Havana Syndrome & Capturing Bigfoot Fallout

The Curious Realm · Episode 257 · Full Transcript

Host Christopher Jordan welcomes author and researcher Dr. John Hall to discuss the current status of Havana Syndrome, pending court cases, and the technologies behind what is now medically called “Anomalous Health Incidents.” In the second part, Fortean researcher Jason McLean discusses the fallout in the cryptozoology community over the documentary *Capturing Bigfoot*.

Christopher Jordan	Host
Guest One	Segment one (Havana Syndrome)
Guest Two	Segment two (Capturing Bigfoot)

Speaker labels and text were generated automatically from the audio; timestamps mark the start of each speaker turn.

[Intro] Come and get me. 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.

Christopher Jordan 0:00:45
Well hello everybody and happy Tuesday night. Hope you are doing well. Hope you've gone out taking care of your civic duty. Things like that. For those of you I was just talking with a friend earlier tonight that was saying that, you know, they are in that kind of way. And they aren't really sure how a lot of things work. They aren't really sure how. A lot of people vote, things like that. So, we a curious realm, as as everybody knows, our color is purple for a reason. By we think everybody should be held accountable for things. We'll be talking about that. The second part tonight with Jason McLean, we'll be talking about government accountability.

Things like Havana syndrome. Stuff like that. In the first segment tonight with our good friend Dr. John Hall. Are down for government accountability. If you are down for how people vote and why they're voting and what they're voting for, and are your concerns. Are your representatives voting the way you would vote? We have created the Curious Realm. Congressional vote tracker. Feel free to stop on by CuriousRealm.com forward slash vote. And you can look up by state. By chamber, by party, by by Region. All kinds of things. You can find out exactly how they vote and what their voting record is. All of this is gathered from public.

Government databases, all the links are there for you to be able to go back and research those votes. All that kind of stuff. But this is how we hold people accountable, folks. This is how we hold feet to the fire. We are allowed to fire these people. If they don't do as we like. We are allowed to replace them, believe it or not. It's an actual thing. So go out there, check that out, Curious Realm. Forward slash vote is where you can find that congressional vote tracker to start educating yourself while you're there. Make sure to stop on by curiousrealm.com forward slash store. And check out Guinea Pigs: Technologies of Control. That is the book.

By our guest in this first segment, our good friend Dr. John Hall. We have him on. Regularly to discuss the world of targeted individuals, Havana syndrome, things like that. Welcome back to the show. How have you been, Doctor?

Segment One — Havana Syndrome

Guest One 0:03:20
Good, Chris. How have you been? I'm surprised you're we're doing this on the big election night. I'm I'm surprised there's enough bandwidth to do the show. You know, yeah, yeah, no, exactly. I'm surprised that we aren't being rush and bobbed. Bye fan. Buy things, all kinds of stuff.

Christopher Jordan 0:03:39
But as as typical, I'm sure that our are our metrics much like whenever we have Mike Turber on? Whenever we have you on, our metrics very much tend to swing toward the Virginia. Area. It's very interesting. We always tend to get quite a few listens in that area. So thank you guys for listening up there, all you alphabet agencies. Who tune in whenever we talk about these really hard-hitting topics but when you first wrote Guinea Pigs of Tec Technologies of Control, Doctor, that was personal case for you. That was something it wasn't like you would just heard of targeted individuals, things like that. You were actively on the receiving end of this.

So how did how did your world Change when you first found out about this topic, when you first found out for reality that there were like Havana syndrome weapons. Sonic weapons, things like that out there.

Guest One 0:04:45
Well, obviously it you know, it's it's life all well. For one, I'll start with I already did have kind of a nean cloud. I've had relatives and insiders and friends that were in intelligence agencies. All my life. So I already knew kind of that the technology was there. I just didn't know that it was being used experimentally on the public. Until I the actually the first book. Came out was actually chronicling the story of an ex-fiancé. That found herself targeted. And she turned to me when nobody else would listen to her when she again, being followed, being stalked. Being inundated with stalkers, organized form of stalking, not just someone that shows up every now and again, but on a 24-7 stalking.

And then started being able to have what we would call synthetic telepathic conversations with the people that were. Portrait or stalking or and eventually wound up controlling her with rhohitinol and sexually trafficking her. So that's kind of what brought me to write the book, really exposing. A crime using the technology that was happening here locally. And it's not until I started doing some radio shows and exposing what I wrote about in the book. Then all of a sudden I started getting bombarded by emails globally actually. From all over the world, saying, Well, this is happening here, it's happening in this state, it's happening in this city, it's happening in this country.

With exactly the same description of events. And an interesting thing that I think I've maybe mentioned this once or twice on interviews that before my book came out, I opened up a website to advertise the book. And there was a guy with just a short synopsis about kind of what it was about. And there was a guy called me from Fort Worth, Texas. And actually have the exact name of the private investigative company

that was doing the targeting. On the girl that I wrote about. And he said, Well, you know, it's this company, and he did it to me, and he's done it to other people up here in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. And this is who it is. Now, I changed the names in the book to avoid any civil lawsuits.

But he, I mean, day one, as soon as he called me, knew exactly who it was. And the technology they were using and had similar stories that were happening in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. So. It's Undoubtedly. This group that was doing it here. And if you extrapolate that, I imagine it's probably private contractors doing it. Most everywhere. There may be some cases where it's whistleblowers that are actually being actively targeted by the CIA or the NSA. I think in most cases, kind of the same way MK Ultra was farmed out. To civilian groups. I think this technology has been farmed out to civilian groups that basically, do the targeting just so the appropriate agencies can actually gather the data on how well it works.

Christopher Jordan 0:07:58
Precisely. And and we have we have postulated that numerous times on this show. The idea that there is no grand overarching type. There is no grand overarching

Guest One 0:08:14
Conspiracy air quotes up in that. Well, and that's what makes it so, that's what makes the solution so hard, too. You know, when it's, you know, when the technology is spread out to you know, hundreds or thousands of people that have access to it in order to do just kind of use it however they want to use it, target whoever they want to target it for whatever reason they want to target. Well, in the big end game of things, that looks like a mixed sample. You know, I mean, it's, it gives you the data you want because each group is going to target people based on their bias. And that's exactly what we've seen happen.

You know, some states it's mostly gay people targeted. Some people, it's sociological or racial targeting. Some people, it's used for sexual assault or sex trafficking. So, I mean, in the end game, it's a mixed bag. It's not just whistleblowers. And that's kind of the scary thing. And for the listeners that may not. Really understand what any of this is. I mean, it's everyday people that are getting targeted. It's not just you know it's not just Havana syndrome happening. You know, to government workers and military and intel workers. It's happening to civilians as well.

Christopher Jordan 0:09:26
That's just it. Is that long before Havana syndrome had a name, long before we heard about? Possible pyrethrin and crickets and all kinds of Hand black bag. Trying to bury a story. There have been a community of people. Targeted individuals for least 30 years. Complained of this same symptomology. Now whether or not any of them have the the same Soft tissue brain injuries that AHI or anomalous health incidents have. Because of the possible microwave technology used. Things like that. I'm not sure. I don't know.

Guest One 0:10:11
Well, the only way to know that would be to do diffusion tensor imaging, all of them. And so far, I mean, none of us have had the money to do that study where you can take all of the civilian victims and do the same scans that they did on the Havana syndrome victims and then say, well, yeah, okay. Here's, you know, here's 100,000 civilians. That have the same white matter damage on DTI that you saw on the Havana syndrome victims. And that would be a very good study to do. Unfortunately, that's probably going to take you know, the NHI or the Health and Human Services or somebody to kind of fund that.

And obviously they don't want the answer that's going to come. From that study.

Christopher Jordan 0:10:54
Yeah, well and you know really is the fact of things get pushed, as we've said so many times, into the world of private contracting, and they get pushed into the world of private contracting because at that point. They are extra duty. Extrajudicial. And they are Extra. Extra constitutional. They don't they don't have to abide by that. At that point, and they have all plausible deniability. You know, the same reason why they still they still util or at least contractors of alphabet agencies still utilize remote viewing. It's called HUMINT, HUMAN GARDED INTENTILIGENCE. You know, and it's no different than boots on the ground. It's exactly how it's treated.

That's exactly how it's classified. They will gladly tell you all day long, we do not use remote viewing. They don't. Contractors thereof do. You know, they are not working on sonic weapons. Contractors thereof are. You know, they they're developing them, they're testing them in the field, they're using them. And and as shown in Venezuela all of a few months ago whenever we had you on. Discombobulator. Mm. Was was possibly used. The the US Secret weapon that we now know was more than likely assembled from Russian parts. Attained through pipelines, things like that.

Guest One 0:12:36
Yeah, and you know, the the interesting thing is but you're right, before it had a name, Havana syndrome, when I basically started writing an introduction to the technology and talking about this, I mean, trust me, it didn't go well for me as a physician. As I tell a lot of the victims that reach out to me, the only person that they think is crazier than you. Is the doctor that believes you. Again yeah, matter of fact, I've I've you know had a patient in recently. Who came from California. Was injured in an automobile accident, who's actually been targeted out of California. And left California for that reason, which is one of the things we figured out a long time ago. It is, it is so government-sponsored in that state.

That there's almost no escaping it once you become a target there. Wow. You know, as a matter of fact, I even said years ago that. We've kind of given up on trying to save California. That when I would have victims call me describing what was going on to them in California. You know, my best advice is to leave. You know, even though it's, you know, you can't run from it. But you can certainly get away from maybe the local people that are controlling it. There. And just real quick, just sense of you. For the listeners that maybe have never heard of this topic, when we're talking about the technology that causes Havana syndrome and how it's being used is targeting in the civilian population.

We're talking about technology that typically starts with someone who's never had signs of mental illness before. In their 40s, average age, notices that all of a sudden they're being stocked. And when I say stocked, it's people at your house, people at your work, people inundating you everywhere you go. Some of that is to get probably bio markers on you, whether it's Scans of your fillings, scans of your brain waves, the way you walk, facial recognition, whatever they can gain DNA in order to basically get you in the system. Well, once the stalking ends, the electronic harassment begins, and that is people. Basically, talking to you through the best way to describe it would be a synthetic telepathy. It's voices in and around you that only you can hear.

And they're describing what you're wearing, what you're doing, what you're thinking. You can think your thoughts back to reply to them. That's the way the technology works. And then that opens you up to the rest of the torture, which is typically millimeter wave and microwave type weapons, burning of the skin, burning of the eyes, burning of the genitals. And what they want you to do is run out to your doctors, go to your family, complain that you're being attacked with microwave energy because. Unless you work for the government and you're a victim of Havana syndrome, in the civilian world, you're typically going to get referred to as psychiatrist.

Whose job is to diagnose you, not help you. So they're going to give you a diagnosis of psychosis not otherwise specified if you're too old to get a schizophrenic diagnosis. And that's how the targeting. Destroys your life. And that's actually the what the government wanted to know. I mean, the whole reason for the experimentation is they needed to know on an unknowing non-consenting population. How quick can we degrade someone with this technology to where they're they're unbelievable. They're unable to work. They're unable to provide for themselves. And they're not going to convince anybody that it's true technology happening to them. Well, and these were things that were quite literally made public.

Christopher Jordan 0:16:15
During the church committee hearings, folks, you can find all these documents. On the Curious Realm Knowledge Vault but Project MK Naomi. Specifically was the one that dealt with how to break a population. Whereas MK Ultra really dealt with to break a person. And rebuild them, and Project Artichoke went further, which was how to break a person and turn them into a Manchurian candidate. Project MK Naomi was, and this is where the movie Jacob's Ladder. Comes from was Project MK Naomi. It's where the it's where the wormwood experiments happened. Where they were exposing people to L S D to gasified L S D. Inside of helmets to see if it would affect them.

They were basically trying to find different ways to be able to aff affect and turn a populace of people. And within that was things like controlling propaganda through through Red Cross. And and through Voice of America, like all kinds of things. That was a big part of it was how do you get an entire population of people. To be able to turn in that kind of way. And you mentioned earlier, let's address this real quick before things go crazy in comments, stuff like that. You mentioned earlier DNA, that kind of stuff. Order for this to happen, in order for voice to skull technology work for this kind of exchange almost telepathically to take place, doctor does there have to be physical contact?

Does there have to be an implant? Do they have to have your DNA? Anything like that.

Guest One 0:18:18

Well, the DNA helps because you can actually track people based on DNA vibrations. Yeah, yeah. And that's easy to get. You can get that from a hair sample in a trash can, an old toothbrush. You know, everybody, anybody that's been targeted will tell you their homes have been broken into. When I was writing my books, there were times where I would leave my house and people were going up my driveway. I could see them in the rearview mirror driving in the alarms. Had been off 16 or 17 times. With people going into my house, basically trying to Sabotage my writing. I mean, it got to the point where I was carrying around my manuscripts.

Stuff that I was doing the writing with, but early on, yeah, it probably did require an implant. And you would have people like Bob Boise. We found a Verichip in his shoulder. He was an entrepreneur and an inventor. Other people we found stuff then you know, we did a lot of scanning, radio frequency scanning, and you would find radio frequencies coming in and out of people. But that doesn't necessarily mean that they're emanating from a chit. Or MAR coming into a chip. So the scanning you know, we found some things, you know, we did, there was a handful of people that we found chips and it kind of got to where, well, maybe if we're not finding it, then maybe it's nano.

Well we know the earliest Record it. History of this happening to anybody was from the early 80s at the Utah State Prison. Where we had three prisoners that described the experimentation they were under. They were in a cell. The electronic hum and the electronic vibrations in the cell were so overpowering that it was hard to even get up and down from a cot. And all three of them explained how they were being told things in their head. And they could think their thoughts back to the person talking to them, and the conversation was locally correct. Using synthetic telepathy at that time. And one of the interesting things as far as the implant part of it, while we early on were looking for implants, we weren't so successful. We did find some.

I mean, not not to the tune that explained the number of people that were having the symptoms. But it kind of went on to, well, maybe we need to look for nano. The problem I have with nanotechnology being a part of this, especially if it's something that's being sprayed. That I would think that we would see. You know, millions of people actually voicing these complaints, not hundreds of thousands of people. Because it would be a lot more widespread than what we're seeing if it were something microscopic or nanoscopic that is being sprayed on you. The other interesting thing is there are some. Guidelines that the government came out with on how to actually diagnose and treat Havana syndrome.

And the interesting thing is none of those diplomats that got evaluated for Havana syndrome. Were radio frequency scanned. None of them were actually put through any type of scanning that was looking for implants. So the government itself obviously wasn't bothering to look for implants. Hold on.

Christopher Jordan 0:21:44
Having a problem with my earpiece. Oh. This. So with all of that in mind, with the fact that we know that we can track people via DNA. We know that we can do voice to skull technology, like you said. prisoners back in the eighties were were reporting things like that, and we we definitely used MK Ultra in prisons. That kind of stuff. I remember when we first met, the the case that we met over was the Navy Yard shooting. I'm trying to find it. There it is. Aaron Alexis. And he specifically. Mentioned the fact that he had begun hearing voices in his head. His his medicals had come back just fine.

Prior to that, he said that he had recently started hearing voices Prior to that.

Guest One 0:22:51
Yeah, and he originally wasn't sure that it was the voice, you know, because like I said, when they we call it voice to skull, it's not necessarily in your head. It can be just in vibrations around you where you hear it, but it is still person specific to you. And he originally thought that he had people nearby talking about him. As a matter of fact, he kind of went off on some people in an airport. That he thought were making comments about him. And then he later on realized that. That it was other voices directed toward him to make it seem like it was those people.

Talking about him and he knew that he had kind of gone off on those people for for no reason. But that is one of the ways they try to drive some of these shootings is by. Basically, kind of driving you crazy, or I guess to use an old term, psychic driving, to get you to do things that you ordinarily wouldn't do. And we've seen that happen with other victims: Myron May. Yeah. Then you had the guy that I thought wasn't from Alaska. They actually tried to go to the FBI and said, you know, somebody is trying to control me. And they want me to do bad things. And the FBI said, Well, go, you know, go see a psychiatrist and we can't help you, even though I'm pretty sure they knew the technology that he was being affected by. And he went on to go down to the Florida airport, I think it was the airport.

And tried to have a shooting at the airport and he wound up getting shoot shot and killed himself. Yeah. Same thing with Myra May. You know, he basically wrote a manifesto of exactly, and he was an, what, an attorney, attorney general in New Mexico or. He he was a a smart guy.

Christopher Jordan 0:24:31
Well, and there was a case all of a year and a half, two years ago, of the gentleman in the storage unit. Yeah. Dust up with the cops and things like that and was talking about the voices coming from his phone. Yeah. And the police officers say, Oh, let me help you with that. Well, yeah, he said we can make it go away. Yeah, yeah, we can help that stop. And yeah. It's and it's it's fascinating to think about that. And whenever you start getting into the world of high frequency devices like cell phones, 5G, that kind of stuff. Even even before then. You don't have to get to that.

For this to happen. You know, and and the example I normally give is my little my little sound gun. Here that I built. For literally less than$150. I purchased Spotlight speaker. Which, yeah, like this can reach easily easily a good fifty yards. Something like that. More if I amplified it. Yeah. Or Bigger ultrasonic. Transducers but this allows me to dial a speaker a cone of sound to fifty fifty yards. And and a ten foot radius. You know, that's pretty incredible for just like a hundred dollars in a circuit off eBay. You know, I can't imagine

what would happen with government funding. I can't imagine what would happen.

If you had more than 150 bucks.

Guest One 0:26:19
Well, and that's exactly what's happened is now it's, you know, it it's companies like Raytheon and Archer and, you know, that are actually spending big bucks on this. And like I told you, it's been a year ago now, last Halloween, I ran into a guy from one of these companies who recognized me and he said, you're you're John Hall. You're the author about the books, about the technology that I work with. And he goes, Well, just so you know, you're completely correct on all that. And he said, we can watch you from space. You know, we can we can communicate to you from space. And if we want to, we can vaporize you from space.

