

## Sasquatch 360 and Other Insights

We can certainly imagine what a sasquatch might look like from the images we have of the subject in the Patterson/Gimlin film. Nevertheless, it would have been wonderful if Patterson could have “done a 360” with his camera so that we could see the bigfoot at different angles.

As we do not have that luxury, here is a presentation of Igor Burtsev’s statue of the homin showing twelve consecutive angles. Sort of imagine that the creature became frozen in time at the moment it stared at Patterson and Gimlin, and one had a chance to walk around her and take twelve shots (follow the images from left to right as in reading).

To me, the images from the back angles are just as impressive as those from the front. I get the feeling of a very thick-fleshed, heavy being. Have you ever patted a horse’s rump? If so, then you know of the little feeling that tells you the animal is extremely solid; and it’s a bit frightening because it’s an “unpredictable mass” and you don’t want to end up getting pushed or crushed by it.

Now, look at the second image showing the relative comparison Jeff Glickman established between the creature in the film and a human male (Michael Hodgson) 6 feet 1¾ inches tall in the image—includes his boots). I certainly don’t have any problem with an estimated creature weight of 542 pounds (Dr. Fahrenbach’s calculation). Indeed, I don’t have a problem with an even higher estimate—much higher.

The third image is a scale comparison of what Roger Patterson would have looked like in relation to the bigfoot he filmed, represented by the Burtsev statue. Patterson was not very tall (5 feet 6 inches in the image—includes his hat and boots), and very slim. Naturally, we sort of see things in relation to our own height/stature—the terms “tall,” “big,” “heavy,” and so forth are relative. Perhaps we have a bit of an insight here as to Patterson’s great excitement upon relating the story of his experience. Certainly any bigfoot would have been exciting to see, but one that was much bigger than the witness would greatly increase astonishment. We can also see more clearly why Patterson did not want Gimlin to ride off and leave him without a horse or a rifle. One would not be able to out-run a being like that, and climbing a tree would have been futile.

We have not been able to justify the height of the bigfoot (7 feet 3½ inches) using mathematics. Such depends on camera/lens specifications and the subject’s distance from the camera. Jeff Glickman used a photo registration, which did not require any specifications or the camera distance. I really don’t think he was far out.



The relative size of the sasquatch in the Patterson/Gimlin film compared with Michael Hodgson.



The relative size of Roger Patterson compared to the bigfoot in his film, represented here by the Burtsev statue.

