

INTRODUCING *The Making of Hominology*

THE MAKING OF HOMINOLOGY *A Science Whose Time Has Come*



With an endorsement
by Dr. Jane Goodall

Foreword by David Hancock & Dr. Jeff Meldrum

DMITRI BAYANOV
in association with
CHRISTOPHER L. MURPHY

THE MAKING OF HOMINOLOGY *A SCIENCE WHOSE TIME HAS COME*
BY DMITRI BAYANOV

Certainly one of the most important works on the subject of hominology in the last few decades, this book presents the case for a new field of study that is now both scientifically and academically justified.



Bayanov's work is supported by both experts and academia, as attested to by the testimonials of the world-famous primatologist Dr. Jane Goodall and other prestigious scholars. *The Making of Hominology* will undoubtedly become a major reference work on the topic.

"Dmitri Bayanov has proposed a new scientific discipline—hominology—that will study the many reports of unclassified hairy, upright, hominoid-like creatures from various quarters of the globe ... Bayanov has authored several books and published papers arguing convincingly that the accumulating evidence for these species warrants a move from the realm of myth and legend to serious scientific investigation."

Jane Goodall, PhD, DBE

Founder – the Jane Goodall Institute & UN Messenger of Peace

"... This present book, *The Making of Hominology*, is a timely and substantial contribution in this frontier of scientific investigation."

Nikolay Drozdov, PhD, Lomonosov Moscow University, Russia

"This book is an eloquent summary of his struggle to promote a scientific 'hominology'... A serious and thoughtful book on a controversial subject."

Paul LeBlond, PhD, University of British Columbia, Canada

"This book makes the explicit case that the study of yetis, sasquatch, and the like qualifies as a science—hominology—both because of the nature of science and because the evidence is overwhelming that these creatures are real—and that they are closer relatives of humans than of apes."

Henry Bauer, PhD, University of Sydney, Australia



*Full testimonials can be found
within the front matter of the book.*

FULL TESTIMONIALS

Dr. Jane Goodall

Dmitri Bayanov has proposed a new scientific discipline—hominology—that will study the many reports of unclassified hairy upright hominoid-like creatures from various quarters of the globe. Beginning in the 1960s, Bayanov worked directly with Professor Boris Porshnev and other Russian scientists investigating reports of relict hominoids, such as the *almasty*, described as a possibly extant Neanderthal. Continuing that work, Bayanov has authored several books and published papers arguing convincingly that the accumulating evidence for these species warrants a move from the realm of myth and legend to serious scientific investigation. A lifetime of scholarly examination of this question, with evidence spanning from the dawn of written communications to the present, has culminated in this important book – *The Making of Hominology*.

Jane Goodall, PhD, DBE; Founder – the Jane Goodall Institute & UN Messenger of Peace

Dr. Nikolay Drozdov

Serious study of the “snowman” phenomenon began with Prof. Boris Porshnev's groundbreaking book *The Present State of the Question of Relict Hominoids* (1963). He noted in it the emerging science of still unclassified higher bipedal primates that later developed into a discipline termed hominology. As a Moscow University student I attended Prof. Porshnev's eye-opening lectures on this subject and was presented by him a copy of his famous book. The relevant research had been initiated by him at the Academy of Sciences and continued at the Darwin Museum by a group of enthusiasts, headed first by museum Chief Curator Pyotr Smolin and followed by Dmitri Bayanov. His present book *The Making of Hominology*, written in association with Christopher Murphy, is a timely and substantial contribution in this frontier of scientific investigation.

Nikolay Drozdov, PhD, Doctor of Sciences in Biology; Doctor in Geography – Chair of Biogeography, Lomonosov Moscow University, Russia

Dr. Paul LeBlond

For years Dmitri Bayanov has argued forcefully for a scientific approach to the interpretation of the evidence for wild hominids (Sasquatch, Yeti, Almasty...). This book is an eloquent summary of his struggle to promote a scientific “hominology.” It also provides examples of the sober and detailed examinations which he advocates, applied to some of the available evidence. A serious and thoughtful book on a controversial subject.

