

CRep256

 Tue, Oct 27, 2026 9:17PM  2:24:46

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Bigfoot, cryptozoology, Patterson-Gimlin, documentary, Ken Gerhard, Stephen Myers, Great Pyramid, SAR scans, retracted study, research methodology, scientific method, Egyptology, phrenology, data gathering, evidence

SPEAKERS

Speaker 5, Speaker 6, Speaker 4, Speaker 3, Speaker 1, Speaker 2



Speaker 1 00:17

Coming to you from the city of the weird, Exploring topics from the esoteric and unexplored to dimensions unknown, shining a light of truth on the darkest corners of our reality. Welcome to the curious realm.

S

Speaker 2 00:46

Well, hello everybody, and happy Tuesday night. I hope you're doing well. I hope you're getting ready. Get ready for a raucous Halloween, everyone. Especially if you have teenagers. It's a Saturday night Halloween, so you know things are going to get wild in the neighborhood. I don't know if anybody out there did crazy things on Halloween, but I, you know, for somebody who went to the seminary, I did some wild stuff before I went to the seminary. That's all I can say. We had some wild Halloween nights back when I was a kid, and it is always one of my favorite nights of the year. So I am looking forward to it. Looking forward to a night, late night of horror movies with my kid, because he doesn't have school the next day. So it's going to be awesome. I hope you guys have a great Halloween. We have a great show lined up for you tonight. A great cadre of guests coming up in November. We're busy doing our pre records right now, lining those up. But we have Dr. John Hall, all kinds of good stuff lined up tonight. In the second part, our good friend Stephen Myers will be joining us for the conversation, and we will specifically be talking about the Beyondie studies that came out. We covered that with him. I guess it was shortly after they came out, probably a year after it was released, and shortly after they hit. It was the studies where they were using synthetic aperture radar to study synthetic aperture radar seismography. SARS was the name of it, and saying that there were huge structures under the Great Pyramid of Giza, this this study has been retracted as of late, and it's very interesting to see this process happening in real time. Frequently, these retractions do not happen till years later, but the paper was actively put into a journal, a white paper journal of remote sensing, like literally the industry of people who make these sensor platforms and things like that. And they were like, "Hey, your data gathering and the way you're saying you're processing this data is not possible." So their study has been retracted, and we'll be getting into that with Stephen and what that means. What that means for science, whenever it comes to people catching those things in real time. And one of my favorite people to talk to about science is in this section. In this segment, we are glad to welcome Ken Gerhard. The video that you see rolling right now is actually the intro, the trailer for capturing Bigfoot, the the now famed documentary by XYZ Films. I love XYZ; they make amazing stuff. Mandy is one of their films, and I love the movie Mandy. But they did a really fantastic job on this documentary, and it truly is, I think, a very well-made documentary. And it's one of those I always say, Ken, if people start talking about it, art achieved, you know, like as an artist, it's one of those. If it causes conversation in society, doesn't matter if you like it or not. Art achieved, so good on them. They've started a conversation, and it started a pretty big conversation within the Bigfoot community. And good

S

Speaker 3 04:20

question.

S

Speaker 2 04:20

That's why I wanted to have you on. I love your.

S

Speaker 3 04:24

Thank you for having me. Well, it's always an honor to talk to you, brother. So

S

Speaker 2 04:28

it's always great having you on. I've been through your cryptozoology course. I've seen you speak numerous, numerous times, and you are one of the most grounded researchers in the world of cryptozoology out there, and really, I think the biggest flag of yours that I love to see fly is the the fact of methodological science. How are we looking at things? How are we examining things? And the fact of doesn't. Matter if it's the Patterson-Gimlin film or a picture taken off somebody's trail cam, that is not going to be what quote proves Bigfoot in that kind of way. We need biological samples. We need we need science, science, science to prove a species, not a picture, not a video. That's a piece of data, so yeah.

S

Speaker 3 05:26

Citizen science, right? That's

S

Speaker 2 05:27

that's exactly homage

S

Speaker 3 05:28

to to the late Dr. Jeff Meldrum, who will be talking about, I'm sure, in this interview. He was an advocate of that. You know, you do. You know, you don't have to be. You don't have to have a degree. You know, if you're if you're a researcher and you're passionate about it, but there is a methodology that you can still follow that very much aligns with you know with how a true scientist would would go about that. And you know, my dad was a scientist, Christopher. He was a PhD. I was raised very much in that deductive reasoning, critical thinking household. Sadly, my college experiment did not was not successful. So maybe in a path in another life, I would have achieved that. But still, I respect science greatly. You know, science is you and I talking right now on this podcast. Everything from the microphone to the chips at our computers to the you know the it's all science, and it's you know, it's a powerful thing. You can't deny it. So,

S

Speaker 2 06:26

yeah, yeah, exactly. And and that's just it. It it really is the idea of critical thinking and and being able to exercise that, being able to remove yourself and your vested interest from what you're looking at, things like that, and it's I've been that's key. I've been really discussing a lot lately the the concept of epistemology, the idea of being able to hold two conflictatory ideas in your head, being able to hold a personal belief, and yet still understand what somebody else believes at the same time, and it can be it can be really hard, and it can be very challenging. And when it comes to things like Bigfoot cryptozoology specifically, that that is one that I I regularly explain to people that without it, there are so many species that you love at the zoo that you'd never have, like you wouldn't see a Komodo dragon, because that was just rumor. That was speculation. That was that was native stories, you know.

S

Speaker 3 07:33

True, true. Well, um, yeah, I've got so so much has been going on, you know, in recent weeks, and I appreciate you having me on to talk about it. Obviously, I saw the documentary on the 20th, yeah, live streamed like everyone else, and I wanted to take some time to look at the the so-called mystery footage and consider all the different all the different aspects of the documentary. So I wanted to your your your show is worthy of the of the finest quality speculation, Christopher. So I'm going to try. Well, I

S

Speaker 2 08:06

appreciate that more than anything.

S

Speaker 3 08:09

Yeah, always fun to talk to you. The first thing I want to address, though, is just the big picture in terms of. Okay, so based on different surveys of the general public through the years, and I think the most recent one landed at 16% of the general population at large. Only 16% thinks there's any chance that Bigfoot might actually exist. Okay, 84% of the general population, if you ask them, will say. I mean, some people might say I don't know, but I think it's fair to say that four out of five or more people say it's a great legend. I love the commercials. I love Harry and the Hendersons. It's a great idea, but no, there's no way Bigfoot could actually exist. So, if we you know connect that or extend that to the Patterson-Gimlin film, then obviously the vast majority of the population has always assumed that it was a hoax. In fact, I've had people come up to me years ago. Oh, I thought that was debunked in 70. You know, it's throughout the year. It's just a so where this film really matters, of course, is to the Bigfoot community and the related communities of the paranormal and ufology and people that just have an interest in anomalous, mysterious things, right? That's that's really what we're talking about here. So, even though it seems for many people on, in at least in my social media circles, like either the world is ending or, you know, this is like you know this is a monumental thing that's happening to most of the world. It it's not really that significant. They probably have always assumed, oh, that was just had to be a guy in a suit, right? So,

S

Speaker 2 09:47

well, parad as we said in the pre-show conversation, paradigms have been attacked. You know, forms of belief of people have been attacked. So, at least that's what they believe. I mean. Some people just made a documentary film.

S

Speaker 3 10:04

Yeah, yeah, no, that's true. And they, like you said, they did a good job. I mean, I was entertained by it, learned a lot about Roger Patterson, some Renee Hinn and stuff. Had a lot of people I respect in there, like Meldrum and Larry Lund, and

S

Speaker 2 10:15

yeah,

S

Speaker 3 10:16

and so on and so forth. So it was definitely well done. I guess, kind of following up with what I was just talking about. Okay, so in terms of why people have ever considered that the Patterson Gimlin film was not a hoax, because there have been obviously that's that's the cause of this, the root cause of this real polarization we have in the community right now. So I just want to review some things about the and by the way, Christopher, I I came prepared

S

Speaker 2 10:44

here for

S

Speaker 3 10:45

for energetic backup. I have a a cast from the Patterson Gimlin film signed by Bob Gimlin in 2004. So that was

S

Speaker 2 10:55

wow.

