite, comet or flying saucer?", the newspaper *Democracia* of July 30 reported that at 11.24 p.m. on July 28, the Argentine authorities at Puerto Madryn (at the head of Golfo Nuevo) received a radio message from the Argentine tanker "Cazador" that they "had seen a flare on the sea just after 9.00 p.m. and, while making a search, had heard voices close by". Their position was 45°56' S, 64°00' W, roughly on a line with the port of Comodoro Rivadavia. A little later, a second message from the "Cazador" said that they and a second Argentine tanker, the "San Antonio", were searching over a five-mile radius.

Meanwhile, the newspaper goes on to say that on July 29 the Norwegian vessel "Sumber" had docked at Puerto Madryn and its captain had told the authorities there that at about 9.00 p.m. on July 28 they: "had seen a meteorite or small comet, flying horizontally to the earth and in a north-easterly direction. It had a luminosity which now and then became intense". The Norwegian captain added: "It might also have been a flying saucer!"