Well, and went on to tell me how they're using some of that technology in some of the African skirmishes right now, too. So they do have areas where they have their playgrounds where they use the technology experimentally. You know, where they know there's not going to be any media presence. So.

Christopher Jordan 0:27:14
Oh, absolutely, absolutely. and and that's just it. Field it field trial is a huge part. Of things like this. Or that's why I've had any people asking.

Guest One 0:27:28
Well I've had people ask me that the big question that target individuals get, why you? You know, if you're, you know, you're a real estate agent and a housewife and you know, why would they be interested in spending the vast amounts of money to stalk you and use this technology on you? Well, the answer to that is: for one, there's no vast amount of money being used in it. It's satellite-based technology. Your tax dollars paid for it. You know, it's all you have to do is be able to log in to use the system. And you see when the the private investigators are using this system.

They're sitting around in their car on a laptop. It's all done from a laptop. So, I mean, the stalking originally followed me around, some of that is a psychological ploy. So, you run around telling everybody that somebody's after you, the government's after me. I mean, most people aren't committing crimes that are going to necessitate the NSA to follow you around everywhere. It is private investigators. Now, once they have the biometrics they need to finish targeting you, all the rest of it's done from a laptop. Then they may be across town, they may be in another city, they may be in another state. I mean, it doesn't, you know, it it they don't have to be right outside your door.

They'll try to convince the targets that the family is involved with some of the targeting, that sometimes it may be the fact, most of the time it's not. They want you to turn on your family. Because your family is the only close support system you got. So they want to make sure that they break that. So that's another common and the other common thing for those of you that maybe dealing with a family member or a relative or somebody that voices these complaints, it starts with tinnitus. You know, when you start getting bombarded by this electromagnetic. Weaponry. It's going to give you ringing in the ears. 100% of targeted individuals, it starts with Tinidas.

Christopher Jordan 0:29:19
That's just it. And it it starts with something that seems I mean, hey, tinnitus can be brought on by a new numerous causalities. Everything from blood pressure to not eating enough during the day. To like the shooting? Rock and roll. All kinds of stuff. So

Guest One 0:29:40
And magnetophosphenes, that's the other one. The two the two most common early complaints other than I've noticed myself being stalked. Well once you notice the stalking. You'll notice tinnitus when they're when they're starting to use the electronic warfare on you. And you'll notice magnetophosphines. What are magnetophosphines? Well that's what happens to your brain when you're in an MRI. If you're trying to sleep at night and you close your eyes and it looks like a lightning show going off with your eyes closed, that's so disturbing that it makes it hard to sleep. The same thing happens when you get a brain MRI, the magnetic stimulation to your optic centers and optic nerves in your brain.

Cause you to see flashes of light. And just about all targeted individuals voice that complaint too. And that's because you're in an umbrella of magnetic, electromagnetic energy that's stimulating areas of your brain that typically wouldn't be stimulated when you're at rest.

Christopher Jordan 0:30:35
Well, and the new technology that's out there especially, once again does not get you doesn't require nano, doesn't require it to touch you, doesn't even require big bulky dishes, things like that, like other previous sonic weaponry, even other heatway weaponry. Like what they are like what they are currently deploying out to the southern border right here in Texas. Where they're putting the heat ray weapons out. Lrads, things like that. Not even that kind of stuff. It is much more of PAC style device that has a a range around it. That's almost almost like an omnidirectional antenna. In that kind of way, where it's tuned specifically. For the people in that area.

That they're trying to affect. Because there's there's videos especially of the of the Air Force. Lady. Who we spoke about previously. The one who had Cartilage, things like that that were damaged. In a where yeah, other people in the restaurant were utterly unaffected. By what was happening. It was it was occurring only to her. With the gentleman with the backpack sitting near her. So it's pretty remarkable the precision with which they can target it. Even amongst a group of people.

Guest One 0:32:09
Well, and like you were showing with your audio spotlight, you know, I've got a device here that operates off of a nine-volt battery that. You know, if I set it off in a big office space. I can pretty much guarantee that about 90% of the people that are working in that office space. Are going to complain of a headache within about 10 or 15 minutes. Some people can kind of hear it. Most people can't. So it's for the most part silent. But over time, it will give you a headache bad enough to, where you'll have a bunch of irritable people starting to turn on each other because their heads are pounding.

Yeah. So, I mean, I mean, and this is. This big. So it's the size of a nine-volt battery. So, I mean, the technology has been miniaturized. And I saw what they're using down on the border now. It's not the big Humvees. Not at all. You know and and a lot of it's probably not even the backpack a lot of it's probably

satellite based

Christopher Jordan 0:33:09
And that's just it. With the realm of technology that is out there now, I mean, I know. Geez, back in the 80s, 90s, they were able to read Title list. Things like that. License plates with full accuracy. All kinds of things with with just satellite based cameras. So they have now. Down to down to less than a meter. Resolution in that kind of way. Is pretty remarkable.

Guest One 0:33:44
Well, and along with weapon systems that are on those platforms as well, it's not just surveillance. It is weaponry on it too. So it's not that you're just being, because most people would say, well, what's it matter if they watch you? If you're not committing a crime, what's it matter? Well, the problem is that there's also weapon systems on there. So it's not just that they're watching you and maybe talking to you and maybe trying to intimidate you about what you're wearing or what you're doing or what you're thinking. They're also burning you. So, I mean, that's the distressing part of it. And that was the distressing part of it when it actually came out as Havana syndrome, now anomalous health incidents since they've changed the name, but.

You know, you were asking, you know, what what impact it had on me writing the book. Well, the initial impact was: I can't believe you're writing this stuff. This sounds like science fiction. To 10 years down the road, I had. You know, some of my colleagues going, oh my God, we didn't realize you were this is far ahead of the curve. You know, now it's on Fox News. It's called Havana syndrome. And you're right, that technology is messing people up. So, I mean, it's I guess if you live long enough, you know, you you get to the truth maybe.

Christopher Jordan 0:34:59
You get to see things to fruition. And I think it honestly is. Think a prime example. And there are so many things that are coming to this point right now. Legality wise in our country. And it's fascinating to see. Inroads that are being made. Especially with things like we just saw finally the declassification. Of of health files. From nine eleven. The fact that, yeah, they rushed things. They knew full well that they were sending people into. Fully hazardous work conditions and just told them, Nope, you're all good. But that finally came out. We are finally seeing some kind of accountability. When it comes to at least the conversation.

Of things like Havana syndrome. With with anomalous health incident.

Guest One 0:36:04
Now actively. Well, the fact that there's a definition in TRICARE helps. And like I've said from the beginning, the minute that it came out. That Havana syndrome was most likely caused by microwave energy weapons. Then immediately the civilian world needed to kind of piggyback on that. And there is a group that's actually trying to do that. There's a lawsuit currently that was brought about by Targeted Justice. That's basically saying that you know, because if you read all the articles on Havana syndrome, they kind of downplay the civilian aspect. You know, all of the articles will say, well, it's mostly diplomats and mostly intelligence service people and, you know, and not very, not very widely affected in the civilian population. Well, it's more widely affected in the civilian population than it is.

In the government employee population. And the lawsuit that Targeted Justice brought about was basically saying that they've been negligent in recognizing the fact that this has been already going on experimentally. In the targeted civilian population, before it was ever called Havana syndrome. Now they've got their lawyers basically trying to get that dismissed. Because if they admit that it's happening in the civilian world and has been for this long. It's really kind of hard to parlay that into that it's a foreign adversary. Yeah. And like I've said on your show, since Havana Syndrome started. I don't think it was ever a foreign adversary that was targeting those diplomats. I think it was our own government.

Christopher Jordan 0:37:43
Horribly, horribly, horribly so. I believe the exact same thing. And and the evidence tends to prove that it tends to point to that. And

Guest One 0:37:56
Especially when they went out of their way to bring out studies from psychologists. You know, to say, well, it's permethrin. You know, we've been bathing in permethrin since you and I were both four or five years old. Yeah. You know, and it didn't cause us to hear voices or get tinnitus or. You know, and then they said it was, well, maybe it was competing surveillance technology in the building that was creating. But the problem is, is it started happening in China and everywhere else and DC and he had other victims other places. Well, the latest, the latest study that just recently came out in June of 2026.

Was yet another psychologist who's an expert in mass psychogenic illness. Saying that well this is still mass psychogenic illness. It's a hallmark of mass psychogenic illness that even all of the experts that are trying to say that it was something else or it was microwave energy. Are still missing the fact that that it's psychogenic illness, that psychogenic illness isn't. They're trying to imply that these people aren't crazy, they're being victimized, and that just being not crazy doesn't exempt you from. Psychogenic illness. So they're still trying to go down any route they can. To allay liability

Christopher Jordan 0:39:12
For that technology. Well, and, you know, never forget that that. You were actually part of a study. Yeah. The haunted people syndrome. The John Hall effect. It was it was called in the study. And I I still say that we should bring those two gentlemen on the show. Yeah, who did the study? But it's it's interesting, I guess, for people. Who did the study. But yeah, it is it is one of those I guess they did the study to try to disprove your work, but at the same token, it's one of those wow. We have, yeah, we now have actual symptomology. That is recognized by military doctors.

Point of diagnosis of something. So

Guest One 0:40:12
Well, and hopefully the lawsuit is, like I said, when it when it when it finally came out on Havana syndrome, like I said, there was there was some vindication because not only did I have that study, I had a an article by the New York Times. That basically said I was the pipe piper or the mentally ill, that my book was creating people to think that they're being targeted. My book was a product of talking to a bunch of people that are being targeted. Now are do some maybe have mental illness? Yeah, maybe, you know. But you know, like having mental illness doesn't protect you from being targeted by technology, that's for sure.

Christopher Jordan 0:40:49
There it I would venture a guess that three out of fifteen people next to you in traffic have mental illness. They're probably on some medication that says do not drive a vehicle. Yeah. Like Prozac. Things like that. On the daily. You know, depression is mental illness, folks. Like all these things are mental illness. So to say that somebody is crazy because they are experiencing this symptomology. I think jumps jumps a very, very large and dangerous shark.

Guest One 0:41:25
Well I I'm hoping we're at a turning point where because I mean when I first started talking about this technology. We were at a point where if you told anybody, somebody's communicating to me with voices that you can't hear and only I can. It was a turnkey diagnosis of psychosis. Your family would have been typically the first ones to actually you know.

Christopher Jordan 0:41:51
Lock you up. I get a lot of crap from people for covering it. Yeah. A lot. And and like I tell them, I would love to dismiss the people who personally reach out to me. On the show. Because of it. And and who have given me their cases. And you know, I think it's very interesting because A, there is we're getting ready to have Chris Diperno on and one of the things that we talked with him about was very distinct, and we need to get you together with Roger Stankovic. Roger Stankovic is one of the heads of MUFON in Australia, and he did a whole study.

On Havana syndrome symptomology and UFO experiencers. And it's very interesting some of the symptomology that is experienced. In AHI being experienced in not only those who are in proximity of craft, but pilots. Who are in proximity of craft. And and I attribute that to the high vibrational fields. You know, of the technology of the crafts themselves. However, I think probably the most interesting layover. From the UFO UAP field and the current congressional hearings going on because there's stuff getting ready to go on. We just had the first MK Ultra hearings again. Targeted individuals were brought up. Havana syndrome was brought up. I think that they are really tipping into that world. And when you look at the fact that.

Just recently. Was talking about NBA Revocation for whistleblowers. And NDA protection. That is what is always kept. People like David Grush from being able to say everything he could. That's what keeps them having to say like I can tell you that in a skiff. Do you do that in a secure compartmentalized information facility? Things like and then maybe tell you about it if you read in that deep. Past that I can't tell you. You know? And because despite especially especially where it comes in. Not just governmental, but governmental contracts. In the private industry field is where it gets really dangerous with the NDAs. Where you can start doing the prison time and stuff like that,'cause sure you'll still have whistleblower protection as far as governmental work goes.

But as far as like, hey, yeah, I work for Bassif. And I'm I'm putting some technology out there, I'm letting somebody know about this, or I'm blowing the whistle on a program that shouldn't be here. You are bound by your NDA and you could do hard prison time, man. Yeah. and yeah, this new this new Blanket Federal Workforce NDA proposal. I think may be a very interesting door along with AHI doctor that really opens up. Like we've said, the solution for this is legal. The solution for this is in the halls of Congress. It's getting

people like Luna and stuff like that to turn their eye to it.

And to bring it up. And hold people accountable. For these black budget programs, for these Russian technologies that are now roaming our streets. Doing this to people.

Guest One 0:45:36
Well, and that is there, there have been some groups that are one particular group that's been going up and doing some lobbying in Washington, and hopefully they kind of get to that. You know, I kind of taking a step back. You know, from some of that after, you know, having, now that I've got a five-year-old daughter. So but it kind of handed over the reins to some other people. But that's kind of the steps that we're going to. I mean, that's what I initially, when the Havana syndrome broke, I said, that's kind of a gift. Yeah. You know, and we need to capitalize on that gift and try to make sure that it turns the correct eyes on the fact that it.

Was already happening in the civilian world. So we'll see where it goes. But I think they're going to have a hard time. Ignoring that fact.

Christopher Jordan 0:46:26
Well, and and once again, I think that specifically, it will be something that allows someone who is using this technology, someone who's familiar with it. It will allow somebody to be able to step forward. About the technology and to actively report more on its existence and what it is and how it works in that kind of way.

Guest One 0:46:53
Well, and that's why, I mean, even, you know, my books and all the lectures that I do and all the interviews that I do, I always say the same thing: that the solutions are going to be political. I know there's a lot of people out there that are looking for ways to shield from it, you know, ways to block it. And, you know, and there are some. Ways to make your life more tolerable. Dealing with it. You know, me and you have both worked on that. But ultimately the solution is going to be mass education on exactly how it works, what it does. And oversight at a government level.

On it because now we're to a point where like I said, it's not necessarily the government agency. That's doing it to you. It's a private investigative group that has access to the technology. And the technology is, and they're getting access to that technology from private contractors. So, not necessarily the CIA or the NSA or any type of government agency. Well, and you know, it's the same. But the CIA gets access to it from a private company. It's the same. I can tell you that. Yeah.

Christopher Jordan 0:47:56
Yeah, that's it that's how they're able to get the parts and stuff like that. You know, is is through those private contractors who can get them from overseas and that kind of stuff. No different than how. How we secured Titanium from Russia for the SR-71. Quite literally. Bought it straight from him. That's all it took. And and like Lockheed Martin was buying Russian titanium to build that plane. They had no idea. And that's exactly how that works. All it takes is a couple of onion layers to obscure that stuff. And that's just it. You use the private contractors, the Blackwaters. Kind of stuff, not only here, but abroad, like you're saying, in African campaigns, that kind of stuff, because they can use the technology, they can test the technology, they are not necessarily bound by the same rules of engagement.

In that kind of way.

Guest One 0:49:03
So, yeah. And that technology should scare everybody. I mean, if you look at just look at the wars that are going on. Right now, warfare itself, we're at a turning point where you know, there's no protecting yourself. I mean, you know, we're all basically soldiers now. I mean, because. This technology will affect civilian populations just as much as it will affect military populations. You know, you're seeing over what's going on in Ukraine and Russia. It's all drone warfare now. That even I think our country is kind of ill-equipped. To defend against. I mean, if things keep on going the way they're going in Iran, I'm surprised we haven't started seeing drone strikes here.

So

Christopher Jordan 0:49:50
And I was I was actually hold on. Let's see if I can find it from task and purpose. I just saw it. There was they just started a new task force. Against drones. Like and it was hilarious because like the image showed a dude with a shotgun. Yeah. But it's like this is the new unit that's gonna fight drones.

Guest One 0:50:19
Like you mean you mean like every Texan would fight a drone. Just a a 12 gauge. Gotcha. My God. Well, and I actually had a a a cat that was flying a drone around my house. And I'll tell you what, even in Texas, it's illegal, even if it's in front in your front doorstep. You can't shoot it down. You know, the, you know, and that's the problem with this kind of technology: it takes a while for the legal system to catch up with. What you can and can't do if your privacy is invaded. And I mean, this drone was hovering. 10 feet in the air right in front of my front door.

So you know, I mean, and by, I mean, of course, I ran back in to get a shotgun. I was going to pop it down. Right. But the guy flew it off before I had the chance. But I called the police anyway. And he's like, well, it's a good thing you didn't. Because you can't shoot them down, even if they're 10 feet in front of your front door. And I said, Well, if it was your daughter and wife that came out of your house and saw it, he goes, Well, I would shoot it down. But that's what he told me. He said, But I'm a cop. And I said, Oh, but because I'm not, I can't though, right? I mean, okay.

And yeah.

Christopher Jordan 0:51:32
And but but that's just it. The technologies are sadly and horribly out there and readily available. Now granted on the scale that we're talking about with the Russian technology, things like that, assembled from a few pieces. From what the reports are saying. But it was not hard for them to get them. To make the device to test. That kind of stuff. And that's that's what's more frightening than anything is the Ease which with which parts can be purchased. To assemble something. It's different than a ghost gun or anything like that.

Guest One 0:52:16
The problem I had with that story after Havana syndrome broke after a couple of years of Havana syndrome is when the press came out and said, Well, we were able to get a device from an underground source that duplicates this type of. Yeah, all of a sudden, when nobody believed all of the counterintel measures, the psychology reports, the permethrin, the crickets, when it was pretty clear cut and the doctors up at UPenn stood their ground and said, this is microwave energy attacks. Then all of a sudden somebody found an underground foreign weapon of that is exactly that technology that's causing it. Yeah, I, you know. And there's even anonymously one of the physicians that worked on some of these people, these diplomats up at the University of Pennsylvania, already said we knew what it was.