I've got obviously a full color print back here signed by Bob Gimlin, the Patty frame 352, and I even have a piece of the film site. This is the big down tree that you see in the foreground of the film. I took a picture of that or a piece of that when I was. So I hope all this energy around me is going to help inspire me a little bit. But okay, so why why have people thought that it was real? Well, the first thing we need to acknowledge is that the film was taken evidently to both Universal Studios and Disney Studios. John Green, I think, took it to an executive at Disney, and maybe it was Roger, someone who took it to Universal, you know, almost immediately after the film was shot, and we're told evidently that there's no way that could have been faked with the technologies that were available to, you know, major studios like Disney and Universal. So those were some of the first things that came out that advocated the reality of the film. We're familiar, of course, my generation with movies like Planet of the Apes and 2001: A Space Odyssey that featured sort of ape men, if you will, in that same era. And we got a pretty good idea of what those costumes looked like at that time. So this seemed to be different, and even the the original production companies evidently express that. Now, initially, Roger Patterson took the film to some scientists at British Columbia University that were familiar with the Sasquatch. Some of the Sasquatch evidence they were mostly of the opinion that they wouldn't necessarily call Roger and Bob hoaxers to their faces, but they didn't really couldn't really conceive that the film was genuine for whatever reason. Yeah, and then shortly thereafter, Roger flew it out to the Smithsonian Institute and showed it to scientists like Dr. John Napier, the primatologist, and others. And again, the vast majority of the scientists in the room, felt like this can't be kosher. Time Life magazine was going to originally feature the footage, and they dropped it and said, "No, this." After what the Smithsonian said, we're not comfortable with this. But in 1971, Roger Patterson took the film to England and had it reviewed by a well. Actually, it was Dr. John Napier had it reviewed by one of his colleagues, a guy named Donald Grieve, who was a primate anatomist specializing in locomotion, the way things move, and he concluded that if the film were shot at 16 frames per second, and it's always been a mystery what speed Roger had the camera set on, it was that his Kodak k1 100 could do 24 frames, 16, and I think 14, and but he couldn't remember what setting he had it on at the time. Grieve concluded that if it was shot at 16 frames per second, that it was impossible for a man, a human, to walk in the manner that the creature and the subject in the film walked. If it was at 24 frames per second, then it could easily be a man in a costume. But six did not. So that was his conclusion. So that was you know kind of one of the first academic, you know, attaboys for Richard Patterson and Bob Gimlin. Then you had a guy named Jeff Glickman, who was a forensic film analyst that was hired in the 70s, I believe, maybe it was Peter Byrne or someone hired him to review the film, which he took a year. This guy, forensic film analyst Jeff Glickman, took a year, analyzed the Patterson-Gimmon film, and concluded that it was in fact genuine, that the subject in the film was seven foot four inches tall, and that it was, you know, not human. So that was an academic, again, another academic score for the Patterson-Gimlin film. Then Roger Patterson, I'm sorry, Renee Dehinden took the film to Russia. I may have said Patterson earlier. It was Dehinden that took it to England and Russia, and a bio.

S

Speaker 3 14:59

Locomotions expert named Dmitry Donskoy, with the Soviet, he was actually trained Olympic athletes for the Soviet Union, but he was an expert in biomechanics, and he analyzed the film and said it absolutely was non-human. Again, so you have these slowly accruing, you know, the vast majority of the academic world is against the film, but every once in a while, there's you have this kind of renegade academic that's coming out and saying, "Wait, wait a minute, there's something there that's not human."

S

Speaker 2 15:31

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 15:32

and I don't want to take all the time up going. No, no, you're

S

Speaker 4 15:35

good. You're good.

S

Speaker 3 15:35

We we all know Dr. Grover Krantz, the physical anthropologist at Washington State, who you know was kind of the predecessor to Dr. Jeff Meldrum. He advocated the reality of the film. Jeff Meldrum, who sadly we lost last year, spoke frequently about the the idea that it was unlikely the Patterson-Gillingham film was a hoax because of all the subtle details, the muscle movements, apparent adipose fatty skin tissues in the right places, seemed unlikely. You know that a costume of that time would contain that level of detail. The breasts or mammary glands, and even the way the thing walked, its gait. You know, constant flexion in both knees and a high degree of pronation. I mean, Meldrum was an expert in bipedalism in hominins, and he watched this thing and said that's non-human, highly compliant gate. And then you have other names that everyone's going to be familiar with: Bill Muns, the the special effects guy who's done a lot of analysis; M.K. Davis, who I've known for many years, who's done a lot of video analysis, thinker thinker. I mean, all these people have looked at the film and found things in it that could not, they, in their opinion, could not have been replicated with a costume. So obviously, all of these, you know, endorsements by different people through the year, were readily accepted by people that advocated the Patterson-Gillingham film as real, and you know said, "Hey, look, you've got really smart people here. You know the experts in various fields that have looked at this at length, and arguing on the other side that the scientists who have said it's a guy in a suit haven't spent any time looking at it. They just took, you know, watched it one time and said, "No, that's that's a guy in a suit." So, so all of those arguments have been around in the Bigfoot field for many, many years, 59 years or whatever. Then you have different motivational arguments against why it couldn't have been a hoax, right? Peter Byrne, one of the four horsemen of Bigfoot Research, pointed out that you know the the film site was actually you know easily viewed by three roads that were passing above it at different junctures, and the area was pretty wide open at that time due to a flood event, and it was a Friday afternoon in in hunting season during hunting season in that area. So why would they have hoaxed this film and put a guy in a furry suit walking across when you've got all these sportsmen and hunters driving by and over the road? It just didn't seem like a good. If you're going to hoax something, that's not a good spot to just throw it out there in that in that area.

S

Speaker 5 18:25

Yeah, yeah.

S

Speaker 3 18:26

Roger Patterson, you know, right after the film was shot, evidently called the University of British Columbia and asked them to send down tracking dogs. You know, the little things like that. It was like, why would he have you know opened himself up to exposure to that degree.

S

Speaker 2 18:42

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 18:43

Why was there no deathbed confession by Roger Patterson? You know, he passed away of of Hodgkin's lymphoma in 1972 and took the secret to his grave. And maybe there's a chance he could have made more money at the end, or you know, if he had revealed, hey, I'm the world's greatest hoaxter, you know. Look what I did, and then of course Bob Gimlin, who I've known since 2004, spoken to many times. I've seen him look hundreds of people right in the eyes and say it was real. You know that was a real creature. It was not a man in a suit. And people have questioned, you know, why would he have said that? Particularly when he really never gained anything financially from,

S

Speaker 2 19:27

yeah,

S

Speaker 3 19:28

you know, from the film. He was cut out almost immediately by Roger Patterson and Al Diatley, who's mentioned in capturing Bigfoot. He disappeared for many years. I mean, he finally tried to get some of the rights to the film back in the late '70s, suing Patricia Patterson, and he really didn't come into the Bigfoot scene until you know 2003. So there were many years when he was just not around, and so then the question becomes: Well, if he got screwed and it was a hoax, why didn't he come out and you know retaliate and say, oh yeah? Yeah. So there's all these like little motivational things that you can look at and question and say, why did he do that? Why did he not do this or that? You know.

S

Speaker 2 20:09

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 20:10

So, anyways, there's a lot of arguments that that advocates have used. Now, I can say, you know, I saw the film for the first time. I was I was only nine years old. I mean, it was from 1975, but I grew up with monster movies. I was a huge Godzilla fan and King Kong and Planet of the Apes. And the first time I saw the Patterson-Gibbon film, I thought to myself, "That's not a costume. That doesn't look like a costume that I've seen." And then I've watched the film hundreds of times through the years as a researcher, and I've seen details in there that I'm still like, man, the the the movement seems very natural. The walk doesn't seem very natural. There's something slightly abnormal, you know. The mass it seems very natural. The the the mammary glands, sorry, mammary glands displace very naturally. So there's a lot of things I've seen in it through the years that I thought, man, it's you know, it does seem you know way beyond the costume technology of that time. That was my subjective conclusion based on. So, so yeah, those are all the reasons for. There's probably a ton more than I'm not thinking about the trackway, and we can talk about the trackway that was left. Not even mentioning capturing Bigfoot, but there was a trackway that was cast by both Roger Patterson, Bob Gilman, and then Bob Titmus. This photograph is by Lyle Laverty, who was a forest worker who stumbled on the film site a couple days later and took this picture of. He took several photographs of the tracks. This one is most famous, and you know the trackway is convincing. I mean, there were 10 casts in a row in succession that were made by researcher Bob Titmus on October 29, 1967, and they appear dynamic and spontaneous. And you can see mid tarsal pressure ridges and all these details that you don't think, and they were very deep. So again, this isn't even addressed in capturing Bigfoot, but man, this trackway has been very convincing to you know at least two physical anthropologists and many other Bigfoot researchers. So

