

Little Has Changed Except Us

John Green is seen here in 1973 (top image). Just five years earlier (1968) he wrote the article shown below which was featured that year in the *Province*, Vancouver, BC. I believe it to be a remarkable piece of work. He touches upon every important aspect of the sasquatch issue. The second image shows John in 2010. He passed away in 2016. The article is well worth a slow and deliberate read by all—sasquatch veterans or otherwise.

The main problem with the article, which you might immediately notice, is that John could have written it yesterday—very little has changed in the intervening 48 years. Certainly, the heap of sightings, footprint photos, casts, and of course sasquatch books, is much higher; however, “more of the same” will never bridge the gap to proper scientific involvement.

Really, it’s difficult to justify that in, say 100 years, some part of a sasquatch (other than possible hair) has not found its way to a proper research organization. Nevertheless, that appears to be what we must believe, unless a piece of the puzzle is missing. It would not surprise me, however, if the sasquatch issue were eventually resolved with something “old,” rather than something “new.” John closes his article with the following:

Surely the time has been reached where the people who control the purse strings and thus direct the course of scientific inquiry should stop acting on belief alone and take steps to have a thorough examination made of the available evidence to determine whether there are Sasquatches or not.

I knew John quite well for about 20 years. He never deviated from belief that the sasquatch was some kind of ape and that someone would “bring one in some day.” He was quick to recognize the Georgia Bigfoot fiasco as a hoax and told me that if a real sasquatch is obtained (dead or alive) we will hear about it up front—with no theatrics sort of thing.

I suggested that a professional expedition was needed into the northern interior of British Columbia. As I recall, he offered that the region is simply too big and rugged; and the chances of finding the creature were slim. He certainly had some experience here by being a part of the Pacific Northwest Expedition, 1959 to 1962.

In BC we need an immediate response process to check out sightings. Most people now have cell phones, so much time would be saved over regular phones. Unfortunately, considerable resources would be required to organize and operate it.



THE CASE FOR THE

SASQUATCH

By John Green

(Editor of the Agassiz Advance)



Giants aren't real — they are only in fairy tales.

Maybe it's because our mothers told us that when we were very young that we are so little touched by the abundant evidence that, in this case, mother was talking through her hat.

Certainly there is some psychological block that prevents society in general and the scientific community in particular from taking a serious look at the matter of the Sasquatch giants.

It isn't because the matter hasn't been brought to the scientists' attention, and it isn't because they find that the evidence doesn't stand up. They have been pestered about the Sasquatch for many years but they have never considered it worthwhile to examine the evidence, or even to find out what there is to examine.

Yet, when a group of scientists gathered at the University of B.C. recently to see what a Yakima Sasquatch hunter, Roger Patterson, said was a movie of one of the creatures taken in California, not one of them denounced it as a hoax.

Are there really such things as Sasquatches? Did Patterson really get a movie of one?

To both questions, the facts answer "yes". Only the emotions say "no".

But the proof that Sasquatches are real is not dependent on the movie. It has been there all along.

Indians throughout the mountainous areas of western North America were all familiar with the hairy giants. Each language group had a name for them. And, while some credited them with supernatural powers, they were always considered real creatures, not legendary ones.

In the mountains near Vancouver, according to the Indians, they used to be quite common. The white man's coming appears to have changed that. Perhaps they are susceptible to human diseases and suffered a population decline, or perhaps they just moved back out of contact because they found the new race of humans more frightening than the old.

Students of the subject do not know of many reports of encounters between white men and Sasquatches during the latter half of the last century, but there are a few. One was recorded by no less than Theodore Roosevelt, who heard it first-hand from a man he knew and trusted. Another, published in the Victoria Colonist in 1884, tells matter-of-factly of the capture of a half-man, half-ape near Yale — an incident that the oldest resident of Yale still remembers.



**Big, hairy giants wandering the hills?
Better believe it, says Agassiz editor**

In more recent times, the number of reports has grown. I know personally of more than 100 people now living who tell of seeing hairy humanoid creatures in the hills. Some had only a brief glimpse, but the majority had ample opportunity for a good look.

It may be argued that these stories are not evidence, only testimony — but there is the matter of the footprints. These have been reported for many years and are often seen today.

