



## *Guest Editorial*

# **The Patterson-Gimlin Film in Light of the Linnaeus and Porshnev Teachings: A Report Presented on the Occasion of the Film's 50th Anniversary**

Dmitri Bayanov \*

*State Darwin Museum, Moscow, Russia 117292*

Fifty years ago, on October 20, 1967, in Bluff Creek, northern California, Roger Patterson, helped by his friend and assistant Robert (Bob) Gimlin, captured on film a female specimen of the higher bipedal primates known in North America as Bigfoot or sasquatch. Up until now, according to the science of anthropology, *Homo sapiens* is the only representative of the bipedal primates on earth. The others are nonexistent because, according to paleoanthropology, man's closest and most recent evolutionary relatives died out tens of thousands of years ago. Such is the scientific paradigm today. For this reason American scientists rejected the film out of hand, largely without studying it, calling it a fabrication showing a man dressed for deception in a special costume imitating natural hairiness – “a man in a fur suit.”

In 1971, sasquatch hunter René Dahinden visited Moscow and handed over to us, followers of professor Boris Porshnev, a copy of the Patterson-Gimlin footage for study and verification. Porshnev was the author of a fundamental work on relict hominoids. According to his concept, *Homo sapiens* is not the only bipedal primate in the world, there are others, including relict Neandertals, which were of special interest for him. This means, he declared, a scientific revolution in prima-

tology, and consequently a paradigm shift in anthropology.

In this connection Porshnev recognized the reality of the so-called “snowmen.” On his initiative, the Soviet Academy of Sciences set up a special commission to study the snowman question. During two years of its existence the Snowman Commission, using ancient, medieval and modern sources of information, gathered and published a lot of material pertaining to the existence of bipedal primate relicts.

Some time later, Porshnev's ideas were strongly attacked by influential conservative scientists, who accused him of creating and spreading pseudoscience. The Snowman Commission was disbanded. When publication of the book *On the Beginning of Human History*, the main work of his life, was interrupted and cancelled, Boris Porshnev suddenly died of a heart attack in 1972.

Study of the film began while he was still with us and continued after his passing. The main investigators were members of the permanent seminar on the problem of relict hominoids formed at the State Darwin Museum in Moscow by its chief curator Pyotr Smolin, after the academy commission stopped functioning. As a result of the film's comprehensive study, with valuable advice of

specialists, such as Dr. Dmitri Donskoy, expert of biomechanics, in particular, we came to a firm conclusion that the film really shows a female Bigfoot. Our analysis was published in the books by Peter Byrne, *The Search for bigfoot: Monster, Myth or Man?* (1975) and Don Hunter with René Dahinden, *Sasquatch* (1973) and what's more important, the film's authenticity was noted and stressed in our article published in the authoritative international journal *Current Anthropology*, December 1974.

This became one of the main reasons for holding the first scientific conference in Vancouver, BC, in 1978, on the problem of sasquatch and other bipedal primates. As reported by American newspapers, our report on the Patterson-Gimlin film was the high point of the conference. It is published in full in the book, *America's Bigfoot – Fact, Not Fiction. U.S. Evidence Verified* (1997) in Russia. [A copy of the book was sent to President Bill Clinton, he confirmed receipt and expressed gratitude.]

The film's serious examination and validation happened in Russia twenty years earlier than similar work done by our colleagues in North America. In 1992, the authenticity of the film was argued for and approved by Dr. Grover Krantz, professor of anthropology at Washington State University, in his book *Big Footprints*. He did so as a result of his personal study of the documentary. In 2006, the film was described as authentic by Dr. Jeff Meldrum, professor of anatomy and anthropology at Idaho State University, in his book *Sasquatch: Legend Meets Science*. In addition, the on-line refereed journal *The Relict Hominoid Inquiry*, has published a number of papers on the subject by both American and Russian authors. In 1995, Jeff Glickman, a certified forensic examiner, released his unpublished report on the intensive analysis of the Bigfoot film over a period of three years. His conclusion: "Despite three years of rigorous examination by the

author, the Patterson-Gimlin film cannot be demonstrated to be a forgery at this time." (<http://www.photekimaging.com/Support/rptc012.pdf>). In 2014, the film was validated by William Munns, Hollywood specialist on costumes and special effects, in his book, *When Roger Met Patty*. We note with satisfaction that the American investigators of the film, using better technology than was available to us, have supplemented and affirmed our findings back in the 70s.