S

Speaker 2 22:14

yeah,

S

Speaker 3 22:14

so again, there's there are lots of layers there that you could make an argument if you're an advocate for the reality of Bigfoot, and absolutely, you can see a lot of things in there that are like, "Hey, this seems legit." And again, we're going back to what you said, Christopher. It's film is not conclusive evidence, right? Yeah, yeah. This piece of footage has been controversial for 59 years; hasn't really moved the needle much, but it's been cool. It's been cool to look at and study. Um. Okay, and then you know, let's talk about arguments against. I mean, and you know, some of these I want to. I I kind of feel because I've kind of been kind of a silent observer like you, Christopher. In recent weeks, watching other people in in the community talk about this stuff, and just considering what some of these things that are being said, some of the skeptics have you know constantly brought up Roger Patterson's character. You know what? Everyone in the Bigfoot community for years has always talked about that Roger Patterson was a shifty guy. Okay, it's like not a breaking revelation. Like, oh, Roger. No, I mean, if you look at the people that worked with him, I mean, gosh, I'm trying to think it was some of the Dr. Grover Krantz, who I mentioned a moment ago, was once asked, "Could Patterson have faked that film?" And he said, "Well, I have no doubt he would have faked it if he could have, but he I don't think he was capable of doing it." John Green said similar things. Someone asked him, "Do you think? Did you think Roger Patterson would get that film?" And he said, "I didn't even think he'd write a book." So I mean, you know, he he was a shifty guy. Bob Gimlin told me that Roger Patterson still owed him gas money for that trip to Bluff Creek in 1967. Gimlin fronted all the money for the gas down there, and and Roger Patterson never paid him back. So I mean, he hired an actor to play Bob Gimlin when he took the film on tour, it just kind of cut Bob out of the deal. So there's all these stories about Roger being shifty. We know that.

S

Speaker 2 24:26

Well, and it's interesting because yes, Atley made De Atley made a lot of money. Whenever whenever you start looking at things like it, and and I wrote it down actually, what was it? 32 million, something like that, or no? I'm sorry, it was 5.8 4 million, is what it would be. What would be the modern equivalent? The modern equivalent of 5.8 4 million. That's what the the tour of the film. Whenever it first came out, because they did make the documentary, and as short as it was, things like that, and it featured the footage in it, and that's kind of where they're coming from. Here is that you know that Patterson wanted to make the documentary. Atley helped fund him to make it, and that this was all rehearsal footage for said documentary that that's been locked away for 50 years. I don't know who doesn't go in there dead safe for 50 years, yeah, that's

S

Speaker 3 25:42

that's something we can talk about in terms of the provenance. Put put up the picture of the sketch that Patterson did.

S

Speaker 2 25:47

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 25:48

so this is another thing. Is people hey Roger Patterson had drawings in his Bigfoot book published in 1966 that looked kind of like Patty as a female Sasquatch walking there in the in the Patty pose. So yeah, that is that has been discussed, and that was kind of curious to a lot of people. Like, why did he do that? But we knew he was trying to make a documentary, as you said.

S

Speaker 2 26:08

Yeah, he'd

S

Speaker 3 26:08

written a book. He was trying to raise money for his research, and he thought, "I'll," you know, he had guys like Bob Gimlin and Hieronymus and others dressing up in a cowboy. Well, I guess they were cowboys; they didn't really have to dress up, but they're out riding riding horses looking for Bigfoot. So, yes, there were reasons why he was he was a trying to create and make money. Yeah, that's true. That's oh gosh, what else? The sketch in his book. I mean, Doctor Bernard Hoovelmanns, the father of cryptozoology, who many skeptics have called a charlatan, he was always from the very beginning stated that it was a man in a suit and it was an obvious hoax. So I mean, he's a pretty pretty big authority in my field, Bernardo Oomans. You know, you gotta, you know, he's he may have been snookered a couple times here and there, but he for the most part was a pretty esteemed zoologist from

S

Speaker 2 27:09

yeah

S

Speaker 3 27:10

from Belgium. Oh yeah, the timeline. You know that's that's always been a big question. You know supposedly they filmed the creature at about 130 on Friday afternoon, and then they had time to ride their horses back to camp, which was two hours or two miles away. Get some plaster, come back to the film site, make casts of the tracks. Oh, and this is after they had to track their horses down. Then after they made the casts, then they drove supposedly to visit with Al Hodgson, a shop owner in Willard Creek, talked to him, maybe Sal McCoy as well. I can't remember. Then they drove to an airport in Eureka and got this film, you know, sent up to somewhere to be developed, and then it was being viewed two days later, you know, in Nakamura, Washington, by John Green. And so I mean, people have looked at that like, how the heck did they get all that stuff done? You know, at that because if you've been to that area, and I have, I mean, everything's far apart. You're not going to drive to Willow Creek in five minutes. That's going to be like an hour. Then you Eureka, that might be two hours. So yeah, that was a good. Those are good questions, and they've been up for you know the timeline doesn't match. How could they get all this done, and and then you know we could also talk about the stories changing in terms of you know Bob Gimlin. I feel his his retelling has been pretty consistent since the first time I heard him tell the story of the encounter back in 2004, and then in later years. But you know there were little details and things here and there that you know was he on the horse when he pulled the rifle or did he dismount and get off the horse? Was the rifle on the right side? You know, it's little things like that where people were questioning, and a lot of that you just had to concede. Well, you know, human memory is not perfect. You know, people, you know, have they fill in the in the dots, right, Christopher? And then they just kind of

S

Speaker 2 29:05

we aren't even trustable in court, man. Like eyewitness testimony is about as good as a lie detector, you know, because we like three people can be watching the same thing and see something totally different. It's it's it's a fascinating phenomena, but it is an absolute and true thing, and especially when it comes to our memories, how that works, what's burned into memory, and what is assumed by memory. It's it's interesting, but yeah, these are fallible.

S

Speaker 2 29:40

I've heard Bob a few times talk and things like that. I've never really heard any change in his story in that kind of way, and I think I, you know, I never had the honor of meeting Bob or anything like that. But at the same token, yeah, I. Don't I don't see a number one. It's not like he has reaped a whole lot of benefit. I think people have a have an inflated idea of what kind of living comes from these things, stuff like that. Ken.

S

Speaker 3 30:18

Oh yeah, we should we should address that because Bob, from what I know, and I'm a bit of an insider because I speak at a lot of Bigfoot conferences. For many years, Bob was appearing at conferences around the country and not being compensated. Yeah, right. He tagged along with his friend Tommy Amarone. He just loved the camaraderie, and he wasn't in it for the money. You know, he was just there. You know, he might have liked some of the attention because I mean, he was Bob Gimlin. He was like Elvis. You know, he'd walk into the building and everyone was like Bob Gimlin.

S

Speaker 2 30:48

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 30:48

but he wasn't in it for the money at that point. Now, later on, he did. You know, to my understanding, he got you know Russ Accord was his agent, and Russ talked to me about that initially, and he said, "Look, dude, Bob's never made any anything off of this, and everyone else did. And he deserves to get a little something for all the. I mean, he went through a lot. His wife was, you know, harassed by coworkers, and he was his reputation. So yeah, he went through a lot of shit. And you know, maybe he should make. And and honestly, the money that speakers are making at these conferences is not exorbitant. You know, it's not like Comic Con where you're Patrick Stewart walking through the door. Yeah, it's like well,

S

Speaker 2 31:30

and where the and where it's like, hey, here's the here's the VIP experience. Come come spend \$150 for a picture with Bob Gimlin. You know stuff like that. It's that's not what

S

Speaker 3 31:44

it is. No, but I mean, you know, I don't. I don't think he ever made any significant amount of money off of this. You know, again, we can make the argument about he may have liked the attention, the camaraderie, and you know, the status. So that there. So, anyways, hopefully, I've made a case that there's there's always been. This is why the film's been controversial for 59 years because you can make strong arguments on either side, right? Yeah. And so,

S

Speaker 2 32:09

well, and I think that's that's a big reason why this film is so controversial because once again, it's it's one of those for so many, and and I'm involved in a lot of communities, and it's it's it's interesting to see um the hooks that that people hang their predications and their beliefs on. You know, like, hey, I'm a former seminarian, man. Like, but but it's also one of those.

