

Bits & Pieces – Issue No. 59

Christopher L. Murphy

Please recall the gamecam images taken in the Island Park area, Idaho (Sasquatch Canada website). The hunter who took those images sent me the following email and images shown.

I was muzzle loader hunting for elk on November 26, 2018 in the northern part of Island Park, Idaho, and was working up a ridge with thick pine; some being quite large. I came upon a bent tree and it still had green needles so I knew it was fairly recent. It was laying to the south east and our winds are predominant from the southwest; so I believe the wind was not a factor.

Also in the same area were several large trees with missing bark and lots of flowing pine gum; some had large chunks missing and others smaller. Some were high and some low. I didn't take pictures of all of them but only the ones around the downed tree. I would estimate about a 100 yard radius of many trees with torn off tree bark. I can't say I felt uneasy but didn't want to hang around there to long due to all this in a small area—knew something was out of place. Some of the bark was at least two inches thick and I tried to rip a piece off to no avail. Elk will not rub their antlers on such big trees—I have seen hundreds of rubs over the years.

Could it be a bear? I don't think so. I have spent hundreds of hours in the back country and this is the first encounter with so many healthy trees missing large chunks of bark.

Just another oddity or something not normal, but again unexplainable. What has happened since the picture [gamecam image] is I'm constantly looking out for unexplainable things.

END

If you look at a map, the Island Park area is essentially an extension of British Columbia (BC). Washington and Idaho are in the southern part of what I call the Sasquatch Homeland. Nothing divides the regions horizontally except an imaginary line (49th Parallel). The city of Island Park has a population of 286 souls.

Naturally, if one keeps traveling north, he or she will end up in south eastern BC; but don't get your hopes up too high—there's not much here either,



although some little towns. The climate is going to be exactly the same; hot bug-infested summers and very cold winters.



I really don't think anyone would see you (or a sasquatch) cross the border if not on a road. Some migrants try this and end up in a terrible state. Even escaped criminals eventually give up in Northwest forests.

Hunters do get "in there" because they are properly equipped and know what they are doing—really, they are about the only ones aside from a few Native people.

As to our hunter's question on the missing tree bark; I don't know the answer. If Dr. Bindernagel were still with us, I would ask him. We know the inner bark (cambium) of many trees is edible. *Outdoor Life* says the following:

Trees on the edible inner bark list include most of the Pines, Slippery Elm, Black Birch, Yellow Birch, Red Spruce, Black Spruce, Balsam Fir and Tamarack. In fact, most species of Pine in North America should be considered "edible plants." The inner bark and Pine nuts can be eaten as food.

I doubt that Native people still gather this food, so am at a loss on this one (sasquatch??).





Shown here is San Jose, California, in about 1959. As you can see, this was hardly the “dark ages.” Back then, newspapers were the main media. Many cities had both a morning and evening paper. Most people had the paper delivered to their door; but you could get one just about anywhere. White-collar workers brought them to the office and naturally what was in the news was discussed all day—you went through the paper page-by-page; not much was missed.

It was in 1958 that the article shown here appeared in the *San Jose News*. John Green showed the date as “about 1959,” but Roger Patterson used a *Humboldt Times* version for which the date is shown as November 18, 1958 (page 44 in his book). The article starts with, “Another ‘Bigfoot’ discovery broke in headlines in San Jose yesterday...” (i.e., November 17).

The first time I saw it was upon visiting John Green in about 2000. He simply handed me an enlarge photocopy and said, “You can have this.” I included a reference to it in *Meet The Sasquatch* (2004) on page 120.

There is no mention of the word “bigfoot” in the *San Jose* article (“abominable snowman” is used), which is a little odd because of Jerry Crew’s finding and subsequent news coverage in early October 1958. Anyway, Dr. Tripp probably found the footprint he reported much earlier than November 17. He mentions being involved in sasquatch research for 18 months. He needed time to do his study and I doubt he jumped on the phone and called the newspaper. It is more likely that word got out and the newspaper called him.

Jerry Crew’s cast was about 17.5 inches (page, 119, *Know the Sasquatch*)

Huge Caveman Loose? 17-Inch Footprint!

By JEANNETTE BEFAME
News Staff Writer

LOS GATOS — Well, it has all the elements of a good mystery story even if it should turn out to be a hoax.

