

THE MUNNS REPORT

Release Number 1D - Critical Observations

An evaluation of the personalized nature
of both this report and the critical
response to it.

This Report reflects an ongoing
analysis by Bill Munns
of the 1967
Patterson-Gimlin Film.

www.themunnsreport.com

Report Copyright by Bill Munns 2009

PG Film copyright: Patricia Patterson

The following is a Philosophical Evaluation of my Report and the subsequent response from people interested in the Report.

A philosophical evaluation is invariably a personal one, and it would be wonderful if this effort could be kept on an entirely factual level, but as I observe the discussions that seem to invariably follow my efforts and released material, those discussions do tend to get personal, especially by those critical of me. Now my very introduction to the whole internet world and Bigfoot/PGF discussions was in fact personal to some extent from the day I first introduced myself, because I used my real name and referenced my real experiences making the Gigantopithecus model so popular in internet Bigfoot lore.

So the personalization of my efforts has been an integral part of my activity, and while I would be quite content if it were phased out, it does appear that my critics have no such intention. So personalized speculation about me does continue with sometimes strange and amusing fallacies being offered into the discussion.

One of the classic challenges of any person under public inspection or debate is the issue of what criticisms to respond to. Just this week, I've been following the debate on the US Senate's confirmation hearings for a new Supreme Court Nominee and observed many of the online discussion boards and reader comments. Some were valid and insightful, others were bizarre to the point of irrational rants. But the process does highlight a problem in any public discussions, however profound in their magnitude (as the above example surely is) or far more mundane, as almost all the BF-related discussions are. The problem common to both the profound and mundane debates is the issue of what criticisms one should respond to, and what criticisms one should simply ignore.

In a black and white world, there is the rational and valuable constructive criticisms on the one extreme and the totally irrational, indeed often delusional rants of destructive critics, on the other extreme. But we live in a world with a full intellectual color palate in between those two extremes, and the majority of comments and criticisms fall into the infinite gradient of grays and hues between pure black and pure white absolutes. So where does one draw the line and decide what criticisms to respond to, and which to ignore. In some endeavors, there are the prior experience of others to compare with and study, to see where a response was helpful, and where it was unnecessary or even counter-productive. Regretfully, I don't have such a benefit, so I must simply rely upon my own judgment to make that choice, hopeful that some other people will find the choice appropriate, while being resigned to the fact other people will invariably find cause to criticize me for even responding to some criticisms.

So as I continue to move forward with my research effort, and this Report, I simply felt it was appropriate at this point in time to address some of the personalized discussions about my effort.

1. My Intentions

A surprising amount of discussion appears to flow around this one simple topic, what are my intentions? The skeptical community in particular, seems hell-bent on perceiving me as having some suspicious agenda, and on occasion has boldly claimed I am perpetrating some kind of charade or committing some kind of fraud. Nothing could be further from the truth, but the skeptical mindset I've seen on the internet is often about as far from the truth as you can get without falling off the edge.

But to address the claims, since they tend to keep sprouting up like weeds, where is the charade? Where is the fraud?

Is there any misrepresentation of my career and experience? My resume on my Creature Gallery website, a very detailed one, by the way, has never been challenged as to having any errors or false claims of credit, that I am aware of. I have been fired from one film job 25 years ago, and I have acknowledged that incident. Out of more than a hundred varied jobs over 40 years, that represents a success rate of only about 99%, which I can live with.

I note various honors and distinctions in my resume, for example, of having won two "Best In World" Re-Creation awards at the World Taxidermy Championships, (noted in the "About the Artist" panel in this magazine page reprint, from Breakthrough Magazine, a premier publication about wildlife art and taxidermy)



or my digital artwork being named a "Milestone in Computer Graphics" (By CGW magazine in 2002), the part of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus

25 YEAR

From humble beginnings, computer art transcends traditional media

RETROSPECTIVE

PART 1 DIGITAL ART

▲ April 2000 Willem Van de Velde's *The Temple of Artemis at Ephesus* is the first digital artwork created with EyeQ, a popular real-time program, to win a major award and be included in the *Survey of American Art* in the West.

▲ July 2000 Mark Davis' *Art of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus* is the first digital artwork to be included in the *Survey of American Art* in the West. It is a composite of photographic and digital images, with a real-time rendered image of the temple's interior, a real-time rendered image of the temple's exterior, and a real-time rendered image of the temple's interior.