So, I mean, trust me, the government knows exactly what the technology is.

Christopher Jordan 0:53:14
If they didn't know, they wouldn't have known the very specific test to use. To look for the damage. Yeah. You know? And that's just it. You know, it's it's kind of to make the same parallel once again. The UFO UAP community. One of the things that they brought up. Yeah. Cannot have somebody. Well, you can't say. That there is not a crash retrieval program. When there is a US military member. Who is drawing damage pay. An injury pay. Trump being part. Of a crash retrievable or over. You can't like. That's oxymoronic. You can't say the program doesn't exist when this guy has been injured by it and has received settlement because of it.

Guest One 0:54:14
Well, I'll tell you, I've I've always been kind of on the outside of the UAP, UFO. What has generated some interest is, and I'm not going to use the name, but I've reached out to someone that's very prevalent in that world that lives here in San Antonio. And I'm hoping to get a meeting with this person. To talk to him about kind of what some of his experiences were with contact. Because when you read his stories. It sounds a lot like targeting. Yeah. You know, and I think, I think it's going to be interesting for him and I to just sit down and kind of bump ideas. And you know who it is. I'm not going to mention the name because it's not finalized yet, but.

Christopher Jordan 0:54:56
But I I mean I have reached out I've got a Fair to Midland idea. We'll chat off, Eric. Yeah. As we're but that's going to be an interesting conversation. Well, like I said, I would love to get you together with Roger Stankovic because I remember when he and I met at MUFON DFW, it was sadly sadly the same weekend that Robert Duncan passed. I remember I was there at MUFON whenever you called me with that news. But he was literally there talking about the parallels. Between Havana syndrome symptomology. And UAP experiencers. Like there is a large parallel. Well, and I've got an open mind to it, you know, so that's why part of the reason I reached out to him because I mean, if hey, if it's reverse engineered technology, I mean, I'd I'd like to know that too. I mean, you know, I wouldn't even go reverse engineered technology. It's just the fact that you're talking about a high frequency technology. And like I say all the time.

Whenever if somebody is in proximity of that craft, that is utilizing that high frequency, high voltage technology. To generate that field. It's like getting a it it's like getting a needle near a magnet. Yeah. Eventually it's going to point north. On its own because it's magnetized partially. You know, and it will forever be magnetized partially until you find a way to demagnetize it. Like it's it's atomically changed. You've you've changed it because of the vibrational field. And and no different then the brain has changed, the brain is altered. Same way with my binaural beats. With frequency. And all you have to do is Vibrate somebody at 19 hertz and suddenly they feel like somebody's in the room with them.

And they may see it. Also, they may see somebody in the room with them. Corner of their eye or a shadow person because 19 hertz is where the water in the eye begins to vibrate and optical hallucinations begin.

Guest One 0:57:17
Well and that's one of the reasons that y you and I kind of came up with that as a treatment for for targeted individuals, is if you think about some of the early technology when they were looking at how to monitor pilots. Yeah. Of tech. Basically, if you can Cause the two hemispheres of the brain to actually operate at different frequencies, that those two different frequencies will compete with each other. Will generate an interference frequency that actually transmits out of the brain. And that if you can pick up that that interference frequency can be heterodyne, beamed back into the brain. And then you can start putting in whatever frequency you want to put into the brain to demonstrate fast heart rate, anxiety, depression, anger.

You know, dummy and whatever, whatever symptom you want to affect. Well that's why I kind of came up with the idea. Well if you use bone conduction headphones and binaural beats, if you can if you can bring both of those hemispheres back into a similar frequency and eliminate the interference frequency. Then can you avoid some of the technology? And for most people, it does work. Yeah. Which brings me up to another thing that is now that they're using for tinnitus is the lanier system. Yep. Because all targeted individuals have tinnitus. It's 100% among targeted individuals. And if you treat the tinnitus, can you actually stop some of the targeting? Because it's the interference frequency beaming out of your brain that typically is what.

Keeps you on the map. For the rest of the targeting. If you can stop that, then you're kind of, you disappear on the playing grid, I guess would be the best way to. To say it. Well, the way they're getting rid of tinnitus now is by Auditory stimulation at the same time as physical tongue stimulation. Oh, and you're basically.

Okay, and you're basically rewiring the brain to operate at a different frequency so the tinnitus goes away. So the tinnitus. Possibly. Is a product of the interference wave. Well, so when you make that, yeah. So now I'm thinking instead of just using the bone conduction headsets with the binaural beats, maybe we should be using the physical stimulation at the tongue level as well.

Get rid of that interference frequency if we can get people off of the grid of targeting.

Christopher Jordan 0:59:45
Yeah. Yeah, well, I mean in that's interesting because there is a sympathetic Nerve goes through the tongue. There's the whole idea of holding your tongue to the roof of your mouth to help with anxiety. Things like that. So, yeah, the fact that you're tapping into a sympathetic nerve. There with the tongue.

Guest One 1:00:09
Also, and it's not much stimulation. What they're using to get rid of tinnitus is they said basically it feels like pop rocks. On your tongue. It's not like you don't have to hold a nine-volt battery to your tongue. It's not that. It's very gentle stimulation along with, now they're using auditory normal conduction. You know, now I would use still use bone conduction.

Christopher Jordan 1:00:32
I was gonna say I was gonna say I would use ultrasonic. I would I would literally make make a rubberized mouthpiece with a piezo inside of it. Yeah. That does the exact same thing. It's just vibrating inside your mouth at the same time. And it'll be interesting to see. Because we were already successfully using bone conduction and binaural beats that have helped a lot of people. Now, it's like anything else, you run into some that it doesn't work. Well, and you would basically, I can see exactly how that would work because basically binaural beats is you're looking for the target frequency and you're going to give each lobe.

Of your brain, each ear. Isolated Harmonic of that so that it creates the wobble, the target frequency, and you would literally sound bath-wise, kind of like throwing a It'd be the equivalent of throwing a Tibetan bowl. In your mouth of the target frequency. You're just going to give it the pure-tone frequency there. Because it's not like it's picking it up in any kind of any kind of isolated stereo way. That's the mono signal. And since it is working wild, that's interesting to give it to give it the actual target mono signal at the same time in that kind of way. Wow. Wow. And that's exciting though. It's exciting because we've had very exciting results, I think, with at least the five or six people that we have worked with. I have a very good friend actually who I need to follow up with because I made him.

An hour-long track to his targeted tinnitus frequency. He happened to know the frequency of his tinnitus. And I was like, I will. Custom craft a track for you. See if that will help alleviate your tinnitus. Do you know how they determine what the tinnitus frequency is? I'm sure it did that if I'm not mistaken, it's basically a a wobble. Where they give you that, they basically ramp through a frequency until you hear it match.

Guest One 1:02:46
Until you hear it match. That's right. Or, or they have you hum along with your tinnitus until you can match it with a hum and then they measure the frequency off of your hum. Yeah. Cause obviously there's nothing that there's no microphones that can pick up the tinnitus. Yeah. You know. Which is something else that I kind of find interesting: that is, people go, well, there's no way you're hearing voices in your head that I can't hear. But you can hear the tinnitus that they can't hear. Yeah, yeah. No, nobody else put your ear up your head and hear the tinnitus, you know, so.

Christopher Jordan 1:03:18
Exactly. And that's just it. You know, with the technologies that are out there, with the stuff that's out there, like, man, I can hear some LED lights. All right. Just the sound of the frequency of the circuit that is powering them. Because it's such a dirty filter capacitor. That they've used. So people have a different range of hearing. Everybody has a different range of hearing. And when you dial that in, when when you get to the point of like you said, heterodyning a signal like that where you have figured out the exact range in which somebody responds to something. It's not hard to physically affect them.

In that kind of way.

Guest One 1:04:09
Well, the interesting thing is you have to have intact hearing to be targeted. Yeah. I can tell you 20 years of doing this. Not one single deaf person has come to me. Talking about targeting. Not one. And some of the people that I was able to talk to. Kind of in confidence, that work for the CIA. Basically told me that you have to have intact hearing. For this technology to work.

Christopher Jordan 1:04:38
Well, what about what about those that are targeted? Experiencing you know, degrading hearing quality. Things like that is that a fact.

Guest One 1:04:52
Haven't necessarily seen that. Now, what we do see is degrading of the vision, and that's just from the severity of electromagnetic. Coverage that's on your body. So we do see sperm counts going lower. And people that are being males that are being targeted, fertility goes lower, vision gets degraded. Kind of overall health gets degraded because there's when you're under microwave energy, there's a ornithine decarboxylase is a a chemical in the human body that's responsible for cleaning up dead cells and rejuvenating cells. That gets becomes deficient. Where you can't repair damage as quickly as your body genetically would. In dying cells so there is some premature aging, there is some vision loss.

Fertility loss, things like that. So what?

Christopher Jordan 1:05:47
On the way out here, Dr. Rogan, number one, thank you as always for coming on and breaking these things down for us. It is once again. I think a topic that all too many shows are a big nebulous topic to begin with. And truly, Cutting through everything. It's something that I pride my show on: the fact that we take on topics like this and we actively help sift. Through the conspiracy theory, through the web of things that's out there on the internet. And get down to the real research of it, get down to the real science behind it, and get down to the real facts. Of what can be done. And like we said.

There will be illegal means. What will ultimately stop this? But those who are targeted right now, let's talk to them. Hey, let's talk to their families. First, and then those who are targeted can they do? Alleviate that symptomology, doctor.

Guest One 1:06:52
Well, wearing a tinfoil hat doesn't work, so that amplifies the signal. Sorry. Yeah, don't, yeah, just like rabbit ears on a TV. We put it on there to help the reception, not stop it. Yeah. Yeah. No, just don't try to convince family members that maybe don't believe you. All of your talking, don't go to a doctor thinking they're going to help you. Certainly don't go to a doctor saying, I'm hearing voices. I've got a chick. In me similarly even though even though the people that are targeting you may tell you that you're implanted you're probably not. They may tell you that your family members are part of it. They're probably not.

It's probably not your local law enforcement. It probably is a a private investigator that has singled you out for some reason, and that may be randomly. It's hard to say. I mean, most of it is random. You can, this is technology that a lot of PIs have. You can pay to have it done to somebody if somebody's trying to steal your inheritance or ruin your competitor, trying to ruin your company or. You know, in my case that I wrote about here, it was a girl that was being sexually trafficked. So for each, there are you know, I'm on Facebook. Guinea pigs of control, technologies of control. You can reach out to me on Facebook. You and I work with binaural beets to try to help people. I think we am going to try to try coordinating some of the tongue stimulation along with it as well. Same.

To see if we can actually even get a larger percentage of people to actually be able to escape it and stay political. As far as like my nexus and targeted justice and me and some of these people who are doing the lobbying, because ultimately the answer is going to be political. It's going to be oversight, not any type of protection.

Christopher Jordan 1:08:47
Well, and once again, as I led in with at the beginning of this, we just came up with our congressional vote tracker. When these things are proposed, folks, when these bills come up, when they these attachments to things pop up. This is how you find out if they voted for it. Yeah. It's a one-stop shop. You don't have to go searching through government websites and deep dig. All that kind of stuff. It's literally as easy as putting in your state. And finding your district. And looking at how they voted for what law. So when these things come up, when the AHI Protection Act comes up, things like that.

See how they voted. And if they don't vote the way you like. Them out. We can fire them.

Guest One 1:09:37
Well, that's what I liked when you opened the show and said, we're purple here on Curious Realm. And I said, just understand, neither side loves you. That's right.

Christopher Jordan 1:09:48
Honestly, it's the the the main thing I remember from my childhood politically, period. Is Ronald Reagan. And I don't care whether you liked them or not, folks. But the wisdom of the ten most dangerous words in the English language. I'm from the government and I'm here to help. Here to help. You hear that? Run, man. Run. All right. because like we've said on the show so many times. Doesn't matter. Feel free to Google search it. Feel free to fact-check me. Never once has the CIA landed in front of Congress. Told the truth the first time. Ever. They've always lied. So that take that where you will with the technology of Havana syndrome.

Targeting technologies and the CIA being involved. Once again, as always, doctor, thank you for your time. Thank you for the candid conversation. I greatly appreciate it. Thank you for having me. It's always a pleasure, Chris. Same, brother. I'll be in touch with links, all that kind of good stuff, as always. You have a great evening. Love to the family. Alright. Man. Always an incredible episode with Dr. John Hall, and I am here to tell you folks. There are so many things on the horizon. That are crossing paths in this kind of way. Like I said, guaranteed. This whistleblower protection for NDAs. Come into play. This technology for Havana syndrome eventually.

So once again, if you are out there, if you're voting, if you're looking at how to hold these folks accountable, curiousrealm.com forward slash vote. Is where you can go to find the Congressional Vote Tracker. Curiousrealm.com forward slash store is where you can go to buy not only your copy of Guinea Pigs Technologies of Control, but also music for targeted individuals if you are a targeted individual or know a targeted individual. This is the binaural beat album. That Dr. John Hall and I worked on together. Literally help bring the symptomology down to help bring it down. Stop on by, check that out. You can find that. It is available on Bandcamp. You can reach out to me directly to get copies if you need it. When we come back, this quick commercial break, folks. We will be joined by our continuing coverage. We basically got Mike.

A whole month. Almost of cryptozoologists and the like. Who are coming on the show to discuss capturing Bigfoot and the fallout and the controversy? This new footage. That has come out in the documentary Capturing Bigfoot. Last week we had Ken Gerhard. This week we have Jason McLean. Coming up soon. We will have Bret Eichenberger. We will also have Lyle Blackburn who we will ask about that. Shortly, while he is on, we will h be having Chester Moore on and I'm sure discuss it with him. So we have a whole month of guests coming on talking about this: what it means to the community, what it means to the research.

Yeah. Bigfoot, Sasquatch in North America. Does it impact that at all? When we come back, we will be hearing from our good friend Jason McLean on exactly that 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 backroom gathering EVPs, or using high-tech gear to track UFO UAP activity.

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 Law. Amazon.com or visit the official Curious Realm store at curiousrealm.com forward slash 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. And welcome back from that quick commercial break. Thank you so much for staying with us, and 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 True Hemp Science today, TrueHempScience.com and Christopher Lynch. Make an amazing spideric product where every part of the hemp plant is used. That's every part, folks. That's seeds, stems, stalks, roots, buds.

Leaves. Every part of the plant is used, combusted, and reused until nothing but an amazing spideric product remains, complete with terpene profiles and all stop on by. TrueHempScience.com today. Get your products. Use the code Curious7 to save 7% off your entire cart of$50 or more. While you are online checking that out, make sure to Hop online and check out are brand new. Congressional vote tabulator. If you're out there voting, folks, we just came up with this congressional vote tracker. It's something that I've been wanting to do for a while, but this is how we can hold anybody. I don't care what party you are. Purple is the color of this show for a reason.

We need to hold everybody accountable. So this helps us do that. And speaking of holding things accountable. In this segment we are very, very pleased to welcome back our good friend Jason McLean, he is the host of Siru Papers, all kinds of things. He has written books like DFW Monsters. He just recently spoke. The Greer Island Goatman Festival there in Fort Worth. Thank you so much for coming on. The the whole reason that I predicated that with truth and holding people accountable is that's part of what our episode is tonight, Jason, which is another response episode. Capturing Bigfoot. It is a splash of a documentary that, even whenever it premiered here in Austin, in my backyard.

For South by this last year. It immediately pulled the XYZ films, immediately pulled it from the rest of the circuit. It was in tons of film festival circuits and they pulled it. Because of the not just the mass reaction. But people trying to get footage. Out of our theaters. All kinds of stuff, to the point that they're cease and desist right now. From people at things, taking pictures, releasing them, stuff like that. We've been very careful about what we post on the show. Yeah. The only thing that we did. The other night was air part of the intro without audio, and then we put up a comparison of the original, the quote original suit.

From Patterson-Gimlin and the quote suit from the new film. And we want to thank our good friend Ken Gerhard for coming on. He did a great job. I think really. Expounding on not only the topic of Bigfoot itself and the importance of continuing the study despite this, but the fact that. As he always says, it's not going to be a piece of film. It's not going to be a picture that gets us to the truth of this species or subspecies.

Segment Two — Capturing Bigfoot Fallout

Guest Two 1:18:05
Yeah. No, and that's so I think the first place to start is regardless of whether or not the Patterson Ginland film is real. Or not. Is fundamentally irrelevant to the reality of the situation. I think the situation is a lot weirder than people think it is. Yeah. I think I've, again, I've said this a thousand times, so I don't want to retread. If you've never heard me speak on this subject, go watch the other episodes of Curious Realm where I've shown up, because trust me, it pops up a lot. Yeah. I think there is a physical component to this. I think there's a spiritual, and there may even be a larger psychological component. That's what the new book that I'm working on is about: saying, hey, we need to kind of look this over because I think we've made a lot of assumptions over the years.

Over the decades, really. And we need to start having a very different conversation about that. Whether Patterson-Gimlin is the film is real or fake. It doesn't change the nature of the conversation. It doesn't mean. Bigfoot or Sasquatch is fake. Or not. In fact. I'll say this way, if the Patterson-Gimlin film was where Bigfoot started. And if it was the only thing we ever had. I would have never believed it. Not because the film is bad, but because... One piece of data is like, okay. What do you do with that? Like, it

Christopher Jordan 1:19:27
Than that could be anything. Like the, like the night crawlers, right? The wow signal. The wow signal is a prime example. We have a one-off incident, a one-off incident that. Proves an anomaly of some kind. But it could have been an anomaly in the circuit? Which has pretty well been. Does it prove extraterrestrial life? Absolutely not.