In 2004, a \$100,000 reward was announced for anyone who could definitively disprove the Patterson-Gimlin film. The reward remains unclaimed. All attempts by debunkers by means of films and videos showing a man in an ape costume have spectacularly failed. The actors demonstrate wrong biomechanics, wrong movements, wrong gait and anatomy, including the intermembral index (ratio of upper limb to lower limb), all of which are quite different from what is characteristic and looks natural in Patterson's film-star dubbed Patty. The actors' hair cover is also wrong, since Hollywood masters of special effects have repeatedly stated that they are unable to produce a costume looking equal to Patty's hair cover. Noted costumer designer and animal actor Janos Prohaska concluded that the hair would need to be glued directly onto the actor – a ten-hour make-up job. If it was a costume, he said, it was the best costume he had ever seen. To him it looked "very, very real."

It's appropriate to mention here one more interesting fact. After Patterson died, Bob Gimlin, who had not earned a cent from the film, was offered big money if he would say that Roger had faked the film. The bribery was indignantly rejected, which tells a lot about both Gimlin and film.

Thus fifty years of the film's existence convincingly testify to its authenticity. A question arises: Why were the Russians first in the film's examination and validation? The answer is: Because, unlike our American

colleagues, we were from the very beginning in possession of Boris Porshnev's revolutionary concept of relict hominoids. This provided us with a solid scientific basis for the analysis.

Question number two: Why were these relict primate beings not known to modern science? The shortest answer is because there was no science to know them – that is natural, biological science. Fortunately, we have it now. As to humanities academic disciplines, such as folkloristics and demonology, they have always known such beings by names which make scientific scholars think it's the subject of pure fantasy and mythology.

In Russian the principal name for these beings is *leshny*, from the word *les* (wood); in English it is translated as *wood goblin*. The words *devil* and *shaitan* (the latter in the Turkish languages) are widely used; *pan*, *satyr*, *silenus* in ancient Greek, *faun* in Latin, etc. This factor has been and remains a serious obstacle to accepting the reality of *leshys* and wood goblins by those who do not realize that mythology is not pure fantasy, but a mixture of truth and fantasy.

In his monograph Porshnev writes of the emergent science of relict hominoids, referring at the same time to Carl Linnaeus, the famous Swedish naturalist of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, creator of the system of classification of animals and plants which is still used today. Linnaeus borrowed the ecclesiastical term *primatus* and used it in biology, having laid the basis for the science of primatology. As is known, he dared to embrace within the Order Primates both apes and man, which scandalized his contemporaries, but was approved by Darwin in the next century. But what is usually unknown by our contemporaries is the fact that Linnaeus is the author of the term *Homo sapiens* (man the wise). Usually it is thought that the term was introduced by paleoanthropologists. Nothing of the sort. Linnaeus used it a century before the birth of Darwinism and paleoanthro-

pology. Using the information of ancient naturalists and travelers of his time, he proposed the existence of two species of man: one is *Homo troglodytes* (caveman in Greek), described as *sylvestris* (woodman) and *nocturnus* (nightman); the other is *Homo sapiens*, described as *diurnus* (diurnal), the term applied to modern man. It is only in contrast to *Homo troglodytes* that the term *Homo sapiens* was coined and used by Linnaeus, and not because he was of such high opinion of representatives of our species.

In an age when religion was dominant bold innovations in science, introduced by Linnaeus, were soon rejected. After his death, the Primate Order was banned and restored only a century later by Darwin's close associate Thomas Huxley. As for *Homo troglodytes*, it was declared to be a mistake by the great naturalist, who allegedly took anthropoid apes for people. The term troglodyte was then applied to the chimpanzee: *Simia troglodytes* (cave ape). Absurd! It was not Linnaeus but his critics who erred.

Two centuries later, justice was restored and Linnaeus rehabilitated in this most important question. This was done by Porshnev in his 1963 work, *The Present State of the Question of Relict Hominoids*, in which he calls the "snowman" by the scientific name of *Homo troglodytes* Linnaeus. In the same work the author substantiated the thesis that the discovery, or more accurately, re-discovery of troglodytes by modern science means the emergence of a new scientific discipline devoted to relict hominoids, just as paleoanthropology, to the question of man's evolutionary origin. In 1972, this new discipline was named *hominology*. Thus Boris Porsnev is the father of hominology, while Carl Linnaeus is its progenitor.

