

## On A Roll

The second roll of film Roger Patterson and Bob Gimlin used at the film site continues to elude us, but I believe we have probably obtained most of the images of any importance. You have to think about this a bit. A 100-foot roll of 16mm film would contain about 4,000 individual frames. Now, with the camera running at 16 frames per second, that is about 4 minutes of filming, which is not a lot of time. I have concluded the following:

The first part of the film probably shows the film subject's footprints taken at Roger's walking height. Bob Gimlin states there are frames showing the footprints along side horse hoof prints. The footage was taken after the men returned from



following the creature, so the hoof prints made when they set out would be evident. Also likely shown is Bob Gimlin jumping off a log to see how far his footprints would sink into the soil compared to the footprints left by the film subject. Bob recalls that Roger filmed this and pointed out the log he used on my film site model—identified in the adjacent image. We don't have any film frames from this part.

The second part probably shows Roger making a cast. One of the frames is shown here. There are numerous frames in this series; however, there is great controversy



as to the sequence. Based on the fact that Roger Patterson does not appear to have significant beard growth (looks clean-shaven), it is speculated the sequence was taken much earlier or later than October 20, 1967 and spliced into the second film roll. Many of these frames were used years ago in the infamous and ridiculous 1998/99 BBC TV production, *The Worlds Greatest Hoaxes*. I don't know where the producers got them if they were not on the second roll. Mrs. Patricia Patterson sent the BBC the second roll for this production, but she told me it was not

returned. She said she had the "loan" papers (saw them recently) and would try to find them (2003); unfortunately it appears she could not find them as she did not get back to me (despite a follow up). It is possible the roll was returned and was misplaced and forgotten.

The BBC was also sent the second roll much earlier for the 1975 Sir David Attenborough BBC documentary entitled *Fabulous Animals*. In this case, they definitely returned it. Unfortunately my enquires to the BBC have fallen on deaf ears.

The third part likely shows close-ups of the film subject's footprints. Roger Thomas (Great Britain) obtained 59 of these frames from some source—I believe they originated from the 1975 BBC production. I was provided these frames by way of Bobbie Short in 2003. Yvon Leclerc put the frames together for me to produce the composite photo shown here. It is evident the men set about to make a cast first and then filmed this part, as we can see that one of the prints has been filled with plaster.



Reconstruction of the tracks : Yvon Leclerc

The fourth part probably shows Roger holding casts. I firmly believe these shots were taken at the film site immediately after the casts had set. Nevertheless, there is also controversy whereby it is speculated that the shots were taken later, perhaps the next day in Yakima.



The second film roll itself was definitely shown at the University of British Columbia on October 26, 1967. I am sure the type of film is the same as that used to film the subject (first roll). If there is an issue with the film development time for the first roll, then the same would apply to the second roll. While I believe both rolls were

developed at the same time and place; if one believes otherwise, the second roll was developed within four (4) days (not counting the day the men traveled back to Yakima, and the day they traveled to the University). This is not enough time to get the film to and back from Palo Alto, California, said to be the closest facility that could develop the type of film used. Any alternate scenario whereby it is suggested that the films were taken much earlier than October 20, 1967 creates a whole series of other problems beyond the scope of this discussion.

In my direct experience, René Dahinden had about a ten-foot strip of film from the second roll that was given to him by Roger Patterson. René had several photographs taken from the frames (I went down and picked up the photos and strip for him while he was away—about 1997. The photos seen here are from this strip. They match the appropriate frames Roger Thomas obtained, except the plaster-filled print



appears to have a handwritten mark. I have no explanation for this. I had the strip in my possession for a week or so, and do recall looking at the first few frames with a magnifying glass. I recall seeing shots of a horse or horses—close-ups from the front. At the time, I was not totally aware of the significance of the strip; I was simply doing René a favor.

Ironically, although we had been looking for film images of the footprints in a series for many years, they had been provided to John Green in about 1968. They were discovered at the end of the roll he had of the first film (P/G film). In 2003, I visited John with the anthropology curator of the Museum of Vancouver. During this visit I asked John to show us the P/G film. He did so, and when the film ended did not turn off the projector because he was talking with us. The screen was blank for probably 10 seconds or so and then the footprints appeared. Roger Patterson had apparently spliced the footprint series to the first film roll. John did not know it was there. Several years



Bill Munns (left) and John Green at Harrison. John had many film rolls and all were explored; the footprints and other images were digitized.

later Bill Munns came to Harrison Hot Springs and took high-resolution images of each film frame.

Although there is an unused copy of the first film roll and a copy of the footprints in a series plus a few other images from the second film roll, it would be far better to have the original films. I doubt that we will ever find the original of the first film roll, and this is likely the case with the second. The 10-foot strip of the second roll is in the possession of René's oldest son. I have asked for it, but he chooses not to provide it; although I doubt that he could find it now (just a very small canister). Bill Munns, who is highly professional regarding actual movie films, believes that the original films would shed new light on some things.

If, as some researchers/scientists believe, the films are highly credible evidence of an unknown/unacknowledged hominid still surviving on our planet, then few people will argue that the original films are of paramount importance to science. There is little I can say here other than it's too bad we don't have the original films.