



Seen here is the sasquatch mask carved by Chehalis Native Ambrose Point (1930s) and Ambrose wearing the mask. We have questioned the inspiration for the design of the mask. The Chehalis people say it was likely based on a sighting. There is a “Mr. Point” mentioned in the McLean’s magazine article by John W. Burns (See BP#31, p.4—applicable material is on the right). This man, however, is William Point. Nevertheless, I think we can say he was related to Ambrose Point, and likely provided the inspiration for the mask (possibly Ambrose’s father).

Ambrose created the mask in the 1930s and gave it to John W. Burns, who donated it to the Museum of Vancouver.

The museum curator of anthropology and I found the mask in storage and I used it in my exhibit (2004/5). It was later repatriated to the Chehalis people. Given what I say is correct, then the mask was based on a recorded sighting.

AT AGASSIZ, near the close of September, 1927, Indian hop-pickers were having their annual picnic. A few of the younger people volunteered to pick a mess of berries on a wooded hillside, a short way from the picnic grounds. They had only started to pick, when out of the bush stepped a naked hairy giant. He was first noticed by a girl of the party, who was so badly frightened that she fell unconscious to the ground. The girl's sudden collapse was seen by an Indian named Point, of Vancouver, and as he ran to her assistance, was astonished to see a giant a few feet away, who continued to walk with an easy gait across the wooded slope in the direction of the Canadian Pacific railway tracks.

Since the foregoing paragraph was written, Mr. Point, replying to an enquiry, has kindly forwarded the following letter to the writer, in which he tells of his experience with the hairy giant:

“Dear Sir: I have your letter asking if it true or not that I saw a hairy giant—man—at Agassiz last September, while picking hops there. It is true and the facts are as follows: This happened at the close of September (1927) when we were having a feast. Adaline August and myself walked to her father's orchard, which is about four miles from the hop fields. We were walking on the railroad track and within a short distance of the orchard, when the girl noticed something walking along the track coming toward us. I looked up but paid no attention to it, as I thought it was some person on his way to Agassiz. But as he came closer we noticed that his appearance was very odd, and on coming still closer we stood still and were astonished—seeing that the creature was naked and covered with hair like an animal. We were almost paralyzed from fear. I picked up two stones with which I intended to hit him if he attempted to molest us, but within fifty feet or so he stood up and looked at us.

“He was twice as big as the average man, with hands so long that they almost touched the ground. It seemed to me that his eyes were very large and the lower part of his nose was wide and spread over the greater part of his face, which gave the creature such a frightful appearance that I ran away as fast as I could. After a minute or two I looked back and saw that he resumed his journey. The girl had fled before I left, and she ran so fast that I did not overtake her until I was close to Agassiz, where we told the story of our adventure to the Indians who were still enjoying themselves. Old Indians who were present said: the wild man was no doubt a “Sasquatch,” a tribe of hairy people whom they claim have always lived in the mountains—in tunnels and caves.”



RUSSIAN SNOWMAN

In this article Igor Burtsev explains the terminology and different names associated with what is commonly called the Russian snowman.

For about the last 70 years the term “Russian snowman” has been generally used for hominoids (humanlike beings) living in our country. It originated from “abominable snowman” (ABSM), offered by English speaking members of the first Himalayan expeditions of the 1950s–60s, or even earlier. In those times the term “yeti” was also used; but only for Himalayan hominoids.

During the North Caucasus expeditions of Marie-Jeanne Koffmann (1970s) the teams gathered a lot of eyewitness reports about what was called the “almasty” or “almasti”; so local people in that region called the Russian snowman by that name (“almastys,” or “almastis” in plural form). Furthermore, there were a lot of other Russian names in local languages all over our country—perhaps some 100-200 names in all. When translated they mostly mean “forest people” or “wild people.”

Some American authors and media people use the term “alma.” I would like to caution everyone not to use this term. In Russian there is no such name! The term was coined by American media people who mistakenly mixed the North-Caucasian name of “almasty” (or “almasti”) with the Mongolian term “almas” and decided that “almas” is the plural of “alma.”

Another misunderstanding was initiated by the late Michail Trachtengerts, who created his website on the subject under the title Alamas.ru. There is no such name for the beings in Russia or in Mongolia! This name was made up by the science fiction author Yefremov who titled his science fiction novel *In the Alamas Canyon.* Having used such a name Trachtengerts unfortunately misled a lot of his readers as to the proper name of the hominoids in Russia. It's a pity that his website continues with this error under another owner.