▲ March 2000 David G. Hill's *Art of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus* is the first digital artwork to be included in the *Survey of American Art* in the West. It is a composite of photographic and digital images, with a real-time rendered image of the temple's interior, a real-time rendered image of the temple's exterior, and a real-time rendered image of the temple's interior.

Composite from Digital Arts Milestones published in Computer Graphics World magazine, January 2002, listing the work of Bill Munns as one of those milestones.

And again here (about the Great Pyramids of Giza):



Composite from Architectural Milestones published in Computer Graphics World magazine, June 2002, listing the work of Bill Munns as one of those milestones (for the second time)

or my nomination to the Digital Hall of Fame, for a digital animation of lighting choreographed to music for my digital art depicting the Hanging Gardens of Babylon:



The DIGITAL HALL OF FAME
AWARD
for excellence in digital art

ANNOUNCING the FIVE NOMINEES

- 1. DAVID G. HO, USA**
for "Faces of Life, Face of Death"
- 2. BILL MUNNS, USA**
for "The Hanging Gardens"
- 3. HAMPUS HEDBERG HANKELL and ALAIN BONNEAU, Sweden**
for "Bubbles Goes Bathing"
- 4. CEM GÜL, Turkey**
for "Analyzer, Balancer, Creator, Navigator"
- 5. ALESSANDRO BAVARI, Italy**
for "Three Peepers"

The Award Ceremony is taking place on October 12th at the 3D Festival in Copenhagen.

www.3dfestival.com

DAVID G. HO
BILL MUNNS
ALESSANDRO BAVARI
CEM GÜL
HAMPUS HEDBERG HANKELL AND ALAIN BONNEAU

No charade or fraud there. Claims of accomplishment or expertise are verified.

Once I began posting my "Creature Suit Analysis" in the Bigfoot Forums starting in January 2008, I represented the material as factually as I know, from my decades of experience in the profession. As far as I know, there has never been a credible challenge to this material from any person with similar professional qualification and industry experience, never a claim of the information being false, deceptive or fraudulent. There may have been disagreements on issues of how common something is, or how reliable some method is, normal professional differing opinions at most, but no charade, no fraud.

So this re-occurring skeptical claim of my perpetrating some kind of charade or fraud does not seem to stem from my experience or expertise prior to my participation in the PG Film discussion. Rather, it seems to be born out of their obsession with imagining a suspicious impression of who I am, or what my intention or goal is, and then accusing me of a fraud or charade because I won't admit to their delusional suspicion, I won't concede to their derogatory fantasy.

A related argument about my intentions is to paint my activity as the desperate actions of a person whose ego is in dire need of some attention. In other words, what I'm doing is just a desperate play for some kind of attention, and my choices of what I do or claim, what I say I believe, are not truthful at all but calculated merely to gain the most attention. One amusing comment argued that if I agreed with the other Hollywood makeup guys who say the PGF subject is just a "cheap suit", I'd be lost amid their more stellar presence, and so I needed to be the lone makeup man who says "She's something real" to stand out, to get attention.

I suppose this "trying to get attention" thing is of concern to people who actually don't get any, but for people who actually do excel at what they do, people who actually do accomplish things of meritorious or admirable endeavor, getting some attention for what they did is simply a common and almost inevitable result of a healthy society which does acknowledge accomplishment and success. We do give public recognition to people who are successful or excel at some endeavor, and thus people who simply aspire to be successful, and to excel, do in fact get recognition.

Across the 40 plus years I have been working and accomplishing things, I have been interviewed and well publicized for my activities and accomplishments in three other endeavors, as a movie makeup artist, as a wildlife artist pioneering a new form of sculptural art, and as a digital artist working with 3D visualizations. In each case, I rather quickly went for unknown to "somebody", a person of interest by the media, interviewers and the general public interested in the particular endeavor or activity I practiced.

So it's nothing unusual that when I apply myself to something, I do make an impact, I do become a subject of interest, and I do often accomplish distinctive and meritorious results. I do get interviewed, my opinions matter, and my successful accomplishments are publicized.

My presence in this sphere of activity, researching the PG Film, and the larger BF debate, is nothing unusual. It reflects the pattern of my prior work and the public awareness of my work.

When I was working in the Makeup/effects field, I had my share of interviews, articles, and "fame" (if you want to call it that), for example, this write-up in Cinefantastique Magazine with an 8 page feature article about my work on the movie "Swamp Thing" in 1981:



It was one of many articles in film industry related magazines which reported on my film work and accomplishments, and reported as well my unsuccessful experience on "Return of the Living Dead".

