

On Killing A Sasquatch & Beyond

by John Morley, Biologist



I have stated numerous times that I entered this research to discover the scientific nature of sasquatches. It initially took only a few years, and I am confident with the results of my research. Yet, I see others who also claim scientific accreditation, and who still fail to recognize the morphological evidence of sasquatches which has always been available to them. Based on anatomical science, it is not required that a sasquatch be killed for researchers to understand how it should be classified or its subsequent taxonomic nomenclature be assigned. Morphology is defined as the form and structure of an organism or any of its parts.

The collection of a sasquatch in the name of science using weapons (including guns) is not as palatable as one may think. In fact it is very much like hunting, rather than the humane collection of a lab specimen. I've included below the quote directly from the North American Wood Ape Conservancy (NAWAC) website regarding their past effort to kill a sasquatch in Oklahoma:

The NAWAC investigator fired upon the animal with an auto-loading shotgun in an attempt to collect a specimen. The creature ran off and no blood was found before the loss of daylight. Additional teams returned to the area in the following days to continue the search for evidence. Stones with apparent blood stains were subsequently discovered a short distance east of the original sighting location in the dry creek bed that is adjacent to the

cabins. Several, but not all, of the rocks were collected. Another team was sent to collect the remaining rocks, but a hard rainfall took place on the day of their arrival, and the team was unable to locate any. Subsequently discovered a short distance east of the original sighting location in the dry creek bed more of the rocks.

The member who identified and followed the blood trail is a very experienced trapper, tracker, and lifelong hunter. He stated, "It was traveling down the rocky creek bed for a fair distance and dropped very little blood." In his opinion, the coloring, sparse distribution and drop pattern of the blood evidence was not indicative of a mortally, or even significantly, wounded animal. The observed blood pattern, he said, was almost certainly produced by a slow steady drip from a flesh wound, probably to either an arm or leg.

Question 1: Did the shooter aim for an arm or a leg to collect a specimen, or was this simply the best shot he could muster in the heat of the moment? So much for being scientific in the collection (killing) of a type specimen. Certainly we can all feel better after hearing that the "lifelong hunter" indicated that in his opinion the wound was not mortal. Since it was not killed, the lifelong hunter's opinion was that the flesh wound would heal and the sasquatch would live.

Question 2: How many more sasquatches will be wounded before this organization or some other person actually kills one? Some could be wounded only to die later. I have included below the position of the late Dr. Helmut Loofs-Wissowa as relates to the killing of unknown wildmen species. I quote from his "Seeing is Believing, Or Is It? How Scientific is 'Wildman' Research?"

Unlike cryptological research, that for Wildmen is really anthropological research (i.e., the search for unknown human beings) and must therefore be conducted according to the ethical principles and scientific

rules of anthropology rather than of zoology or paleontology. If there is now the tendency, among more enlightened primatologists and other scholars, to view the great apes as being entitled to the same protections as humans (right to life, protection of individual liberty and prohibition of torture), why should this not be so for still unknown hominoids and especially non-sapiens hominids? The latter are clearly man and should automatically enjoy the rights thereof, regardless of whether these rights will eventually also be accorded to the great apes. In practical terms this means that in no circumstances (except self-defense) is a researcher allowed to kill the object of his or her research in order to get possession of it as ironclad proof of its existence. Even the hunting, subduing, stunning or capturing of a Wildman cannot be permissible because it would deprive this creature of its liberty and would probably even involve some form of torture.

What if, for argument's sake, a hitherto unknown tribe was discovered tomorrow in a remote valley in Irian Jaya: could any western scholar, sitting in his armchair say "get me one of those blokes dead or alive or I am not convinced of their existence?" Certainly not. He would either have to go to the remote valley to see for himself or he would have to be content with the description provided by the anthropologist in the field without this being less scientific.

In keeping with Dr. Loofs-Wissowa's position, I refer to a filmed discussion made in the 1972 between John Green, René Dahinden, and Robert Morgan. This discussion was only five years after the 1967 Patterson and Gimlin film. We know that John Green was at the same site within eight months of the original filming. In this filmed discussion, Green and Morgan were in disagreement regarding the killing of animals, and in particular a sasquatch. Dahinden was strongly in favor of such a killing.