Their existence cannot be denied or explained away. They are too big and too deep in the ground to be made by humans, but too human-like to be made by any known animal.

Scientists' doubts on that score were, or should have been, laid to rest last fall when provincial anthropologist Don Abbott studied, photographed and took casts of 15-inch tracks in the same part of California where Patterson made his movie.

Finally, there are the pictures. Patterson's is not the first photo taken of a Sasquatch. It was preceded by at least one color slide from California and a series of black and white snapshots from Oregon, but it is the first movie and the first picture in sharp enough focus to be studied.

The Sasquatch itself, as described and photographed, isn't anything particularly unbelievable. It is just a big ape that made the same adaptation as man did for walking erect. The lower jaw of something similar, Gigantopithecus, has been found in China.

The land bridge to Alaska would have been open to this creature at the same time that man and a good many animals made the crossing. It didn't have to evolve in the Americas.

Presumably man has proved too tough a competitor for the big fellow, leaving him only the forested hillsides to call his own, but there are hundreds of thousands of square miles of those in western North America.

But, if there are Sasquatches, and people see them quite often, why don't they tell about it?

They are laughed at if they try, that's why. The key to the mystery of the Sasquatch is as simple as that.

I do not contend that there are no valid objections to the idea of something unknown in the animal world hereabouts.

As far as I know, no giant bones have ever been studied, and that is hard to understand. There are several reports of the finding of giant human skeletons, and I would not be surprised to learn someday that a museum or two had such objects forgotten in storage somewhere all along. As a matter of fact, there are reports that could be checked right now that might lead to such bones, if there were resources available to go and look.



Still, no such bones are known and I have no explanation for this, unless there is some basis in fact for Indian stories that the Sasquatch disposed of his dead — a practice far more human-like than I would expect him to be capable of.

Another valid objection is that a large animal would have to leave indications where it had been feeding and its droppings should be found. There are creatures that conceal their droppings, and some accounts suggest that the Sasquatch does this, but I think it far more likely that such signs are being seen all the time but are identified with some known animal — probably bears.

Further, there is no report of anyone finding a place where such creatures are in continuous occupancy. However, primates generally have no fixed abode.

I realize that these suggested explanations cannot satisfy a man who has spent a great deal of time in the woods and has never seen any indication that the Sasquatch exists. As a matter of fact, they don't even satisfy me.

But the difficulties of trying to explain away the things that do point to the existence of the

Sasquatch are infinitely greater.

Consider the sighting reports — the veteran outdoorsman who has never seen a Sasquatch has got to face the fact that his experience is not universal. There are plenty of competent outdoorsmen who have seen them.

A man who makes his living hunting grizzly bears, for instance, is not going to see a bear and think it is a Sasquatch, or vice-versa. Clayton Mack of Bella Coola, one of the top grizzly guides in the world, has reported seeing one of the giants.



One of the first white men to report seeing a Sasquatch in B.C. was timber cruiser Mike King. Another man who has seen one is head of the audio-visual department at the University of Oregon. The two men who recently reported to the provincial museum that they watched a Sasquatch for many minutes near Pitt Lake two years ago are experienced prospectors.

Sightings of Sasquatches are by no means rare. Quite the opposite. The number of people who have seen them is literally endless. Anyone can find them by inquiring among his own friends, provided he can convince them that his inquiries are serious.

Zoologists have a tendency to argue that no "trained observer" has ever seen one. If they mean no one with a PhD in zoology, they may be right.

A scientist who tried to tell of such an experience would have a lot more to lose than a layman would.

In any event, this "trained observer" business is a foolish sort of snobbishness. A Sasquatch walks and runs erect on long, straight legs. No other animal does so. A bear will stand erect to look around but will walk on all fours, and his hind legs are anything but long and straight. A Sasquatch has a flat face, a bear has a long, pointed snout. A Sasquatch has hands and lacks claws.

Even the tracks aren't really all similar. A bear has his longest toe in the centre of his foot. A Sasquatch has his big toe on the inside, like a human, and it is far bigger than the others.

A person who has had a good clear look doesn't need any training to be able to make these basic distinctions. Someone who gets only a glimpse might well make a mistake, but in most cases would mistake something unheard-of for something more believable, not the other way around.

