

# THE MUNNS REPORT

Release Number 1B - Status Review

This release is an evaluation of the response  
to the report material presented thus far.

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

[www.themunnsreport.com](http://www.themunnsreport.com)

Report Copyright by Bill Munns 2009

PG Film copyright: Patricia Patterson

## **Evaluation of the Report Release and its Aftermath**

It has now been nearly 8 weeks since the actual debut of the Report, Part 1, and the establishment of this website for report information. The time has afforded me a fine opportunity to evaluate the results, reactions, and analysis of others about my material thus far.

So this Report Supplement is a look back, so to speak, part of my ongoing effort to reach some final determinations about this most curious film, as well as an analysis of the reaction by others who have interest in the report and my activity.

This Aftermath Evaluation is one of the methods I use to help me plan the future effort, because there is in fact so much work to be done and limited resources and time to do them. So my efforts do shift the priorities on occasion, some specific goals moved up the list of things to do, other goals moved down the list to be attended to later. A fine example of this is the Report 1A Update, on the film copying and genealogy. I actually had no plan for this until I had the opportunity to scan additional film material while in Yakima for the Bob Gimlin event, where the report was announced. This new material crystallized some thoughts I had, and documented some issues of camera frame shape and size, thus prompting the report supplement. And I will continue to supplement the report as things like this come together in my research effort.

The Evaluation will be broken out into the following topics:

1. The review of the actual report material itself, and actual valid criticisms to it.
2. Frivolous criticisms and petty gamesmanship I have observed.
3. The curious shifting nature of the Internet Forums where this report and my activity are discussed.
4. Perceptions of the film and its subject which have changed in my mind as my work continues.
5. New Goals and Priorities.

## **1. The review of the actual report material itself, and actual valid criticisms to it.**

I remain proud of the Report as it stands, in so far as what I accomplished in consideration of the means and resources I had to work with, but clearly there is much work to be done. Aside from some mis-spellings of a man's name, and a slight math error in the conversion of metric to decimal (which did not impact on any substantial conclusion), I find the report remains substantially correct as presented.

This is not to say further research may not alter it. To the contrary, it likely will, as noted below, but that is the inevitable result of an open-minded research effort that follows the data responsibly. There is still new data to be evaluated and considered, and that new data will invariably shape a new conclusion. That conclusion may reinforce the present report, or modify it, or possibly even refute it. But I will rely on the data for the determination.

The most substantial issue of the report which is undergoing re-evaluation is the question of the lens on Roger's camera that day at Bluff Creek. A new evaluation of John Green's footage, taken the following year there (1968), does provide new data for the site analysis, and presents some contradicting data as well. This introduction of new data and new variables does make the lens determination more complex, and so I am continuing to work this through. There is no flaw in the digital model I developed using the 15mm lens specification, but now I must falsify other lens options and it is in this process where Green's footage must be factored in.

About the only responsible rebuttal to the report was offered by a man who posts to the BFF under the screen name "Gigantofooticus". He and I consulted for months before the report was released, and he has raised some fine questions, as well as being the only person who actually made a responsible effort to prepare an actual presentation of his theory and analysis methodology. In other words, he's the only person who offered a competing presentation of proof for what he feels is the correct solution to the issue of lens and location site object positions.

I disagree with his analysis but admire that he and I could disagree respectfully, cooperatively, and we do continue to correspond privately, as well as post publicly in forums, and we continue to debate the matter with respectful shared intent to try and find a truthful solution. Sadly, most of the people who have criticized the report are mere cynics intent on tearing down any constructive effort, and creating an environment of bitter acrimony and blatant lying to achieve their disrespectful agendas.

In the matter of the presentation of material Gigantofooticus has presented, I cannot endorse it because I find that the dependence upon the trackway specification (for determining the other site object placements, filming lens specifications, and determining the film subject's position), does produce discrepancies I find ultimately in such contradiction as to null out his conclusions.

Specifically, the combination of subject estimated distance at the start of the trackway segment, combined with the lens specification, when applied to the optical formula I used, yields a subject well under 5' tall, which makes a 14.5" foot seem all but impossible anatomically (and surely not supported by any film image data I have seen).

Such a height further makes a 41" step anatomically impossible for a subject of that height. These impossibilities thus negate the trackway specification itself, and that trackway specification is his primary foundation for his analysis. This is not a formal refutation of his analysis, so much as a brief outline of where I find it most problematic, and thus why I cannot endorse his analysis.

But aside from this effort by Gigantofotocus, I found almost all the attacks on the report to be mere obstructionist efforts, with no intent to actually offer a constructive proof of an idea, just an effort to try and discredit mine by creating confusion.

