

## The Making of Hominology: A Science Whose Time Has Come

By Dmitri Bayanov in association with Christopher L. Murphy

### **Book Review by Gene Baade**

The background to Dmitri Bayanov's latest book, The Making of Hominology: A Science Whose Time Has Come, may be useful.

In 1963, in Moscow, Russia, Boris Porshnev published a scholarly book titled, The Present State of the Question of Relict Hominoids. His thesis was that *Homo troglodytes Linnaeus* (which he called the "snowman" and thought might be remnant Neanderthals), still existed into the twentieth century.

Just three years later, in 1966, in Yakima, Washington, Roger Patterson wrote a far less scholarly, but far more widely read book, Do Abominable Snowmen of America Really Exist? A year later he proved to himself, if not to the world, that "abominable snowmen" really did exist in America when he and Bob Gimlin filmed a female sasquatch along Bluff Creek in northern California.

Even earlier, in 1961, biologist and cryptozoologist Ivan Sanderson (Loren Coleman asserts that Sanderson introduced the term, "cryptozoology"), a Scottish-born American, wrote, Abominable Snowmen: Legend Come to Life: The Story Of Sub-Humans On Five Continents From The Early Ice Age Until Today.

We must not overlook the work of two anthropologists who were pioneers in thinking about the subject. British

anthropologist Dr. Myra Shackley in 1983 published Still Living? Yeti, Sasquatch and the Neanderthal Enigma, in which she argued for the existence today of one or more relict hominoid species. American anthropologist Dr. Grover Krantz was particularly interested in evidence for the sasquatch. He published two books, Big Foot-Prints: A Scientific Inquiry into the Reality of Sasquatch in 1992, and Bigfoot Sasquatch Evidence in 1999, the latter a revision of his previous book, with added material.

Porshnev's book, published in an edition of only 180 copies, led to his being "shut down" in terms of the acceptance of his findings and loss of credibility by various scientific, academic, and governmental authorities in Russia who disagreed with him. Patterson's book, the early printings of which were published in several thousand copies—now scarce in those printings—has gone through several editions, the latest by Hancock House in 2019. Sanderson's book is easily found in various editions today. Shackley's and Krantz' books are also readily available.

Ever since the publication of these several important books, the present existence of giant, hairy, bipedal primates on several continents has been the subject of debate between growing numbers of those who accept their existence—many of whom claim to have seen them, and skeptics—none of whom have seen them and who therefore dismiss the very idea as absurd.

We need to add Dmitri Bayanov, a student of Porshnev, to that circle of original researchers and writers. His books examine the evidence of this remarkable primate's existence

by providing not only modern evidence, but centuries old documentary information found in “old world” art, literature, folklore, and religion. His conclusions are that, yes, such hairy bipedal giant primates indeed existed and still exist into the present time.

With the publication of Bayanov’s latest book, The Making of Hominology: A Science Whose Time Has Come, (2019) by Hancock House Publishers of Surrey, BC, and Blaine, WA, the author, in association with Christopher L. Murphy, has put an exclamation point on his contention that such creatures do exist. He makes his point by arguing, in a fashion not unlike the late Dr. John Bindernagel in his second book, The Discovery of the Sasquatch, (2010) that the conservative way science typically responds to new, unusual, and unexpected information in the world of anthropology and biology needs to be reckoned with, and challenged.

With this book, Bayanov formally proposes what he has been talking and writing about in one way or another for decades, namely, that a scientific field (Murphy: “a valid scientific discipline”) named hominology must be accepted as a legitimate field within anthropological studies. His book is essentially the formal proposal for and identification of that science.

Put simply, hominology is the study of early and still living hominoids, hominins, or homins. As noted above, another term used is “relict hominoids.”

Bayanov sets the stage by supporting the contention of “physicist, historian, and philosopher of science” Thomas

Kuhn that regular “scientific process” is greatly resistant to paradigm shifts (paradigms are established ways of looking at things that become exclusive and proprietary, and that jealously resist new ideas). When relict hominoid evidence is discovered, collected, and organized in a way that radically challenges long-accepted truths of anthropology, it and related sciences often dig in and refuse to consider the evidence.

When it comes to “relict hominoids,” the response of science seems to be an “all or nothing” response. The repeated mantra is, “Show us a body,” which is of course essential for proof, but which at the same time unfairly (and unscientifically?) rejects the “body” of evidence which is already present.

This rejection by science is primarily based, in the case of anthropology, on the long-accepted truth that *homo sapiens* is the only “man primate” (reviewer’s term) on the planet and that he has been alone with his fellows for tens of thousands of years.