Dr. R. Maurice Tripp, 15321 Quito Rd., a geologist and geophysicist, has the cast of a footprint 17 inches long he made in the Bluff Creek area east of Eureka. The footprint reportedly belongs to an “abominable snowman” who has been seen by the townspeople.

The Indians in Bluff Creek and the old timers in Eureka say the original legend goes back to about 1850.

But only 18 months ago it was revived and citizens of Bluff Creek, including a clergyman and a woman, said they saw the huge, husky illusive figure.

SKETCH MADE

Eyewitness accounts put together in a sketch by one of the men of Willow Creek show the figure to be an enormous cave-man like creature.

Dr. Tripp’s engineering studies of the soil properties and depth of the footprint of which he made a cast show the weight of the owner of the print to be more than 800 pounds.

“The print is distinctly different from that of a bear or any other animal known to be in the area,” Dr. Tripp said.

Although he does not discount possibility of a hoax, Dr. Tripp said he believes that the tracks left by the visitor lend certain credibility to the story.

“Several people have tried

to track him, and in one instance his footsteps could be followed a distance of 1½ miles through bush country.

“It would be difficult to fraudulently prepare hundreds of such tracks overnight—particularly in the type of country in which they were found.”

Other evidence of the “abominable snowman” of Bluff Creek is a strand of hair found on a tree at a distance seven feet three inches from the ground. The hair was found immediately

after reports that he was seen in the area.

TWIN INTERESTS

Dr. Tripp says his interest in the situation is both scientific and curious.

He became involved in the story several months ago through communications with townspeople who told him of seeing the figure in the area.

Dr. Tripp was able to get to the scene in time to get a cast of the footprint.

“Now, we just have to find the foot that fits it,” he said.



He Has Cast As Proof

Dr. R. Maurice Tripp measures a cast of what he says is the footprint of an “abominable snowman.” Dr. Tripp says the footprint is that of a man who weighs more than 800 pounds and has been reported seen by residents of an area near Eureka.

and Dr. Tripp’s cast was about 17 inches, so it is reasonable to say that the same “print-maker” might have made the prints in both cases (length varies in accordance with depth).

Dr. Tripp died in September 1999, and I really have to wonder if any professionals (anthropologists or others) contacted him out of either scientific interest or mere curiosity. My gut-feel says no, they didn’t. Despite the fact that

the population of San Jose in 1959 was about 204,000 souls, it is unlikely professionals there had the time to read the newspaper. I am not being facetious. Few professionals read books not published by a university, so I doubt newspapers would be high on their reading list. This is unfortunate; Dr. Tripp was a professional so deserved attention.



Some of you might remember Joe Btfsplk, a character in the Li'l Abner comic series back in the 1950s. For those who don't, Joe was the absolute extent of bad luck. Everywhere he went, a dark cloud followed him. He could not do anything right and you avoided him like a plague for fear his bad luck would rub off on you.

About "lucky" 13 years ago, I started to keep track of all the "unlucky" things that have happened in the world of cryptozoology. Just when a story got to the point of "WOW" there would be a sentence that started with "Unfortunately" and your hopes were dashed for any sort of firm/tangible proof as to the incident. I recently had occasion to add yet another story, so decided to let you see the list; which now has a few updates.

CRYPTO CATASTROPHES

(Effectively the originally published introduction)

Cryptozoology (in which term I am including hominology for this article) is plagued with probably more "unfortunate" occurrences than any other field of study. Just when it seems firm evidence is at hand for the existence of some creature, bad luck prevails and we

are left with only words, or at the best a dubious image. Even the seasoned sasquatch researcher Thomas Steenburg confronted me with this concern, and I had to admit that I had noticed the anomaly time and time again.

In some cases, the bad luck is the result of bad judgement or lack of concern by the people involved. In other words, if they had simply given the situation more thought, we would have solved many issues—20/20 hindsight, I agree; however, some of the cases are highly frustrating, if not maddening.

I present here a partial list of Crypto Catastrophes (just the ones I have uncovered in my research mainly associated with homins).

01. UNFORTUNATELY, the alleged ape-boy captured in Yale, British Columbia in 1884 was shipped to England, but never arrived.