Guest Two 1:19:52
Exactly. It doesn't prove anything. We don't know what this is. If all we had ever had was the film, then I would have gone to it's a dude in a suit, it's a dude in a really good suit. But it's a dude in a suit because there was no other body of evidence to work with. But there is a massive body of evidence to go with. And again, the reason they were in that area looking was because there had been prior reports. There is a lot there. So. I don't, there's, there are, I call them scofftics because they're not skeptics. Skeptics are people who want data. Scoftics are people who just want to just.

Yeah, exactly. I'm a skeptic. But Scoffer's like, huh, this just proves that there's nothing to anything. I'm like, no, no, shut your pie hole. That's not. Skepticism that's not science yeah living in your own little bubble. Mm-hmm. So again. Whether or not Patterson and Giml, the Patterson-Gimlin film is real. Or if it was a hoax. Is Irrel is fundamentally irrelevant. Yeah. Whether or not the Bigfoot phenomena is real. At best. Patterson with the Patterson-Gimlin film did. Was it did have a massive cultural impact. That's yes. And it is something a lot of people have pointed to. Again, René Dahinden. That was his big deal. So, where I kind of want to start with this, and I have I have been pinging poor Chris.

So many ideas. As first things to bring up because this is going to love it nuts. It but I want to start with Importance of actually putting things into their appropriate context first, right? Because the problem is everybody wants us to either be everyone in this new documentary is lying, or everyone in this, and then therefore. Patterson-Gimlin is legit film and everything's good and everything's back to where we were. Yeah. Everything in the in the film is true, and Patterson-Gimlin faked and hoaxed this. And that's what's going on. Think that's the situation we find ourselves in. In fact, it's not clean at all. We'll go into more

details where I think we actually are on this. It's definitely not clean.

But the most that can actually be said here. Of this new documentary in the film that they have is okay, claim's been made. That's as far as we can go. Yep. Anyone else who said this conclusively proves that it's that it was faked

Christopher Jordan 1:22:33
You're overstepping your bounds. They are literally stepping into the exact same pile as anybody who looks at the Patterson-Gimlin film and says it's a lock. Exactly. It's literally no different than myopic point of view.

Guest Two 1:22:49
And now I will say this, though. Everyone who said, ah, you know, this film is clearly made up, or rather, the new documentary is just made up. It's just a bunch of trash. We shouldn't look at Patterson-Gimlin more closely, or we shouldn't, we shouldn't question its authenticity. You're also way off board there. Yeah. The problem is everyone wants to come to a conclusion and we don't have enough data to come to a conclusion. One thing I think we need to remember. Is the Mythbusters. And not for the reason everybody wants is thinking where I'm going on this. And I I wrote it down making sure I got all the all the numbers correct.

By the way, love Mythbusters. But back in 2006, it was episode 67. Firearms folklore. They talked about. The story of Carlos Hathcock in one of his most famous shots. If you don't know who Carlos Hathcock was. My father was in Vietnam, so I got a lot of this stuff. He literally pioneered. The concept of the m of Marine Force recon. He was a sniper. Dude by you talk to people who know their stuff. They believe he was one of the best snipers to have ever lived. Because of some of the stuff he did.

Christopher Jordan 1:24:14
Yeah. Insane. Part of Marty Martyr Incorporated during Vietnam. That was the famed platoon. Of snipers. Oh yeah. Or come in there.

Guest Two 1:24:24
And there was a bunch of stuff he did that it's entirely possible that his his kill count was much higher. Absolutely. But because of the regul of like what it took to count it. And there was a lot of stuff he did that he he believed was off book, but they never told him was off book so they never told him where he went. Yeah. So, yeah, like. Home dude was full on amazing. Like the dude. Was set on fire. He saved people. He had to come back, get skin grafts, the water they put him out with. Had gave him a fungal infection. After all that, he went back.

Tour and in duty and still did stuff. And he trained. I mean, the dude was amazing. But there's this one story. Of him fighting going up against another sniper they had named Cobra. Long story short, he they get into this, I mean, and literally movies are based off of this story. He ends up shooting Cobra. Through his scope. And the thing he's always said is the only reason I'm so because the bullet goes straight through, doesn't touch the sides of the barrel. And goes and get and goes into his head. Kills a guy. He realized he, the only way that was possible is if he was aiming at him.

Which means he pulled the trigger first. That's it. Okay. The story stood. And then 2006, Mythbusters. Debunked it. They said, nope, not possible. This shot did not happen. I watched it live. Well, I mean, I watch it. I watched the show when it first started. Yeah. And it's like, look, I'm not. Greatest shot in the world. In fact, I'm a pretty poor shot, but I do realize, but I do kind of, I did watch it. It was like, hold on, you're using a modern scope. You're using the wrong ammunition. This is not valid at all. You can't debunk. This story, you can't call this busted off of what you did. You didn't recreate the actual situation.

And a lot of people wrote in on that. So they went back. And they did it again the next year. Only went from a full segment to like a two minute section, right? And then the which is right there. Yeah. This is them going back and redoing it. Now they call it plausible at the end of this one because they caught a lot of flack for it. Yep. But here's the problem. Order to call it plausible they ended up using an M1 Grand. And what they called armor piercing rounds. So for the next years. That you know give or take 18 17 18 years a lot of people called Carlos Hathcock a liar.

His name was Drugs in the Mud. There were a lot of people on internet boards talking about how he was just straight up lying about this thing, that the Mythbusters had confirmed that this was impossible because they had to use, because even when they said it was plausible, they had to use armor-piercing rounds. Okay, flash forward to again, let me make sure I get the year right, 2024. Fat electrician and then Nick Johnson from Pew View. They decide. Why don't we do a joint thing? You know, thy literation, his big thing is military history, right? And the eyes does a gun channel. It's like, let's recreate this story. Let's actually test it.

And you know what happens when they went and they got the actual it was a Mosin they got. Three power Soviet era nozenagat Mozen Nagat. Sorry, I that's why I wrote down some terrible names. You got the actual scope. We got a bunch of them because they figured, you know, we'll probably have to do this more than once. And it was a Winchester Model 70 was the gun that Carlos Hathcock used. And they used the proper ammunition. And you know what they found out? First shot, it worked. They confirmed that Carlos Hathcock's story was not just plausible, but entirely possible. On the first shot. So for for almost 20 years.

Bunch of people on the internet. Use the Mythbusters as their as they're evidence that Carlos Hathcock was a lying son of a gun. In the in the slandered him. And they defamed him because of it. And then two, and then some guys on the internet. Went out and said, okay, why don't we actually test this? So I go through this story to say this. Bunking matters. How is not just that somebody can come out and say, I have debunked this. They have to prove their claim. What you will find very often with a lot of Debunking. And we saw this a lot on actually on the Mythbusters. Like they were, again, I love Mythbusters. I like watching Adam Savage's new work. I love his stuff.

You could tell when they were doing something that they didn't like. When they were doing some a myth that perhaps bothered them for some reason or another. And you could see how they were setting it up to fail. Or if they got a my the one that sticks in my brain the most was. Pyramid power. Where they cut and one of the things was they cut an apple in half. And they put one out and they put one under the pyramid, and the one under the pyramid legitimately did not decay as fast. Yeah. And they wrote the whole thing off by saying, oh, there must have been a different viral load on the because the one of the guys used a table saw to cut it. It's like, well, there must have been a different bacterial load or something, not viral load,

bacterial load on this. And that's what caused it to happen. How many instruments used to cut it?

Yeah, it's like, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, hold up there. Like, I'm not even saying that I necessarily believe that Pyramid did anything. But what I am saying is, you just wrote out an entire exercise, entire experiment was no for no reason. Think about it. It, it's the, if the idea is there's a different load on one side than the other, well, why would that be?

Christopher Jordan 1:30:56
Like, I'm sorry, you didn't, like, you gotta respond. You gotta, you gotta, you got something you didn't want to happen and you didn't want to deal with that. Well, that happens a lot. Even with this, like you're saying, there's a, and there is, for those of you that are not a firearms. Fanatic, do not understand calibers. Things like that. Is what Carlos used as a sniper. And as opposed to an M1 Carbine, which is shooting a 308, they both shoot the exact same round. They both shoot the exact same round. Difference is that a 30 oh six has a capacity of 21% more powder. So you want to know why you need to use armor-piercing rounds in one and not in the other. You've got almost 25% more powder load behind it.

Guest Two 1:31:47
And in several of the virtually, like even the early tests on the, on the, on the, the new one where they were like, okay, we probably screwed this up. They used Hunting-tipped rifle rounds. They used hollow points. They even said they used a hollow point. Yeah. He wasn't using hollow points. He was using full metal jacket. Yeah, yeah. Solid copper jacket. Exactly. I say all this, not to say that the de the people who debunk things are always wrong. Oftentimes they are right, but we have to review the work. Bunking requires the same level and the same scrutiny as the people making the original claim. The same rigor of science, the same rigor. Exactly.

Just because this new film has come out and said, hey, here's this new footage. Here's all these claims that these people are making. Therefore, it's debunked. No, you're, you're.

Christopher Jordan 1:32:40
Way ahead of the cor yeah. I'll bring it up on camera right now. This is this is what I was talking about the other night with Ken Gerhard. This is B<unk>H Photo Video, folks. Like one of my go-to places in the industry of audio video. You can now, for five hundred twenty nine dollars, go out and buy your own film developing machine at home. And develop 8mm and 16mm film. There are a thousand auctions out there where you can go out and buy bulk lots. New in OS New Old Stock Film film from the period that is period, so it looks period. You can shoot it in a period camera that you can buy off eBay for a few hundred bucks that works.

There is zero per cent reason to think that the new footage found in a safe. Is not fake. There's zero reason to think to not think that and to not put that into the equation when for$529. You can fake it on the real medium yourself.

Guest Two 1:33:49
You jumped ahead. You jumped ahead of my story here. But that's exactly. So let's go into it. So again, I want to put on a nice little bow and the whole. Absolutely. It doesn't mean that everything the Mythbusters did was bad by any stretch of the imagination. Love them. But it's a but it's a great example of how sometimes somebody will say, this is, you know, here's the D here's the people who've debunked it, but they haven't because their work was shoddy. And that happens a lot. There's a lot of assumptions. So. When we come to this new film, I want to talk about the documentary, but what I want to talk about first is what I think is literally the weakest point, which is the new film.

Brains. Dress rehearsal is literally the it is the l it is the least convincing aspect of this and here's why. You've already jumped ahead of me. But I'm sorry. It's fine. It's fine. So some background on me. Way back in the year, in in yestern days. And if I had pursued this a little more, I probably wouldn't be here. I would be doing something different. I don't know if I'd be happier, wealthier, maybe wealthier. But probably not. I was going to be, I was going to go into academia. I was going to go into archaeology and as an artist, right? What I had noticed was a lot of people, art history was my original major. I couldn't do archaeology at the school I was at.

I could do it as a minor. I couldn't do it as a major. One of the things I've noticed is a lot of Archaeologists are terrible at determining what things are artistically because that's not how they're thinking, right? And there's a lot of claims made throughout art history where people say, oh, Leonardo da Vinci didn't use tools to make straight lines. And it's like, no, of course he did. Like it's there's a lot of myth making and it's like we need kind of both to come together. It's like let's do better work on history. But then let's also it's like let's let's rethink this. That's kind of the pres the way I was going. And art restoration is always one of those things you kind of want to learn how to do.

Well, to so if you're going to get into art and if you want to get into that realm, you start learning about forgery. Not because you're training to forge things. You're going to find a lot of there's a ton of art forgery going on so you learn how to do it and you learn a lot of questions to ask. This is where I want to bring bring up incognito. there is a movie, it's a B movie. And it's called Incognito. It is honestly one of my favorite movies of all time. I admit the movie itself is only okay, right? Yeah, Jason Patrick's the is the lead.

The movie's okay. Like, it's not a great film. But what it is, it's a movie about an art forger. Who gets hired to to create a forged rembrand. And so the entire the first third of the film is him going through and in forging this rembrand. And go, and what the reason I really like this movie is. Whoever did this did a lot of research. How art's forged, what artists are actually looking for when a piece is found. And the thing is this stuff happens all the time. Where there is pieces that we knew existed that show up somewhere, right? Or something we didn't know existed. And it shows up in a barn or it shows up in somebody's house or whatever, right?

But that's also how a lot of stuff is laundered. So the entire movie, like the first third of the movie, they spend a lot of time showing how he forges. And fakes this rembrand pink. By the way, rembrand's my favorite artist of all time. So it's like, the movie's crack for me. And if you want to understand why I dislike the art world so much, watch this film. There's several monologues. And the first third. After that, it becomes sort of an action thriller kind of film, and it's fine. Like the rest of it's fine. It's the first third that I

love a lot. Because they get a lot right except for the fact there's some s some some of these dealers that he's getting the materials from that are sketchy, right? He was like, there's no sketchy art mid art.

Materials dealers running around out there. I'm sorry. You're not going to be doing some sort of drug deal with, you know, for lapis lazuli so you can hand grind your own. Your own paint. It's not going to happen. Yeah. I'm going to make my own pigments. It's like so yeah, it's like you just go and buy it. You're fine. Calm down. The movie and one of the things they do in the film. Is he takes this Artwork. Or this canvas from the right time frame. That's it's some artists no one's ever heard of. It's not worth anything. He buys it. And he ends up stripping it down.

And that's what he paints on. Because it would the fibers and the wood that the frame that the painting is on. Pass inspection. He uses lead from that's several hundred years old to make the lead white. So that it would again pass. They do a really good job of showing how someone who knows what they're doing can forge. By the way, most forgeries, not that good. They just they're like it's sort of like all the all the movies where the it's an art heist and they're coming through the vents. And it's like, no, most art that's stolen, they just rip it off the wall and run like hell. That's it. Yeah, if not just straight up cut it right out of the frame. Yeah.

Well, that's that's another way that they do it. But essentially, it's like it's during like it's during the museum hours. They just go in, they just r and run. Like, that's it. Yeah, there's not as complicated as people think. And it's not as heisty. Yeah, it's not as icy. It's really like. And honestly, most forgeries are not that dope. They just paint using modern stuff, and most people will buy it on the black market. And it's like, oh, hey, this is a forgery. And you're like, what? There was a whole movie on how to do it correctly. Why doesn't anybody watch this? I mentioned all that.

To say this. The new footage there's we should at least ask the question. Why did it not the whole 60 years thing. Why did it come out? Like 30 seconds after you could make this for free. This film for this footage for free on AI. And to the point and to your point about the the the film, which is why I brought up Incognito, that scene where he's taking a frame, strips it down, paints on it. To your point. Sure, the film was manufactured in the 60s. The film shit's the correct film. That's right. Sure. Granted. Dated with the codes and symbols and everything in 1966.

There is nothing in the documentary that would suggest that it wasn't just manufactured in an AI. Manufactured this film and then they just put it on and then they just transferred it onto this film in modern times. There's nothing in the documentary that would that would say here's why that's impossible. And I'll, and I know we talked a little bit before this. You said there's no way that a chemical analysis could confirm if the film was. Processed in six years. Only because of my experiences, I think there might be a way to do that, but Kodak would have to do that.

Christopher Jordan 1:41:33
And and they don't. Yeah. Even even then it's one of those like even though the emulsification process and and this is my mom worked at a in a fox photo. Back in way back in the day. Mm-hmm. There may have been some 16-year-old developing your film one day. 35 year old with 16 years experience. Oh yeah. Both in the same year using the exact same market chemicals, just a different emulsification percentage or something like that, which is why or left in too long and it burns. Or overexposed. In the process, and it burned. You know, as many people claim about the feet on the Patterson-Gimlin film.

You know, that like, no, no, it's not actually white. That's an over emulsified spot. That's a that's a spot that's over overexposed in the film that's not the actual color of Patty's feet.

Guest Two 1:42:34
Exactly. So again. Only point I'm making is Forging a new film is literally easier now. Than it's ever been. Now, if there was. Again, let's say Kodak looks at it and they have some process that says. We can confirm this was processed in the 60s. Okay, cool. Then we're done. If they could. And they, and the film was handed over for that process. And they're like, yep, this was 100% done in the 60s, then we're done. It's a f Patterson Giblins a forgery. It was a hoax. This is done. Till that has done yeah. Only thing we have is a film that is easily created through AI.

And then transferred onto the correct film. That still has to be in the loop. And when people say, well, hold on, we have the provenance of the film. No, we don't. What we have is a claim. The claim is that this woman had it. Has it because her f her father was the guy who developed the film back in the 60s and just kept a copy of it. By the way, that story is not unbelievable. Again. Our history world, the comic world, I'm here to tell you. Stuff like this happens all the time. So I'm not going to sit here and say that's an unbelievable story. I'm not saying this new footage is fake. What I'm saying is.

We need the same degree of scrutiny. Yes. And there needs to be more actual work done on validating whether or not this film is legitimately 50 plus years old. Or if it's something that's been m that's modern. We need to find, is this woman? Is does this story actually pass the test? Or is this the story that's been presented to legitimize a fake? Forgery. Yeah. We don't have that data yet. To say either way. Yes. Is with you don't have enough information to make that determination. So anyone who would say the film, it's this new film is fake. Whoa, hold on. You don't know that. But anyone who would say it's, yeah, it's like anyone who said that it is real.

Okay, well you don't know that either. It just explained how much, how easy it would be to do this. Now if this had come out 20 years ago... Again, you know what? Guess what? That's, we can't, you know, I would believe that this was real if it came out 20 years ago because we didn't have AI so easily available. Yeah. But you're telling me the y one year after? AI do this for free. That's when this film comes out. I'm like, ugh. Like, if that doesn't give you pause. Then it's because you want this new film to be real. That is your bias. In no different way.

