

Sasquatch/Human Comparison - P/G Film

I think we all need to take a closer look at what Jeff Glickman (a certified forensic examiner) did with his photographic registration of a human and the sasquatch in the Patterson/Gimlin film. I have stated before that the process he used does not depend on any “external” factors, such as foot size or camera distance. There is, of course, always a margin of error in this type of work; however, I firmly believe it would be very minimal because he used highly sophisticated equipment—and is himself a very “exacting” person.

What we see here in the detail I have proved from Glickman’s report is the comparison of a man 6 feet, 1.75 inches tall (including his boots) with the filmed sasquatch. The man is standing very erect, so there would be little or no “slouch” associated with his posture.

It is very clearly seen that we have a being that is considerably taller and larger than the man. Its WALKING HEIGHT is calculated at 7 feet 3.5 inches (87.5 inches). There is no doubt in my mind that if the sasquatch were a man in a costume, the man would need to have the same WALKING HEIGHT or something to compensate to make him that tall. A man who has a STANDING HEIGHT of 72 inches (6 feet), has a WALKING HEIGHT of about 66.66 inches. To get that man up to 87.5 inches, we have to somehow add 20.84 inches to him. Giving him stilts of any sort is out of the question because they would impede the way he walks. You cannot add anything to his body, so all that is left is his head.

The process for adding height above the shoulders is to design a large artificial head whereby the person wearing it looks out of the mouth or some other “peep hole.” However, such apparatus is very noticeable and it is highly improbable that anything of this nature was used for the Patterson/Gimlin film subject.

Consider for a moment that the man seen here is to be fitted with a costume that will match the sasquatch shown. Now, draw an imaginary line from the man’s eyes over to the sasquatch. The line ends up below its chin. If the man were shorter, then the line would end up even lower.

I would say that one could design a reasonable bigfoot headpiece that would add 10 inches to the person’s height. So, given Jeff Glickman’s conclusion, what you would need would be a person with a walking height of 77.5 inches (6 feet 5.5 inches) to match the Patterson/Gimlin subject. A man with this walking height would have a standing height of about 7 feet. We can, of course, do a little refining on all of this and get away with a person a few inches shorter—but not much.

Aside from this very rudimentary comparison, it has been established the length of the sasquatch arms and legs



are essentially beyond human standards—its arms are too long and its legs are too short. One can certainly make arms longer and hands bigger as was done for the movie prop seen here at a cost of about \$10,000; but other than stilts how can legs be extended? Keep in mind the walk must be “natural.” Aside from a somewhat unusual gait, the P/G sasquatch walks perfectly

Unfortunately, at the time the film was taken in 1967 doing this type of analysis was very difficult and expensive. Indeed, it would be some 30 years before the technology was available to properly examine the film (Glickman—*Toward a Resolution of the Bigfoot Phenomenon*).

Scientists themselves don’t have significant personal financial resources (much less than businessmen) and to get funding for this sort of thing would have been impossible. As a result they simply looked at the film and for the most part considered it a hoax. The news media did its usual “shoot from the hip” reporting and the film drifted into disrepute.

With so many years of negativity and the emergence of “docufiction” and “fake news,” going back to square one is bordering on the impossible.

It appears we are going to need more than the film and the other evidence we have to make any inroads, but I do support pressing for scientific involvement with what we have.