02. UNFORTUNATELY, possible sasquatch bones (several incidents) were sent to museums, but never arrived, or have become lost in the museums.

03. UNFORTUNATELY, Francis De Loys had a boating accident and lost the skin, skull/jaw of the man-beast his group shot in Venezuela in 1920.

04. UNFORTUNATELY, the mummified remains of several giants found in Lovelock, Nevada, in 1911 were either discarded due to lack of interest, or destroyed in a fire. Only one skull survived.

05. UNFORTUNATELY, two yeti mummies in separate monasteries examined by the Tibetan lama, Chemed Rigdzin Dorje Lope, in 1953, were destroyed when the temples were razed by the Chinese.

06. UNFORTUNATELY, the alleged yeti skeletal hand at Pangboche, Nepal, was stolen in 1991 and thus no longer available for updated scientific examination. NOTE: In the 1950s the hand was tampered with whereby some bones were stolen and replaced with human bones. When the hand was later professionally examined, the analysis turned up human bones and animal bones (animal not identified). UPDATE: The stolen bones were found in 2011 and DNA shows that they were "human."

07. UNFORTUNATELY, in 1977 the captain of the Japanese trawler, Zulyo

Maru, decided that the rotting carcass of some kind of sea creature hauled-up might spoil his catch of fresh fish, so had the thing dumped back into the sea.

08. UNFORTUNATELY, in 1959 Professor Youri Ivanovitch Merejinsky decided to try and shoot a Russian snowman with a gun rather than a camera. He missed, so we have neither a body nor a photograph.

09. UNFORTUNATELY, zoologist Nikolai Baikov apparently decided that a "half-man" he saw in Manchuria in 1914 who was a hunter's "helper," was not in his line of studies so did not photograph him or do any detailed research on him.

10. UNFORTUNATELY, what were possibly the remains of a juvenile cadborosaurus (sea monster) found in the stomach of a whale in 1937 were discarded.

11. UNFORTUNATELY, Dr. Karapetian who examined what is believed to have been a living Russian snowman in 1941 did not, or could not, arrange to have the creature subjected to further study. (It is believed the oddity was shot.)

12. UNFORTUNATELY, Major-General Topilsky, whose forces shot and killed what we believe was a Russian snowman in 1925 (which was examined by his unit's medical doctor who declared it was not a human being), did not at least have a small part of the creature preserved for future analysis.

13. UNFORTUNATELY, what appears to have been a Russian hominid that was captured and placed in a car trunk in 1989 got away when the trunk was inadvertently opened.

14. UNFORTUNATELY, the grave of the Russian ape-woman, Zana, who died in 1880s or 1890s, could not be located (her bones might have provided firm scientific proof of her species existence).

15. UNFORTUNATELY, the original copy of the Patterson/Gimlin film ended up in a legal quagmire and has never been found and made available for examination.

16. UNFORTUNATELY, the second roll of film Patterson took at the film site was loaned to the BBC (probably 1990s) and was never returned. I was promised (about in 2000) copies of the loan documents, but unfortunately they evidently could not be located.

17. UNFORTUNATELY, the reporter who wrote the first newspaper article on the Patterson/Gimlin experience (article of October 21, 1967) did not put his name on the article, so we do not know who he or she was (although we believe we know who it was—Al Tostado).

18. UNFORTUNATELY, Native American artisans in ancient times who decided to depict a sasquatch (rock carving or painting) had very little artistic ability. We are therefore left with very abstract images.

19. UNFORTUNATELY, Albert Ostman did not realize the significance of his experience in 1924 and did not at least try to interest a professional into getting some explorations done in the area of his confinement. He could have gone to a newspaper and probably would have got extensive “press.” He eventually contacted John Green in 1957.

20. UNFORTUNATELY, given the Minnesota Iceman is authentic, whoever owned, or owns the corpse, does not wish it subjected to scientific analysis. Keep in mind that Frank Hansen is now dead, so cannot be charged if he did actually kill the creature as is suspected.

21. UNFORTUNATELY, in 1948 a giant snake that measured 115 feet long was killed by soldiers and simply pushed back into the river from which it came. This occurred in Guaporé territory, South America. A Rio de Janeiro newspaper showed a photo of the animal.