Christopher Jordan 1:45:27
Then the the legacy believer. Yeah. That the Patterson-Gimlin footage is real. Is real. Yeah. And it's the same claim. It's just the difference between six seconds. In 40 seconds. The new one's 40 seconds. The old ones 60. Things like that. I mean, hey, I found the camera for less than 200 bucks.

Guest Two 1:45:53
And you don't even have to, again, you don't even have to have the camera. You go on, you AI this footage maybe a couple of times. And then you just transfer it. On to sell. That's all you had to do. Make for this for for this to be a forgery so again I want to be very, very clear. Some people are like, see, Jason said it's forged. I did not say it was forged. I don't know that. Could be. What I'm saying is. To accept it as prima facie evidence. Is fa is fake. Like that's a bad conclusion to come to. You don't have enough data that the film is real.

So that to me was the weakest part of this whole documentary because.

Christopher Jordan 1:46:33
They don't really spend enough time proving that this is legit. Oh, snap, son.$22 with$6 delivery for a roll of film. For a hundred feet of film. Bet you get 40 seconds out of that.

Guest Two 1:46:48
Oh yeah, easily. Easily. That's what I'm saying. Like, it's like there is a claim that all we have is a claim has been made. Great. And when it's proven, if it's proven one way or the other, then we will have something more to go on. But right now, what we don't have is anything conclusive that the film is legitimate. We just don't have that. I'm sorry. If you wanna th if you wanna throw the Patterson Ginlin film, that's fine.

Christopher Jordan 1:47:13
But this is not the thing. This is not the hill to die on for that. Just as easily thrown out. I have just shown you on. On actual browser. Where, for less than a thousand dollars, you can shoot that piece of footage and develop it with vintage equipment. Getting the exact same you'll get the exact same date codes. You'll get all that stuff. You'll get all that stuff. Yeah.

Guest Two 1:47:39
And it's in I go again I go back to if this had come out 20 years ago, it's a different conversation that we're having. If you if you look at this and you don't say, hey, you know. In the age of AI, we should probably be a little more cautious. If you if that's not coming to your mind, then that's because you don't you're already coming with your bias. So, again, like I'm saying, I want to, we'll move the story down a little bit here because we've hung up on this point. But, I'm not saying the new footage is fake. I'm not saying that I think it's fake. What I'm saying is, if you are not looking at this with at least that in mind.

Yeah. You're not being objective. That's it. You're not being objective yet. And I'm sorry, the film, until the film can be validated as being processed, I don't even need it to be processed in the 60s. If they had processed it, before 2000. Yeah. Okay cool, then we're done. Again. The ability to create that video with with AI is too easy now. To simply accept this film that comes literally out of nowhere. With no real provenance. You know, again, I'm not saying that the story behind it is fake either. I'm just saying. This is how real material makes it into the real art and real comics and real archaeological objects make it into the

make it into the world, but it's also how forgeries make it into the real world too.

Because it's a very easy story to have.

Christopher Jordan 1:49:11
Even the provenance of connection to the person claiming to find the footage. How? Did did did she hear you were making the documentary and reach out to you? How'd she get the film? How did she know? How did y'all contact each other? How did you come to find out that she had this footage? Oh like none of that is explained. In that kind of way.

Guest Two 1:49:38
And here's where I want to get to. I was going to make this point later, but I think it's a point that's worth making now. But I think it's a point that's worth making now. I made your point earlier than you wanted to. You go ahead and make this point earlier. I'm going to make whatever point I want to make right now, damn it. No, again, you're right. It's like. There's a lot of unanswered questions. And here, and this is something we, the word itself, the word documentary. We need to realize it doesn't mean what we think it means. We think documentary means. Reality. The only difference between most documentaries and the Lion King is that you know the lion was animated.

That's it. In fact if you look at most, and I hate to say this. Most documentaries, if you scratch beneath the surface. They're straight up frauds. Because so much information is removed to make a story. Not the reality. But a story. We've seen this time and time again. Again, this is not me saying that these documentarians, these documentarians did this. But what I'm saying is. We think documentary that means everyone's ethical. Everything was done above board. There was no suspicious editing. Everything was created to tell the truth. No. That is not what a documentary means. No.

Christopher Jordan 1:50:58
I mean, here's the actual definition of documentary. But that does not mean that these things are done with ethics. We literally, in the last year, man, our good friend Peter Robbins. Is in the midst of a lawsuit right now. Over the n Linda Napo God rest her soul, Linda Napolitano, but over the documentary with her. Mm-hmm. That was made and and Partially produced by the ex-wife of Bud Hopkins. So very much a hit piece on his work. None of that was portrayed. Either Linda. When she was invited to be a part of it? Nor Peter Robbins when he was invited to be a part of it.

To the point that they are now suing the production company. Oh yeah. Because you you came to us under false pretense telling us that you were going with a different narrative. Than what you went with. Same thing with our good friend Tom Reid. And unsolved mysteries and what they did with the Berkshire's UFO. No different. No different.

Guest Two 1:52:10
Remember the very, I think it was the very first Making of a Murderer that was on Netflix where it was this, and they're like, hey, this poor guy was railroaded. And as soon as it came out, the prosecution came out and said, you missed all of this. And they dropped. So much that you're like, oh. None of this was real. Like they just straight admitted.

Christopher Jordan 1:52:31
All of the evidence. And this happens. I have friends that make documentaries. I have friends that do this stuff. But I have friends that make documentaries about cults, man. Very good. Good friend up the road. Yep. But but if you're doing it ethically. If you're doing it right. Then it's not as sincere. And that's what's funny: those don't nearly get. The headline because they are not sensational. In that kind of way. Because no, it's just straight fact and it's disturbing, and most people don't pardon my language. People don't want to kinder to that shit. They don't want to give it the energy. They don't even want to learn that it's going on in their backyard.

Guest Two 1:53:14
Exactly. No, it's like the real stuff is usually far more disturbing than anything that. Yeah. So. Again. There are documentaries I have and will still recommend because they were done well.

Christopher Jordan 1:53:26
And I'm not even claiming that this documentary was done poorly. No, no. That's not what I'm saying. Me and Ken Gerhard said. I watched it twice. To make sure I was prepared for our my interview with Ken. It was a good, well made documentary.

Guest Two 1:53:39
It was, again, very well made. In fact, the points that I think speak the most highly of it, I want to come to, I'm going to come to here in a second, but I wanted to preface it with this. Please. You can make something well and not make it right. We don't know. That's the problem. Everyone says documentary real. That's not what the word documentary means. And that's the problem. You're conflating docu. We're saying, well, they made a documentary. Therefore, everything that's presented must be real and truthful and factual. That's not what that means. And again, all I am stating here is. There is a history of document of documentaries that have come out.

Under that don't hold up under scrutiny at all. And that is something we need to take into consideration. When addressing this, when looking at this, is saying, just because it's a documentary doesn't mean it's real. With that being said, I'm not claiming that they did anything untoward. I'm not saying that at all. What I am saying is we have to keep that in the melee of conversation. That's right. Because this is just data. All we have are claims. The strongest piece of evidence that I that honestly Donny Cho, he was on Dean's show last week. I know you want to have a trim. Yeah, Dean B Dr. Dean Bertram. Yeah.

I think Donny Cho did a much better chance. So go watch that. And I know you're going to have him on. So watch him here too. I think he did a much better job of arguing. Point as to why it was faked because of Roger Patterson than the film itself did. And here's what I want to point out. There's a lot of claims made by a lot of people. Again, anyone can say anything and they can be honest and still be wrong. Sure. Right. But the thing the film did, and this is where I think Donnie is, I mean, probably has one of the most insightful commentaries on the situation when he said.

Roger Patterson was a carnage. If you're like me, you're like. Little hands, you know, with rides. No, a barker. Exactly. Well, specifically though, he was referring to wrestling because he's a big wrestling fan, huge wrestling fan. And he's points and one of the stories he tells was in his interview was: so you can go

listen to him and again, listen to him here on this. This is one of the most insightful things I can think of about and it almost swayed me to say, yep, no, he's right. People get to that point. So I don't want to make all of it, all of his points for him. But the most pressing point about him calling him in the car and he said, this is a guy who lives Kayfabe.

Right. And he points out, you know, Cody Rhodes, Dusty Rhodes' son. He thought wrestling was real. Until he was like 11 or 12. Because Dusty Rhodes lived the Kayfabe. He was a carny. A lot of these pe a lot of these wrestlers, they live their persona. And then when they retired, they're like, okay, cool. I think he talked about the Undertaker. He was like, I can buy clothes that aren't black. Right. Because they the monochrome clothing. Exactly. And it's like and you realize, okay. That makes sense that, you know. You don't take off the persona. It's it's not that that's the real you. But rather, it's just easy. You just stay in character the whole time. And there's character actors. Well, you reveal.

Christopher Jordan 1:57:16
Thing is you rev you reveal very much part of that Ruth. If you break that character in public. Yeah, if you're if you're walking around in your tie-dye grateful dead shirt around BJ's shopping for a brisket and you're the friggin' Undertaker and you have a you have a wrestling match in two days. Some fans are going to question some things. Right. That's it. Do you get sucked down into the persona and into the us versus them? Like, I was literally, I had a good friend of mine. Who who writes or who does editing for TV? Who had a friend who wrote for WWE? And we were in the midst of talking with him, reaching out to talk to him.

About how that is literally the example of the American political spectrum. Oh, and what our politics is. Like, straight up, it is WWE. Yeah, 100%. 100%. You may as well have me and Jean Green right there with the microphone. Mm-hmm.

Guest Two 1:58:27
You know, oh, yeah. So, yeah. Oh, yeah. I'm right. I'm right there with you on that. But the point that he was making is that Roger Patterson was a carnage. He had this. How he thought. And this is how he did things. And honestly, this is where we need to bring up Jackson Paul. Again, this is where I'm gonna lean into my into my art a little bit because when you hear Jackson Pollock, right? You see, you know, the splatter paintings. And by the way, I'm not a Jackson Pollock fan at all. I don't like, I don't like his work. I, I think it's. I love it.

I know, some people do. Like I said, that's just, I'm just not, like, I don't hate it. I just, it's not my thing. It doesn't move you in that. It doesn't move me. That having been said, one of the things I've talked to, we learn in art history. And it was actually a bit of a it actually rocked. The art history, the art historian world, the museum world, when a certain thing came out about him. So the mythos of Jackson Pollock. Was that he was this bohemian artist. He was shoving it against. The formal education of art, right? Color theory design, throwing all of it out the window. And he would just get.

Blind raging drunk, and he'd be smoking and making his paintings. It was just this pure, raw expression. And there's these. Photographs of him smoking. You can even find like cigarette material on his on the canvases because it was on the floor. And it's like it was raw, it was visceral. He was just, he was doing. You

know, this was passion. This is all he was doing, right? Then somebody found the wrong drawer. And you know what they discovered? Jackson Pollock did studies. Of his paintings before he painted them. Practiced. When he would, you know, pretty for the splatters, like it was, he knew he was practicing how to make that one particular.

Throw. And a lot of people went back and re-looked at. His work and they said this dude didn't get rid of color theory and design. He just used classical color theory in classic design. Differently. He was doing dozens if not hundreds of studies. Before he ever did a full painting. He was not this bohemian madman who was just you know, throwing his passion on the canvas. Although people will still make that claim today. And then it would be one-off. In that kind of way. Yeah, exactly. And it's like

Christopher Jordan 2:01:09
But here's the thing, it's like all of but that entire mythos was created by him to sell paintings. Well, and I'll put it I'll put it into our terminology and into our generation's terminology. And that that that would be the McFarlane webbing. The McMarlin webbing would be a prime example of that exact same thing where every single web looks so unique. So different in every panel, in every panel. But there is a method to the madness of how that web. Is dried and strung together. That makes each one unique in that kind of way, but there's a technique that Todd uses to draw it faster than the average human.

Exactly. Exactly. Because he's practiced that technique. It's a trick. Most things are tricks. I hate to say. Most things are tricks. Through careful study and repetition by an artist and we actually we bookended our interview with with Ken Gerhard. With the freight. I make esoteric music. I make some really wild and I used to be on the radio on an avant-garde program. In Houston once a month with my music. As a local composer. And I remember sometimes my dad and his buddy from high school, who we'd drink beer with. With two nim. At like 10 o'clock. Drinking on a Sunday night and listen in. And we go out, build a deck the next weekend. Hey, man, why don't?

Why don't you write some music people can listen to? Something with a beat. Maybe some words. Um,'cause it was all soundscape esoteric stuff. Oh, yeah. And I'd I I would take all feedback so beautifully. And like, okay, all right. What was it that moved you particularly to that opinion? You know? Yeah. Like as an artist, I wanted to know that. But I would always end it with well. You were at least moved to dislike. Yeah. Being is that you were moved to emotion. As an artist, art achieved. Thank you. Yeah, exactly. Exactly. It never hurt my feelings that they didn't like the music. The fact that it moved you to an emotional reaction, even of dislike, means that my job as the artist is done.

Guest Two 2:03:30
No, 100%. So again, going back to Pollock for just a quick second, and this is where it matters. Part of the appeal of Jackson Pollock's work. Is the Jackson Pollock mythos. Of the Bohemian Madman. It's not and again. Going back to incognito, one of one of the. Oh, Alexa, there is a conversation he had. He has several conversations, including that first third. Of the movie. About why he dislikes the art world and they and all of it is 100% true. It's subjective and the problem is most people this is why I prefer like comics and art and things that are reproduced. You don't need to have the original, have the reproduction. If the art moves you and it works, then it works. Don't.

You know. So much of art is mythos, right? It is the story behind it, not whether or not the work is good. One of the lines that just stays in my head every day is. Man in the golden the man in the golden helmet. If it's a Rembrandt, then it's it's it's priceless. If it was some dude in some random dude in his in his studio, then it's worthless. It's not about art. It's autograph. So much of the art world is about autograph. And once and the thing is, w if people in the time knew what Jackson Pullock was doing, he would not have been nearly as successful.

If he'd been successful at all. Because he it his mythos is what drove. The people to value him as an artist. When we talk about Roger Patterson. The myth of Roger Patterson, he was just some dumb cowboy who wanted to. Make a film about Bigfoot and just got lucky. That's and the problem is that's a myth. This was a very talented very sophisticated. Artist. He was a very sophisticated to and I again I'll I'll all props to Donnie on this one. He was a very sophisticated carny. When he when they were again, he had Bob Gimlund dressed up in like like, yeah, Bob Gimlin is of Native American stock.

He's not Apache. He's he doesn't dress like that, right? And he would have him wear things. He had a dude, another dude who would dress up with the braids when Bob Gimlin wasn't there. The dude was a showman. He knew how to be a carnival barker. He was. New K fab. The what did what did Tom Hanks call it in the in the documentary, or not the documentary, the biopic for Elvis, the snow job. The man was a snowman. He knew how to do that. If that's not in your mix when you look at the Patterson-Gimlin film, then you're not looking at it. That's a big deal.

To say it's not a big deal to say, no, no, no, it's that's not a thing. No, he was not just some random cowboy with a camera. Was very sophisticated. He was of the showmanship realm. He he had

Christopher Jordan 2:06:47
Raised money for numerous expeditions. The money for expeditions didn't necessarily come out of his own pocket the whole time. The whole expedition in 66 was financed by other people.

Guest Two 2:07:01
Exactly. The dude knew what he was doing. He wanted to be and he did want to be a part of something. Sure. Doing the math on this, we need to at least set that on the table and say, hey. Grover Krantz, I think I told I've told this story before on the show. My archaeology teacher was literally one of his students. Like I heard all of these stories. I'm essentially, from a big put first, bigfoot perspective, I am a Grover Krantz grandchild. Synthetically. Because I heard all of those stories secondhand from my archaeology professor. Grover Krantz, I think it was Krantz himself who said. If anyone would have faked it.

It would have been Roger Patterson. Patterson had he he absolutely had the skill he had the drive he knew how to he knew how to con people that's gotta be the myth has to be officially. That's the best thing this film does. It's not whether again, it doesn't make Patterson-Gimlin fake, but what it means is. The myth of Roger Patterson that you have in your head. Becomes a part of the math. As to why he couldn't have faked it? That's got to go out the window. The reality of Roger Patterson makes the Patterson-Gimlin footage being faked far more possible. I will always say.

Christopher Jordan 2:08:24
And that because the same way you bring art into things, man, I see everything through tech. Everything. And and the one thing I have always held and will still hold, which was brought up in the film. Was it Alginates, things like that, how to create that kind of stuff. Was not common knowledge like it is today. You couldn't go to like Barnes and Noble and buy a book on how to make masks. You like that was a very specialized knowledge set. Mm-hmm. With a very few people in that industry at that point, to make something of that grade. When it comes to that, because I mean, hey, and at the time there was no special effects Oscars.

Okay, there was nothing like that, but there was a special mention. There was an honorary mention for things like that. And the one that got it in 67, the year after. Planet of the Apes. And that was no, that was. That was no paddy looking outfit. That was a very, very stiff moving. You know, things like that. So it wasn't nearly as realistic, like when when you hear Jeff Meldrum and other people start breaking down muscle groups that are moving underneath fur. Yeah. Things like that. That's not what you get out of Planet of the Apes 1967. There's a reason why they're all wearing clothes the entire time. Yeah. Yeah.

Guest Two 2:10:05
I'm going to bring that back to a point. Because I want to come back to, I want to put a pin in that idea for just a second because I want to, I want to finish one thought because this is going to go back into why I still think. There is a part of this conversation that we need to, that still is valid as far as. Pro Patty, right? Which is the special effects. My thing might only counter to Donnie's argument saying, hey, this because. The claim is one of the reasons that Clint and him had it out, and there was this big rift in the family, was Clint believed.