The fallacy of "he's just desperate for the fame" is that fame, if you want to call it that, is as much a disruption of your privacy as it is a gratification of any sort. It 'cuts both ways' as we say, having positive benefit, and negative consequences as well at times. It can publicize your success as well as wallow in your failures or difficulties.

People who have never had it seem to think it's some kind of candy, some form of aphrodisiac a person relishes in desperation. People who have had some form of "fame" generally settle into a more mature acceptance that it simply "comes with the territory" of success, and so you manage it responsibly. I've had enough that it is simply a factual occurrence I manage along with my other activities.

Similarly, once I began doing computer graphics, within about a year and a half, my work was being written up in magazines devoted to digital art and media, such as this article from Design Graphics Magazine:



Once again, accomplishment brought public recognition, interviews, articles and some admiration from other people in the field.

I applied myself to the skill, and aspired to do well, and other people recognized my successful results.

My motive was to simply accomplish something I can be proud of, because I adhere to the philosophy that one's life should be dedicated to respectful accomplishment. If that brings recognition, fame, public interest or such, we accept this as a healthy result of a constructive society.

Can you imagine a world so filled with cynicism that a college graduate who excelled to become the class valedictorian would be accused of striving to be an excellent student merely because he/she was desperate for some attention to stand out from the other graduates?

Can you imagine a world so cynical that a soldier or law enforcement officer, being decorated for heroic and selfless service toward others, is accused of merely doing that heroic gesture "for the fame".

When did recognition for accomplishment become so cynically disrespected, that when a person achieves some accomplishment, and there is public recognition, that the cynic can only obsess that the person's accomplishment was motivated only by some desperation for a moment of "Fame"?

I'll never understand that kind of demented cynicism. There is simply nothing wrong with recognition of accomplishment, nothing suspicious about people who aspire to accomplish things.

Another suspicious claim is that my posting of articles on "Creature Suit Analysis" on the Bigfoot Forums was somehow a desperate bid for attention, and not the informational and educational offering I stated it was. One need only look to my past to see the pattern of openly sharing information and educational material based on my expertise, is, in fact, what I do and I believe is a responsible thing for any accomplished person to do. When you have attained a high level of knowledge and expertise, you should share it with others in an educational form, as I did when I won my "Best in World" wildlife art re-creation awards, and then set up a series of "how to" articles in Breakthrough Magazine to share with the community my knowledge and experience.

Below is a reprint of their article index, and articles by or about me are accented with a red line.

REPRODUCTIONS & RE-CREATIONS

- Lucas, John Scott. *Part 1: Reconstructing a Dodo (with Phil Fraley and George Dante)*, Issue 86, pp82-90
Part 2: Reconstructing a Dodo (with Phil Fraley and George Dante), Issue 87, pp74-82
- Munns, Bill. *Baby Orangutan*, Issue 19, p74
Re-Creating The Giant Panda, Issue 28, pp22-27 -----
Best In World Re-Creation (archeopteryx), Issue 30, pp60-61 -----
Re-Creations: Uses & Reasons For, Issue 31, p10 -----
In The Beginning...The Mannikin, Issue 31, pp11-15 -----
Skin Deep: Re-Creating Textures, Issue 32, pp26-31 -----
Re-Creations: Hair & Fur Basics, Issue 33, pp82-88 -----
Re-Creations: Dino-Mania, Issue 34, pp82-87 -----
Re-Creations: Fowl & Their Feathers, Issue 35, pp96-101 -----
Re-Creations: Part I, The Re-Creation of The Chimpanzee, Issue 36, pp104-108 -----
Re-Creations: Part II, The Re-Creation of The Chimpanzee, Issue 37, pp76-81 -----
Re-Creating A Legend: The Saber-toothed Cat, Issue 42, pp90-95 -----
- Murawska, Dennis. *Geoduck (Just When You Think You've Seen It All)*, Issue 66, pp46-47
- Nelson, Randy. *Flexible, Reproduction Wattles*, Issue 46, pp136-137
- Newmyer, Frank. *Using Artificial Bills And Heads*, Issue 13, pp10-22
- Paulson, Harry. *Re-Creating an Artificial Black Rhinoceros*, Issue 57, pp40-42
- Rinehart, Dan. *A Day ... With Mike Kirkhart (dolphin reproduction)*, Issue 56, pp56-61
Brown Trout Reproduction: Scale Texturing & Prep Work, Issue 63, pp42-45
- Senk, Gary. *Flexible Fiberglass Fish Heads*, Issue 10, pp18-19
- Vickerson, Michael. *"High-Tech" Tips for Repro Fish Heads* Issue 53, p117
- Walker, Ken. *Irish Elk: 2005 Best in World Re-Creation*, Issue 87, pp52-55
- Walker, Ralph J. *Shoot & Release Rhino*, Issue 57, pp110-111
- Williamson, Bob. *Sheep Horns Re-Creations*, Issue 18, pp63-65
- Williamson, Bob. *The Reproductions of Bill Munns*, Issue 18, pp82-83 -----