Paul LeBlond, PhD, Professor emeritus, Dept. Physics and Oceanography, University of British Columbia

Dr. Henry Bauer

This book makes the explicit case that the study of yetis, Sasquatch, and the like qualifies as a science—hominology—both because of the nature of science and because the evidence is overwhelming that these creatures are real—and that they are closer relatives of humans than of apes. The author has been with this project essentially from the beginning, and his accounts of its history are authentic. A valuable resource for both fans and skeptics.

Henry Bauer, PhD, Professor emeritus of Chemistry and Science Studies, University of Sydney, Australia

FOREWORD ENTRIES

FOREWORD BY DAVID HANCOCK

I was apprehensive to publish the first Hancock House book on sasquatch back in about 1975. I had just spent 10 years associating with scientists and going through graduate school and then nearly another 10 years starting a publishing company, focusing on down-to-earth history and natural history books. How could I take our “rationally based publishing company” and do books on a “fringe creature”—the mythical sasquatch? Well, it was those same roots that demanded it.

Charles Guiquez, Museum Biologist, Dr. Clifford Carl, Museum Director, Wilson Duff and Don Abbott, Museum Anthropologists, Dr. Adam Schawinski, Museum Botanist, York Edwards, Park Biologist, and a whole host of “drop-by-biologists” of Parks, Wildlife and Fisheries would share the tall round coffee table; the only place in the room where coffee cups, skulls, a bottled frog, ancient masks or dried plants ever came together. This hallowed spot was in the bowels of the old Provincial Museum (now the Royal Museum), where the discussions were a wondrous treasury of British Columbia wildlife and management theories.

Even the guru of wildlife Dr. Ian McTaggart-Cowan would drop by to feel the pulse of what was driving British Columbia wildlife studies. At the center of every table sat Frank Beebe, the most read, most consulted and most respected member of the Museum staff—the artist who never went to high school and whom all scientists depended upon to ground and give respectability and biological reference and representative illustrations to all their papers.

Frank became my mentor for the next 60 years. He taught me how to train a Cooper's hawk when I was 11 years old and led me on my first and many Museum and private expeditions. I remember an early paper he evolved at that coffee table in the Museum basement, the "Ecology of Sasquatch." Its evolution was inspiring. It partly evolved from the skepticism and arguments of those gathered biologists and yet often from the free-floated ridicule that were collectively offered. An often invited quest and stimulator of the topic at that round table was John Green, who emerged from the tunnels that permeated under the Museum and Parliament Buildings. He had been searching long-stowed boxes for old bones of sasquatches. I will not delineate who pooh-poohed his efforts or who supported them; I rather state that the consistent banter that always arose fostered my perennial interest in science and scientists—and sasquatches.

It was those conversations around that table that demanded, when I had completed my commercial pilots license, that I should go to university and become a biologist. It was those biologists, anthropologists and botanists and particularly Frank Beebe, the enlightened artist, and perhaps one of the last living people who could have written a "Natural History of the World," who drove my life of inquiry.

From the John Green contacts I encountered, it was Bob Titmus who I found wandering the shores and hills of Princess Royal Island that put me into sasquatch fieldwork. I helped him place two large cartons of old Brownie Hawkeye camera traps in good sasquatch habitat.

From the date I released John Green's *The Apes Among Us*, I got an annual visit from René Dahinden, politely threatening me with jail for violating his copyrights as to publishing some of the images Green used that René said he owned. After the threats came discussions of his latest investigations.

Many years later (2005) I republished a book he owned, Roger Patterson's *Do Abominable Snowmen of America Really Exist?* It was republished with a supplement under a different title, and in 2018 I republished just the book itself. This first book and many other Hancock House titles were largely brokered by the region's most prolific and serious sasquatch researcher—Chris Murphy. Thanks Chris.

Science is wonderfully enlightening. If it wasn't bogged down by the individual limitations of scientists, by the taboos and jealousy of professionalism and of the "thematic eagerness" to get grants, science would have long ago overcome human frailties.

