

Heironimus vs. Heironimus: His 43 Story-Changes

Roger Knights / 1/10/12 / 12,130 Words

Contents (major items are highlighted)

1. Contents (major items are highlighted).....	1
2. Introduction.....	3
3. Discussion.....	3
4. Preview of Major Changes (Spoiler Alert!).....	4
5. Yakima Contradictions	6
6. When was BH first approached about suit wearing?	6
7. Was BH concerned about possible illegality?	7
8. Did BH agree to wear the suit before, or while at, Tampico?	7
9. How many meetings were there at Tampico?.....	7
10. How many suit try-ons were there?	7
11. What day did P&G leave?.....	9
12. How many days later did BH depart?	9
13. Where was the rendezvous to be?.....	9
14. How long was BH away from Yakima?	10
15. Was BH's employer on strike during the filming?	10
16. Did BH ever see Patterson after the filming?	11
17. Bluff Creek Contradictions	12
18. What was the mileage from the meet-up to Bluff Creek Road?.....	12
19. And from there how many miles to the campsite?	12
20. Was the filmsite right by the roadside?.....	13
21. Who put the film in the mailing envelope?.....	14
22. Who put the suit in the trunk?.....	14
23. What were Patterson's track-stompers made of?.....	15
24. Was a next-day film-announcement planned?	15
25. Did a next-day film-announcement occur?.....	16
26. Did BH sleep overnight in Eureka?	18

27. Confidentiality & Confession-Related Contradictions	19
28. Did BH promise Patterson absolute secrecy?	19
29. Did BH go to the Idle Hour bar?.....	20
30. Did he implicitly “reveal” the hoax to his buddies?	20
31. Did he explicitly “tell” anyone there about the hoax?	20
32. How soon did BH’s buddies realize the suit’s purpose?.....	22
33. Did his mom, Opal, ask BH about the suit?.....	23
34. Who leaked the news about the suit?	23
35. If asked, “Was it you in the suit?”, when did BH first say “Yes”?.....	24
36. Did BH talk to the media prior to seeing <i>World’s Greatest Hoaxes</i> in 1999?.....	25
37. Did BH “come forward” with money in mind?	26
38. Does BH have scruples now about hoaxing film-viewers?	27
39. Is BH willing to take another lie detector test?.....	28
40. Suit-Related Contradictions	28
41. Was it easy to walk in the costume?	29
42. What extra material was glued onto the suit?	29
43. How big was the gap behind the eye-holes?.....	30
44. How high were the boots inside the suit?	30
45. Were the Bigfoot’s feet made of slippers?.....	31
46. Was BH barefoot or shod inside the rubber boots?	31
47. Was there padding in the suit?	32
48. Were there any metal parts in the suit?.....	33
49. Was the suit split around the waist or up the back?	33
50. Was the suit removed from the trunk by BH’s relatives?.....	34
51. Was Patterson’s suit-retrieval in Yakima surreptitious or not?	36
52. Blundering Bob’s Bodacious Bloopers: A Summary	39

Introduction

Greg Long – “He [Bob Heironimus] has never changed his story.”

– “Interviews Provided to Rense.com with Greg Long, Michaela Kocis and Kal Korff,” at <http://.www.rense.com/RenseInterviews.html>.)

Rob McConnell – “You have never altered your story.”

Bob Heironimus – “No reason to alter it. The truth’s the truth.”

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

If Long & McConnell had been thinking critically they’d have noticed *many* story-alterations. Where the story has been told in broadcast interviews, even more changes will be apparent to a person who has transcripts to review and compare. To do that, I transcribed the interviews from the audio. (The full transcripts are posted elsewhere on this site so you can look them over yourself.)

I list 43 story-changes here. Most are my own “finds,” but many were first posted by others on Bigfootforums.com (BFF). (I refer to the original version of the site, which has been lost due to hacking.) Within each story-change item (except #35), quotes are listed chronologically.

I’ve highlighted the heading lines of the 25 major items—58% of the total. I’ve omitted a few additional items, either because they were trivial or because I didn’t have enough detail to be sure they were real changes.

Discussion

The judicial system considers story changes to be suspicious.

That’s because an alibi that has no roots in reality is more likely to show significant variations, and more of them, than a true account. A person with a phony alibi is less likely to flesh out its bare bones consistently, especially when long gaps intervene. If his tale were rooted in reality, he wouldn’t “lose the plot” very often, or very badly. Therefore, as is well known, police departments make a practice of repeatedly questioning a suspect to see if such variations emerge.