Professor Boris Porshnev started to call them "relict hominoids" using the Latin words in Russian (spelling as well). Since that time (1960s) we Russian researchers use that more technical term—and the new science of Hominology was born.

Porshnev found also that Carl Linnaeus gave these beings the name *Homo troglodytes*, which means "cave men." That is why we in Russia sometimes call them "troglodyte."

Some Russian researchers and authors (including Porshnev, Bayanov, Bykova and others) found that in Russian literature (going back centuries or even a millennia) the most popular name for the Russian snowman was "leshy" (or "leshey"), which means, "forest man," or even "forest deity" (divine status).

Only during recent decades did we began to use the term "leshy" for hominoids in Russia—(Dmitri Bayanov in his book, 1991, Maya Bykova in her book, 1991, plus some others, including me). Nikolay Akoev even titled his 2016 book about hominoids as "*Leshy.*"

For me personally, I consider highly intriguing a statement about leshy that was written in the 1800s by the famous Russian lexicographer Vladimir Dal (1801–1872): "Leshy bend and break the trees." As a result, in 2002 I began to study this phenomenon in the Vyatka region of Russia. Over time I became skilled in recognizing unusual forest "structures" made by leshys and other similar hominoids all over the world—thousands of such structures.

In the last decades the media started to call relict hominoids "yeti," probably because it is a more simple and shorter term—but this is not correct; it applies to just one type of hominoid.

Whatever the case, I think, the most fitting general scientific term for all such beings in the world is "hominoid," or the short form "homin." For a common name in Russia, then the term "Russian snowman" is best. This term can then be used in conjunction with other primary hominoid names (sasquatch/bigfoot, yeti, yowie, yeren and so forth).

—00—

I have provided here the primary world hominoids in the field of Hominology and the regions in which they exist. This material has been presented previously, but I wish to expand on it a little in light of what Igor Burtsev has written.

Now that Igor has fully explained the issue of names, we can see now why he and Dmitri Bayanov have been so insistent that only the term "Russian snowman" be used for Russian hominoids. Indeed, I have been guilty of using the word "almasty," stating that it has become the common word for such beings. This is absolutely not the case and it is important that we stay on track regardless of what journalists and others state.

As to the word "bigfoot," I really don't like it because it belittles the subject. The word "sasquatch" predates it by some 30 years, but was not widespread thus allowing another word to replace it.

I remember sitting with John Green in about 2002 and discussing my manuscript called *Meet Bigfoot.* John looked at the cover and said in effect, "Let's not call it that; use "sasquatch," which I did, calling the book *Meet the Sasquatch.* Nevertheless, with the sequel/update of the work I relented to *Know the Sasquatch/Bigfoot*, because more people were familiar with "bigfoot" than "sasquatch."

I think most professional people prefer the word "sasquatch," but I doubt it will ever completely replace "bigfoot." Anyway, that is my position for the record.

—00—



In the late 1990s, I made a cast of my own foot and compared it with sasquatch casts taken by Bob Titmus at Bluff Creek in 1958, as seen here. Casts are a bit different in size from the foot that made the footprint, so it's best to compare a cast with a cast for a proper comparison.

We can obviously see here that the sasquatch casts are much larger than my cast; but ROUGHLY how much larger are they? Given the spaces around the cast are about relative; I show a red and yellow box outline representing the size of each cast being measured.



If I enlarge my cast to the same length of the sasquatch cast as shown here with green and pink outlines, the surface of my cast is 85.4% of the sasquatch cast; but I am not average size and the sasquatch cast shown is larger than average.

Using this same process MATHEMATICALLY for averages, the average human male foot size in the USA is 10.67 inches long and 4 inches wide (from the Internet). The average sasquatch foot is 15.6 inches long and 7.2 inches wide (H. Fahrenbach). Using these figures I arrive at 81.6% for the enlarged human foot. In other words, the enlarged foot would cover about 81.6% of the surface covered by the sasquatch foot. Note that without enlargement, the human foot coverage is 38%, so you can see the difference.

This being the case, how justified are we in calling the sasquatch “bigfoot?” For the average US male, totally justified; Nevertheless, I doubt any normal human foot would equal the sasquatch foot in width, so there will always be some justification.

As I recall, Dr. Grover Krantz makes the point that the name “bigfoot” is NOT justified because a human the same size as a sasquatch would also have big feet. Unfortunately, I must beg to differ a little—certainly “big feet,” but not as big as a sasquatch. Whatever the case I still don’t like the name.