This book is another attempt to overcome these human limits. Had it not been for Jane Goodall endorsing this work I would have said it was another scholarly attempt to give credibility to a topic so needing of a "paradigm shift" of the establishment to give it the credibility it deserves! Jane has enabled scientists to make one of the last and greatest paradigm shifts—that animals can display human traits and emotions. Galilei died under house arrest and Bruno at the stake for pointing out the obvious—things that were simply a contradiction to the "science of the day." Meteorites went from an "earth-based science" (of course at a time when everything was earth-centered) to a field of astronomy in another paradigm shift—perhaps some other shifts would today be enlightening. Dmitri Bayanov is perhaps another prophetic researcher of our times.

Enjoy. Be enlightened. Question and don't get hung up on scientists' adoration of themselves; being stuck to last months flavor or their non-scientific tendencies in covering their butts. Remember that fecal analysis is an excellent, accepted ecological tool. Using every tool to follow and analyze one's own trail could be most enlightening. Allow a shift when deserved.

David Hancock
Publisher & Biologist
"Long may the Eagles Fly"

PS: I never put a transmitter on an eagle that I didn't wonder what habitat or creatures it might be so familiar with as it traversed the unknown mountains and valleys of the wild northwest. DH

FOREWORD BY DR. JEFF MELDRUM

In *The Making of Hominology*, senior Russian homin investigator Dmitri Bayanov offers a timely retrospective and introspective consideration of the conception, gestation, difficult labor and imminent birth of a new scientific discipline. In science, names and definitions of terminology are integral to effective communication of knowledge. “Hominology” is the study of “homins,” a generic term coined by Bayanov to include all forms of “hairy bipedal primates, whose degree of kinship with humans (*Homo sapiens*) is still to be established.” It is a name essentially synonymous with “relict hominoids,” a term first popularized by Boris Porshnev, and carried on, after much deliberation, in the title of *The Relict Hominoid Inquiry* (www.isu.edu/rhi), a singular academic journal established in 2012, as an attendant to the birth of this revolutionary discipline.

The account of this travail contains numerous dichotomies, highlighting contrasting perspectives, interpretations, politics and paradigms. There have been and continue to be interesting distinctions in the US vs. Soviet institutional approaches to this scientific enigma. There have been and continue to be polarized opinions about the nature of homins—more human-like vs. more ape-like. There have been and continue to be disparities in opinion regarding the uniformity vs. diversity of homins – e.g., Sanderson’s Neo-Giants (sasquatch or bigfoot) vs. Neanderthaloids (almas). Exploring these differences makes for intellectual “dramatic tension” that can breathe vigor into the nascent discipline, desirably, and lend resolution and delineation. To this end, *The Making of Hominology* offers a seminal contribution to the conversation.

With the spirit of the Bolsheviks, but hardly speaking in the majority, Bayanov parallels Kuhn’s principles of scientific revolution with the struggles for scientific recognition of hominology, in the midst of a generational paradigm shift. This paradigm shift has turned from the single-species hypothesis, which posited that two culture-bearing hominins could not exist at the same time, an assumption of the competitive exclusion principle. Now, however, the fossil record shows that myriad now-extinct hominins existed simultaneously across the same landscapes. There was not a single-file line of evolution, but a bushy tree, making room for the possibility that Bigfoot and other relict hominoids could exist. The question remains, what evidence points to the probability of such species existing today? Bayanov offers a frank indictment of the scientific communities on both continents, as ones “duped by the mass media,” rendered largely ignorant of the primary data, in spite of Sisyphean efforts by some to present the evidence through scholarly channels, and engage objective discussion. “The theory is the tool that allows you to see the facts,” anthropologist Esteban Sarmiento says. “For people to see something totally new, they’d need a theory that would allow for it. Unless the academics have new theories, some facts will always be closed to them.” Bayanov credits Porshnev as among the first to provide a theory to accommodate the “anomalous” facts.

