

Grover Was Not That Gullible

We see that on page 294 of Dr. Grover Krantz's book, *Bigfoot/Sasquatch Evidence*, is found this ridiculous photograph with the caption shown. We were all angry, disillusioned, astounded, and even disappointed that Grover would use such a photograph, especially with that caption. We can all see that it is about the poorest image of a fake sasquatch ever attempted. I recall sitting with John Green and he just hung his head and shook it in disbelief.

So why did Grover use the photo and caption? Well, let's say I put that photo in front of you and asked you to clearly prove to me (assume I'm a scientist) that what is seen is, or is not, a sasquatch. However, there are a couple of rules here:

1. As a scientist I do not accept as proof what people see.
2. As a scientist, I do not accept as proof what people say.

CASE IN POINT: Certainly, if scientists did accept as firm proof things seen and said, then the sasquatch would have been recognized as a species 100 years ago or longer.

So, how are you going to provide the proof? There is one way, and only one way you could do this. You would have to find whoever or whatever it is in the photo and also find a sasquatch. Then you would need to get DNA from both and see if there is a match. Now you would be 99.9999% (ad infinitum) correct on the finding – which I would accept as proof, one way or the other.

I know this all sounds a little far-fetched because common sense tells us that the image is just some guy in a very poor costume. But, I am sure, had you approached Grover while he were with us, and confronted him with the issue, what I am saying here is what he would have said. In other words, he provided the photograph and caption to prove a point (albeit not a good idea).

Remarkably, I might have been instrumental in Grover using this little ploy. Many years ago we got into a bit of a legal battle over footprint casts. He said, and rightly so, that one cannot copyright the footprints of an animal. I



Figure 2. What is it? This photograph was discovered, already old, somewhere in western Washington in 1971. There is no information on its origin, and no one has shown me clearly that it is, or is not, a sasquatch.

Dr. Grover Krantz, 1999. Bigfoot/Sasquatch Evidence. Hancock House Publishers, p. 294.

agreed and said that we would go to court and he can prove that an animal made the prints.

In this same context we have the Patterson/Gimlin film, which comprises some 953 film frames or "photographs." Although the images of the subject are convincing, there is absolutely no way a photograph of any sort can prove beyond a doubt that anything seen actually exists unless such were physically obtained and compared with the photograph. If this involved a sasquatch, why bother?