That this was real because Patterson was living the Kayfabe, right? That's the that's the the the main thrust, is that yeah. Patterson lived the Kayfabe. He was a carney. And so, again, the same way that Dusty wrote, that Cody Rhodes believed that wrestling was real until he was a teenager. That's the same thing. My only problem with that is other claim Mm-hmm. Who were related to Broger Patterson, who were making money at the beginning, you know, with when they were doing the actual documentary and the film was on tour, and they were making all this money, was that they all claimed that, yeah, we all knew it was fake.

Okay, so hold on. How is Roger Patterson? So carny. His son believes it's real, but everyone that he was working with at the time. Knew it was fake. That's a that's a big problem. As far as that conversation goes. And here's where, again, like I said. I think the truth is a little bit messier. Those people just had to believe. It was fake. We've all known people that tell you a story and you're like, I don't buy this story. You know, he thinks it was real, but I think he's making it up. Right. We've all had that. We've all known those people. People who were interviewed because again it's 50 on years or over 50 years almost 60 years later all they had to do was believe.

That it was fake. They didn't have to know it was baked. And of course, for them. Everyone's like, yeah, of course he faked it. Cause Roger Patterson would be the kind of person to fake something like this. He wanted he was he was a get you know get rich quick scheme kind of guy right so they just had to believe it. That's all. That's the only thing that had to happen here. Doesn't need to be, that doesn't mean that they

knew it. So for me, the discordance there is worth noting. Yes, we do need to deconstruct. The mythos around Roger Patterson. And we should take the claim that Clint makes.

Very seriously. But again, if Donny Cho is right, and this was just a guy who lived the Kayfabe. Why did all these other people why are they claiming that they knew it was faked? Now they may have suspected it was faked. And they may have believed it was fake. It doesn't mean they knew it was fake. So and that's a that th those are two very different things. And I think that that gets lost in this conversation. Again, this goes back to the messiness of it. I'm going to very quickly I love. Come back to a point here. Go ahead. This episode's going to be forever if I keep talking like this.

So Boba Hope Tip the importance, I think there's something we need to learn from Bubba Hotep on this. And this sort of wraps everything up for me, honestly. If you haven't seen it, you should. It's a great film. It was actually I I was in college, they filmed a lot of this around Nacogdochis and I met Joe Lansdale and all that. It was fun. For those who don't know, the ballad of Bubba Hotep. Is that Elvis faked? He didn't accidentally fake. He accidentally faked his death. He switches places with this because he he just didn't and this is all like literally in the first couple of minutes.

I haven't spoiled anything. He switches places with this impersonator because he thinks. The music's not his anymore. You know, he's lost control. He doesn't like to like, he kind of wants to go back to simpler times. And so he s he he pays this other dude. Who, and so he's living the life and he's just kind of decompressing while this other dude is playing him. On on the road. But of course. He has a bad heart and can't keep up with all the drugs and dies. And he's like, oh no, I need to go back and tell everyone I'm still alive. But the document that he has, the contract he has.

Showing that he's the real Elvis gets burned up in a fire. And so now he's living as this random ostensibly Elvis Presley's living as and Elvis Presley impersonator. And now he's old and he's in this nursing home in Deep East, Texas. And a mummy has shown up and starts killing people. That's the film. The heck, you some kind of bubba hotap or something? Exactly. I can't tell you how much I love this movie. It's hilarious. It is a great movie. It's a great movie. And in his his his compatriot is a I forget the name of the actor. If you see the actor, you'll he's been in a thousand things, but he he's this he's a black man who claims that he's actually JFK.

That they they faked his assassination, dyed his skin and dropped him off at this in this health in this nursing home. Yeah. Now ostensibly we the audience and of course you know Joe Lansdale and Bruce Campbell, who plays Elvis in this, they've all said yes, that's the real Elvis. But use little media media literacy here. We're supposed to believe that that's actually Elvis. But if you think about it for three seconds, the only reason we believe it's Elvis is because the main character believes he's Elvis. Yeah. And so we should look at the other character who thinks he's JFK and realize there's a point where you should stop and go, Well, hold on, what?

Maybe that's the same thing with Bruce Campbell's character. Bruce Campbell is just as nutty. Yeah. But this is the thing. He has decided to believe this narrative. He's decided to believe the narrative. He's said the narrative for so long that the narrative is now true. Mm-hmm. And so he may be just as delusional as the other guy. But here's the thing. There is actually a mummy that's killing people. Yeah. That's the premise of the film.

Christopher Jordan 2:16:59
So again, nobody believes them about the mummy. Because, buddy, you're Elvis.

Guest Two 2:17:07
Yeah, because yeah, exactly. There's a couple crazy old guys who think there's a mummy running around. Yeah, yeah. Running around deep east Texas, killing people. Yeah. So what wisdom does Bubba Hotep bring to us? Sometimes crazy people are right. In fact more often than not,

Christopher Jordan 2:17:27
Sometimes crazy people are correct. Crazy, much like most science fiction, things like that, my friend, are. Ruly rooted in Non-fiction they come from some kind of reality. They come from something that... We as humanity integrally believe or have collectively decided. Did a very, very Basque. In its way. You know, very, very Freddy Krueger. Where we have given it the energy.

Guest Two 2:18:06
Yeah, exactly. So the simple fact of the matter is what we have here at this point. Is a tale of two stories. And that's all we have. Yeah. We don't have we don't know that the film is real. The new film. We don't know that the old film it's faked. What we know is we have two sets of claims. One of the reasons I've always at least said the Patterson, I've never said the Patterson-Gimlin film is real. What I've said is, I can't disprove the Patterson-Gimlin film. That's right. To this date, no one, and this again. No one has managed to replicate the footage. In fact, every time someone puts people have spent a lot of money trying to recreate a costume.

That works. And every time they do it, it actually gives us as researchers more data as to what something fake looks like. That's all they've managed to do. And there's even the even the whole frame rate.

Christopher Jordan 2:19:07
Because there's a selectable frame rate, 24 frames per second. Which is standard film. And sixteen frames per second. And as many people have biologically pointed out, that if that thing was set at 16 frames per second when it was shot. There is physically no way a human being would be able to do it.

Guest Two 2:19:28
Exactly. Like physiologically. And that's and again, that's but he doesn't he at least Roger Patterson always claimed that he didn't remember what he had it set to. Yeah. And that's fair.

Christopher Jordan 2:19:40
I wouldn't remember in that moment. Yeah, exactly. I'll be and you know what, folks? I'll tell you right now: I do this for a living. Four hours the other day with one of my cameras that I know intimately. Man, I got two of them. I went out and shot like I used the, I put them out to rent all kinds of stuff, man. My SD cards wouldn't work. And they wouldn't work. They wouldn't work. And this was on site. And I was like, well, you know, fortunately, it records to a hard drive. So I recorded to a hard drive. I spent four hours at home. I got to the point of literally, let's reboot this thing, let's get it down to ground zero and install the latest stuff.

And when I went to plug in the USB, man I saw the micro switch. To go between SD card and CF card. It's what I do for a living, man. So if you're like, how could he possibly not know? Hey, it's what I do for a living.

They're two hours on site. I wondered why my SD cards weren't working. Okay. Like it's a tiny little switch. That's why. And maybe you don't remember where it was. That's a human thing. Dude, Thomas cracked. I brought my wife in. I was like, maybe just so you never feel bad. About anything with electronics that don't work out for you.

This is what I want to spent half a day cursing at and doing.

Guest Two 2:21:12
And it was remember when I said that m most things are are tricks? That's so much of the art world is a trick. Hopper, the guy who did Nighthawks. The p very famous painting? Yeah. He was asked. If the reason there's no door on that diner. Is because he was symbolized, he wanted to convey the idea that these people are trapped in their lives and, and the, and the. Reporter may goes in this whole long thing about what it meant. Hopper looked, and I'm going to clean it up a little bit and said, I did it again. He just forgot to paint it in. And it just didn't dawn on me in the moment. I was so in the moment, didn't think about painting a door on the place.

And there's so many times when you, when artists are, are honest and they're talking amongst what, when they're like, and people come in, they're like, man, did you do it because of this, this, and you're like, and they're like, and they think, no, but yes. And that's the public statement is sure. That's why we did it. Right. Yeah.

Christopher Jordan 2:22:15
Yeah. Well, and and that's just it, you know, to to bring that up once again, it's the fact of whether, whether the, and I will not, I will say the same as Ken Gerhard always says with any piece of footage. This is just a piece of data. It's not evidence, it's not the evidence, it's not the nail in a coffin. Or anything like that because to do so would be unscientific. More point of data than a data set. Is what it is. And that's a singular point of datum, this new piece of footage in this documentary.

Guest Two 2:22:46
All it is. And that's my point, right? It's like. Again, why bring up Bubba Hotep? Yes. Could Roger Patterson have faked this footage? Well, again, I go back to no one's been able to recreate it, and that is a point on the board for it. It really is. That should not be, that should not be taken one way or the other. Because again, I have a question that says. If he could do that. Why didn't he just go to Hollywood? And make tons of money in special effects. Exactly. Right.

Christopher Jordan 2:23:18
That's invalid. Yeah, this would have been his demo reel. This might have been your demo reel, dude. Yeah.

Guest Two 2:23:27
All and the problem is the only answer that we have, and this is, and this is one of my problems with, again, it goes back to the documentary. It's a very well-made documentary, but it is. It's very clear. There's a lot of editing involved in this with Meldrum, with Finland, with Munz. With a lot of people, it's clear. This was very edited, going back to my whole point about documentaries and the Lion King. What we have is this is this family drama and then this true crime-esque story of this mob boss-esque guy in asphalt. Right. Now. I'm not going to say. That's not the case. I have met some re I grew up in a I grew up in a as a m the son of a mechanic who he owned his own shop.

I've met some really sketchy people in my life. I'm just going to say that. In the blue-collar world, there's some real sketchy people. Sure. That having been so. In the white-collar world, there's some real sketchy people. They just clean up nicer. Exactly. But my point being is like, you think mafiosa, like they basically describe this guy as like some mafioso crime lord. I'm just saying. It seems counterintuitive for a lot of people. You know, blue collar, it's like, no, there's some people who absolutely act like that. My problem with the whole thing is, though, is. This is really, really convenient. There's a it's it's it's I don't like tight stories. I don't like convenient narratives. There's a very convenient narrative now.

Here's the thing. Is it a convenient narrative because that's just what the truth is? Or was it just the convenient narrative to drive the story?

Christopher Jordan 2:25:06
I don't I don't have that answer. I have never had the honor of meeting Bob Gimlin. And I'll say that, folks. Honor. Because, yeah, he's he's a name in community and he's he's somebody who's at least experienced to the to the limited point it is. Has led a discussion. For a long time. So I'll say honor. In that way. Same way I don't I'm not a I'm not a huge fan of the recent work of Dr. Stephen Greer. But if I shook his hand in public I'd say it was an honor. Because we're here and the discussion is here a lot because of him. We're here right now and the discussion is here right now a lot of because of Bob Gimlin.

And not because of Bob Gimlin's raging 70 years of being on the road talking about this. That has been the last decade, maybe. Yeah. Maybe. Like 2005 is when all this started. And even then. Even then, yeah, 20 years. But even though he hasn't made a lot of anything, again, this goes exactly. It's not like the man's made his whole living. Off of this or made millions of dollars. They athlete. Maybe made more money off this movie. Than Bob's scene in his life.

Guest Two 2:26:25
And that goes back to my whole point about like, again. There's there's enough questions below the surface of this documentary that when asked, brings a lot of this into question. It brings a lot of the claims into question. Yeah. And people say, well, why would why would Patterson's wife say this? I hate to say this, and this is my day my day job. One of the things I I'm an escrow officer for a title company. And I have been for over 20 years. Elder and I'm again. Please hear what I'm not saying. I'm not accusing anybody of anything. Nope. What I am saying, though, is. I have a lot of training and I've had a lot of experiences.

With the elderly where people are elder abuse is a real thing manipulation of the elderly is a thing yep and I hate to say this: whether if Bob were to come out tomorrow and say it's fake or it's real, or he stands by it

and it's real. I don't know that I'm going to trust that either. Because he's still because he's in his 90s too. You can manipulate people that age. They you can make them believe whatever you want them to believe. I'm, I hate to say this. That doesn't mean I think that anyone's lying. It just means I have to, because I don't know whether or not anyone's lying or telling the truth. I have to look at this and say, what do I?

What does what does experience tell me? The problem is people who are who are elderly are easily manipulated. I have seen it. I have actually, in my career, I have seen people do things. I'm like,

Christopher Jordan 2:27:48
Whoa, we got problems here. It's it's no different, man. I spent. A good 10 to 15 years of my life. With youth. Mm-hmm. I will I will always say you will find somebody is honest rarely. Is it nine euro? A nine-year-old will tell you directly what's on their mind. It will tell you exactly what they saw go down. As they saw it go down. However, they're also very easily coached. They're also very easily manipulated. In that kind of way. And that's that's not saying that a child's testimony is not true. But it's saying that they are very easily coached. That they can very easily be led down the road of a narrative and to accept that narrative, to accept that narrative as true.

By what they believe and to express it is thus. And that's that is just for the same it's for want of acceptance, for want of love of the person training them in that way and telling them to respond it's for that person's exactly. Not not for their own. And it's the same thing with the elderly. It's more the fact of they're they're more afraid. Displease you. And to lose this moment of connection.

Guest Two 2:29:16
Particularly when it's when it's when her it's her son that they that they from whom she has been estranged for so many years. Yeah.

Christopher Jordan 2:29:25
And I know it was very interesting to see. Oh because it in the documentary, there and no spoilers, folks, but in the documentary, there was a moment where Bob Hieronymus and Clint. Patterson go to meet Bob Gimlin at I guess it's like the Yakima Bigfoot Conference. And go to talk to him and many people say it's like a confession. I didn't necessarily see it as a confession. I saw it as a as. Somebody agreeing with some old friends that he's happy to see, something like that. But I think the more interesting response than anything. Was at one point Bob's wife. Began to block the camera. And I think it was very much like you're saying.

Jason, the idea of they were leading Bob down a road of narrative? That she knows Bob doesn't believe. And there's again, that whole situation was, I didn't, like that was that was that was like I was uncomfortable. Then that situation for Bob. I was uncomfortable watching it. Cause it's like that's that's not, I don't know. I don't know. That's like I saw the same thing happen, and despite what you think, folks. Of the Travis Walton experience, things like that. I saw Travis Walton get cornered by a dude. Asking questions like that in Roswell this last year. And buddy, it was all I could do to j to literally just pop a camera.

Like two a hundred feet away, and just record from a distance and not go over and say something. It is it I would venture to say it is one of the most unjournalistic things in the world. And I used to work for Alex

Jones, everybody. And I would tell him to his face. I can't say that's necessarily like whenever you would approach somebody in the airport with the camera, look, look, here he is. Let's ask him the question right here. Like, that's not journalism. That's not how that's done. That's not actual reporting.

Guest Two 2:31:39
Well, and I go again, I go back to my again, my training on elder abuse. Like, I'm sorry. You can't hear half like half the people who've who've told me stories at conventions. I caught maybe half of it if I was lucky. Yeah, because there's so much too much going on. You're watching lips move. And then you have someone who's at who's Bob's age. I'm sorry. That whole situation was the most. Yeah. That was the most scammy thing of the entire film. And that's and where I'm omitting a lot of what looks like some very creative editing on the part when they're interviewing Meldrum. 'Cause Meldrum can't defend himself. He can't come out and say, Hey, here's my thoughts on all this. No, no.

Christopher Jordan 2:32:20
'Cause he's gone now. But but. He did, and I said this with Kim. Whenever we had Ken Gerhard on talking about it, he did. Immediately, the first, well. Oh wow. This kind of looks like it's like a dress rehearsal. Yeah. But even after he said that. He immediately got a, he was like, hold on, hold on, pause that real quick. And he started pointing out things that were different. From the Patterson-Gimlin film. Exactly. And then things cut.

Guest Two 2:32:53
Exactly. That's why that's what I'm saying. Like, th so this goes back to, again, why did why am I saying all this? Why did I bring up Bubba Hotep? Yeah. Here's the thing. I love the bubble. But compared to that, yeah, exactly. But there's a point. It wasn't just because I love Bubba Hotep and it's yeah, it's because there is because Roger Patterson was the kind of person who would have faked it if he could. And and had and by the way, I agree with Dean. Everyone's calling this film the cash grab. The original film is a cash grab. Like, sure. People made a lot of money off that. Like, don't, again, not the people that you would think. Yeah.

Christopher Jordan 2:33:34
That being said, it's like the people in this film. Not the people in the film not a single person in this film except for Attlee.

Guest Two 2:33:43
So the question then becomes so but that being said. Just because everyone's like, well, isn't it convenient that a guy who's got there with they do have a suit? They're trying to do these recreations because he's making a documentary. Isn't it convenient that he gets one? Well, the problem is the only way you're going to get one on camera is if you have a camera. You're going to be out in it. The in honestly, this goes back to my point. Whether whether Bruce Campbell's character was actually Elvis or not, whether the other guy's name, I cannot remember it, was actually JFK or not. Maybe they were just two crazy old dudes, but there was a mummy to fight. And they fought it, bravely.

That's right. Should always remember the Bubba Hotep for saving us from the mummy. That being said, the simple fact of the matter is at least in text. Yeah, at least for particularly for DPS Texas. If we got rid of

every artifact. Every painting. Every piece of evidence that we have of history that was obtained by unscrupulous people. Or from people who were grave robbers, or people who just, we would know nothing about history. You'd have no museums. Everything would be empty. The simple fact of the matter is. We find art most most colleges and most of these universities that are running around there doing other they do the cleanup archaeology. The real archaeology is done by some dude who's trying to make a buck. And so he's digging and he finds something, he sells it, and then everyone comes in.