S

Speaker 1 32:45

It's

S

Speaker 2 32:45

it's fascinating to see how people react when something like this pushes up against what they believe and confronts it, and and ask some real questions because there are some real questions to be asked about the film, about the provenance. At the same token, I will say that there was all of out of an hour and a half documentary, there was all of five minutes or so spent on the provenance of the new piece of footage,

S

Speaker 3 33:22

yeah,

S

Speaker 2 33:22

you know, and where that came from, and and how it came to be, and things like that. So, like, there there wasn't a whole lot gone into about the the lady's father who supposedly developed the film, and you was it a copy of the film? Don't don't tell me the like I don't know I I've done transfers for a lot of people for film and things like that to video all kinds of

S

Speaker 3 33:51

and you didn't keep a copy for yourself I'm

S

Speaker 2 33:55

sure I may have but I don't know that you were necessarily here's the thing he was developing for them, so you think he wasn't missing a roll? Hey, I sent you 12 rolls of film. Where's my where's my 12 can of film? You only sent me 11 back.

S

Speaker 3 34:14

Yeah, that was actually one of the first questions I had when I heard about the story of this this found footage. Is why would someone? It's not his intellectual property. Why does he have that film in his safe for 60

S

Speaker 2 34:27

years? Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 34:27

and then, and then beyond that, it's like, well, Roger Patterson. You know, the skeptics are saying, well, Roger Patterson. You know, he burned the costume. He and Aldi Atley. Well, then why did they let this guy have the film? Or I guess if he was doing it behind his back. And then it was brought up supposedly that his wife had told him early on, get rid of that film. I don't want you know I don't want anything to do with that. So he didn't throw it away or send it back to Roger Patterson. He puts it in the safe. So I mean, yeah, there's questions there that are like, I don't know, kind of. Head scratching. The provenance doesn't make a whole lot of sense, but I guess it's not impossible that he was just a dude that you know thought he had something cool or you know wanted leveraged out. Who knows? I mean, I guess I guess there are reasons that someone might do that. But

S

Speaker 2 35:16

if even that case, like not that hard. I'm a I'm a vintage lover. I love I've rack full of vintage gear right here behind me. You know, see that. Um, it's it's not that tough to find a working 16 millimeter Kodak A series camera. Um, probably not that hard to find a reel of new old stock film for that 16 millimeter camera. Go out, film it, and develop it. Because sure, it's got the it's got the grading marks for the date and the year and everything else on it. But once again, doesn't mean you didn't buy a lot of film from somewhere. Yeah, that was from 1966, and you just went out and shot it.

S

Speaker 3 36:04

That's a good point. Now I have heard one argument that the that the K100 film apparently could not be processed after or after 2009. There were no more labs that were processing it. I don't. That is that is true. I'm not a film guy, but that sounds like that is absolutely true.

S

Speaker 2 36:23

That was a big thing to the point and fact that there are now home processing units for eight millimeter and things like that because that was a big thing whenever it happened. Because independent filmmakers still used Super Eight, they still used 16 millimeter things like in film school, all that kind of vintage,

S

Speaker 3 36:43

that vintage look, yeah, looks good,

S

Speaker 2 36:45

yeah, yeah, and like your vintage

S

Speaker 3 36:47

gear back there, it sounds good, looks good, well, and

S

Speaker 2 36:50

you still you still need to learn those processes of upscaling a 16 millimeter to 35, you know, things like that. You need to learn the physical cutting process to understand what digital editing is in that kind of way, so there there are still some good uses for it, but yeah, that is that is an actual thing that like places to develop that went away. They stopped doing it. So, but once again, doesn't mean that they didn't film it in 2000 something like that. Yeah, I'm just I'm just spitballing and hypothesizing in the opposite, pushing back in the opposite direction, and I am those

S

Speaker 3 37:28

questions are going to be there. And another one being, you know, we talked about Aldi Atley, and he's kind of made out in the in the documentary to be okay, a bad guy. You know, he maybe slapped his wife around. I didn't

S

Speaker 2 37:40

I didn't like him by the end of it,

S

Speaker 3 37:42

but some of the skeptics out there have basically said that he was like have tried to make him out to be like this mafia boss,

S

Speaker 1 37:50

yeah,

S

Speaker 3 37:50

ex Teamster guy, and he would have people knocked off. If that's the case, then why did again? Why did this guy have a film in his say for 60 years that belongs to a mafia boss who could have him knocked off, you know that doesn't really make sense. And was Bob Hieronimus and Bob Gimlin were they really that afraid of him that they thought he was going to kill them? I mean, that's a bit of a stretch to say to go from yeah he's a bad guy and a wife beater and he's made all this money to he's going to have people killed. So I mean, I I feel there's been a little bit. That's just an example of a little bit of the overreaction and maybe over analysis that we've seen in recent weeks in terms of of what we think we might know about somebody. But I want to go since we're not we're now talking about capturing Bigfoot.

S

Speaker 2 38:35

Absolutely, it

S

Speaker 3 38:36

was a great documentary. I mean, you know, beautifully shot. Yeah, good, you know, soundtrack. I mean, everything was storytelling was spot on, and the history was really compelling to me. You know, I won't quibble over the little minor things. At one point, there's a graphic that says Roger Patterson goes to the Bluff Creek, California, for the first time in 1965. He actually went in 63. You know, those are like minor details that only a nerd like me is going to look at and say, "Okay, not a big deal." But what I really want to talk about, Christopher, is I feel I have a unique perspective because I've been blessed to have appeared on like 120 TV show episodes and countless documentaries. I've been a de facto producer on many of these documentaries because you know they'll the producers will ask for my you know suggestions and this and that and I understand I've watched the process unfold behind the scenes.

S

Speaker 4 39:32

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 39:32

So one thing that I've noticed or concluded about capturing Bigfoot is that it was the dialog is heavily edited. Okay, it's sound bites. You don't get a lot of context. Somebody will say something here, one sentence, one sentence there, so it's heavily edited. So we don't know what the full conversations were. We know what the juicy sound bites that made the final cut are.

S

Speaker 2 39:53

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 39:54

I would challenge anyone who knows Dr. Jeff knew Dr. Jeff Meldrum. Sorry, to. Think of a time when he answered anything in a one-sentence sound bite. I mean, the guy could go on whatever he was going to tell you. There was a very complex explanation coming with lots of different, and you don't get that, Melgren, in the documentary. You get a couple of comments here and there, but he's not really giving any context in terms of the other people that they interviewed, and I'm not trying to be disingenuous, but we have to accept the reality that you know these are elderly people. We're talking about people in their 70s and 80s and 90s. Like Bob

S

Speaker 2 40:32

Gimlin didn't even recognize himself in the group picture of them on horseback. He was like, "Hey, wait, where am I in here?"

S

Speaker 3 40:40

So they're seniors, and you know, so they're you know maybe it's not as fresh. Everything isn't as fresh as it was yesterday. But beyond that, the vast majority of people, when they're being filmed, when they're on camera and being filmed, are very uncomfortable with that. Okay, I'm I do it for a living, and I've gotten used to to To that vibe, but you see somebody that's not used to being on camera, and you throw them on camera, and you're interviewing them. That's a very uncomfortable situation for most people. I think we can all acknowledge that. A lot of people don't want to be filmed. So, and I get I got that vibe from a lot of the people that they were talking to in terms of Patricia Patterson and Ivody Atley and and some of the other that they just didn't seem real comfortable. It was like, oh shoot, I'm on camera now, I'm talking. So we have to, I think, acknowledge the fact that people in that situation, when they're uncomfortable and you know feeling vulnerable, they're easily led into delivering what they think the person filming them wants them to say or do. Okay, so you know that you know you at that point you're vulnerable. You become a people pleaser. This person's filming me. Oh shoot! Yeah, this. You know. So I'm not saying that they weren't being completely honest and genuine.

S

Speaker 2 41:59

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 42:00

But we can't. What I'm. What I am trying to say is we can't put too much stock. And I've seen people doing this online and what people are saying in this documentary because again, a it's been heavily edited, we don't get a lot of context, and b they might be very uncomfortable in that moment. And an example of that I think is when they approach Bob Gimlin at the Yakima Bigfoot Conference.