The articles above, attributed to me as author, I contributed to the magazine without asking any fee or payment. The editor, Kathy Bloomquist, who still owns and edits the magazine today, can be referenced to verify this fact. I contributed my knowledge to the community, without compensation, simply because I wanted to share what I had learned with the people who had interest in the subject.

So my offering the "Creature Suit Analysis" to the BFF wasn't unusual in any way. It was what I like to do, share my knowledge with others who have interest in the subject, and share that knowledge without expectation of fee or pay. So once again, I must ask, where is the charade? Where is the fraud? Where is the suspicious or deceptive behavior on my part.

I've long believed that well worn but never outdated concept that honesty is the best policy. The following are simple and honest answers to the issues of intention so often brought up.

A. Why am I doing this research on the film?

I've been fascinated with the film since it was first released, and generally fascinated with cryptozoology, as a subject, most of my life. I believe there are species of wildlife we haven't discovered and categorized scientifically yet, that the world hasn't been fully explored, and that continued effort to look into the mysteries of cryptozoology is a valid endeavor. But the Bigfoot/Sasquatch subject alone is the one area of cryptozoology that tends to see debate cross over into hoaxed events with movie makeup/special effects. As I have professional expertise in this area, I felt I could lend some knowledge and information to this discussion. It really is that simple, but the suspicious mind cannot accept simple and benign explanations. The suspicious mind must search for some suspicious motive, and invent one if necessary.

The Patterson Gimlin Film is, frankly, the only film of a possible cryptozoological entity which has enough quality image data and duration of subject motion to allow for an in-depth analysis. Most photos and videos, aptly called "Blobsquatches" are so poor in image quality and potential for analysis that I simply do not give them any effort. The PG Film, on the other hand, has an astonishing amount of potential image data which may allow a definitive analysis and reliable conclusion.

So that is why I started this effort, and that is why I am focusing on the PG Film essentially, and not other sightings or photo material. I choose to continue because the film has more complexity than I had anticipated, and has more potential for analysis than I could not appreciate until I acquainted myself with the film in detail, and participated in the discussions in the forums.

I genuinely want to understand what I'm seeing in this film, and so I choose to continue my analysis and evaluation of it until I hopefully find some answers to the questions in my own mind. And I'm quite willing to share with others, who may have an interest, the results of my effort.

B. Am I just in this "For the Money"?

This criticism is a favorite of skeptical minds, and it is flawed both by the fact and by the very concept.

The flawed concept is that if a person gets money for doing something, then they have no intention of possible benevolent goal, and no personal integrity. The money, according to this flawed concept, erases all benevolence and integrity. But you can apply this to say any doctor who gets money for rendering medical service or treatment has no benevolent will to actually heal people, because he/she is getting paid. Or any teacher, who gets paid to teach, has no genuine desire to help students learn, because the teacher is just "in it for the money". The truth of course is that people of benevolent intentions, good will, and integrity, do get paid for doing things, and we should admire people who work for their compensation, having more integrity than people expecting money for nothing.

Sadly, this "He's just in it for the money" is one of the lamest criticisms around, yet the most common fallback for critics who have exhausted all other rational claims.

Theory aside, now, I will honestly address the factual circumstance (because if I did not, skeptics would say I was hiding the facts behind the theory). These are the facts:

I do not get paid for interviews. I don't intend to in the future.

If I am invited to some event away from my home, another city, for example, I will expect the hosting people to cover my travel expenses.

If I am actually commissioned to do work, based on my prior professional endeavors, any kind of makeup related physical fabrication, or any type of digital graphics and animation program content, I will regard that as a job, and I will get paid for that job. It requires an expenditure of time, skill, some material costs, and facility overhead, and so I will charge a fee for that effort, as I have for the last 40 years. That is what I do professionally, physical makeup/effects fabrications, and digital artwork and animations. Nothing about doing research on this film requires a vow of poverty in order to retain one's integrity.

Am I selling anything? No.

