

WE WERE IN EUROPE FOR ALMOST A MONTH. WE WROTE FROM SPAIN TO COMMUNICATE OUR VISIT AND CONFIRMED IT LATER FROM A TELEPHONE BOX IN DIGNE (ALPES DE HAUTE PROVENCE). THE NEXT DAY VERY EARLY IN THE MORNING AS WE HAD ARRANGED, HE WAS WAITING FOR US AT THE BUS STOP. BEING HIS GUESTS FOR A COUPLE OF DAYS, WE DISCOVERED THAT AIME MICHEL IS A WONDERFUL HUMAN BEING, A VERY CHEERFULL AND SOMETIMES FUNNY FELLOW WHO REMEMBERED EVERY SUBJECT IN OUR LONG TIME MAIL EXCHANGE. IS WAS AN EXTRAORDINARY EXPERIENCE, NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF THE ENRICHMENT WE EXPERIENCED AS UFOLOGISTS BUT ALSO CONFIRMING A GREAT FRIENDSHIP WITH A MARVELOUS PERSON. CHER AIME, MERCI DE VOTRE AMITTE.

Transcription of an interview made to Mr. Aimé Michel. Saint Vincent les Forts, 26 th. november of 1980.

Q.: We'd like to know your opinion about Ufo's after 34 years of research and investigations.

M.: My opinion about the subject is that I don't know more than I knew 34 years ago and that everything I know - from the point of view of the knowledge itself - are things I know but that I can't prove and that therefore cannot be considered scientific. One of them, for example, is the certitude I've got from the long frequentation of the phenomenon. These are opinions but not scientific truths. But, what is missing? What is missing to this knowledge? Develop a trustfull methodology since none exists to investigate this.

Q.: Then, if this methodology doesn't exist, we must try to find it?

M.: I could not assure you that trying to find it is the best way. Wise men never search for a methodology, they find it by investigating. A greek philosopher said that the only way to prove movement is by moving. In this case it's the same. We'll find a methodology not by looking for it, just simply investigating them. Instead I don't believe that when we find that certain methodology it will only be useful to investigate Ufo's, it will also be useful to study other very important phenomena surrounding us, those we live with. For example the ones being studied by parapsychology. It's the same lack of methodology that deprives us to develop in one field and the other.

What's the difference between art and science? Science becomes old-fashioned, it develops changing modern thinking by completely new conceptions. As an example nowadays there will be no more just one biologist that takes the time to read Pasteur's books. That's "old fashioned" and doesn't interest to anybody. But, every M.D. listens to Bach and contemplates with extasy one of Da Vinci's paintings. That's because they are eternal. Art is eternal but science "developes" and "passes", it grows old. Every time that something new is being found, scientists capitalize it quickly leaving aside what they have been using till then. Immediately scientists start to search for new knowledge to replace what they have just learned. In art this does not occur.

Q.: It may be a constant development?

M.: I would better say accumulative. The reason I think why we are not going to find anything presently on Ufo's or about parapsychology is that the knowledge about it is not accumulative. That's worse in the case of parapsychology because it's older. If you read books from the ending of the XVIII century or the beginnings of the XIX, from the time in which very much has been spoken about animal magnetism, you'll see that all experiences made by the french Puisegur cover all made today in the field of parapsychology. We didn't go further, we just changed the approaching way. That is why it can't be considered a science. It will become a science when we find the way to make it develop. What did we discover till today in parapsychology? Just nothing. What did we learn about Ufo's in a 30 years long research? In my opinion: nothing. But, in spite of the fact that we didn't learn anything about them, I can assure you that they taught us a lot. Nowadays we don't think the same way. Thirty years ago, nobody thought about the possibility of the existence of a "non-human mentality", just religions had something to do with this idea, but from another point of view. With the exception of religions, some years ago none would have dared to think about a non-human intelligence, a feeling, a non-human spirit. To find a reflection about non-human thinking we have to look back to the conceptions about the angels of the middle age. From the middle age and before. I would almost say from the beginning of history because, for example, the most complete treaty written till today on Ufology is a book entitled "Teology elements" written by Proclus who was a greek philosopher. In the book you can find all theoretical reflections on a superior human thinking. I think that if we want to find out something new, we'll have to fix science. To go further in science one does not need to be a genius, a mathematician or have a superior intelligence; patience and the application of a method we learn at school are enough. One day we'll find the way to make Ufology develop without being genial and even not very intelligent. Today in Ufology we have to trust witnesses. We try to find out if they say the truth, but finally we're obliged to believe or not. That last day we are not going