S

Speaker 2 42:22

Yep,

S

Speaker 3 42:23

Clint, Clint, and Patterson and and Bob Ronas wait in line. Bob's in a in a wheelchair, and they finally get up there to talk to him. And first of all, you know Bob's you know like most people that are in their 90s probably don't have the sharpest hearing. And when you're at a convention like that, it's very loud. There's a lot of talking. There's a lot of talking around you, next to you, maybe speakers, whatever. So it's a very noisy situation. So they walk up to him. They're talking to him, and he's basically what he did. His reaction was very familiar to me when I'm in a conference and someone is, you know, I'm feeling a little bit overwhelmed, and someone's coming up to me, and I came here. It's like, yeah, yes, yes, you know, yes, yes, you know, someone's telling me their Bigfoot story, and I can't hear a word they're saying. I'm like, oh yes,

S

Speaker 2 43:09

yeah,

S

Speaker 3 43:09

yeah. I guess I shouldn't admit I'm doing that. So it didn't seem to me so much like people are trying to make it out like Bob confessed in that moment. Yeah, it was more like, yeah, I'm awkward and uncomfortable right now because Bob Hieronymus and Clint have just walked up to me, and I'm probably not expecting to be in this situation. There's people filming me; it's loud, and I think he just basically was just trying to get rid of them. Yeah, that's how it felt to be like. You know, yeah, yeah, sure, yeah. Whatever you say, it was

S

Speaker 2 43:36

a more than awkward moment, and I don't. I'm I'm with you. It's one of those. It it didn't seem like a confessatory moment. It didn't seem like a confession in that kind of way.

S

Speaker 3 43:51

Now the setting where he was interviewed at home, there were a couple things he said that were a little bit more. You're a little more open to that type of interpretation because then he doesn't have those excuses and he knows presumably what they're showing him and asking him. So I'm not necessarily defending anything that anyone said or he said in that particular situation. But I just wanted to make that point that you know we really need to weigh this new data. You know, yeah, these new data points in terms of the actual mystery film and what we think we're seeing in the film, as opposed to who said what. And I think there's too much emphasis, or has been too much emphasis, out there in social media and the Bigfoot groups on Iva and Patricia said this, Clint said this, Bob said this, Jeff said this. It's like that's not. Those are like the weakest points of evidence that you could pull up is like what somebody said when they were in that heavily edited film. Yeah,

S

Speaker 2 44:47

secondhand information and making

S

Speaker 3 44:49

a blurb or a sound bite and then trying to interpret that. So I think we just need to stay away from he said she said basically.

S

Speaker 2 44:57

Well, and you know I think that we need to get away. From the knee-jerk reaction of the the idea of anybody having to renounce anything in any kind of way like that, like say once again saying that this documentary discredits Jeff Melgren's work. No, no, it doesn't. This documentary does not discredit Bigfoot. It does not discredit your work as a cryptozoologist in the field, your expeditions that you've done, the work of Adam Davies, you know Shelley Covington, Montana, all all kinds of people that are out there in the field doing this kind of stuff, or at the library, many very stuff,

S

Speaker 3 45:44

very bright people. Yeah, sorry, you mentioned lots of really bright people in the field, critical thinkers. Yeah, no, I appreciate that, and you know, I would add on to that that you know, even Meldrum, if he were here, would acknowledge as he always did that the strongest evidence is not the film.

S

Speaker 2 46:05

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 46:05

it's the footprint evidence, the physical trace evidence, or technology, as he called it.

S

Speaker 2 46:09

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 46:10

and he spent a lot of time. He, in his own words, it was the most abundant and informative line of evidence. Yeah, and he saw not only physical details in what he perceived to be mid-tarsal pressure ridges in several footprints dynamics, but he also saw in his or concluded that he had seen footprints from the same individual at in an approximate location, but at different time periods, even years apart.

S

Speaker 2 46:38

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 46:39

and he could identify. And this is an anatomist who spent, you know, who wrote his dissertation on evolutionary bipedalism in early hominins. You know, he's basically like this is his specialty: is looking at feet and footprints and technology. And he really was convinced by that more than the film. Now he he did he was very convinced by the film, and particularly the way the walking gait of Patty reinforced some of his hypotheses about you know increased degrees of pronation and things like that. But the footprint evidence is still number one, and you know the eyewitness accounts. You know we talked. We just talked basically talked about that, you know. There, it's a numbers game because you have so many 1000s of documented Bigfoot accounts, observations, alleged observations. But you know, Christopher, there's a range or a spectrum of credibility in those. You know, there are some that are very credible where you're like, "Wow, this seems like this person really did see something, and there are others where you're like, I don't know. This there, there are too many questions about this.

S

Speaker 5 47:46

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 47:46

So I think there's a, you know, there's a some researchers, some of my colleagues put a huge emphasis on that.

S

Speaker 2 47:52

And and you know, like we talked about this pre-show, and I'm glad that you brought up Meldrum and his analysis of things because even his reaction to the film, because it it was interesting the the the kind of I guess gotcha aha attempt with with researchers and things like that, where they were like, okay, and he was like, I feel like you're pushing me to a precipice, and you're gonna push me off, like you're gonna show me something.

S

Speaker 3 48:25

Yeah, he didn't say that,

S

Speaker 2 48:28

and then they showed him, and and he was completely and utterly open to it to the point that he even used the term dress rehearsal, you know. But he then also began breaking it down scientifically and comparing it to the Patterson-Gimlin film, and then things cut off and went somewhere else. But but it was very interesting to see his reaction to it, which was more than measured and very scientific and and even accepting in its way.

S

Speaker 3 48:59

Yeah, yeah, and I think we were talking about this before we we kicked it off here, but I've heard Meldrum interviewed many times about the Patterson Gilman film, and he frequently said if it was a hoax,

S Speaker 2 49:11
yeah,

S Speaker 3 49:12
you know, then and he would explain his arguments why he thought that was highly unlikely.

S Speaker 2 49:17
Yeah, but

S Speaker 3 49:17
there was always that acknowledgement there that it it could have been, you know. There's any true scientist is going to allow a certain percentage of, you know, future evidence may come forward, and you know that's how science works. Now, I'd like to, you know, I basically like to state for the record as well that I've always thought there was a chance that the Patterson-Gilling film was a hoax.

S Speaker 2 49:43
Yeah,

S Speaker 3 49:43
that I've that has occurred to me many times throughout the years. I've never thought 100%. And this is something else that's kind of you know been getting under my skin, Christopher. Is I'm seeing so many people, particularly on a you know sites that claim to espouse critical. Thinking with regard to Bigfoot and other things, where people are saying this is the nail in the coffin,

S Speaker 2 50:05
yeah,

S

Speaker 3 50:05

and it's 100%. That's the suit, 100%. You know, and that's not science, guys. That's not critical thinking. There is no nail in the coffin. The coffin's always a little bit open. That's right. That's right. There's always a means of escape. You know, there's nothing 100%. It's you know, you have to state we have to avoid these kind of declarative, superlative statements about it is this, it's not that, it's definitely that.

S

Speaker 2 50:32

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 50:33

Okay. So that said, you know, I'd like to state here for the record that after analyzing this new mystery film, and you know I'm always going to leave a little bit of margin of error, just like we talked about. But I have come to the conclusion that is now more probable than not that the Patterson-Gilman film was hoaxed. Okay, I think I base this on what Jeff said. Meldrum said initially, you know, the contours of this costume in the mystery film are strikingly similar. They are, and certainly advocates have pointed to a lot of differences. The legs look a little skinnier.

S

Speaker 2 51:11

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 51:11

The head's not quite as conical. But in the the frame you're showing right there, I mean that's a pretty good. That's probably one of the closest. Where if you compare that to the original Patterson-Gimman film, you can see the contours, the buttocks, the back, the trapezius muscles. You know, even the bulging thigh or calf, gastrocnemius muscle, the feet, the bottom of the feet. It looks strikingly similar.

S

Speaker 2 51:38

Yeah.

S

Speaker 3 51:38

So taking in taken in totality, when we consider the similarities in the suit that we see in this film, the fact that the found footage opens with a shaky camera, and then you see a guy riding on horseback, which wasn't in the original film, but it was said that they were on horseback. Then we see the creature looking back at the film, just like Patty in 352, looking back at the camera, and walking from left to right, and taking in totality, then yes, that is very very similar to the Patterson-Gimlin film. So then we, so then it comes down to this argument of is this a rehearsal film, a dry run footage, or as many people claimed, was it filmed after the fact as a recreation, and you know, or whatever, it just seems far more likely that it was a rehearsal film because a you know there there there wasn't really a timeline, you know. Patterson didn't have time to put together this, and and the main thing is no one ever talked about a recreation in all these years. Bob Gimlin, no one in the Bigfoot film field who I respect, who knows the history, has ever talked about rumors of a recreation film that Roger shot, and it clearly looks like Bob Gimlin in this film too. So, so yeah, I guess that's where I'm at right now. As I'd say, it's more probable than not that that the Patterson-Gillingham film was Hoaxed, but there's no nail in the coffin because you know future evidence could come for it. I mean, I'm not saying it's going to happen. Mark Evans seems like a pretty legit filmmaker, credible guy, but maybe in 10 years it's discovered that it was actually created with AI, and so you know, I'm just. I'm not saying it's gonna happen, but it's not impossible that that could happen. So you know, you you can't say 100. But I will say, more probable than not that the Patterson Gilman film was hoaxed. Um, you know, it's personally, it's you know, obviously disappointing. I mean, I you know, I've I've been fascinated by the film for many years. Sure, I thought it was a very strong piece of evidence for the for the existence of Bigfoot or Sasquatch.