Am I negotiating a book deal? No.

Is there any money coming in now from this? No.

Does my website have any ads or other revenue generating elements, where I might have a profit motive to generate more website traffic? No. I don't have ads on any of my websites, never had then, never plan to.

So, where's the money skeptics think I'm in it for? Aside from being compensated by the MonsterQuest production, for actual things fabricated, and actual digital animation show content

I produced, there's been nothing financially in this for me. And no prospects for the future are under discussion.

That's the truth, but of course people who have no regard for the truth can (and likely will) continue to imagine that there's some kind of pot of gold under a rainbow at Bluff Creek, and I'm plotting to grab that pot of gold the moment the rainbow appears.

So this brings us back to the essential question: Where's the charade? Where's the fraud?

Backed into a corner, the skeptical mind seems to fall back upon the claim that I have falsified my report in some way, and failing to now "admit" to such may constitute some type of charade. The two problems with that are: first, I didn't do any such thing in my report as it stands, and second, I don't do such things in general.

I actually exhausted myself, in my original report preparation, trying to be certain my material was the fullest and most accurate disclosure I could accomplish, perhaps naively thinking that it would be appreciated as such. No such luck though. The criticisms persist that the report is wrong and that I have withheld data. As I have addressed these in the prior Report Update 1B (also available in a PDF form from the website), I will merely reference that they are addressed in that document.

So I must close this section with the same questions, still unanswered as far as I am concerned: Where is the charade? Where is the fraud?

And I anticipate the skeptical response will be wonderfully imaginative.

2. My Future Intentions

I do plan to keep working on this film analysis, as my time and schedule permits, because I still have many questions in my own mind, things I would like to resolve. The film is truly an intriguing mystery, and for my own satisfaction, I'd like to know exactly how much can really be determined or solved from the data we have.

Is this my final or ultimate ambition? Certainly not. I am still working with a good friend on the prospect of funding to take my patented digital speech animation software to a marketable product. With any hope, the economy will finally improve and investment capital for tech startups will start flowing again, and we will get that going. If so, the PGF will be set aside for occasional activity as I focus on my software invention. And other creative endeavors of mine continue to be developed, projects with no connection to the PG Film or even cryptozoology in general.

So it would appear that Fate will decide how much longer I will be active in this research effort. But if I am successful and have other obligations, I would certainly be willing to back or sponsor other responsible research endeavors. I still would like to see a factual solution to the curious mystery that is Bigfoot, and a factual solution to the very fascinating Patterson Gimlin Film.

3. Why did I apparently "change course" in my research?

This question does come up often, by both skeptical and supportive people alike, so I welcome the chance to respond to it.

First, I happen to believe in the potential of the human mind, and the lifelong joy of continuing one's education. So I am disappointed by people who think the human mind is small and limited to one area of familiar knowledge or expertise. People can have a vast interest in many subjects and knowledgeable fields, if they apply themselves. I read three newspapers a day, many science/technology magazines each month, and I am fascinated by new ideas and technologies.

I've been a makeup artist, a sculptor, a mold maker, an animatronics designer, a software designer, a digital artist, a paleo-anthropology anatomist, an archaeological visualist, a photographer and cinematographer, a teacher, a dinosaur sculptor, a writer, a film director, and an inventor of new molding technologies, programmable robotic designs and digital speech animation (all three of which were applied for as patents, with one granted and the other two stalled by patent attorney costs and fees).

If someone were to actually look at my resume, then seeing me shift or expand my research beyond just costumes and makeup effects would not seem at all unexpected or out of place. To people who try to diminish me (saying things like "But he's just a movie makeup guy. what does he know about lenses?") use the "But he's just a . . ." phrase to try and suggest a person has no other capability, no other potential for knowledgeable pursuit. It never occurred to me that I would have to explain or defend my expansion of my activity into other areas of research, because I believe in the vast potential of an educated person to master many subjects or areas of knowledge and skill. But I suppose it should be done, for the record.

I went into this film analysis with all the skills listed above, all the technical knowledge and experience. But my initial perception of the PG Film, and where I might contribute, was to the issue of costume suits and masks, makeup effects technology, because I felt that was lacking in the general discussions, the comprehensive contribution of someone with extensive professional expertise and experience. So I started on that basis, because I felt I could make a contribution to the discussion there.