Dmitri Bayanov and other founders of hominology assert that this entrenched “truth” is by no means the case and that a formal scientific field called “hominology” is necessary to bring anthropology to its senses. Notwithstanding the important contributions of outliers such as Shackley and Krantz, anthropology must become more open-minded and support both “amateur” and professional research. While this insistence will be debated, it needs to be tested in order to determine if the debate is worthwhile.

In the seventeen chapters of his book, Bayanov, with Murphy's assistance and encouragement, examines the role played by certain anthropologically hardened positions, or paradigms, and why they must be challenged in theory and practice.

Cited as primary evidence that a challenge to the *status quo*—that only *homo sapiens* represent hominins today—must be vigorously mounted is the famous 1967 Patterson-Gimlin film. Bayanov also cites other important forms of contemporary evidence, especially footprints and the potential value of DNA, but he cites Patterson-Gimlin because, although initially and casually dismissed, this film has stood up to serious, vigorous analysis from several points of view and cannot be ignored. Of value to new readers is Bayanov's decision to reprint within this current book an analysis of the film that had been published in one of his earlier books, America's Bigfoot: Fact Not Fiction (Moscow, 1997), co-written by him and colleague Igor Burtsev.

Additionally, Bayanov summons from his career of studying pre-modern sources a wide array of reasons both practical and philosophical why hominology deserves to become a recognized scientific field. Even if definitive proof, such as “a body on a table,” is not presently available, he insists that a “paradigm shift” in anthropology is long overdue and that the weight of history's documentation as well as current research and discovery warrants such a shift. *Homo sapiens* should no longer, Bayanov asserts, be considered the only hominin living on the planet.

Bayanov gives a brief summary of the development of

hominology in Russia and references its suppression. He reviews the rise of the study of cryptozoology by the first generation or two of cryptozoologists who founded the now-defunct International Society of Cryptozoology (ISC) in 1982 at the Smithsonian Institution. The preliminary material in the book is excellent and should not be overlooked. It begins with an endorsement of Bayanov's books by Dr. Jane Goodall and several other scientists. Two Forewords, written by Hancock House publisher David Hancock, and Dr. Jeffrey Meldrum, Professor of Anatomy and Anthropology at Idaho State University, are of great interest.

Reviews are not completely honest if no criticisms are made, should there be things in a book to criticize. This reviewer understands that it is difficult to translate thoughts from another language into English in a coherent way that results in a smooth transition of thoughts and points. The authors/collaborators have done an excellent job in accomplishing this, but a reader unacquainted with this subject may expect to hit a bump or two when it comes to grasping all the details of the thesis of the book. There is also some repetition in the book as arguments and points are repeated. However, the nature of the material means that such repetition, where it occurs, is helpful for the reader to better grasp the arguments.

This reviewer wishes that the author had not included, late in the book, what is almost undoubtedly a boilerplate text attributed to President Bill Clinton. Bayanov had, years ago, sent Clinton a copy of one of his earlier books. He received a generic reply that was almost certainly staff-produced and

intended to be used to reply to thousands of gifts, queries, and offers by people from all fields of human interest. Bayanov's comment after quoting the White House reply seems to indicate that he believes Clinton had actually paid personal attention to the book. One would hope that Clinton, in fact, did pay attention to the book and that this reviewer would stand corrected in his belief that Clinton had other things on his plate of greater urgency and never gave it a glance. This criticism, however, is not a "deal-breaker" for anyone reading the book. It may only be a reminder that words credited to national leaders are not always authentic and trustworthy.

Along with Porshnev's book in 1963, Patterson's in 1966, Sanderson's in 1961, Shackley's in 1983, and Krantz' in 1992 and 1999, hundreds of books have been written about sasquatch (aka Bigfoot). This reviewer considers perhaps thirty of them "top shelf," "best books" of importance. The Making of Hominology belongs on that shelf.

The Making of Hominology is essential reading for anyone who thinks that a formal, scientific study of relict hominoids, including sasquatch, yowie, yeti, et al., should take place and deserves a seat "at the table" of scientific thought and exploration.

The author, the associate, and this reviewer hope that scientists who do not care to entertain such a field of study at the moment might be encouraged to change their minds. Dmitri Bayanov offers hope that the goal he is advocating will someday be reached. As with all, now aging, original researchers who are growing fewer in number by the year, he

hopes that it will be in his lifetime.

Publisher: Hancock House Publishers, Surrey, BC, Canada

Date of this review September 3, 2019