S

Speaker 6 53:45

Sure,

S

Speaker 3 53:46

I would say that my I've been telling people for years that I was 90% convinced that Bigfoot existed based on all the the cumulative evidence, and I feel like maybe that's dropped now to 75%, 70% sure that Bigfoot exists. So I'm not. I'm certainly not thrown in the towel, but you know the percentage went down because a strong piece of evidence I think has been debunked. So, um, yeah. So I don't know. And not we can talk about big picture now, like the legacy of what what this all means. I don't know. What do you think?

S

Speaker 2 54:17

Well, and you know, it it comes down to much of what our conversation is in the next part, and that we have all the time whenever it comes to UFOs, UAPs, paranormal, whatever. One of the presentations I give, Ken, is on media fakery, on spotting media fakery, things like that, but also the vested interest in media fakery. Why? Why? You know, and I just to respond to your percentage and things like that. I would I would say that this goes this goes a decent way. To proving that it might be not not genuine, but at the same token, I'll give the piece of footage that they have just as much provenance as the Patterson Gimlin film,

S

Speaker 1 55:13

sure,

S

Speaker 2 55:14

because it's coming secondhand. It's not coming from the person that shot it, not coming from the person that developed it.

S

Speaker 3 55:23

There are going to be questions for sure.

S

Speaker 2 55:25

I I would say both of them stand on the same point of provenance for me,

S

Speaker 3 55:31

and to serve a certain level of scrutiny. I mean, I think it's fair that if Mark Evans could release this 16 millimeter film to an objective, you know,

S

Speaker 2 55:42

yeah,

S

Speaker 3 55:43

review by people in the Bigfoot field, or you know, facilitate that or whatever, so that we can verify that yes, it was probably developed in this year and it was not semi manufactured. If he'd be willing to do that, or Teresa Johnson, or whoever owns the footage, you know, here's the thing, Christopher: the legacy of the Patterson-Gilman film really boils down to it brought a huge number of people into the Bigfoot field.

S

Speaker 2 56:06

Yes,

S

Speaker 3 56:07

you know whether the intention was that or not, and the intention was obviously money or whatever. But my whole generation of Bigfoot researchers and subsequent generations, along with the legend of Boggy Creek, which I think was another film that was you know fictional or based on true events, but was very influential. But the Patterson-Gilling film brought a lot of people into the field, and actually a lot of pretty bright people and a lot of very passionate researchers. And it it it ignited a fire or you know lit a spark, however you want to say it. And that's a good thing, I think, because regardless of whether it was a hoax or not, it did bring a lot of people into the film. And there's other evidence that we just talked about that's going to hopefully now become the focus, the footprint evidence, the search for bones, physical remains, DNA, or whatever that should be the focus.

S

Speaker 2 56:58

Yeah,

S

Speaker 3 56:58

and you know, photographic evidence, as we discussed earlier, you know, it's not definitive proof in a scientific realm. It's not conclusive, so it's always going to be controversial.

S

Speaker 2 57:11

That's that's just it, and and it is something that I I try to bring home so many times. Man, is the idea of evidence is what you give your lawyer to keep you out of prison. Like never let it meet a lesser bar than that. The word evidence. Aside from that, you have data. You have data. You have points of data, and especially whenever it comes to video, photos, audio recording, any of that, that is data. It's not evidence in that kind of way. It's just as just as prone to hearsay and conjecture as the telephone game in that kind of way. So it is something that should lead you down a possible road of investigation, but it should never be the linchpin upon which your investigation hangs. And

S

Speaker 3 58:08

well, very well said, Christopher. 100% agree.

S

Speaker 2 58:11

And you know, I once again think that community-wise, a lot of people, because once again, there there were people when it first came out. I live right here in Austin. I I have guys that go out and work South by things like that. There were people talking about it being a money grab, all kinds of stuff. And it's like I don't think you realize how much it costs to get a film into South by Southwest, much less the other film festivals that it was a in rung to go to, and then they pulled it. Yeah, because people started releasing footage and things like that to the point that even on Bigfoot Day, October 20 last week, whenever this was released in theaters, in small release, many of the theaters they actually had people putting phones in RF bags, things like that, like they do at modern concerts, stuff like that. Where it's like, no, no, you will not be going out with footage from this. I heard

S

Speaker 3 59:18

about that, but you know, if it was a money grab, Amazon didn't know about it because I couldn't find that documentary very easily. It didn't pop up right away. Yeah, it wasn't like I had to search all over Amazon Prime for it to find it. You watch

S

Speaker 2 59:33

the same kind of stuff I do, so you would think algorithmically it would have been suggested to you. That would be right there as soon as they switched on Prime. That's what I said too. Was like, oh, it's gonna pop up immediately. Like, no, I had to go searching. Like, I had to put the entire title in for it to find it. But, but it, it really is the idea that once again, it's one of those. It brings if if this film. Alone, the original Patterson Giblin film. If if it only brought people to the world of research in that kind of way, then good for that. Good for it, because once again, as I will bookend this show with the phrase "art achieved," you know, you you caused you caused a conversation, even if with a six six second clip of footage, it has caused a 60 year stir in conversation and stir to the point that once again people people's paradigms hang on it, and and when that paradigm is pushed against by a film, it it inflames things, and it's fascinating to see how our society reacts to such things. When when once again, like we've said, it's not we've said it with you on the show. It's not like there is a Bigfoot expert out there.

S

Speaker 3 1:00:59

No experts, you know.

S

Speaker 2 1:01:01

Nobody, nobody has their dissertation written on Bigfoot. Well, I don't know. Maybe somebody might have like a mythology dissertation or something like that written on it. But, but at the same token, it's not like somebody's letters or career in that kind of way are hanging on this one piece of film, not even not even Bob Gimlin's in that kind of way. So

S

Speaker 3 1:01:27

absolutely, the search search goes on, Christopher. Yeah, let's find the bones. I mean, that's that's where I've been at for several years now. Anyways, people are sending me videos and photos all the time, and I'm just like, I can't, I can't do this anymore. We got to find the DNA or the bones. If these things exist, it's out there. So that that needs to be the focus from here on out. Well,

S

Speaker 2 1:01:45

and it's it's great to see some of the sciences that are coming out there right now in the field: oil alleles from handprints, all kinds of stuff. It is it is really cool to see some of the new things being leveraged. So, yeah, I'm I'm with you. I I think that it's diminished a little bit, maybe tarnished a bit of the varnish, on my belief. But I'm still greater than 80% that there is something there.

S

Speaker 3 1:02:14

It's a bit of a gut punch, but I'm right there with you. I'm 70 to 80% sure. No longer 90. We dropped it down a few points, but for me, overwhelmingly, I mean, if you look at the footprint evidence, the eyewitness accounts, and just a lot of other things, hair samples, audio recordings. I mean, it's it's a it's a pretty strong circumstantial case, and I'm you know

S

Speaker 2 1:02:34

yeah, absolutely. I'm

S

Speaker 3 1:02:35

compelled to go with that for now. I know same

S

Speaker 2 1:02:38

same man. I want to thank you so much for coming on, for for truly coming onto my show with this. You could have gone on to 1000 shows with these opinions and with this breakdown of this film and the community impact. And I want to thank you so much for always coming on the show, Ken. It's always an

S

Speaker 3 1:02:56

honor, Christopher. Always discussion, brother.

S

Speaker 2 1:02:58

Yeah, same man. And it's it's one of those. I think that the community needs to take probably a step back from itself, think about things for a hot minute, and and if anything, think about how we critically look at things, and do we critically look at things, and even things like this, even things like the Patterson-Gimlin film, like you said, have been examined, and I mean frame by frame by frame, like the Zapruder film, 1000s of times breaking it down, for us to find this out at this point, you know, but we'll we'll see what shakes out on things. And I'm of faith; I think things will go fantastically as far as proving Bigfoot at some point. I think that we are just around the corner from such things before we let you go, Ken. You have an amazing series that you put on a great educational series that you have. How can people go and take your cryptozoology course online? And where can people go to find all of your books and your tour information? Where are you appearing next, man?