So I will persevere in my efforts to reach some factual conclusions about this film, undeterred by the obstructions. I will continue to supplement the report with updates as the work progresses, and if any of my analysis thus far changes, I will document the reasons for the revision thoroughly.

## **2. Frivolous criticisms and petty gamesmanship I have observed.**

Sadly, the frivolous criticisms far outnumber the responsible ones. I will try to address some of the most blatantly meritless ones, because they have often been enfolded in pretentious veneers of scientific terminology.

First among them is the claim I am withholding data, thus preventing other researchers from evaluating my results. This is a laughable and blatant lie, but it passes for seeming merit because those who fabricated this lie make claims of complicated process as being necessary to accomplish what I did, especially with the site model, and then once they establish this complicated process, they can list any number of data requirements that must be met for their claimed process, and say I did not provide such. On this basis, they claim I am withholding the data they claim I must have used to get my results.

The digital Bluff Creek site model I made, and show in the report, and published the data upon, is the complete data set anyone needs to replicate the model, if they know how to use a 3D visualization software package and want to make the effort. Apparently so far, nobody has wanted to take the time to make the effort. The placement of tree objects can indeed be calculated by sophisticated methods, and I hope to use alternate methods in the future to check the results by varied methodologies.

But the replication method I used was described correctly and can be replicated by any person who simply wants to take the time, make the effort, and understands the basic trial and error process. There is no secret data, no hidden procedures, just people who are ignorant of the process I used and are maliciously using their ignorance in the guise of claiming I have not been fully open with my data.

So I will continue to work on this analysis, but try to make my presentation more "idiot proof" so the idiots can understand it and will have less basis to complain of hidden or withheld data. And I apologize for the derogatory term I use here, as perhaps being unseemly for a report, but to some extent, I must meet the enemy on his terrain, and I must deal with the reality that this report is in fact subjected to insulting, derogatory, and devious remarks by idiots posing as learned critical thinkers. If you would like to hold me at fault for acknowledging there are idiots in the world, so be it. It's hard for me to ignore them when they are in my face every day with more of their asinine internet postings.

Second, among the frivolous claims, is the false claim that I am biased and the whole report is just a cherry-picked compilation of snippets of data to reinforce some foregone conclusion. Particularly popular these last few days is a quote from an interview in a newspaper, from nine years ago, where I stated that based on my knowledge of furcloth materials of the 60's and 70's I thought the film's subject could not be a fur costume worn by a human, because I did not see the kind of cloth fold dynamics I know rigid backed furcloth of the time exhibited in motion. I stand by that opinion, and see no reason to change it. But then the furcloth issue was my only basis for a conclusion. I had not studied the film as I have now, and had not looked into other issues like the site landscape, the filming camera or lens, the subject's anatomical proportions as compared to humans, and issues of film resolution, details and motion blur.

So my conclusion nine years ago was based on one factor. Now, years later, my conclusions are based on many more factors that have been studied in the past year and a half.

Now the classic pseudo-skeptic (or scoftic, as some people say) criticism is that because my overall opinion (that the subject is likely something real and not a human in a fur costume) is substantially unchanged, then I must not have used the real data, but instead just some falsified or cherry-picked data that supported the conclusion, while ignoring any data that would refute the conclusion of nine years ago. So the claim is that if a researcher has a conclusion based on one analysis, and then, years later, does more analysis based on other factors, and the new resulting conclusion more or less substantiates the earlier one, then the researcher must be biased, because it is not possible for a new and factual analysis to confirm a prior conclusion in an unbiased way.

This, of course, is pure unadulterated intellectual drivel. A subsequent analysis, using different factors and data, can lead to any of several outcomes. It may substantiate the prior conclusion, it may modify the prior conclusion, or it may fully refute the prior conclusion. In this case, it has substantiated the prior conclusion, one of three responsible and respectable outcomes. But that does not satisfy the pseudo-skeptics who are intent on trying to prove me as being biased. I suppose it never will. But it is the second major accusation I have seen argued against my work, and it is as baseless as the first.

To those who subscribe to it, nothing I say will change their minds, but I do have confidence that the majority of people in the world do have a rational mind and will not even consider any claims of my being biased without far greater proof than the meager rational that my new analysis did not discredit my prior analysis. If there is consistency in my conclusions, I would say that is because there is consistency in truth.