People do tell lies, I know. I am prepared to accept also that they can have hallucinations, but I don't believe that detailed visions appear in good lighting conditions to deceive the eyes of people who experience no other symptoms of nervous or mental disorder, are neither starving nor exhausted, have not been drinking or taking drugs, are wide awake and actively watching what is going on — and have no other such experience before or after.

Nor do I believe that hallucinations affect several people simultaneously when no form of crowd hysteria is involved, or that they can be photographed, or that they make footprints.

In short, the only way most of the stories of Sasquatch sightings that I have heard firsthand can be dismissed is to believe that all the people who tell them are liars, and in many cases liars who have done a lot of research.

In some cases, that could be exactly what is going on, but I cannot accept that it is so in every case. Yet, if the Sasquatch does not exist, every last one of those people must be lying.

Explaining away footprints presents an even more difficult problem, since they last a long time and the skeptic who wishes to deny them can only do so by refusing to go and look at them.

The easy explanation is that bears make them, but no one ever tried that explanation after seeing either a footprint or a cast. The only other possibility, discounting the Sasquatch, is that humans deliberately manufacture them. That theory leaves three questions: who? why? and how?

Disregard the first two if you wish, since humans do some strange things for no apparent reasons, but the third is a real sticker.



Bruce Berryman, Bob Titmus and Sylvester McCoy hold casts made in California.

The prints can't be made by someone wearing false feet, because every set shows variations from print to print that can only be explained by natural foot movement, particularly of the toes, and because the prints sink far deeper than could be achieved by any weight a man could carry.



The prints can hardly be sculptured, either, unless someone has found a way to hammer in pressure cracks and ridges and can do this work in the dark at a rate of better than a track a minute. There can't be more than one sculptor either, because whatever makes the tracks has to stand in them. The surface is often otherwise unmarked.

What the hoax theory really comes down to is some sort of track-making machine or machines that can vary individual prints like a living foot, can climb steep banks by digging in the toes, can jump up on, or over things, and crawl under them and can go through

thick brush without breaking it down.

The machine must have been in operation for several decades on both sides of the border. It has been taken miles from the nearest road in places where there is no reason to believe anyone would ever see the results. All this time, and that means for a century or more, and over an area 2,000 miles long and almost half that wide, someone has paid the bill and operated the machine — and has never been caught at it.

All the requirements I have stated except the time element are established by things I have seen for myself. Anyone who can bring himself to believe in such an operation has precious little excuse to balk over something comparatively simple like the existence of an unknown animal.

The real objections to taking the Sasquatch seriously all centre around the unlikelihood of any large creature being able to leave so little evidence of its existence.

Right in California, a much more difficult concealment did take place and has been fully authenticated.

In 1872, the last dozen or so of the Yahi Indians gave up fighting the white man and disappeared from sight in a very small valley on the slopes of Mount Lassen. They lived there undetected for 12 years,

until the continuous loss of territory to the ranchers made it necessary for them to raid cabins for food. Even then, in a decade of raiding, they were seen only once.

In 1894, the last five survivors made their home on two pieces of land no more than half-a-mile wide and three miles long. Their presence was entirely unknown for 15 years, until some surveyors blundered into their camp.

When the last survivor, known to the white world as Ishi, walked into captivity in 1911 he had lived for 39 years in concealment on the fringe of civilization. Yet he and his people had permanent camps and made daily use of fires, even cremating their dead.

By contrast, the Sasquatch requires no homes and no fires, and has an unlimited area to range in, yet frequently is reported seen.

The people who investigate Sasquatch reports are not noticeably lacking in skepticism. The attribute they have in common is a willingness to spend time, money and effort to get to the bottom of something that intrigues them. When they learn of reports of giant footprints, they go see for themselves. When they hear that someone aims to have seen a Sasquatch, they go to get the story first hand, and do what they can to check on it.

Further, they are all pig-headed enough to base their opinions on the evidence they have seen and heard, even though their friends, the "experts," and the world in general ridicule them.

Opposite to them are those zoologists and anthropologists who were taught in university that no primate but man ever lived in North America and who decline to have anything to do with any evidence that might suggest otherwise.