S

Speaker 3 1:04:22

I appreciate it, brother. So, exploring cryptozoology on Patreon is how you can access currently my critically acclaimed cryptozoology course. Thank you, Christopher, for being a an e student, and I also have a an exclusive Patreon podcast on there called Crypted Legacy. So yeah, I wish people would come out and if if they want to to gain the knowledge, I'll teach you everything you wanted to know and things even things you didn't need to know about cryptozoology. But that's the spot. I'm also easily found on all social media platforms, and I have a YouTube channel. I'm going to be working on this winter, trying to beef that up a little bit, and yeah, I guess I can frequently be caught on the History Channel on shows like The Proof is out there on Unexplained with William Shatner.

S

Speaker 2 1:05:10

Absolutely, man. Thank you as always for your time. I appreciate it. I'll be in touch with links as always. All kinds of great stuff. Thank you so much, Ken. Take care, man.

S

Speaker 3 1:05:21

Peace out.

S

Speaker 2 1:05:22

All right, we'll see you soon. Um, man, always a great conversation with King Gerhard, folks. Make sure to stop on by kingGerhard.com. That is where you can visit his store. That's where you can find all of his books. That is where you can find his cryptozoology courses. You can also find all of Ken's books as well as all of the books and courses and everything from our other guests right over at Curious Realm. You can find all of that at curiousrealm.com. You can like, follow, subscribe. You can find our videos page at curiousrealm.com forward slash videos, where you can find all of the YouTube pages of our guests, including Ken Gerhard. Whenever we come back from this quick commercial break, folks, we will be joined by Stephen Myers of the Pharaohs Pump Foundation. We will be talking about the redaction of the SARS study on the Great Pyramid, the synthetic aperture radar seismography study that was put out by Philip Biondi and other scientists a couple years ago. So that has just been redacted by Remote Sensing Journal. We will be getting into that, what it means for science, and what things like faking data and stuff like that does to the world of real research, and does it stymie it? Does it does it change things in that kind of way? We'll be back with Stephen Myers right after this, folks. The key to good science is good research. At the heart of good research is a good data set. With the field observation and encounter log from Curious Research, you can easily keep track of your investigative information all in one place, making it easier to review cases and readily see comparisons and contrasts between them. Whether out in the woods squatching in a back room gathering EVPs or using high-tech gear to track UFO UAP activity, this easy-to-carry pocket-sized scientific data log is the perfect companion for any field researcher. You can find your copy of the Curious Research Field Observation and Encounter Log at Amazon.com, or visit the official Curious Realm store at curiousrealm.com/store to reserve your copy for yourself, your family, or a mind that you want to open. That website again is curiousrealm.com forward slash store. Well, hello everybody, and welcome back from that quick commercial break. Thank you so much for staying with us. Also, thank you so much to our sponsors, especially True Hemp Science. If you're a user of CBD products like I am, stop on by TrueHimpScience.com today. Christopher Lynch and True Hemp Science use a spygeric process where every part of the hemp plant is used. That's every part, folks: the seeds, the stems, the roots, the leaves, the fibers, the buds, the stalks. Every part of the plant is used, combusted, and reused. And that process followed time and time again until nothing but an amazing spygeric product remains complete with terpene profiles and all. Stop on by and check them out today. I use True Hem Science. I've used them for years. They are by far the best stuff that I've found, even from dispensaries. Stop on by. Use the code Curious seven@truehemscience.com to save 7% off your entire cart of \$50 or more. Our guest in this segment is our good friend Stephen Myers. He is from the Pharaohs Pump Foundation, and as as always, we will be talking pyramids, pyramid technology, pyramid building, specifically today, is kind of a victory lap episode on occasion back in the day, and you are you are actively one of the guests, Stephen, who has been with us long enough to say back in the days of dudes and beer. That's true. Yeah, whenever you were on that. Show we we had on social media hashtag dudes and beer called it, and you can go on Facebook.

S

Speaker 2 1:10:06

You can look up all kinds of stuff where with just look up hashtag dudes and beer called it, and you'll see all kinds of things that we would talk about in our episode before they hit the headlines, and it'd be like, yep, see, we told you this is what it was going to be, and this would be one of those moments where we would normally say #dudes and beer called it because we first had you on probably a couple years ago now talking about the the now famed synthetic aperture radar Doppler tomography reveals details of undiscovered high-resolution internal structure of the Great Pyramid of Giza, probably one of the most verbose paper titles ever. But this was the paper that came out from Filippo Biondi and Curado Malanga. You can find that, folks, on Arvid on Arcsiv, you can find that on Curious Realm. We've had it up there for a while in our Knowledge Vault. But the big news about that is that the Journal of Remote Sensing, which is where it was first published, has actually retracted this study, and we'll be getting into some of that retraction today because it's it's interesting. They get into the actual problems with the mathematics, the problems with interpreting the readings from that technology in that kind of way, all kinds of stuff. And like I told you in pre-record, Stephen, I. I've seen a certain person on social media that I know that's been posting all kinds of findings of their own, you know, using this method. And it's like you mean the one that has been shown to be mathematically false, that they that they fully massaged the math to get what they wanted out of it, so yeah, yeah. Welcome, welcome back to the show.

S

Speaker 4 1:12:07

Well, thank you for that introduction. That's a tremendous, you know, lead up into this interview. But right, we were on another interview together. You interviewed me a number of years ago, or whenever it was, and you were and you and I were in agreement that these SAR scans that were quite popular around the world, and you know everyone was embracing them. You and I said that we have tremendous questions, including the way the data was gathered, the way it was analyzed, and all of that. So we had the contention, you and I, that those scans were flawed based on the research methods used to create the results those scans produced, and to say a little bit about myself, I'm an alternative researcher. Wrote some books about the Great Pyramid and that type of thing, but I'm seemingly pretty unique in that I actually am a researcher in the alternative realm that wants to talk about research methods, you know, someone someone will come up with, well, this this piece of evidence means this. Well, how did you how did you get there? What what process did you use? How or somebody made up a correlation about the Great Pyramid and stars. Well, what how does that work? You know, and I'm I'm interested in the methodology and the research methods. Which, if you ever encounter a researcher that doesn't care about pyramids, they probably are interested in research methods as well. But most researchers that I encounter in the alternative realm are researchers absolutely will not discuss research methods at all, and become triggered when that subject comes up. So they want to tell you the results of their research, but not how it was done. So that was my focus on analyzing these synthetic aperture radar Doppler tomography scans. Yeah, and the fancier the name, the the it doesn't mean it's more valid. Well,

S

Speaker 2 1:14:27

that's that's just it. You know, it's it. I remember. I will never forget, Miss Frank. If you are still alive out there, she was my English teacher, junior and senior year of high school. It was the first time I was ever called a word that I had to look up. She called me verbose, and she was like, "Just because you can explain it for a sentence and a half, two sentences, Chris, doesn't mean you have to." True and and yeah yeah even even going back to the intro of this Stephen um I am verbose that is that is a quality that I have but when you look at once again synthetic aperture radar Doppler tomography reveals details of undiscovered high resolution internal structure of the Great Pyramid of Giza um it takes something special to let that just roll off the tongue.

S

Speaker 4 1:15:23

Oh yeah, it's it's definitely fun to say, and synthetic aperture radar type scans are absolutely fantastic.

S

Speaker 2 1:15:34

Absolutely,

S

Speaker 4 1:15:35

they are awesome, and they are awesome in discovering structures like in the rainforest of Brazil and that type of thing, they can see through vegetation exceptionally well, and they have a place and an application that makes those things wonderful. That type of Radar, but these scans or SAR scans don't go down into the ground. They go in like feet, two feet, maybe, maybe 10 feet.

S

Speaker 2 1:16:14

Yeah.

S

Speaker 4 1:16:15

So the scans were used in an improper way. You know, I I have a rope that I use that I can that I can lift. You know, something that weighs 10 pounds and it works great. Well, it's not going to lift my car. You know, that's a that's an application that doesn't work for that type of a rope technology. Do you get my drift?

S Speaker 2 1:16:41
Yeah, yeah.

S Speaker 4 1:16:42
And what these guys did was they they used this radar type of technology in an improper way. So that's that's just the first thing they did wrong.

S Speaker 2 1:16:56
Well, and exactly, and you know, once again, it's the idea of massaging the math.

S Speaker 4 1:17:03
Oh yeah,

S Speaker 2 1:17:04
and and when you when you have to massage the math, when you when you have to use a pry bar to get the key in the keyhole, that's that's a different means by which to open the lock. You know,

S Speaker 4 1:17:18
that's true. They also said that part of the process was proprietary, which means that it is secret.

S Speaker 2 1:17:25
Yeah.