The simple fact of the matter is Roger Patterson being a shady character. Does not invalidate the film. Should however the fact that he is a shady character should change your opinion of it a little bit. It's not as cut and dry. The this is so I'm gonna I'll bring all this together. Does this disfilm disprove Patterson-Gimlin? No. It doesn't. It's it doesn't do that yet. Isn't enough information here to disprove it. What there is. Are some are honestly the best claims against it. And it's not even the new film because like I've said.

Christopher Jordan 2:35:52
Right now, we don't have any evidence that that new film is worth anything. I would like to think that. At least I've done a pretty decent job eviscerating that. In the concept of that.'Cause once again, less than a grand, you can do one yourself minus the costume of an actor. Sorry. Probably about three grand.

Guest Two 2:36:12
Right now, well, I think I think you do it for less. Cause again, I'm saying I think the whole film is AI. And then you just transfer it onto the film. And that's the part that costs you less than a thousand. So yeah, I think you're right. Less than$1,000. This footage could be easily recreated and the same information. The same quote-unquote evidence that was presented in the film could be presented. The same provenance could be the film is, this film, this new footage has not been proven, has not been tested, has not been scrutinized nearly as much as it needs to be for it to be validated.

Does this is this the fun? No, this is no, this isn't a nail. This is what we have is a bunch of claims. What we have is unsubstantiated materials. The only thing you have here is a period piece of material. You have a period of cellophane. Nothing more. That only appeared after it was easier to fake. Again, 20 years ago, this is a nail in the coffin. 30 years ago, this is a nail in the coffin. Yeah.

Christopher Jordan 2:37:10
It's not an, it's, by no means is this a nail in the coffin today. Here's the thing though: I wouldn't even say it's a nail in the coffin then. 'Cause you got the same exact thing. Hundred bucks at any antique shop, you can find you a working Kodak camera that he had, K100. You could go out, even easier at that point, go out to a local shop. Oh, yeah. You can buy a buy a reel of new old stock and have them develop it. Exactly. But you'd probably be developing it yourself. So that so that it wasn't in public view. And stuff like that. And that's just it. Number one.

This dude who worked for who was it, Lockheed Martin? Yeah. Developing film he's just going to use the Lockheed Martin facility on his own time. That's what they let them do. They let them do that all the time, develop their own film and use their chemicals and things like that. You know, th th it's just it's a spurious story to me that doesn't add up a whole lot.

Guest Two 2:38:16
Exactly. So what we have is a bunch of claims. What we have is footage that point, all we have is it is a, it's just some random footage that we know nothing about. That's all we have. Now that being said, I actually find it exciting because this is the best claim against the Patterson-Gimlin film. Because up to this point, every claim has been. But I just don't think it looks like a m like it's a real monkey. Like what? Okay, can you just, can you give me something definite on that? What is why does it look like a man in a suit to you? Because I spent a lot of time growing up. I love the Muppets. I w I, you know.

I wanted to, I was thinking about doing the Jim Henson thing until, you know. You know, I found girls. But I still, you know, I still love me some Muppets and some special effects. And it's like. I you know. I'm sorry, that costume. Is it like it's convincing for like if it was a costume. It's convincing for a reason. So the simple fact of the matter is you can't say that it just what looks like it doing a costume to me. That's not objective. Where's the zipper? Where's the points of joinery? Where's the guy's head and all? Like, give me some reason. The only argument we've ever had against it was.

Well, it doesn't look like a monkey to me. Okay, well, that's nothing. This is a better claim. This is the best claim that we have against it: saying, hey, Roger Patterson. Home dude would have been a Charlatan given the opportunity. This dude was someone who would absolutely fake it. He was not a cowboy. It deconstructs the myth of Roger Patterson. And that's the most convincing aspect of this. So at this point, everyone's like, well, hold on, Jason, are you saying it's real? Are you saying it's fake? What's going on? I'm going to just make this as plain as possible.

Christopher Jordan 2:40:01
The answer where I stand on this right now is it's messy, and that's what science is about. That's right. That's right. Science is not clean. And here's the back-to-backs, folks. This is once again that overexposed image of the foot bottom. That we were talking about, but these are two images from the Patterson-Gimlin film. And then here are these are the same images that Ken sent us. These are images from the new film. So very interesting how two of them are, you know. Blurry like the others and this one is Crisp. That's a that's a pretty crisp shot right there for a Bigfoot, you know what I mean?

So yeah, that exactly. And once again, where where is the joinery in that first one? Anything like that whenever you get into the actual

Guest Two 2:41:04
And here's the thing, right? All of my objections go away if but if Gimlin were to come out and say, Yeah, we faked it, here's how we did it, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, here's why. Cool. Because the only thing that has to make sense, the only time a story has to make sense, is if it's fiction. My friend, history doesn't make sense. Our lives don't make sense. We've all known people who make decisions and you're like, what? Why would you do that? The simple fact of the matter is yeah. Only fiction has to make sense. All of the things that I would say why didn't why didn't he use this as a demo reel to go to Hollywood and make a ton of money?

Why? Would his the people who are working with him at the time know that this was fake, but his kid absolutely believes it 100%, right? Like he's so much of a car and he his kid is snowballed, but not the

people around, like. There's all of those questions go away because I don't necessarily need reality to make sense to me. Right. Unfortunately, history doesn't make sense. People don't make sense. We don't make sense to ourselves half the time. Right. So I don't need, so I don't need my objections of things that don't make sense is just simply saying that is a question that needs to be on the board.

And they can go away. They absolutely can. There's no reason that they can't go away. At the same time, accept this document. Documentary as the gospel truth is also one hundred percent. Th that I'm sorry. You're getting snowballed. There was a poll on X the other day. I will never forget it because it's so beautiful. It said, in regards to AI. The question, it's like, have you A? You've never been fooled by AI. B, you've been fooled once or twice. C, you have a hard time determining whether or not something is AI. Or D, you've seen a cat playing the banjo. The thing about it is, I thought about it for a second, I realized there's only actually two answers because answer one.

And answer and answer one and answer four. The I've Never Been Fooled by AI. And I've seen a cat playing a banjo. They're actually the same answer. It's the same exact answer. The problem is, if you believe that the Patterson-Gimlin footage is 100% real, and the other person who believes that. This new documentary is 100% real. They're the same exactly. All I am saying is this could absolutely debunk Patterson-Gimlin. And by the way, I'd be excited if it did. Changes the conversation.

Christopher Jordan 2:43:50
There are a ton of there's a ton of sightings, there's a ton of reports that people write off because the quote-unquote Bigfoot doesn't match Patty. Well, and once again, as we've as we've said numerous times, not just with you, not just with Lyle Blackburn, not just with Adam Davies, not just Ken Gerhard. Does not it's not the linchpin. It's not the linchpin. There are there are 8,500 other pieces of evidence out there. That people like Dr. Jeffrey Meldrum was hot on the trail of. That are actual biological things. Stuff like that. That we have actual forensic evidence that, like, if you took this thing in front of a trial.

That's evidence. That's evidence. And that's something that I bring up on the show all the time, man, is never let that definition. Anything less than what would free you in court. Day you let the term evidence. Be used with any other depth than that. Woe be it unto you, what people call evidence against you. You know what I mean? That should be what you give your evidence. When you give evidence to your lawyer, it should be tried and true, and it should be exactly what will free you. No question. Anything other than that is data. And that's just no, and I'm the there's tons of other data out there that is much more evidentiary.

Get a piece of footage that's six seconds long, shot from a distance.

Guest Two 2:45:32
Oh, 100%. And that's what I'm saying. Like, Patterson-Gimlin is debunked, my question, or is actually debunked. It's like, yep, no, this is a fake. Then a lot that opens up a lot of possibilities for us. I would be excited if it was- if it was- if it's disproven. My thing is though. I understand in the same way that I would have answered two or three hay. I've been fooled once or twice by AI. Sure. It means. All it means is, I can't say yes or no yet. There isn't enough information that is in to make that decision. What I am saying is. Should the film say, hey, we got a big asterisk on this, it should be moved down.

The totem pole. It 100% should be. Yeah. Is it is the film being real sexy? Yes, it is, right? It's here's a picture of the thing. It's damn sexy. There's an only squatch out there for for Patty. That's how sexy it is. But that having been said, I knew you'd catch it. That being said, ha ha ha ha. I know. I know. Only squatch.com. Uh-huh. Oh, I thought about it. I'll split it with you 60-40, buddy. Hey, there you go. Yeah. There's a story behind that I will have to tell offline. Anywhere. So it's like is it sexy? Yeah. But is it good evidence? Well, that's the problem is we can't prove that we've never been able to conclusively prove that that's an actual Sasquatch. What we've been able to say is no one has been able to debunk it.

Now we finally have something that can say, hey, here's a good reason to question this. Okay, cool. I want more work done on this new footage. I want to know when it was developed, if they can figure that out. I want, I want. Better connections. To for the provenance of this film. How did you get it? Where did it really come from? What reason do we have to believe the story that you're presenting to us? Because I think the problem, because here's you know what the messiest version of this story really is? And I think this might this legitimately could be the truth of it. Donnie's right when he says Roger Patterson's a carny.

Roger Patterson absolutely faked the fil the film. Problem is. And maybe, and maybe oh, the reason a lot of people are using this story of about this shady businessman. Is to hide this story, was created to make the story more compelling and to hide the fact that they've been lying to people. But the new footage is 100% faked. That's the messy version of this story. That's the and the problem is that's a better than 50% chance of being true. Again, I'm not saying whether Patterson Giblin is real or not. I don't know. What I'm saying is. We have this. And then we have this. Debunking of the Roger Patterson mythos is probably the most important thing to have happened because it changes the conversation around the film.

The film should be taken down a peg on the totem pole and it should be put on with a lot of other stuff where it's like, hey, this is interesting but questionable. Till we have better information about this new footage. Because the simple fact of the matter is, until that new footage is validated one way or the other. It's just more, it's more data. That's all that it is. This is just.

Christopher Jordan 2:49:14
Patterson-Gimlin have a claim, and then this is, and then we have a counter. And we have and we have the aside from the word. Patterson and Giblin. Uh-huh. The exact same scientific data. Yeah. On both pieces of film. Exactly. Code markings from the manufacturer. And and from a camera.

Guest Two 2:49:41
That's it. Well, that's it. Except there's what there's one other piece. There's one other piece that the footage that Patterson-Gimlin has. There's one piece of scientific evidence that we have there that we don't have. For this other one. Right now, which is we know for a fact. Patterson-Gimlin was filmed in the 60s. Yes. We don't know when this new thing is. And that. Like, that's a huge mess. That is a huge hole that people are like, oh, no, it must be like, why? Well, the code, again, we've already.

Christopher Jordan 2:50:11
It told you when it was made. Incognito again.

Guest Two 2:50:16
Go watch that film and realize how easy this stuff is. And I'm telling you, there are so many fakes out there that are in museums. Every year, people are like, oh, hey, we found this thing's hung in a museum for the last 20, 30 years and it's faked. Or this shows up. And it happens all the time. I'm my only point, again, I'm not saying anything other than. We need more information. This is the best the... Deconstruction of the Roger Patterson myth is the best reason to look at the film and say, okay. We should put an asterisk with it. We should move it off because again, there's now a legitimate claim here.

It's not just uh-uh. There's a legitimate claim. And I go back to, I want to circle back to the mythbusters. Go ahead. Yeah. And we can end we can end it here, cause this is the in the Mythbusters got it right or wrong in 2006. They got it right in 2007, but the but the way they got it right in 2007 was so bad. It revalidated their original claim of their original incorrect claim of. Carlos Hathcock's shot not being possible. That's we should take a lot we should take a long time to look at that situation and say okay. You can come to the right conclusion but for the wrong reasons.

And if you do the thing, if you do it wrong in the first time. And through the wrong methodologies. And through the wrong methodology, that's my point. The wrong methodology. Even if you come to the right conclusion, it's going to actually reinforce the wrong assumption because that was the whole point. They said, yeah. People say, well, hold on. The Mythbusters said it was the that it was plausible. They said, yeah, but only with armor piercing. So everyone's like, nope, they got it right the first time, even though they clearly had screwed it up. Well so badly. That it was comical.

Christopher Jordan 2:52:08
Well and in that vein, like we literally just did a whole episode on the SARS scans. Of the Great Pyramids. The the Beyondi stuff. And how it's been Retrouted. Buy the people. They put it in the Journal of Remote Sensing, and that's basically like a white paper journal. By the people who make these sensor platforms. Yeah. And they were like her data gathering methodology. Is flawed. In your mathematics to squeeze it all together. Very flaw. And right now, there is actively a person out on social media. I follow them, I know them, that's posting all kinds of. Bombastic oh, using the Beyondi method. Oh, you mean the one that's been proven mathematically false?

The like you can't use a false methodology to get true result. Exactly. That's a fallacy. By definition. And that's right, exactly. And that's

Guest Two 2:53:16
That's where we are. If we're going, like, I don't mind. I really legitimately don't mind. Any piece of data being debunked. Can I tell you my okay, fantasy is the wrong word. What I would find to be the most interesting version of the Bigfoot phenomenon. Cause right now we've talked about this ad infinitum. I think there's a real thing, I think there's a supernatural thing, I think there's some some super some psychology thing. But you know what I think the most interesting version of this story really is? Is that all of these footprints? That we have, the thing that we actually have. Is either faked or the byproduct of some Abnormalities that occur every once in a while in bears.

Because honestly, if there's people running around faking these footprints that got that got over on Jeff Meldrum and Brover Cranz, Dr. Rover Cranz. I find I would find that far more fascinating. Well, who are these people? Why are they doing experts? And by the way, I people, but don't you believe in experts? Well, hold on. Experts make a lot of mistakes. Yeah. In fact, my favorite story about it is. That's how you become an expert. But my favorite thing no d do you know what story every time I read anything by any scientist, the thing that that pops up in my head is the story of the Z-ray.

If you've never heard the story, I'm going to make it very, very quick. Go ahead. Early 20th century, and this guy believed he had discovered what he called a Z-ray, and he had this test. Where you can see it, right? But you can only see it out of the corner of your eye. Physicists from around the world would come and look and they all said that they saw this line. And it's like it was just, it was just, they, his whole point was we just didn't have the technology to properly observe more clearly, but he found this one, he had rigged this thing up and it worked and he could see it.

Many, many physicists, big name physicists came out and they all agreed. And then one dude from from America came over. And he was, he saw the setup. And he's like, hey, can I take a look at this? And he in. He switched, something around that basically would have made it completely pointless, right? And he made certain that, his assistant didn't say anything to the to the scientist. And the guy was like, yeah, see the lines right there. I can see it 100%. There was absolutely no lying because he had taken the part out of the machine that would have actually produced it. It is considi it's it's one of those stories that people tell in the scientific community to say, hey, be careful because all these people, like the dude thought, like he was, he wasn't trying to con anybody. He thought he had discovered something real.

Other scientists agreed with him. All wrong. So does the idea that Meldrum and Go River Grants and all these other the Am I sh would I be shaken at all? Would I be shook at? Should know because people make mistakes. That's how science works. I wouldn't be surprised if they made mistakes. We all do. If they got snow jobbed by somebody, that's fine. My problem is. They looked at these footprints from all over the country. If you're telling the most interesting version of this story for me is that there is some sort of massive conspiracy to make everyone believe that there's a Bigfoot and that they had all this stuff and they figured out how to do this and it tricked everybody.

The reason I find that more interesting is kind of organization is doing that.

Christopher Jordan 2:57:04
That's the more interesting version. Like, I'm sorry. Dude, hanging out in the woods, something you know, but yeah, yeah, like that's interesting. Don't get me wrong, you know, man. It's hilarious because that's why my wife. I love my wife. I love you, baby. I love you. And she loves coming to the conventions. But when it comes to conspiracy. Yeah. That kind of pardon my language, that kind of shit. She she will not buy. Any of it. Because she's like, there is no way. People are that organized. And I'll always bring up the bus. But you try to get people on a Zoom call? Come on. And I'll always bring up the fact of like, hey, there were people building parts for bombs in the middle of Alabama.

Next to my grandmother's facility while she was a Rosie the Riveter, that they had no idea those parts were going to Los Alamos. And they didn't know that for another thirty, forty years, man, that what they were

assembling every day was part of the Manhattan Project. They had no idea. Zero. Zero percent idea. That was the case going on. So like you said, but what's the best interest? It's kind of like the whole Chemtrail thing. It's like, what's the vested interest in point in poisoning the people that you're trying to bilk for money? No, trying to figure that out.

Guest Two 2:58:24
So, like, like, I like I said, I would be shocked if it's like the more interesting version of this is that it is all fake and it's and it's snowjobbed everybody. I'm like, okay. That's more interesting to me. I would look are you c I am 30 seconds on any given day of saying all cryptozoology and all of this stuff. It's all paranormal, in which case, and psychological, in which case, cool. I can wipe my hands and move on because we can't observe. That's right. That's not testable. That's not individual as we would say. Because it's psychology. Exactly. So it's like, well, just walk on. Like, just okay, cool. I'm going to go do more I'm going to go draw comics'cause because there's nothing more I can do here.

There is physical evidence. Yeah. And so the simple fact of the matter is if until you can explain that away. Is something real here. And like I said, and I'm not over here saying that it has to be an ape, dude. I am willing to believe that this is all fake. In fact, I would even, I would be far more amused if it were. But I want actual evidence. I don't want. The same here, same conjecture. Right. Again, I want to make certain I'm doing the Mythbuster thing at its best. And not episode 67 or 64, right? Where they where they where they screw the pooch so hard.

It makes a war hero. A laughing stock for 20 years. Yeah. The simple fact of the matter is. We're part of a chain. It goes all the way from the beginning of time and will continue on. I don't want to be the weak link in this chain. Yeah. Absolutely. Ask better of ourselves. Is Patterson-Gimlin a fake? I don't know. What I do know is. We have the best claim against it that has ever come out. And that we need, it needs to be reviewed. It needs to be. Explored. And we need to have a more honest conversation about it. It even with the same rigor as the original claim.