A third and amusing criticism of my report is that I did everything wrong. Wrong format, wrong procedures, wrong data, wrong reasoning, wrong spelling, wrong usage of the pronoun "I" (referencing myself), wrong everything. If anybody is buying this criticism, I can't imagine anything I can say here that would clear it up. I would only say, if I am so incompetent, if my efforts are such a failure, and my presentation is so worthlessly flawed, why are these critics expending so much time trying to convince each other how wrong I am. I would think, if they respected themselves, they would spend less time complaining of how wrong I am, and show the world how right they are in their own investigations. I would think they would put forth their own presentations of proof and say "This is the truth of this film, based on my analysis" so the world can read their own great thoughts on the rightful conclusion of this filmed mystery, instead of just reading their endless criticisms of how wrong they claim I am.

But where is the report of any of these critics of my effort? Nowhere to be found. There is only the insulting and belittling of another person, yet no presentation of any report or analysis showing these critics are capable of solving the film's mystery themselves.

Trying to show the world how smart you are by endlessly trying to claim another person is stupid, wears thin after awhile, a hollow and fleeting victory, if any at all. Desperate people rely on that tactic when they have no positive effort of their own to proudly take rightful credit for. So their endless criticism that I can do no right ultimately shows that actually, they can't do anything right, because there is far more respectful merit in your own accomplishment than the criticism of another's efforts. As they have none of the former, they wallow in the latter.

One final criticism of note, a rather pretentious one, is the criticism of my using the Bryce software application for my digital model, and not one of the generally acknowledged "high end" 3D animation software packages, like Maya or Softimage, for the digital model. The factual part of this frivolous criticism is that Maya and Softimage are, indeed, vastly superior software products, in terms of their spectacular capabilities for doing the finest and most complex CGI special effects for Hollywood movies today. But the frivolous part of this particular criticism is the failure of the critics to see (or acknowledge) that the digital model is, in truth, a very simple 3D digital file, and virtually any 3D visualization software can produce it. There are no rampaging dinosaurs running through the model, no transforming robots, no Spiderman swinging through the trees, and no other CGI high end techniques involved. No NURBS models, no particle effects, no physical dynamics, no massive animation of thousands of digital entities, no sophisticated volumetric lighting or rendering needs.

The digital model I made is about a half dozen simple polygon meshes, and about the same number of polygonal spheres or cylinders, simple procedural textures or simple planar mapping of an image onto the mesh, and fixed camera positions of one specified camera horizontal angle of view. These elements, regardless of the software, rely on pure mathematics to calculate their shape and position, and so if the software uses correct math, then the model is as excellent in Bryce as it would be in Maya or Softimage, for what was accomplished.

So this pretentious but frivolous criticism tries to confuse the reader into thinking a software capable of vastly more complex applications can do a simple task better, when it cannot. A simpler software can do a simple task equally well, with equal mathematical precision. Bryce was a fine choice for the digital model, and its results, for the actual model built, are as precise as

any other software could do. Where other software would excel is if one wanted to make a digital subject actually walk through the scene, and a digital camera replicate Roger's camera in every move, and have a digital model of Bob Gimlin on his horse, observing Roger filming. A model with that kind of animation sophistication would indeed necessitate a fine software like Maya or Softimage.

The critics who pretentiously judged my software as inferior obviously did not actually appraise the digital model and the elements it required to accomplish its intended task, which was to place objects in the scene to study how a camera with a 15mm lens can replicate the film images with a high degree of accuracy. The software used accomplished that goal sufficiently well to illustrate the point of the experiment.

But people like to use the critical tactic of saying "You didn't use the very best tools for your research", failing to know or disclose that often the "best tools" are in fact unnecessarily complicated, while still not yielding a superior result for a simple application. It reveals the desperation of their intention to win an argument at all cost, that they abandon truthful reasoning and rely on pretentious deception to try and make their point.

### **Final Appraisal of Frivolous Critics**

Ultimately, these frivolous critics do actually criticize themselves, because they offer to the public forum of interaction only negativism; complaints, insults, criticisms and remarks about what others are doing wrong. Where is their pride in their own admirable effort? Why do they not give as much, or more time to accenting the positive in their own lives? I try to keep my reports and remarks on a positive level, and this update starts and ends on positive notes, as one example.

I invite people to visit my other websites, one being the Bill Munns Creature Gallery, which illustrates my 40 years of career and personal endeavors creating physical sculptures, models, makeup effects and the like, and I am proud of my accomplishments illustrated there. I also welcome people to the Bill Munns Gallery, my digital art gallery of accomplishments with computer graphics. With this work, I am similarly pleased to show my positive accomplishments in this new artistic endeavor. I try to give positive recognition to people whom I admire, and in this report, I acknowledged the positive collaboration with a man who does disagree with my report, but disagreed in a respectful and constructive manner. I acknowledge the kindness of a man in the cinematography forum, who helped me with a very positive contribution to my understanding of magazine-type 16mm cameras.