S

Speaker 4 1:17:26

So we have a secret magic wand that detected these big chambers that we won't tell you how it was done. So that means it's not science. Science is repeatable type of experimentation, but when you enter in the secret factor, it certainly is a big red flag. So that is another problem that these scans were involved with. So the process, you know, is ultimately became terrible.

S

Speaker 2 1:18:01

Well, and that's just it, you know. And I've got some stats up right now about SARS radar stuff like that. When you're when you're talking about what you're using from a satellite, things like that. When and I specifically put in limestone for some strange reason, you know, what is what is the penetrating quality of SARS on limestone because that's what we're looking at is limestone caverns, things like that, and and at the most it's 10 to 20 meters depending on the bandwidth that you use, but but they're talking about results down to 90 meters, and and not just that, but results with massive resolution, and that's that's where it really comes to bear is the fact of the resolution of these scans, even at 10 meters, stuff like that. From and if you were scanning on the bed of the desert with that technology, it'd be totally different than bouncing it off from a satellite.

S

Speaker 4 1:19:00

Right. Yeah. Yeah. So they they there's just so much of it that's wrong.

S

Speaker 2 1:19:07

Well,

S

Speaker 4 1:19:07

that you and I are not. Well, a lot of people can reject anything. You can reject the what the shape of the earth is. You can reject a purpose for the Great Pyramid. We're not talking about rejection. We're talking about something of a much higher level of, you know, we're talking about retraction. That's that's even more bad than rejection, if I can put it that way. So it's it's really interesting to see this thing crumble into nothingness and right before our eyes. Usually, it takes a long time. Yeah, yeah. You know, it takes generations. But this, this is a really interesting example that will be studied in colleges. You know, Mark Twain said that a lie can travel around. The world before the truth can get its pants on, and this is an example of how wise Mark Twain was. And but for it to just be a few years and it's ended up in the ash heap of rejected ideas is just an interesting thing to watch,

S

Speaker 2 1:20:22

and once again, not not in the pile of rejected hypothesis, yeah, in the pile of flawed methodology of science. So fully fully retracted by the scientific journal, and that's honestly, and we we talked about this recently with Jared Murphy, our good friend Jared Murphy. The idea, and I don't think, and this is just this is just me off the cuff. I I think they honestly thought that they had something, Stephen. Oh yeah, they honestly thought that they had something because what you don't do if you're trying to falsify something, if you're trying to falsify some data, things you soft release it to a university here and there, stuff like that. What you don't do is put it in the Journal of Remote Sensing. The people who literally oversee this industry, the people who write the white papers on the technology of the industry, things like that. So I don't because of where they placed it. I don't think that they were intentionally trying to deceive in that kind of way.

S

Speaker 4 1:21:34

Well, it does. It doesn't matter. No, no, what their intentions are. I mean, they could have intentionally tried to deceive people for profit,

S

Speaker 2 1:21:42

yeah,

S

Speaker 4 1:21:42

or they could have essentially been deceived by themselves by embracing flawed research methods to come up with invalid data, or they could have been incompetent researchers and fiddled with the data enough to come up with with blurry pictures that ultimately became crystal clear underground massive structures. So ultimately, it has been rejected by most people. So rejected and retracted. So it's uh,

S

Speaker 2 1:22:22

and to the it's

S

Speaker 4 1:22:23

just interesting

S

Speaker 2 1:22:24

to the point that, and this is this is why I'm saying because like yeah, Retraction Watch is looking at actively prosecuting them for research misconduct, things like that, because because of where it was posted things like that, and that that's why I make that important distinction. I don't think that they were trying to purposefully deceive people. I think that they had massaged some numbers to a point and looked at things through a different lens for so long that they're talking

S

Speaker 4 1:22:55

about the two the two researchers.

S

Speaker 1 1:22:58

Yeah,

S

Speaker 4 1:22:59

yeah. Well, there's an old-timey mining term called married to the vein.

S

Speaker 2 1:23:05

Yep, exactly.

S

Speaker 4 1:23:07

And what they've kind of convinced themselves: Hey, we're on to something, and eh, let's you know the numbers are kind of funny, or we come up with a with a fuzzy picture, but we're gonna, like you say, cook the books with the with the math just a little bit to present it better, and then it maybe it all got away from them, and for some reason that article was published, and you know now it's a lot of egg on a lot of people's faces.

S

Speaker 2 1:23:41

Yeah, yeah, and and you know, to the fact of there have been tours about this. There, I was supposed to go out and videotape a a conference that had them speaking at it, and I was I was greatly looking forward to going to that conference actually and meeting them and talking. But yeah, it it comes to the point specifically, because one of the things that I talk about regularly, not just on the show, but as Curious Research, is the idea of we've got to be open. My favorite phrase from science is "killing your darlings." The idea that the idea that you have an idea, you have a hypothesis, but everything doesn't add up to it, so we got to scratch it and we got to start over again. We got to we got to start back from from the beginning because at some point the the data got corrupted or something like that. But you've got to be willing, like you said, to get off the vein to say like there is no gold in this vein. We've just convinced ourselves that there

S

Speaker 4 1:24:41

is, yeah, and so I I agree with that. Science is like a perfect system, except where people are involved. But you know, and if you question science, you're doing science. Yeah, and people have questions. Science and they've caught up with the the flawed methodology, and in fact, they've caught up with you and I. You and I had it figured out years ago. We and the same reason why we have rejected it is the same reason why it has been retracted worldwide is because the methodology, the process that you get from A to B, was flawed and not good. Why? That's why I like CSI. I used to watch CSI because most of the show is the science. You know, here's the data. Like here's the blood. Here's the analyst. Here, you know. Here's the chemical process.

S

Speaker 2 1:25:43

Yeah.

S

Speaker 4 1:25:43

And and if any of that's flawed, then the result is flawed. So, the study of scans of the Great Pyramid and the Giza Plateau is really interesting. They had scans in the 1970s that detected. Oh, there was more moisture, you know, in the area than we thought. There was pictures of big equipment in the Queen's Chamber in the 1970s, and then the another scan was the Houdin internal spiral ramp scan, and he also produced fuzzy pictures that ultimately he thought was an internal spiral ramp, but then the and all of these scans use different processes, and then the Pyramid Scan project used Muon technology, and they said and they came up with they were quite tentative. They said, "Well, we have a couple areas with some anomalous data points. You know, they have a little fuzzy area by the grand gallery. You know, the the big void. Then they had a little little kind of area by the original entrance above the chevrons, if you will, also called the little void, and that scan did not detect the internal spiral ramp.

 Speaker 2 1:27:06
Yeah.

 Speaker 4 1:27:07
So these scans aren't complementary; they are often contradictory.

 Speaker 2 1:27:12
Well, so that's

 Speaker 4 1:27:14
interesting.

 Speaker 2 1:27:15
And you know, speaking of the Muon study, like I have it up on screen right now. It was weird. Before you mentioned that, I was typing it in the background, Stephen. It's yeah, my brain. I was just about to say our brains are creepily right in the same place. But when you look at this study, let's let's take a look at all those authors.

 Speaker 4 1:27:37
Yeah,

 Speaker 2 1:27:38
there there was a lot of research behind this, there was a lot, as opposed to two.

S

Speaker 4 1:27:46

Well, there's that, and and the process was certainly much more open. How they collected data, how they analyzed data, but I was actually quite skeptical about both voids, you know. I mean, I was kind of on the fence, you know, didn't know. But when they inserted that little camera and took pictures of the little void, that is an awesome confirmation of the scans, how they were produced, the the you know the Muon scans, how they were conducted, how they were analyzed, and how they came up with the information. So those scans are kind of like the gold standard of Great Pyramid scans, you know, throughout history. So that gives finding, or actually confirming the existence of the small void, if you will, yeah, gives really big credence of the validity of the big void. So you know, not all scans are bad, is what I'm getting at. Well, also just one other point. Also, the Muon scan did not detect the internal spiral ramp, which I think does not exist. Yeah,

S

Speaker 2 1:29:11

yeah, and there's been studies on that. You know, studies how it would be done. I just I just found one a second ago from the Journal of Nature, and and that's that's what's interesting, you know, Stephen is that right there once again, hypothesis, the idea of hypothesis, the idea of the Journal of Nature is going to post post a paper not only showing the Muon study and the voids, but also one hypothesizing the fact that there's a spiral ramp around on the inside, so they're willing to hypothesize other things. What they're not willing to do is have fictitious math involved or mysterious means. Like you can hypothesize, I got. Science is supposed to hyperbolically hypothesize. That's what you're supposed to do.