100%. 100%. That's all I'm asking is that we do the same due diligence. That has been done on the original. Debunkers have to prove their point also. I'm excited about it.

Christopher Jordan 3:00:40
Because again, if we can if we can take something off the board, then cool, we have a better picture of what we're actually dealing with. And hey, man, like, believe me, believe me. And I've said this before on my show, this is part of the reason that my show is not larger. Jason, is because I will not. Reports such things. I won't I won't court court such topics. I won't court such sensationalism. Stuff like that. My job is to be here to stand in the middle and provide a logical bridge. Between these things and between these communities and within the conversation, because there is a level-headed way to talk about this. There is a way to talk about this without attacking anybody's paradigms.

Like we we have equally offended both sides here tonight, my man. If I haven't pissed off everybody, I haven't done my job poorly. I haven't ticked everybody off tonight. I don't know if I did my job right on this topic. Yep. Everyone's happy that I've done my job wrong. That's just it. That's just it. And I'm not here to. Toddle any conversation. I'm not here to soft-pitch anything. It's more about the fact that we've got to be

able to hold the light up to ourselves. Got to be able to do that. And like the example that I keep bringing up. Former seminarian for the Catholic Church, whatever that means, folks.

But I'll tell you this. When an exorcist for the Catholic Church came out recently and said, All UFOs are demons? They stripped him of the title of exorcist. Because his job is to investigate on a case by case basis. What is demon demoniac and not? And by you saying all in a blanket statement means you ceased investigating a long time ago. So while they didn't pull his collar as a priest. They pulled his ordination. As an exorcist, which is a specialized ordination. And rightfully so. And we should hold ourselves to the same standards. Of investigation, no less.

Guest Two 3:02:57
No, 100%. They're put and again, it's like even though I would be more inclined probably to agree with him, I think his statement is wrong. Yeah, what even though it's like you put me and him on a desk and it's like, yeah, we're going to agree a lot. But I would disagree with him because I do think there's an aspect of this. Of the UFO phenomena that is 100% physical, but not because I think they're aliens from outer spice. That's a that's a Roseanne joke for anyone who wasn't paying attention. Who's Alan and why and why is he out of spice? Yeah, but no, i it's I think there is.

I can. There's reason to think that a lot of UFOs have just been technology that legitimate I don't know what that is yeah technology and maybe even natural phenomena. That that is unrecognized. It's like, but I do think a lot of it's supernatural. Even demonic, but I'm not sure. But I wouldn't say every UFO sighting is of some investigatory statement. It's like, I'm sorry, you're wrong here. Yeah. So, again, what have we learned today if we've learned nothing else? Which is what we've learned is.

Christopher Jordan 3:04:11
Just do a better job. Yeah. Science and bias swings both ways. Okay. And we have to remove remove our biases. In order to take in new data like this piece of film, but we also have to make sure to remove our biases so that we put this piece of film through the same rigors. That anything else needs to go to and more than more than just some date codes on cellophane. Exactly.

Guest Two 3:04:38
That's insufficient. So it's like, hey guys, everyone, everyone.

Christopher Jordan 3:04:42
It's spurious and non-non-connective tissue in a court of law. That would that would be called circumstantial evidence.

Guest Two 3:04:51
At best. At best. Yeah. This new footage would probably even not be allowed. In many courts if you couldn't prove the profit. Because again, if you can't prove where it came from, they're like, then we can't trust that this was created and that this was, this is what it claims to be. Because part of the legitimacy is, well, it was made it was that it was filmed that this dude made a duplicate of. Right, because that's really the claim. This dude made a redid this and did a duplicate of that footage. Because again, you're telling me that they didn't notice they were missing a reel? No, exactly. I think that was Ken's point. That was Ken's point. You send off, you know, 11 pieces of film. You only get back 10. No one's asking anything. That still makes sense. I'd be asking that question all day long for eight bucks for a real 16 millimeter film back in the day.

Back in the day, back in the day. Back in the days for like five bucks. Come on. Yeah. Particularly, if that's your dress rehearsal. Like, you need, like, you need that in order to know: do I need to overexpose things? Where, what works, what doesn't work? What, like, the entire premise of him not having, like, that means that dude made a this dude who gen here's, and this is the part that, again, I didn't go into it because I was just trying to keep you on time, but we don't care anymore, I guess. Wait, yeah, I was more worried about your time, buddy. Ah, don't worry. I'm just worried about your time. I just got a nine-year-old to take trick or treat, and the sun ain't down yet. So, yeah, there you go.

Exactly. But it's like you're telling me that this the the the entire this entire story hinges on this dude being so dangerous that no one's gonna talk but this one dude developed this one roll of film and kept a copy of it. Insurance? Nothing like it th like I said, I'm the first one to say only fiction has to make sense.

Christopher Jordan 3:06:42
Well, and why that story? Why that one? Yeah. Why? Why that piece of film? Why not the why not the longer one?

Guest Two 3:06:51
Why not the footage where they're putting the costume on? Yeah. Right? Like. There's a like, again, I am not saying, I have never said this film is faked. What I am saying is we have legitimate questions that. To your point. If this footage was brought to a court of law, there are courts that wouldn't accept it as evidence because the provenance is questionable at best. That's right. There's more work to be done to accept it. All I'm saying is everybody. Everybody.

Christopher Jordan 3:07:22
Calm down, have a coach. I don't even think the antiques road show would accept the provenance. Oh, they wouldn't. No, they absolutely wouldn't. Again, there's not for value, anyway. Yeah, not for value. Like, Collectible piece. There are some collectors that probably pay good money for it. However, now it's there for certification. Exactly. It's just like, well, it's in a film now. So that makes it worth something. Like, that's it. That's all we.

Guest Two 3:07:49
I'm just saying, like everyone who, it's like everyone calm down. Everyone who's saying it's real. Everyone who's this new film is real. Everyone who's saying it's 100% fake. You're both on either sides of the AI question. I've never been fooled and I've seen a cat playing a banjo. Those are the same exact answer. Y'all are both arguing from the same position of this is what I believe, and this either supports or counters my belief, and therefore I either accept it or I reject it. Can't we all just come back and say, hey? There's an interesting story here. There's value to this conversation.

Christopher Jordan 3:08:23
And let's figure it out doing good work. Well, and the absolutist mentality is not where science lies. You know? Period. It's not where it lies. That's just it. If you're trying to scientifically look at this in any kind of way, shape or form. You can't look at it that way.

Guest Two 3:08:48
No, 100%. And that's good s here's the thing, anything worth doing is hard. And the problem is it's much easier to have an emotional reaction, positive or negative, than it is to stop and go, hold on. Let's actually take a look at this and see what it is. Let's investigate. Let's put in the years. That it will probably take. Actually properly investigate this. And then come to a conclusion. Yeah. That's hard. That's Harder to do. And unfortunately, it's not as sexy or satisfying as typing out on social media. I stay in with Gimlin, or this just proves that I was right the whole time that Roger Patterson was escaped, was a, you know, was a scammer, was a scammer. Like, I'm sorry.

It's more satisfying to put that out on s on on Facebook and Instagram and and and your TikTok. Than it is to say don't know. Let's investigate. Yeah. That's hard. And that's not going to win. Like, we are not winning friends today. No, no, absolutely. When this comes out. I know for a fact there's going to be people who are going to unfriend me and block me that I've known for years because they're like, you didn't like. But here's the thing, I wasn't there. I don't know that. That's it. And I'm gonna say the darkest thing I've ever said. On air. Okay. Oh, I was going to say on air because we've had some wild private. I know. We've had some. Yeah, I'm like.

We've we've had some yeah, I'm just saying on air, on air. On air. Because I don't want I don't want to drop I do like to keep things a little light, you know. Yeah, life's hard enough as it is. That's it. I have seen really? I've seen people that I've known. For years, family friends, people that we knew, people we grew up with. Prison for horrific things. Yeah. You never know anyone. Everyone's like, well, I know Bob Kim. Look, I have a lot of friends who've known him for years, love him. I've spoken with the guy. He's a good guy. My problem though is at the end of the day, none of us actually know what really happened.

And if you think for a second that that sweet old man couldn't have, couldn't, for a hundred reasons, couldn't be doing what he's doing now and saying what he's saying now. And him be lying to you, then you've either led a very charmed life. Or you have or you have missed out on a lot of really tremendously dark and evil things that people have done. People who are in prison that I know personally. And I wished. That somebody in prison would have taken care of that son of a bitch. I have known s I and I'm going to try and keep it as vague as I can because again, I don't want to

Christopher Jordan 3:11:35
That's all right. That's all right. Hey, man. Like, I tell people all the time, especially when it comes to. This show, my audience. Things like that. I love you guys. I'll look right at the camera. I love every one of you. Depths of my soul for the curious mind that you are. However, there are things about me that you'll just never know. Because that's for me and my wife to discuss outside of this. That's financials. That's, you know. Personal things, personal struggles that I have outside of this microphone that I've had. Since before I was a seminarian, since before I was fourteen. You know? Things like that. So there there are those yeah, like you're saying, there are those parts of us that sometimes only few people will ever know and sometimes nobody will ever know.

In that kind of way. And you kinda have to accept that about everybody that you know, no matter how long you've known them. Hell man. Found out this last year at a family, my, my dad's side of the family never has family reunions. All right. Like, a family reunion for us is like a friggin' funeral. Maybe a wedding a little bit more than a funeral. But even then, there's still some of them that are like, yeah, he ain't showing up because so-and-so's here. And oh yeah. But we went out to the Jimmy Buffett Resort. We had a good weekend. It was great. My uncle Joe is very much me. He's like the younger member of the family, but he spent a lot of time with my grandfather.

Lotta lot of time. Now I knew some wild things about my grandfather. All kinds of stuff. New he used to sell bootleg liquor on Sundays in Texas. You know, all kinds of stuff like that. Little did I know that he'd done time in prison for attempted murder. There you go. Yeah, that's an eye opener. I was like, whoa. My uncle was like, oh, yeah. Like him and that's what brought him to Texas. He was like after World War Two him and his him and his cousin were were running a running a gambling and bootleg liquor rink. Some dude ended up going in debt to him for like 10 grand or something like that, and they liked to beat him to death.

Hmm. It's like, holy crap. This is a dude I used to ride on the lawnmower lid with. You know? Like, oh, exactly. Like, I loved my papa. Who the hell? What the what? Yeah, what happened here? Yeah. Oh, exactly. So you never know.

Guest Two 3:14:09
You never know. That and that's the only point I make. Like, I w Bob Gimlin has been, but I'm not, I'm not even saying that he has. In fact, that's the thing I want to say: I want him to be as honest as the day is long. I've, like I said, he's a good guy. If he has been lying, it doesn't bother me because I have, I've, I, I'm sorry, I've been through worse. It would what would piss me off is I know people. They are friends with him. Yeah. And he's been lying to them. And I'm, I would, it would piss me off that he lied to them. Yeah.

More than me. Yeah. But the thing is I'm also not going, but I'm also not going to go all. Mythbustery on, you know. On Hath on Hath on Hathcock here and say that I know he's, I don't know him. That seems I don't know if he's lying or he's telling the truth. The liar, the truth, is inconsequential to the data and the science. Exactly. And all exactly, that's my only point: for everyone who would say, I side with him, I was like, look. The simple fact of the matter is your skin in the game is not what you think it is. Yeah. I've seen quote unquote, good men do some really dark and evil things.

I have on more than one occasion thought about what do we need to do to get rid of somebody? Because that's how bad this that's how bad some of this stuff gets. Don't know until all of a sudden someone's told

you this, and you're like, what just happened here? Yeah. No. Because we never know. All we can do is go off the data. I will not declare this I will not declare Bob Gimlin or Roger Patterson a liar. That's right. I'm also not going to sit here and and stake my reputation on whether or not he's telling the truth. Yeah. Or calling the fact that the the the Patterson-Gimlin film is infallible.

Exactly. The simple fact of the matter is we have the best argument against it that has ever been posed. Yeah. And it's time to review it and do our due diligence. Yeah, or at least give it the light of day in that kind of way. Yeah.

Christopher Jordan 3:16:04
Give it its same credence that this has been given for 70. Let's hope it doesn't go for 70 years. Right, exactly. Like Cough. Is it the cell? Is it 50? But well, we're on the shady. We're almost to 60. Almost to 60. Okay, so yeah. Yeah, we're almost to 60s. It's been hard to sin plus years. It's the UFO phenomenon that I think. It's the UFO phenomenon. Yeah, I know. Sorry. 47 for that, 67 for Bigfoot.

Guest Two 3:16:32
So again, I go back to I just look, I don't know. And we don't, and here's the thing. We cannot, we can actually survive not knowing 100%. That's right.

Christopher Jordan 3:16:41
That's right. We survive every day not knowing whether or not Pluto is actually a planet. I know for a fact that's a planet. That's what my high school textbook says for astronomy, but that is not what my son's chart of the planets says. It's and that's and both of them are science.

Guest Two 3:17:01
Exactly. So hold on. Well, let's end with this thought. Did they demote? Something a little bit higher, a little bit funnier than what we've been talking about in particular in the last few minutes. I did they demote? Pluto from being a planet to a planetesimal. Planetesimal because they found out it was secretly Cybertron and they don't want anyone going there. That's right. That's right. Exactly. What one do you do if you find the bridge? Exactly. That's what I'm saying. They don't want us to go find Optimus Prime, who's actually hanging out there. They've all been decommissioned, you know, they ran out of Energon and they're just waiting for somebody to come and.

Christopher Jordan 3:17:43
And they're like, no, we we can't have people knowing that what they still want to know the planet they've discovered on the outer rim is. Right there. That's topics for other episodes, though. Jason, man, thank you as always for coming on. It's always, it, we always have a great time whenever we talk on or off air, but man, we really do dig deep into some stuff and dig heels into some stuff. We have left. Some large deep ruts. For the community to deal with. Tonight. I think, and and some come to terms on both sides. Of this debate. For the community. So thank you for your time. Thank you, as always, for your honest and candid conversation, my friend.

Guest Two 3:18:29
That's always my pleasure, man. Again, this is Yours is one of the few shows I still do. Because like if I do Donnie's show, I know it's because it's going to be fun. Yeah. I like helping out Dean because we're going to have a good conversation. And I like doing your show because I know we're going to have a good conversation for a really long time. And it's and it's gonna be and it's gonna be wild. Like this is again, honestly, this is one of the three shows that I will do consistently because I know there's going to be that your your audience wants to hear.

Harder conversations and harder truths. Even if they don't agree with them. Yeah. And that's what this shows, because we don't agree on a lot of things. I think that's absolutely. I think people would be shocked by how little we actually agree on. But what we agree on is doing the right work. Yeah. We both want ultimately the same thing, which is what are the facts? We're trying to discover what the truth is. And that's why I love coming on this show. So I appreciate you.

Christopher Jordan 3:19:30
Thank you. As we let you go, let everybody know where they can go to keep up, where they can go to.

Guest Two 3:19:35
Look for new material, all that kind of Jason. All that kind of stuff, Jason. I know you have I don't even know that all that kind of stuff. Yeah, all that honestly, at this point, just follow me on Facebook. and you know, if anything, when anything changes, like I do have serial papers on X and I mostly just randomly post thoughts. You know, the that happens like once every three months. On there. That I had a thought, yeah. Like I got X just so I could like the the paid version, just so I could do more AI stuff because I'm working I am working on a project. I am working on a project.

But here's, here, let me, if I can pull it up, let me see if I can find the last thing I posted. And this is like the first thing I've posted in. Like three months? No, I'm sorry. Nine months. I posted the emerotic hubris is a spirit that inhabits all governments and burns the most brightly in utopians. It is this burning that ignites the flames of tyranny. Well ow. Nine months before that I posted, we can't have nice things because we are not nice people. This is why we need Jesus so desperately. Absolutely. Absolute truth. Well, if you want to follow me, it's Siru Papers. Siru Papers, Siru Papers on X, but like you're going to get some random post at 2 a.m. That's all right every season.

Once or twice a year, follow me on Facebook. I'll post stuff like I am working on a comic, I should be. Finishing up choopy rules. In the little bit and I post other friends stuff from time to time there. And when something happens, I guess you can find me there.

Christopher Jordan 3:21:09

Awesome. Jason, thank you as always for the time, buddy. Hold the line real quick while we close things out. While you were online checking out everything. From Jason McLean and Siru Papers, make sure to stop on by Curious Realm. CuriousRealm.com is where you can like, follow, subscribe. Curiousrealm.com forward slash as you can see right here on your screen, is where you can go to access the all-new congressional vote tracker if you want to keep your government in check. Red or blue folks or even independent. Stop on by, check it out. That is all data pulled directly from government websites, and it has all the backlinks to the sites for your citational work.

Things like that, that is also where you can find your link to Curious Research. And the field observation and encounter log. Thank you so much, everybody. As always, for your open hearts, your open minds, that is what makes the conversation. And without the conversation, humanity does not march forward. So remember. Take care of yourselves, take care of each other, and stay curious. We'll talk to you soon.

[Outro] Thank you for tuning in to this episode of The Curious Realm. Stay tuned for more guests, forbidden topics, and hidden truths. Follow us on social media by searching Curious Realm. To download the official Curious Realm app and view the knowledge vault, or become a sponsor of Curious Realm, visit our website at curiousrealm.com. Curious Realm is available on your favorite podcast and video services. Curiousrealm.com, as well as KGRA radio, APR-TV, and the official Curious Realm app for Roku devices. Curious Realm is a proud member of the Ground Zero Media family of podcasts. For more shows and members-only content, visit GroundZeroPlus.com today. Thanks for listening. Stay curious and remember. The other cell. Is always one.