I emphasize the positive because I admire that philosophy of life. I must acknowledge that there are negative elements in life, and negative criticisms of my effort, and I cannot ignore them entirely, but I can continue to give more thought and time to the positive, both in my own efforts and in the efforts of others.

So what does it say of people who are unrelentingly negative, who demonstrate no positive effort or accomplishment of their own to take pride in, and just wallow in the criticisms of others? What does it say of people who seem to think the only way they will be noticed, the only way their thoughts matter, is if they insult and demean another person? To me, it says that these

people are living shallow or disappointing lives, and have no pride in their own accomplishments or capabilities. They see themselves as low, and take satisfaction in trying to put someone else lower.

I sometimes look at the sheer volume of demeaning remarks my critics post, the sheer pettiness with which they try to find yet more reasons to discredit or criticize me, as if they had not done enough to accomplish their goal. Do they not realize that as long as they continue to criticize me, and look for new petty excuses to belittle me, they are giving testament to their failure to accomplish their goal, because if I were indeed so wrong, so incompetent, they should have proven such conclusively a long time ago, and moved on to more constructive things in their own lives.

So I look upon their unrelenting criticisms, and see people who's lives are so empty that trying to discredit me is a goal, an accomplishment they hope will bring some merit to their lives. And they are truly fools, because they cannot understand that discrediting another person will never be a really admirable accomplishment. It will never prove you are a wise or good person. If you succeed, it will only prove you may be less wretched than the person you discredited.

I chose instead to focus my time and life's effort on positive accomplishments.

### **3. The curious shifting nature of the Internet Forums where this report and my activity are discussed.**

The internet forum environment is a curious place. It has the potential for free-flowing exchanges of ideas, and many people do find value in these exchanges. But the forum environment can also bring out the worst in human nature, when people hide behind anonymous screen names and indulge in posting unmoderated false statements freely to attack others who disagree or represent an idea they are determined to belittle. When there is poor moderation, a forum can descend into a pathetic environment where the worst of human nature flourishes and a mob mentality drives away dissenting opinions and leaves a tribe of like-minded bullies and clowns.

The JREF Forum is potentially a fine forum, but many of the people posting there are so warped in their thinking that I have chosen to ignore their existence, as best I can. I would say there are a few rational people there, but the pathetic ones far outnumber them. And one man there (whom I refer to as St. Joseph, the Humble, self-appointed Patron Saint of Science and Engineering) has sadly dedicated himself to discrediting me at all cost, and in doing so, he has essentially demolished his own personal integrity, a sad result for a man who has many potential abilities and accomplishments of his own he could show the world. Now, he simply tries with unrelenting, almost pathological determination, to show the world how wrong I am. I pity this man, as he continues to post in this forum. The others there, I just ignore, by and large, a proportional response to the weight of their thoughts.



The BFF forum is one I still post to, but there is a curious cross dynamic between this one and the JREF noted above. Anything I post on the BFF is immediately carried over to JREF and dissected endlessly, and then the occasional stupid conclusion arrived at on the JREF is carried over to the BFF by some low level apprentice pseudo-skeptic. So I found that I would sometimes post remarks on the BFF knowing they only had significance to the other forum participants. But I don't plan to do this anymore, as I am re-evaluating all my forum participation. I simply find that my peace of mind, and my productivity in my research, are greatly enhanced when I reduce or even cease my forum participation for days or weeks at a time.

There is a curious misconception that the BFF is a "safe haven" forum where I face no criticism. That could not be further from the truth, because I have an abundance of critics. The forum is better moderated, and the more vicious and inflammatory postings are not allowed, but there is still ample criticism of my research over there.

The SFB forum, administered by Melissa Hovey, is a third I do participate in. She has a stricter moderation policy and I welcome that. I respect her and look forward to continued participation in that forum.

And I recently joined a forum for cinematography and all matters related to filming cameras and related technologies, as part of my camera and lens analysis. I tried to keep my thread on a pure discussion of cameras, lenses and the like, but it seems the allure of "Bigfoot" reduces many otherwise grown men to boyish distraction, and the thread has been derailed several times by people who make rash judgments about the film based on laughably unfounded rumors, and are convinced the film is a mere hoax. So far, their arguments have been based on low grade rumors moreso that solid factual understanding, but it has been interesting for me to discover how deeply entrenched some of the false rumors and misinformation about the film actually are in popular culture.

