



1

FIRST NATIONS SASQUATCH REFERENCES

There is no hard evidence that indicates any recognized primates (other than human beings) have ever naturally inhabited North America at the same time as humans. Nevertheless, early North American First Nations people have depicted what may be ape-like creatures in their art. Furthermore, through oral legends, these people have passed on the tales of “wild men of the woods” for countless generations. It might be reasoned that their inspiration was brought about by sasquatch sightings.

First Nations Stone Carvings

It is possible that ancient carved stone heads made by First Nations people in the Columbia River valley (between Oregon and Washington) depict sasquatch creatures. Several heads have been discovered; a photograph of one head and drawings of two are shown here (left). Another one of the heads (not shown) has been dated at between 1500 BC and AD 500. It is reasonable to assume that the dating of all of the heads would also be in this same time period.

The contention that the images are just abstract or fanciful images of known animals can be countered with the argument that other stone heads depict known animals that are fully recognizable. We are therefore led to the conclusion that First Nations people intentionally depicted some sort of primate other than a human being. However, there are no other known primates in North America, other than possible sasquatch creatures; therefore, a connection has been reasoned.¹ Given the estimated age of the heads, we can exclude First Nations people being aware of other primates (i.e., creatures of this nature being brought to North America by Europeans or others). However, while unlikely, we cannot exclude pet monkeys brought back from South America during early transmigration.

The first published mention of the carvings occurred in 1877 in an address² by Q.C. Marsh, a pioneer paleontologist. Marsh stated, “Among many stone carvings which I saw there [near the Columbia River] were a number of heads, which so strongly resemble those of apes that the likeness at once suggests itself.” Further, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology Roderick Sprague (University of Idaho) stated, “Several prehistoric carvings collected in the lower Columbia River valley share non-human but anthropoid features. A relationship between these stone heads and Sasquatch phenomena is suggested.”³

1. There is limited evidence that an ape species existed here about 20 million years ago.
2. *American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Nashville, TN.
3. *Manlike Monsters on Trial*, Halpin/Ames, University of B.C. Press (1980), p. 229.

MUSEUM DESCRIPTION OF THE STONE FOOT

NUMBER: QAD 92

AREA OR TRIBE: Lillooet

ARTIFACT: Ceremonial bowl.
Medicine man's ceremonial stone.

SIZE: L: 22.4 cm

W: 17.8 cm

Th/H: 6.5 cm

DESCRIPTION: Bottom surface concave, shaped like a man's foot, with four toes; large toe broken off; heel of foot also broken off. Upper surface decorated with an oblong flower design, the center of which is an oblong concavity.

DATE COLL: 1947

COLLECTOR: Mr. S. H. Gibbs

DONOR: Mr. S. H. Gibbs

REPLICAS: Princeton Museum,
May/78

Ceremonial Bowl Considerations

The fact that some First Nations people hold the sasquatch sacred in their beliefs gives credibility to a medicine man making a "bowl" of this nature.

Designing the bowl after a sasquatch footprint would give it some spiritual significance, and thus anything mixed in the bowl would have special powers.

We also have this remarkable stone foot that shows some resemblance to a sasquatch footprint, although it appears too short for a normal print. However, this might be because it was patterned after a print made with the foot bent at the midtarsal break.



Stone Foot

Left: view from under foot.

Right: view from above.

All that is known of the artifact is that it came from Lillooet, British Columbia. It was given to the Vancouver Museum in 1947. John Green provides the following analysis:

It may be just the product of the artist's imagination, but seen from the bottom it seems to be a skillful representation of a natural object, with none of the stylized effects of the top view. Such a foot could not be the foot of any known animal, as the base of the toe that is broken off is far larger than that of any of the other toes. Plainly it was a "big toe." A human foot is not a good match either. The stone foot has a heavy pad of flesh under the toes for two thirds of their length, with a deep crease dividing the pad from the ball of the foot, and its toenails (which do not show well in the pictures) are on the rear half of the terminal section of the toes, starting almost at the joints, instead of being right at the front.

This fragment can be matched fairly closely with a standard sasquatch print, but to do so requires that the missing part at the back be almost as long as what remains. To me the pattern at the top suggests that not very much is missing, and so does the shallow bowl in the bottom of the foot, which is complete in this fragment. There is more damage to the fragment than the two large missing pieces, so I could not tell whether one side at the back is already starting to round off short. From the bottom it looks as if it might be, but from the top it does not. Favoring the possibility that the original carving was much longer is the very fact that it is broken. It would be more likely for a long object to break in the middle than for a short one to break near the end.

In a letter to the Vancouver Museum dated October 11, 1972, Dr. Grover S. Krantz, Washington State University, Department of Anthropology, stated, "The appearance of the underside of this foot resembles the footprints of the legendary sasquatch, and this may be the earliest known record of man's concern over footprints of this type."