To put the matter in perspective, let me say two things:

First, until two months ago, when Dr. Clifford Carl, director of the B.C. Museum, sent Don Abbott to look at the tracks I had called about from California, no representative of any scientific institution had been to see the tracks or had even talked to people claiming to have seen a hairy giant.



Second, no person ever devoted any amount of time to studying the tracks and interviewing witnesses without reaching the conclusion that Sasquatches do exist.

There may be a scientist somewhere who can dispute those statements, but I doubt it.

The difference in attitude can well be illustrated by what happened when Roger Patterson made his movie. The first people outside the immediate area to be notified were at the B.C. Museum, and they notified Humboldt State College, less than 100 miles from the scene.

**please
turn**



SIZE 14 shoe of Bruce Berryman beside 17-inch cast of Sasquatch track made in California.

But the only people who turned up to check the story on the spot were two "Sasquatch hunters," Jim McLarin, a Humboldt State student, and Rene Dahinden, from Vancouver, who was in San Francisco at the time.

As it happened, torrential rains closed the area within 24 hours and little checking could be done right away, but no one could have predicted that.

The day the processed film was first shown in Yakima — the first time Patterson himself saw it — who was on hand to see it too? McLarin, Dahinden and myself. Scientists in B.C. saw the film at all only because of our efforts to have it shown to them and because Patterson was not sure what to do with it first.

Only Dr. Ian McTaggart-Cowan took the trouble to see it on both occasions that it was shown at the university of B.C. and no scientist took much time to interview the men who had made it. Dahinden, McLarin and myself, on the other hand, studied the film and its owners at four showings and spent the best part of two days going over the story with Patterson and his partner, Bob Gimlin.

It startled us to hear several scientists declare that they did not question that Patterson and Gimlin were sincere, but that they had their doubts about the thing they had filmed being real.

The idea that anyone would parade around in an ape suit in front of two men hunting just such a thing and armed with heavy rifles is pretty hard to believe. That any man could have moved as freely as the creature on the film while carrying the weight to make the tracks which Patterson and Gimlin said they saw it make, is totally beyond belief. If the film is a hoax, Patterson and Gimlin have to be the hoaxers.

Dahinden and I have the advantage of having known Patterson before he got the film. Also we have the background of familiarity with dozens of detailed eye-witness descriptions to guide our assessment of whether the creature pictured is genuine. It isn't because we are more gullible that we are able to state flatly that the film is genuine while the scientists are still in doubt, it is because we have looked into the matter thoroughly enough to be sure of our ground.

Despite a general invitation, no scientists came to the film-showing from farther than Victoria, except for a man whose fare from Humboldt State was paid by a radio station. On the other hand, Bob Titmus, a Sasquatch hunter of nine years standing, came from Kitimat at his own expense and then went on down to California to see for himself down there. He found the tracks in good condition and reported that they conformed exactly to Patterson's account. Following them up a steep hillside he found a place where the creature apparently sat and watched Patterson studying its tracks.

The people who make fake films as a business could probably tell conclusively if any of their techniques have been used. Students of anatomy should be able to determine whether any human in a suit could duplicate the movements of the thing on the film — and I would suggest that they pay close attention to the swing of the arms and the width between the shoulder joints.

Further, there could be a police investigation of the men concerned, including lie detector tests and a thorough

check on their movements before the film was made.

Either there are Sasquatches or there are not — there is no middle ground. If there are no Sasquatches, there is no need to do anything about them — and that is precisely the position that has been taken up to the present.



If there are Sasquatches, however, they are extremely important. As man's nearest relative, at least physically, they will make it possible for him to learn a lot about himself and his origins.

They may also be much closer to man mentally than any known creature. Perhaps they are capable of speech. Even if they are nothing special, the mere fact that they have eluded man for so long would make them of particular interest.

In short, if there are Sasquatches, they are something that curious man in his quest for knowledge should be ready to spend time, trouble and money to catch.

The situation now is that the established position is crumbling in spite of all that the entrenched experts can do to keep it intact. Where once they could brush off any questions with easy explanations, now they are faced with things they cannot explain except by suggesting fantastic and pointless hoaxes.

Surely the time has been reached where the people who control the purse strings and thus direct the course of scientific inquiry should stop acting on belief alone and take steps to have a thorough examination made of the available evidence to determine whether there are Sasquatches or not.



courtesy
of THE PROVINCE