22. UNFORTUNATELY, a Puerto Rican rancher who killed (1980s) what appears in photographs to be a chupacabra, refuses to allow the corpse to be examined by scientists as he is afraid it will be confiscated.

23. UNFORTUNATELY, the Wallace family does not wish to prove that the wooden feet carved by Ray Wallace made some/all of the footprints found in California. (All we ask is that one of the family members demonstrate the process using the actual feet.) The last I heard, the fake feet had been declared family heirlooms and would not be made available for testing.

24. UNFORTUNATELY, a personal (face to face) researcher interview was not conducted with William Roe who had one of the most credible sasquatch sightings on record (Mica Mountain, B.C., 1955). Nevertheless, thanks to John

Green, we do have Roe’s sworn statement. **UPDATE:** We finally found his family about 10 years ago (William being long gone) and now have a photo of him.

25. UNFORTUNATELY, Al DeAtley does not remember (or does not wish to divulge) where he got the Patterson and Gimlin film developed. Knowing this information would go a long way in combating the skeptics.

26. UNFORTUNATELY, After many years of financial support for sasquatch/bigfoot research, the benefactor (working through the Boston Academy of Applied Sciences) discontinued his research support about one year after the Patterson/Gimlin film had been effectively given a clean bill of health by a certified forensic examiner.

27. UNFORTUNATELY, writer Deborah Martyr’s plaster cast of the track of an alleged orang-pendek (or “little man”) taken in 1989, which had been examined by Kerinci Seblat National Park officials and found to be of no animal with which they were familiar, was sent to the Indonesian National Parks Department and was never seen again. To add insult to injury, this organization did not even provide a statement on the cast. (NOTE: It should also be mentioned that Martyr did take photos of the tracks, but the light was dim and it was raining so they turned out poorly—odd that she did not have a flash... let’s not ask.

28. UNFORTUNATELY, in or about 1959 the mummified corpse of what was believed to be a yeti baby was shipped from the State Museum of Nepal to Peiping (now Beijing), China, for study, but disappeared somewhere on the journey. The mummy was found in Tibet by a Nepalese trader who took it to the Nepal museum. The museum directory told Dr. Boris Porshnev, a Russian scientist in Moscow, of this occurrence in April 1959.

29. UNFORTUNATELY, The fellow with the camera was below an embankment and couldn’t see the creature Tim Meissner shot at on May 5, 1979 at Dunn Lake (near Barrier) British Columbia. According to Meissner, the creature was about 50 feet away—a regular film camera would have provided a decent photo.

30. UNFORTUNATELY, skeletons of

giants about 23 feet tall found in Ecuador in 1965 by a Roman Catholic priest (died in 1999) were “looted.” He displayed the skeletons in his own museum. (I have great difficulties with this one.)

31. UNFORTUNATELY, alleged sasquatch hair collected for some 25 years was “distributed” leaving none (but a sample I had been given) for analysis by Bryan Sykes (Oxford University initiative). The hair I had was deemed “human.”

I could add numerous cases of camera-related “unfortunate” incidents; but I have deemed those forgivable. I could also list many “lost opportunities,” which had they been handled properly would have greatly aided in our research.

The question is, Why does Joe seem to carry cryptozoology under his cloud? Skeptics will say that many incidents never happened in the first place. In other words, just words dreamed up by authors, journalists and so forth. I suppose some blame can be assigned to professionals who did not pay any, or much, attention when the trail was “hot.” On this point, all I can say is UNFORTUNATELY the word CRYPTOZOOLOGY (which currently includes homins) has such a bad reputation that few professionals want to take a chance.

I have stated in a previous paper that hominology must be totally divorced from cryptozoology because this word is like Joe Btfsplk—when professionals see it they run away. Of course, I can’t guarantee that disassociation of homins with cryptozoology would have made a difference. Nevertheless, the issue “hit home” with me when a professional refused to allow his name to be used in a book if the word “cryptozoology” appeared in that book. I originally thought this was ridiculous; but it bothered me, and still does.

UNFORTUNATELY some words by their association have too much power. There are words, although legitimate, you absolutely must not use in formal writing because people will get the wrong idea.

Just like Joe Btfsplk, you stay away from what are “bad words” and I am afraid that in the world of science “cryptozoology” is a bad word.