Against this backdrop, Bayanov considers the nature of some of the most compelling anomalous evidence at present—the footprints and the film. Smithsonian primatologist John Napier, one of the few scientists to offer a relatively objective assessment of the evidence, concluded on the basis of the footprints, that sasquatch does exist. “There must be something in north-west America that needs explaining, and that something leaves man-like footprints.” (Napier, 1973, p. 205). Bayanov reprints a poster presentation I delivered at the annual meetings of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists in 1999. This evaluation commenced in 1996 when I personally examined a fresh track line in the ground, comprised of 15-inch hominoid footprints. More than 20 years later, I have assembled over 300 specimens of footprints attributed to various relict hominoids around the world. Examples of these are presented in Chris Murphy’s contributed chapter.

It is timely, on the heels of its 50th anniversary, to consider the most compelling photographic evidence—the Patterson and Gimlin film, taken in 1967. Russian investigators made significant contributions to the study and analysis of this film. Here again another dichotomy is revealing—the contrasting opinions, after regarding the very same film clip, arrived at by the academicians vs. those of the non-academic professionals, who, it is noted, had no “axe to grind.” The history of the alternate perceptions and pronouncements about the film is very revealing of the sometimes glacial-pace of the realization of paradigm shifts in science. To illustrate, consider once again Dr. Napier, who was among the first scientists to critically examine the film in the USA. In his book, he ultimately came to the conclusion that the film was a hoax, although he acknowledged he

couldn't put his finger on exactly what to base that conclusion upon. Subsequently, he offered this caveat, "The upper half of the body bears some resemblance to an ape and the lower half is typically human. It is almost impossible to conceive that such structural hybrids could exist in nature. One half of the animal must be artificial." (Napier, 1973, p. 91). In essence, the film subject did not fit commonly held preconceptions of what a hominid should look like, not to mention that the prevailing paradigm would not even allow for the existence of another extant bipedal hominid. Shortly after the publication of his book, a more complete fossilized skeleton a specimen of *Australopithecus afarensis*, among our earliest hominin ancestors (popularly dubbed "Lucy") was discovered in East Africa, and publically announced to much fanfare. The experts were cited in the press as noting how interesting a specimen it was—from the waist up it looks much like a chimpanzee, while from the waist down it resembled a human. It seems such hybrids of structure were no longer inconceivable after all. Perhaps the potential of other bipedal homins existing alongside *Homo sapiens* should not be assumed as inconceivable either.

Kuhn has suggested that it may take the passing of a generation before a novel paradigm can take root and flourish. Bayanov, in essence, is issuing a call to action, which if realized, will likely first be responded to by the upcoming generation of scholars. I have seen signs of such germinations and suspect *The Making of Hominology* may contribute to their nurturing.

Jeff Meldrum, PhD
Professor of Anatomy & Anthropology
Idaho State University

INTRODUCTION

As I have taken part in the making of hominology, it's in place here to relate briefly how I came to it and have kept at it, without grants and funding, since 1964 to the present (December 2018); that is for 54 years. I quote from an interview, mentioning some facts of my biography.

As a boy, I was very interested in animals, and visits to the zoo excited me much more than visits to the cinema (not any longer, for I hate seeing animals in cages).

On June 22, 1941, Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union, and history's most terrible war started. Moscow was repeatedly bombed, and my father took the family (mother, sister, and me) to Tajikistan (then part of the Soviet Union), far away from the front. My father was soon called-up into the army, and my mother, sister and I stayed in Tajikistan until the end of the war in 1945, when we returned to Moscow.

While in Tajikistan, we lived in a small town called Shakhrinav and it was there and then that I heard for the first time a rumor of "hairy wild men" living in the mountains; but could hardly believe this. I recalled it decades later when I revisited Tajikistan in 1982 on a hominological expedition, as described in one of my books.

At the time, I continued to entertain great interest in animals and dreamed to become a famous zoologist; like the eminent German naturalist Alfred Brehm (1829–84), /... /

As a youth and young man, back in Moscow, I gave much thought to what happened to mankind as a result of a second and much nastier world war—about what happened to the German people under Hitler, and the Soviet people under Stalin. From zoology my interests shifted to philosophy, sociology, and anthropology. It was due to these interests that in 1964 I met Professor Boris Porshnev, who acquainted me with the problem of so-called relict hominoids, and that was the start of my hominological investigation, including the Bigfoot phenomenon. (*Bigfoot Research: The Russian Vision*, pp. 389–391).