As I became more immersed in the film discussion, and saw the depth of the material, the many copies of the film frames, the several croppings of the film itself, and the debates on such issues as size, step length, trackways, and the like, I saw problems with the multitude of still frame images used to illustrate claims of herniated bulges, wristbands, muscle movements and diaper butts. The problem was the extent that the images may have been altered by various copying and adjustments of contrast, color separation, and the like with software imaging programs. So I began to question what was on the real source film, and wondered how close I could get to the most reliable, least manipulated image versions.

I was also curious about the film stock debate (how was a Kodachrome film rush developed on a weekend?) and wondered if it might have been Ektachrome film stock instead. That prompted

me to buy an old 1966 version of the "Cinematographer's Bible", the ASC Manual. While browsing through it for information on film stocks of the era, I found the lens section and the optical formula. I was already familiar with that book, having used it myself in college when I was a film school student in 1966-68 and filmed my own 16mm film projects, and so this chance encounter refreshed my awareness of how subject distance or subject size can be calculated if other filming data is known.

That's what led me to think about a digital site model of Bluff Creek (based on my 12 years experience as a digital graphics artist, visualizing environments and archaeological sites), and I considered the methods one might employ to make such a digital model. Given I was well versed in 3D digital visualizations, I simply moved into that direction, never thinking I would need to explain or defend this "change of course". It was well within my capabilities from the start, but I just had not anticipated making a digital model of Bluff Creek when I first joined the PGF debate.

Commencing that, I assumed as everyone else did, that there was a 25mm lens on Roger's camera. I tried for 2 months to build a model with that lens specification, and it failed repeatedly. Seeing some indications that a wider angle lens might better solve, I looked at the options for the k-100 camera, and a 15mm lens was an option. So I simply tested it as an alternative, and the digital model solve quite splendidly, in remarkable swift time. As a professional photographer and cinematographer from my early years, I immediately understood both the potential and the criteria for how such a lens might be on Roger's camera, as well as understanding how such a lens would impact on the discussion.

So I pursued a new line of investigation as I saw the potential for some useful analysis, a perfectly reasonable thing for any responsible investigator to do, relying on expertise I had well established. But to build a site model, I knew I'd need a true full frame version of the film, and the LMS version most readily available was a zoomed in version. So in search of a good full frame version, I simply concluded if nobody had one, I'd need to scan one myself. But nobody had a film copy they'd trust to release to a researcher's possession. If I wanted to scan a copy of the film, I (and my scanning equipment) would need to go to the film copy location. I considered a portable 16mm scanner called a Viper, but it scanned direct to a video file, whereas I wanted actual individual scanned frames as still images in exact numbered sequence, and I wanted a 4K resolution, and the Viper scanned at regular TV resolution, far below my needs.

So being the inventor that I am, I saw the solution was to develop my own portable scanning system. I speced it out, acquired the components, configured the system, and successfully scanned one of John Green's copies of the film in February, 2009. Having that capability opened the door to my scanning some frames from Bob Gimlin's film copy in May at Yakima, and ultimately to scan Patricia Patterson's archive copy in June. The combination of these scans allowed me a unique opportunity to do an evaluation of film copy genealogy, a work now in progress.

People who actually do research, and actually discover things, should have no trouble following this non-linear path of discovery and investigation. It's the critics of researchers, the people who discover nothing except new ways to complain about the research efforts of others, who find

such a non-linear path to be somehow "suspicious", because their simple minds cannot follow anything but simple trains of thought.

And oddly, some of my harshest critics claim law enforcement investigation backgrounds, and real LE investigations, done well, sometimes travel the most non-linear, convoluted paths to the final solutions, so I would have expected such investigators to be the first to appreciate a non-linear path.

So, summing up this issue, I had many skills and areas of expertise going into this PG Film adventure, but at first, applied the one skill I thought was most relevant and most needed, makeup and film costume fabrication expertise. As I got further into it, I saw a need to clear up the issue of how reliable various image versions were, and that required some comparative analysis of the image genealogy (which copies are from which copies and how were they enhanced or filtered). Seeing issues of subject size debated, I felt a digital model might be useful, and having 12 years experience developing digital models, I simply added that to the research agenda. Finding the 25mm lens specification would not solve, I simply tested an alternative lens available for the specified camera type, and it solved well. Understanding photography and lenses, I explored this further.

Did I abandon my original goal, analyzing the film from a makeup and costume perspective? No, certainly not. There is just a reasonable limit to how many things one person can do at one time, so I simply moved that aspect of the research down the list of things to do (gave it a rest, so to speak), while working to settle some issues of film resolution, image detail, and lens on the filming camera.