As this discussion continued, Green asked Morgan two questions. "Why take this species? (meaning why start with his species to stop the killing of animals as advocated by Morgan). Why start with this one? But before Morgan could respond Green stated:

"I'll tell you why. It's because it looks more like man than any other, and as far as I'm concerned that is a concern for human kind, not for any animal kind."

A few years later, Green changed his mind and considered the sasquatch an ape, thus the title of his 1978 book, *Sasquatch the Apes Among Us*, and he did support killing a sasquatch. He was likely influenced by Dr. Grover Krantz.

This is an absolutely revealing statement by John Green, which since 1972 has received virtually no publicity. We know that John had been at the same site of the 1967 Patterson and Gimlin filming. Yet this discussion was five years after the filming. John did not cite any scientific evidence to support his statement, thus it remains an open question as to why he made such a statement. Yet I find it exquisitely significant that John did not say, "It looks more like an ape than any other."

Later in the same filmed documentary, Robert Morgan asked Hattie Carter to relate her experience with a sasquatch mother. Hattie befriended a pregnant female sasquatch who repeatedly came to a creek to drink, and already had one child. Hattie was able to observe this mother give birth behind a stump, only 25 to 30 yards from her. She observed the mother cleaning the newborn, and holding it close to her chest.

Robert asked Hattie if she thought a sasquatch was an animal. Hattie replied: "No they're not, they're human."

Related to the above quote from Dr. Helmut Loofs-Wissowa, a great ape research ban, or severe restrictions on the use of great apes in research, is currently in place in the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Germany and Austria. These countries have ruled that chimpanzees, gorillas, and orangutans are cognitively so similar to humans that using them as test subjects is unethical. Austria is the only country in

the world where experiments on lesser apes (the gibbons) are also completely banned.

It seems appropriate to provide here the definition of the field of study known as biological anthropology. The following is from Wikipedia:

Biological anthropology and physical anthropology are synonymous terms to describe anthropological research focused on the study of human and nonhuman primates in their biological, evolutionary, and demographic dimensions. It examines the biological and social factors that have affected the evolution of humans and other primates, and that generate, maintain or change contemporary genetic and physiological variation.

Biological anthropology, also known as physical anthropology, is a scientific discipline concerned with the biological and behavioral aspects of human beings, their extinct hominin ancestors, and related nonhuman primates, particularly from an evolutionary perspective. It is a subfield of anthropology that provides a biological perspective to the systematic study of human beings.

We are fortunate that even in 1978 not everyone believed that a sasquatch was an ape. George Haas, a founder of the Bay Area Group, when asked what sasquatches are, replied: "Their footprints indicate they are not apes." Even George Haas recognized the anatomical differences between a sasquatch foot and that of an ape.

There exists an extensive, even exhausting data base of scientific studies related to human and nonhuman primates. Existing and new evidence of suspected sasquatch activity must be analyzed against such a data base. It is no longer OK to fantasize, paranormalize, dogmatize, speculate, or exercise selective bias in this research. All evidence must be analyzed and juxtaposed with existing science. Thus it is time for sasquatch research to go forward based on a foundation stemming from and supported by documented research studies of human and nonhuman primates.

What I am about to say is not meant to demean, insult, or be rude. That said,

other researchers who also claim scientific credentials must correctly analyze all evidence juxtaposed with the existing science of human and nonhuman primate knowledge. If we fail to do this, we will remain stuck in 1978 thinking.

Note 1: There are several hundred scientific studies that should be read by researchers desiring to understand human and nonhuman primate morphology; in particular the anatomy of the foot. In studying these, one is likely to find additional references.

John Morley
Biologist
Texas Hominid Research



Robert Morgan (left), René Dahinden (back), and John Green at Cougar, Washington, in 1974. At that time the three were our most high profile sasquatch researchers.

Note 2: For references and further information on this subject please email John Morley <joro1120@earthlink.net>.

—00—