But there is one man there, named Charlie Peich whose kindness and helpfulness has more than made up for the fools I encountered there. Charlie posted images of magazines used on 16mm magazine type cameras, which I had never seen before, and then even sent me some used magazine cartridges for my own examination and analysis. His kindness exemplifies all that is good about our human culture and I wanted to thank him publicly with this mention.

In summation, I still see merit to the forum environment, and so will continue, but I will reduce my participation overall simply because the benefit does not justify a more aggressive schedule of participation. I will try to remain open to sincere questions by responsible and curious people, but will quarantine the participants who demonstrate the mentality of intellectual germs. They are mere obstructionists, and I have confidence my effort is worthy enough to be completed, and not obstructed.

#### **4. Perceptions of the film and its subject which have changed in my mind as my work continues.**

My whole perception of this curious film has changed over the last year and a half. That should be obvious to people who have watched my analysis go from merely about subject figure and makeup/costume technologies, and branch out into wider issues of the film itself.

I now appreciate far more how motion blur is a factor in dire need of attention, and so I look forward to giving that far more analysis.

I see how image quality and the false image detail induced by copy processes is a major issue in generating confusion about what we can and cannot see. So I feel that striving to clear up this issue is a major need as well.

I will continue to work on the camera/lens analysis, and try to clear up the lens focal length issue, because it remains very unsettling in my mind. I remain absolutely confident the lens on Roger's camera was not a 25mm lens but the specific focal length may not be the 15mm I described in my report release. Given those are the only two options for a Kodak lens with a companion lens for the viewfinder, I now must give more consideration to a lens that did not have a corresponding viewfinder lens of same focal length, although I still find the very concept odd, to say the least. So this issue remains a primary concern for me to continue evaluating and testing by various methods. But it is a complex issue and the optical sciences needed to lead to a conclusion are demanding of rigorous effort, and meticulous documentation, which is time consuming.

I do continue to look at the subject figure herself, "Patty" as she is affectionately called, and I continue to see elements of the body that do not look like any kind of costume effect I am aware of, but this is a more subjective analysis and I must find a way to make that aspect of the research more impartially testable. That will require funding I do not have at present, so that remains a more distant goal.

And I have come to the conclusion that any responsible analysis of "Patty" requires multiple image frames for any anatomical feature being described. Using single frames for any argued conclusion presents a far weaker argument than using multiple frames to substantiate a feature, so when I resume this part of the analysis, I will give more attention to body features which are substantiated across multiple frames, as having more merit than features that show up in a single isolated frame.

## **5. New Goals and Priorities.**

My priorities now are to work on an image stabilized version of the film for future analysis, and then a motion blur analysis as well. These are foundation tasks, which confer no judgment of the subject being real or hoaxed, but provide a better analytical bases for further study. I will continue to work on the lens issue, emphasizing a thorough effort to resolve this issue, which I still regard as crucial to understanding this film and its subject.

A review of the comparative anatomy is still planned.

Continued work on refining and adding further objects to the digital model of the Bluff Creek area will be done.

At some point, I do anticipate addressing a popular concept called the "foot as ruler" which attempts to estimate body height by the apparent size of the foot in some frames. I've outlined in the report the variables I feel have not been accounted for at present, and so I hope to do an analysis which does account for those variables.

### **Added Note:**

On June 25, 2009, I was in Yakima, Washington, and did a film scan of Patricia Patterson's archival vault copy of the film, as well as a scan of some transparencies she possessed which were taken directly from the true camera original. These transparencies do represent the finest appraisal of the original film image quality, and provide a fine basis for evaluating image detail reduction through copying. I am planning to do a report release about this scan effort in the near future.

Currently there is research on the leader markings, which need to be deciphered. And I am working on an image stabilized version of the film, zoomed in on the subject. But as has been well reported, the camera original was projected (and scratched) many times before copies were made, and so there are significant scratch marks on all existing copies. The zoomed in and image stabilized effort makes those scratch marks more apparent, so I have added scratch removal to the list of work to do. This slows down the full appraisal of the scan material.

These scans will ultimately contribute to our understanding of the film, by advancing an analysis of what image detail is true camera captured detail, and what detail is falsely induced by copying processes. I have come to suspect that a considerable amount of image detail debated by people on both sides of the argument (real or hoaxed) is false detail, and thus renders the arguments moot. But this analysis will require time, meticulous documentation, and probably some film testing.

This release update reflects my thoughts, opinions, and appraisal of the report and its aftermath, as of July 6, 2009.

Bill Munns