My first book on the subject (in Russian) was titled *Wood Goblin dubbed "Ape": A Comparative Study In Demonology*. I wrote this book after expeditions to the Caucasus; interviewing witnesses and reading a great many books on folklore and demonology. My conclusions: such folklore terms as devils, goblins, brownies, etc., mean real biological beings for the local population in many geographical areas where such terms are traditionally used.

With great amazement, I had discovered a giant gap between the tenet of science and what common locals take for the truth. For instance, Professor of psychology Constantin Platonov cites the words of an old hunter in Siberia, who told him, “I don’t know if apes exist or just imagined, but I saw the Leshy with my own eyes, and more than once,” as an example of belief in sheer superstition. Why? Because the Russian-English dictionary translates “Leshy” as “wood-goblin,” and “goblin of the woods,” with the designation “folklore.” It’s appropriate to add that an eyewitness in Siberia claims to have encountered a “hornless devil.”

In this respect, it is instructive to quote from Theodore Roosevelt’s book *Wilderness Hunter: Outdoor Pastimes of an American Hunter* (1893), wherein he recounts an episode in the life of a hunter and trapper, named Bauman, who was hunting and trapping with a partner in the mountains of Idaho /Montana in the early 1800s. His partner discovered near their camp some tracks of a bear that “has been walking on two legs.” Bauman laughed at this ... At midnight he was awakened by some noise, his nostrils were struck by a strong, wild-beast odor; he caught the loom of a great body in the darkness ... Eventually, when the two men parted for a time, Bauman’s partner was killed by the beast-like stranger. After that “Bauman, utterly unnerved, and believing that the creature with which he had to deal was something either **half human** or **half devil**, some great **goblin-beast**, abandoned everything but his rifle and struck off at speed down the pass ...” (Quoted from Ivan T. Sanderson, *Abominable Snowmen: Legend Come To Life*, 2006, pp.105–108, my emphasis – DB).

So it’s not accidental that the nature of such “devils” and “goblins” is at present thoroughly investigated by diverse scholars whose findings are posted by the Relict Hominoid Inquiry at Idaho State University.

After my book on folklore and demonology about hairy wildmen in Eurasia, I wrote a similar work of 69 pages regarding such denizens of North America, titled “*Learning from Folklore*” (*Russian Hominology*, 2016, pp. 43–112). I based it mainly on the material in the book *Giants, Cannibals & Monsters: Bigfoot in Native Culture*, 2008, by anthropologist Kathy Moskowicz Strain. My conclusions were similar or identical with those of my first book: Native Americans using various ethnic names (regarded in North America as mythological), view Bigfoot (or Sasquatch) as biologically real beings. When I asked Kathy about my conclusion, she answered, “I think Native people view Bigfoot as a relative— but the kind you don’t really want to invite to Christmas dinner.”

Was it important and relevant to the making of hominology? Very much so. The first reason used by the angry academic critics and opponents of Porshnev—accusing him of creating and spreading pseudoscience—was his alleged presenting of non-existent mythological creatures as being real. So where is the truth in this crucial issue: on the side of native people around the world or on the side of the scientific community? This question was the first chain that tied me to this research. The second was different but no less strong, which I now relate.

As a young man, going on expeditions, I sort of polled the natives on their views and experiences. Getting older, staying more at home, dealing more with the theory than practice of hominology, I started to poll educated people around me on their knowledge of themselves, so to speak. Namely, what they thought about the species name of ourselves—*Homo sapiens*. It’s Latin; in English it means literally “wise man.” Strange, isn’t it?

