

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.)