to be obliged to think if the witness is reliable or not. We will not believe or not, because knowledge and facts will be most important. Then we'll begin to go further. As an example, today we're not obliged to believe in the good faith of a scientist. That would be completely illogical. On the opposite, I've been in permanent contact with them in all the years I've worked in a research center. We always can think that scientists are lying. Our first hypothesis has to be that they are wrong. But, even thinking that one of them is wrong, that he is lying or is a fool, one can make experiences and test personally if what they say is the truth. That is what we couldn't reach yet in Ufology, find something credible we can prove.

Q.: May be, because one can't make experiments in Ufology?

M.: Exactly. As an example we can quote astronomy. For too much time men thought it was impossible to make experiments. That has been the truth till the XVII century when Galilei appeared saying: "see my telescope, that's how it's being built and it's used for this or that experience". That has been very important because till then it seemed impossible to make experiments in astronomy because of the inaccessibility of the object being studied. This would prove the impossibility of doing experiences. But, one day we'll find that instead of the appearances it is possible. I don't know how it will be.

Q.: What does music represent in your life? (before the interview he enjoyed us with some fugues from Bach played by himself at the piano).

M.: It's a kind of rigor, an intuitive mathematics. I always feel it when somebody doesn't love music. And this is because "something" is missing in his memory, perhaps a method. Music is mathematical rigor and a little intuition. It also includes feelings, of course. If we take, for example, the most pathetic pieces like the ones I just played or Tchaikovsky's fifth symphony, I feel that it's destiny speaking, death, it's the most deep of the human being coming to surface. It is also the language of an absolute rigor and of an apparent mathematics. And, as you surely know, most of the mathematicians are musicians or have an excellent musical talent.

Q.: What do you think about people who investigate Ufo's, the "Ufologists"?

M.: They must have a very big imagination, because to find out and recognize that one failed by formulating phantastic hypothesis you must be able to imagine more phantastic things. I remember something said by a friend of mine, the physician Max Born: "what you say is false, we all know it's completely false, but what we would like to know is if it is sufficiently false". And, we have to have a lot of imagination to get to understand that our most beautiful dreams are false. Konrad Lorenz told me once that the best training for a researcher or for those people who make investigation is throwing out of the window every morning two or three of our most loved hypothesis. People who does not "practice" science believes that scientists and wise does not use their imagination sufficiently. In reality, they use it a lot, but every morning they throw out of the window two or three of the most beloved hypothesis. When one has no sufficient imagination, he keeps and believes these hypothesis. That's what happens in Ufology, each one has his own hypothesis and believes them. The fact of the existence of so many hypothesis proves that we didn't find the real one, the only one. As an advice for ufologists I may say that they have to be very patient because to find things as simple as the fundamental equation of dynamics we'll do not last much. But, we have to keep on working though the task takes 2000 years. In this moment everybody wants to demonstrate; ones that they are from earth, others that they come from other planets, from parallel worlds, etc.. I think that these are ways of thinking that show a big lack of rigor because, how can we oppose the extraterrestrial hypothesis to the terrestrial one? There are twenty ways to prove that they are the same and twenty more to prove they're different. We must think about all this exercising imagination, distrust and increase our critical spirit. If someone shows to you something never seen, something in what you did never believe, it's necessary for you to fight against your prejudices and feel interested. I did speak about Lorenz because I do like him very much. He said that the chimpanzee is not an animal. Then I asked that if in that case it's a human being and he answered not, that he's between man and animal. With this he demonstrates his openness. It's similar to man but it's not, he's intelligent, he's logical but has no logic... It's the same in Ufology. There are illogical things, still misterious that seem to be logical but one has to be disposed to accept them. When somebody tells us an incredible story, the most logical attitude is to think that as it is phantastic it should be false. The fact is that one must try to think that incredible things could be real.

Q.: We should not let us acomplex by the absurd (quoting Michel's words)

M.: If we would have shown this little recorder to Descartes or Galilei, they surely would have said that thinking about something like that is completely idiot and absurd. We simply cannot understand not understandable things and it's possible we'll not understand them never. We're surrounded by absurd and incomprehensible things, the world is full of them. So, we don't have to be afraid and study them from ahead.

Martha B. González
Adalberto C. Ujvári