... man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep. (*Measure for Measure*, II, ii)

Can such creature be called *Homo sapiens*? So I kept asking my friends, acquaintances and others: Who coined the term “*Homo sapiens*,” when and why? I don’t remember anyone

answering it correctly. What separates man from animals, including non-human primates, is human language. Therefore I put my question recently to Noam Chomsky, who is:

...an American linguist, philosopher, cognitive scientist, historian, political activist, and social critic. Sometimes described as the “father of modern linguistics,” Chomsky is also a major figure in analytic philosophy and one of the founders of the field of cognitive science.” (Wikipedia)

His answer received in November 2018 was: “I’m one of those who doesn’t know who or when [as to the *Homo sapiens* term], though I think it’s clear why. It’s a very distinct species, and ‘sapiens’ is at least a hopeful designation.”

Actually, if educated humans, including anthropologists, philosophers and linguists do not know the origin of their own species name, this is a “designation” that the current paradigm in anthropology is in error and inadequate. To use John Napier’s words, “*Homo sapiens* is not the one and only living product of the hominid line.” Why then was this crucial fact not known to science earlier? Because there was no science to know it. The Darwinian revolution is still incomplete and going on. As a result, the needed science was born as late as the second half of the 20th century and as described now in *The Making of Hominology: A Science Whose Time Has Come*, now in print by Hancock House Publishers.

That its time has come is shown, for example, by the work “The Patterson-Gimlin Film in Light of the Linnaeus and Porshnev Teachings” 7:97-101 (2018), posted by the Relict Hominoid Inquiry (RHI) On-line Journal (website); making quite explicit the origin of the term *Homo sapiens*. Also by the work “The Ecology of an Uncatalogued Hominoid of the Boreal Forest (Taiga) of North America and Eurasia,” by Dr. John Bindernagel; posted on the Sasquatch Canada website and shedding a bright light on the ecological issue of hominology.

What’s more and very important is that hominology has reached the DNA testing level in its development, as testified by such works on the RHI as “DNA as Evidence for the Existence of Relict Hominoids,” 5:8-31 (2016) and “Normal Science, Revolutionary Science: Notes on Bryan Sykes’ *The Nature of the Beast*,” 4:75-78 (2015)

Finally, Dr. Henry Bauer, in his mind-opening book *Science Is Not What You Think* (2017) advocates establishment of a Science Court whose sole mission “would have to be limited strictly to clarifying purely scientific issues about which there is dispute” (p. 209).

The Making of Hominology is a call to the scientific community—to primatologists, anthropologists and paleoanthropologists—to abandon assumptions turned into erroneous convictions; a call to heed the on-going revolution in the science of man and shift the paradigm. Dr. Jane Goodall is describing the situation as “one of the greatest unsolved mysteries in the natural world.” In fact, the “mystery” remains largely a mystery because facts and arguments shedding light on it have been stubbornly hushed up and ignored by the dominant mainstream scientists. Hopefully, this book will help put an end to the impasse even before the establishment of a Science Court.

Dmitri Bayanov
Moscow, Russia
December 3, 2018

BOOK CHAPTERS

1. Setting the Stage
2. Scientific Look At Science
3. Comments on Kuhn's Theory and
An Example of Its Application
4. Hominology in the Light of Kuhn's Theory
5. Theory, Method and Proofs
6. The Weight and Pressure of the Paradigm
7. There is Nothing as Practical as a Good Theory
8. First Academic Conference
9. Chances Lost Because of Inadequate Theory & Tactic
10. Out of Sadness Shall Come Gladness
11. Moving in the Right Direction
12. Getting to Square Two
13. The Footprint Evidence
14. Footprint Cast Examples
15. The Patterson and Gimlin Film
16. Authoritative Conclusions on the PG Film
17. A Call to Action

Bibliography
General Index

BOOK SPECIFICATIONS: Size: 8.5 inches by 5.5 inches. Pages: 151. Softcover. Will be available in color and grayscale; also as an ebook. There may be another option.

THE FOUNDERS OF HOMINOLOGY



The founders of hominoid research in Russia: (left to right) Boris Porshnev, Alexander Mashkovtsev, Pyotr Smolin, Dmitri Bayanov, and Marie-Jeanne Koffmann. The photograph from which these images were obtained was taken in January 1968. Boris Porshnev arranged a photographer, invited his very close friends and colleagues and said, "This is for us to be remembered in the future."
(© D. Bayanov)