One intriguing delusion of skeptical paranoia has me abandoning my makeup/costume effort because I found something I fear to reveal, something supporting a hoax and a performer in a suit, and the whole lens thing is a smoke and mirrors diversion. I continue to be astonished by the vivid imagination of delusional people. I will resume the analysis of the film's subject figure, "Patty" as she is frequently called, as time permits, and nothing I have seen in all the months of scanning film copies, doing frame by frame image stabilization of the film, and evaluating the film's resolution has revealed anything that alters my evaluation of the makeup/costume issues I have previously discussed in my Creature Suit Analysis. If anything, I've seen more anatomical detail that argues for a real creature, and I look forward to getting back to that phase of my analysis with fresh material to illustrate the findings.

4. Has my Report been "trashed"?

I suppose, rhetorically, this could be answered in two ways. One way would be to concede that skeptical people have thrown a lot of trash at the report, yes. They certainly have.

But is the report itself "trashed" as meaning discredited? No, actually it hasn't. It certainly is contested, I will readily acknowledge that. And it is undergoing a re-evaluation, I will similarly acknowledge that. And some of the more frivolous criticisms I have already described in my prior report release, 1B (available in a PDF document from the website) so I won't repeat them here.

But I do keep hearing claims by critics that my report has been utterly trashed (discredited), and often these same critics lament why I will not give up, concede to their claim, and perhaps beg forgiveness for the error of my ways.

So this is a more sweeping rebuttal to those critical laments:

A. The Report is about far more than just a lens, regardless of how the lens topic resolves. The Report is also about the film copy genealogy, copy methods and analysis, camera identification marks, determining frame size to the exactitudes needed for future reliable photogrammetry analysis work, and there is far more content to the Report to come. None of this other material has been "trashed" that I am aware of.

B. The Report will eventually encompass all my "Creature Suit Analysis" material, once I resume that aspect of the research, and that body of factual material has not been "trashed".

But taking the lens issue as the single primary point of criticism, there has not been any effective rebuttal to the simple fact that my digital site model (using a 15mm lens) still works quite splendidly, and so the question remains, if it is all wrong, why does it work so right. I had hoped for more contributions from people with skill in 3D visualization software to evaluate the model, and if it is flawed, to help me find the flaw. No such legitimate help has materialized yet. One misguided person used a CAD application, and came up with results that he could not make sense of, but his failings are not mine.

Putting this issue into proper perspective, these are the following facts or considerations I still work with:

1. My digital model, based on the 15mm specification, still works splendidly, so if it is wrong and another model, based on a different lens specification works better, it has not been shown yet. One model offered showed object placement, but did not verify object scaling or size, a second ingredient in a successful model, as mine did. So I do not consider it sufficiently well developed to challenge my current model. And the behavior of the person making it did not inspire a feeling of constructive collaboration.

I do plan to revisit this issue, by simultaneously building three models, by the exact same methodology, using 25mm, 20mm and 15mm lens specifications, and seeing which version fails to solve first, and which fails second, to see if one will continue to successfully prevail. This analysis I will document every step of the way, for all three lens specifications, which will hopefully better illustrate the testing methodology for those who will inevitably evaluate it once it's done and released.

The principle argument I see recurring as the reported destruction of my lens analysis is John Green's statement that his camera used for filming the McClarin re-enactment was done with a Keystone K-50 Magazine camera and a 1 inch (25mm) lens, plus the comparisons of frames from his footage (which others, including my critics, have, because of my successful efforts doing film scans) to the PGF, and the well argued similarities of tree scaling in the two film images. Those who take my silence on this issue as sulking defeat fail to grasp that there are still unresolved

issues about the comparison, which I am working on, and those unresolved issues may put the whole lens issue back into open discussion of alternatives. Specifically, there are lens distortion issues I am currently evaluating (which may skew the comparison with the PGF), as well as a walking distance analysis for McClarin's walk which does not reconcile with a 25mm lens, and other issues about the filming camera as well to be resolved.

I will present this new analysis and the resolution of these issues when I have something documented and definitive. But at this point in time, I will concede nothing, and will not predict the outcome of the analysis. So regardless of how frequent or impassioned is the plea from critics that I concede this issue, it is in fact far from settled.

Finally, I must close with a truly amusing, if pathetic, remark a friend brought to my attention from one of the fringe forums I cease to read. This amusing person, who seems truly agonized by my existence, posted some remarks wondering why somebody could not "take this guy down", or some similar combative analogy, as if the skeptical community and I were engaged in some sort of wrestling match.