In the following photo, we see Roger Patterson comparing his foot with a cast from the film site. Roger’s foot in the



photo is 8.59 inches long (as calculated using the 14.5 inch cast). This is hardly a valid comparison when the average human male foot is 10.67 inches long (over two inches longer). Here is the comparison if Roger had an average foot size.



Ivan Sanderson shows this image from the P/G film in his *Argosy* magazine article (1968). He states the following in reference to it:

...important factor discussed by scientists is what appears to be a crest on the back of Woodswoman’s head. If it is a crest, say some experts, Woodswoman might be a man. Also significant is presence of buttocks, which are clearly shown. Apes do not have buttocks. Humans do. Presence of this mass enable creature to maintain low center of gravity which permits it to walk in human upright stance, rather than stooping as apes do.

Years later, Dr. Krantz dismissed the “crest” issue; stating that a female could have a crest (sagittal crest). What I have not thought about before is the statement concerning “buttocks.” If sasquatch have large buttocks (very obvious in the P/G film) then this is possibly another factor pointing to the closeness of these homins to humans.



The top of Mount St. Helens, Wash- ington, is seen here before its volcanic eruption in 1980 and after. The magnificent mountain predominated over the landscape for untold years. Scientists knew it was an active volcano, but its massive eruption surprised the world. The second photo seen was provided by Russ Kinne, an aerial photographer with the Smithsonian Institution. He kindly gave me this image and others to use in my book *Know the Sasquatch*. The mountain and its region has measured significantly in sasquatch lore.

In the year 1847 Paul Kane, states in his book, *Wanderings of an Artist Among the Indians of North America (1859)* that natives said the mountain was inhabited by “a race of beings of a different species called Skoocooms.” Kane was unable to get any Natives to guide him in exploring the mountain, so we know nothing further.

In the 1850s, Rocquae Ducheny, who frequented the mountain, told his daughter, Agnes Eliot, that huge apes inhabited the Mount St. Helens region.

During the 1860s, the three Burgoine brothers who established a copper mine near Grizzly Lake mysteriously disappeared. I’m not so sure sasquatch were involved; but it has been inferred.

The next incident I have was in 1924 when Fred Beck and four other prospectors claimed they were attacked while in their cabin by a band of “Mountain Devils,” or giant hairy apes. This incident has become one of the “sasquatch classics.”

In 1930 a forest ranger took a photograph of a 16-inch footprint found near Spirit Lake. Years later (1944) another forest ranger said that he had sometimes faked prints in the area with a wooden foot—going back 20 years. Whether the photo was of a faked print we don’t know. Although John Green said he was not impressed with the photo.

In 1955 a group of about 10 YMCA hikers reported seeing what appears to have been a sasquatch which had “longish dirty white hair.”

In 1963 Three people driving at night along a remote mountain road in this area stated they saw a 10-foot tall, white, hairy figure moving rapidly along the roadside. It is odd that color was white as with the previous incident.

In 1971 Elmer Wollenburg reported an unusual experience while parked at the Yale Reservoir and looking at the scenery. He heard a sound of tremendous power coming from across the Yale Reservoir lake. The sound lasted for about eight to ten seconds. He then observed a figure moving up from the beach, across the logging road that borders the east side of the lake. It disappeared on the other side of the road when it went onto lower ground.

In 1980 two men, while trying to get off the mountain after the volcanic eruption, stated that they saw a bigfoot walk out of the forest onto a road. It looked at them, and returned to forest.

In 2000, researchers found unusual prints in soft ground in which fruit had been placed in hopes of getting sasquatch footprints. A large plaster cast was taken, which became known as the Skoookum Cast. The cast appears to show that a large primate of some sort reclined on the ground leaving body prints.

I am sure there are other accounts since I ceased keeping track in 2005. I went to Mount St. Helens the next year. On the road into the mountain there is a gift shop with a large sasquatch sculpture. I bought a little bigfoot figurine, which I recall was made from Mount St. Helens volcanic ash (but could be wrong—unable to find it for the moment). Images of both are seen here.

Tons of ash covered the entire area; it



is very clean and fine and could easily be used for modeling with an additive or mixed with clay. The shop sold bags of it; and likely still does.

The devastation caused by the volcano is astounding, but the land recovered very quickly with new growth.

Of course, on my mind is the possibility that some sasquatch could have been caught up in the eruption and became buried under the debris and ash or on/near the surface. Nevertheless, I doubt much would be left of any remains at this time; and if anything the chances of finding such would be very slim—unless by chance. I would say, however, that such a find in this region is more plausible than anywhere else I can think of.