In 1966, the journal, *Questions of Philosophy* (No. 3), carried Porshnev's article "Is a Scientific Revolution in Primatology Possible Today?" The author answered the question in the positive, referring in so doing

to the work of the American philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). A revolution in science means a shift of scientific paradigms, a process protracted and painful for scientists, just what we see happening in the snowman problem since the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

It is necessary to note that a paradigm shift in a given science is inevitably accompanied and followed by a change of experts in it. When after Nicholas Copernicus, in the course of scientific revolution in astronomy, the geocentric paradigm was changed to the heliocentric, the unrivaled-for-ages authorities in astronomy Aristotle and Ptolemy were replaced by Galileo, Kepler and others. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century the paradigm of astronomers, declaring that stones dropping from heaven is sheer fantasy and mythology, was challenged by the paradigm stating that stones do fall from heaven. As a result astronomers ceased to be experts on the question and relevant experts appeared among those who collected and studied stones that fall from the sky. They created the science of meteorites. When in the 19<sup>th</sup> century the famous German anthropologist Rudolf Virchow stated that the unusual bones unearthed in 1856, in the valley of Neandertal belonged to modern man suffering from rickets, he proved that expertise in the study of such bones had to shift to specialists of a different kind.

In this connection we inform the scientific community that the main specialists in the question of existence and study of the living hominids different from *Homo sapiens* are hominologists, not paleoanthropologists, i.e. specialists in the study of fossils. According to the proverb, there is no harm without good and no good without harm. Paleoanthropologists have produced great good, having substantiated man's evolutionary origin by the study of relevant fossils. And they have committed and continue to commit a phenomenal scientific error that has caused a misconception in the question of the higher

primates' extinction. They extrapolate the time of death of individual beings whose bones they find and examine to the time of extinction of whole taxa of creatures, that is extinction of whole species and populations. From the example of the fish *Latimeria* (coelacanth) paleontologists have learned that such methodology can lead to mistakes of tens of millions of years in dating the time of extinction. Such methodology is criticized by paleontologist LS Davitashvili in his book, *The History of Evolutionary Paleontology from Darwin to Our Days* (1948) p. 486 (in Russian; Dmitri Bayanov, *Russian Homino-logy*, 2016, p. 141). This problem is known as "the incompleteness or imperfection of the geological record," used by Darwin as an argument in defense of his theory of natural selection. The argument has not been fully understood and accepted yet – I mean the vastness of the said incompleteness and imperfection. Fossil bones, with all their great value for science, represent only the minutest picture of fullness and richness of life forms on the surface of land and in the ocean. Ignorance of this fact is the root cause of science's mistake in overlooking and ignoring the existence of relict higher primates. Thus the accusation that hominology is pseudo-scientific is devoid of scientific substance and is itself pseudoscientific.

But let us return to Carl Linnaeus and the film whose 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary we celebrate. The Swedish biographer of Linnaeus, professor Gunnar Broberg writes that Linnaeus sent forth his pupils "on voyages of exploration. Many of them actually suffered martyrdom in the field, sacrificing their lives for science and its master. They travelled in all directions: one large group voyaged eastward, in the direction of the East Indies and China" (Gunnar Broberg, *Carl Linnaeus*, 2006, p. 37). It is wonderful how Linnaeus' activities have echoed and reverberated in ours. Hominologists in Russia and other countries also travel far and wide, and two suffered

martyrdom in the field. They are our comrade Vladimir Pushkarev, who did not return from his dangerous expedition in Siberia, and Spanish biologist Jordi Magraner, author of the work *Les hominoids reliques d'Asie Central* (1992), who was murdered during his field work in the mountains of Pakistan.

Deeply interested in the question of troglodytes, Linnaeus wrote: "Is it not amazing that man, endowed by nature with curiosity, has left the Troglodytes in the dark and did not want to investigate the creatures that resemble him to such a high degree?" He strongly criticized navigators who "driven by greed, despise the task of natural science, such as investigation of the way of life of troglodytes." He wished that a monarch would obtain a troglodyte for amusement. "And it would be of no small benefit," he wrote, "for a

philosopher to spend several days in the company of such an animal in order to investigate how superior human reason is..." (Carl Linnaeus, *Anthropomorpha*, 1760; Dmitri Bayanov, *Bigfoot Research: The Russian Vision*, 2011, p. 330).

Professor Broberg says that "Linnaeus was most keen to catch a Troglodyte and asked his travelling pupils for help" (personal communication). Two centuries later comes forth a brave and skillful man, named Roger Patterson, who, using the progress of the age, captures a troglodyte on film with a movie camera for all the world to see. The world, alas, is still incredulous. It's interesting to contemplate what Linnaeus would have said looking at this capture. I asked myself this question when we studied the film back in the 1970s.