The mere remark itself gives testament to the fact that nobody has "taken me down" thus far, or he would have praised the result of my defeat instead of wishing for the future prospect of such.

It also reflects a truly sad and childish mentality, that one is so intolerant of ideas and efforts one doesn't agree with, that he cannot simply say, in a dignified way, "I disagree with Bill Munns because. . . ." and finish the sentence with his dissenting thoughts for the public to consider.

All I have to say is, I'm still standing. And I do stand proudly, because I have accomplished some things I believe are meritorious. I posted this list in one of the forums, in response to a question about my efforts and the merits (or lack of) in this film analysis, and I feel that the list does rightfully belong in this Report as it progresses.

Closing Remarks

So I close this update with the following, a list of accomplishments I believe I may rightfully take credit for:

1. Publishing in a forum a series of discussions on Creature Suit technology and process, far more detailed and factually centered, than any previous offering by any professional makeup artist before, so that people with interest in the subject can better acquaint themselves with the materials, technologies and processes, to better make up their own minds and not just rely upon a professional makeup artist's casual declaration of "In my professional opinion. . ." and then a conclusion with no substantive explanation we can review and evaluate.

2. Developing a portable scanning device specifically for 16mm film, so the film, in varied copies, may finally be scanned for archival preservation and potential future research.
3. Doing the high resolution "full frame" scans of the film, essential for any photogrammetry analysis, which could not have been done with the prior frame images available from any source.
4. Bringing to the discussion the whole issue of the lens on Patterson's camera, because it is a critical component in any photogrammetry solution that might be accomplished in the future.
5. Putting into motion a realistic expectation that a true and reliable digital model recreating the Bluff Creek site is attainable, and will be a valuable research resource once accomplished (regardless of whether you feel my specific model is the right one or not, I was the first to do it and encourage others to test it or develop alternatives).
6. Finding the connection between camera identification marks and this specific film, so we can finally verify on no uncertain terms that the film was shot with a K-100 camera, based on actual scans for frames from the camera original and verification of the K-100's distinctive identification mark.
7. Doing actual filming tests with a K-100 camera to test some of the resolution and lens issues, as well as head shape issues.
8. Scanning 202 frames of trackway footage for the first time, for future research potential.
9. Discovering the traditional frame count is off by several frames, and working to inventory various film copies to clear up the discrepancy for a more factual frame reference system in the future.
10. Insuring that for all scanning I do, Patricia Patterson has complete copies of all files and data, so she may administer the licensing to media and researchers. Most people active in this discussion rely upon the LMS frames, which you have access to because Mrs. Patterson licensed the footage to the LMS production. By comparison, Rick Noll did copy many frames with a fine frame imaging process, but he has no rights to license or release the imaging, and Mrs. Patterson doesn't have copies, so it is not generally available to other researchers through her. The NASI project scanned her film, but she has never been given copies of those scans, and so she cannot administer any licensing to media or researchers. Because I have provided Mrs. Patterson with master files of everything I do, she can license the material for public viewing and study.
11. I am currently working on an image stabilized, zoomed in HD Video version of the film, and Mrs. Patterson will receive the master HD DVD compilation of it for copying and media licensing, so she may authorize showings of it. By respecting Mrs. Patterson's authority over this film, and supporting her by providing her with everything I scan or compile into a video format, I have set the stage for future research efforts to have access to better quality film material, once she begins licensing this material to media projects or researchers.

When I do the motion analysis compilation into a video format, Mrs. Patterson will also receive the DVD Master so she can license the analysis material to media and researchers through her administration.

Everyone before copied frames or the film and held those copies without providing her with appropriate duplicates for her archive. I've changed that, and by respecting Mrs. Patterson's unique position as administrator of the film licensing, and ensuring she has copies of everything, I have established a procedure where everything scanned or digitized may be accessed in the future through her licensing administration.

12. I am spending my time and effort doing actual research, and preparing actual reports advocating the results I find, instead of just criticizing others efforts and arguing for the sake of arguing. If others would apply their stated or claimed expertise to do a little more of the former, and less of the latter, we might actually solve this fascinating film mystery.

In closing this update of the Report, with these factual and philosophical remarks, I would hope, in the best of all worlds, that the discussion can return to the film, its content, and other similar issues that really will advance our understanding of it, and possibly lead us to a factual conclusion.

I plan to continue with this research, and hope that I can add additional meritorious accomplishments to the above list.

Bill Munns August 8, 2009