In defense of BH it could be said that it’s unnatural if a story is rigidly unchanging. If there were no variations, it would be “too pat.” Further, in recollecting a complex, long-ago event, a few story variations and additions are only to be expected because, for instance:

- 1 As recent research has established, memory is not merely "retrieved"; rather, it is partially "reconstructed" –so it won't be reconstructed the same way each time.
- 1 Over time, some people clear their memories of minor points.
- 2 Some people figure it's a kindness not to bore their audience or themselves by telling the same exact account every time, or by inflicting every trivial detail on them.

But BH's story-changes are numerous. Even seven changes would be incriminating: he's rung up six times more. BH has done himself proud.

In defense of BH it could be said that many of those changes are either minor or debatable—the latter being items where there's room for interpretation, also known as "wiggle room."

But it won't do to say that the "minor" items don't count. They do count—at a minimum, they exhaust BH's quota of forgivable flubs. They should still give "partial debits" to BH. And even if you *did* find an interpretation to explain the debatable items away—or pretended to yourself that you had—you'd still have the 25 major ones left, and they weigh against the likelihood of the minor changes being innocent. It's been said, "Quantity has a quality all its own." In other words, the quantity of BH's improvisations, retouches, and missteps has the quality of baloney. So, when viewed as a whole, BH's account rings false—and therefore it doesn't deserve the benefit of the doubt in debatable cases. The likelihood is that they're "of a piece" with the rest of his yarn.

In defense of BH it could be said that he suffers from memory loss. The event occurred a long time ago, and he's a senior citizen.

But this isn't a long-forgotten or minor event that he's suddenly been asked to dredge up from his memory banks. It was a key event in his life, as he realized at the time. He's kept turning it over in his mind whenever he brooded over being cheated out of the \$1000 that was promised him. And he regularly had his memory of the event stimulated by having to field inquiries as to whether he was the man in the suit.

Further, BH has undercut any bad-memory defense by heatedly denying to Long that his memory was playing tricks on him (Long, p. 416) and by not being too proud to admit ignorance: "When I asked him a question he couldn't answer, he simply said, 'I don't know that,' or 'I don't remember.'" (Long, p. 341) He doesn't sound like he's "all at sea."

Preview of Major Changes (Spoiler Alert!)

Because 25 items were particularly suspicious, I graded them as "major." I consider it **suspicious if a story-change**:

A. **Is extreme**, even if it affects only a minor aspect of the tale. In these cases the new version is starkly different from the old one:

14	Was the filmsite right alongside the road?	YES	NO		
20	Did BH sleep overnight in Eureka?	YES	NO	NO	YES
22	Did BH go to the Idle Hour bar?	NO	YES	YES	YES
33	Was it easy to walk in the costume?	YES	NO		

B. **Affects a clear-cut situation** (about which an honest mistake is hard to imagine), e.g.:

36	How big was the gap behind the eye-holes?	2 "	1.5 "	1 "	.25-.5 "
37	How high were the boots inside the suit?	Waist	Knee	Hip	
38	Was BH barefoot or shod in those boots?	Barefoot	Shod		
39	Was there padding or a harness in the suit?	NEITHER (implicit)	NO Belt	BOTH (padding & strap)	
40	Were there any metal parts in the suit?	NO	YES (a heavy car-top zipper)		

(This clear-cutness also applies, a bit less strongly, to the remaining items.)

C. **"Patches up" the story to account for new evidence or new witnesses**—especially when the prior (phony) version made the claimant "look good" (as in the first five items below), e.g.:

10	Was BH's employer on strike while filming?	YES (per Long)	NO ("lost a week's pay")		
23	Did he "reveal" the hoax to his buddies?	NO	No Memory	YES	YES
24	Did he "tell" any buddy about the hoax?	NO	NO	NO	YES
27	Who leaked the news about the suit?	mom & aunt	buddies		
29	Did he talk to the media before 1999?	NO	YES		
34	What extra material was glued onto the suit?	Fur Coat	Horsehide		
41	Where was the suit split?	Around the waist		Up the back	

D. **"Improves" the story by removing an implausible element**:

18	Was a next-day film-announcement planned?	NO	YES	
19	Did a next-day film-announcement occur?	NO	NO	YES
43	Was Patterson's Yakima suit-retrieval seen?	NO	YES	

E. **Polishes the raconteur's image**:

2	Was BH concerned about possible illegality?	NO	YES		
21	Did BH promise Patterson absolute secrecy?	YES	NO		
30	Did BH come forward with money in mind?	YES	NO		
31	Does BH have scruples now about hoaxing?	NO	YES		

F. Is evasive:

32	Is BH willing to take another lie detector test?	YES	NO		
42	Did his relatives remove the suit from trunk?	NO	MAYBE	YES	

Yakima Contradictions

Contents

1. When was BH first approached about suit wearing?	6
2. Was BH concerned about possible illegality?	7
3. Did BH agree to wear the suit before, or while at, Tampico?	7
4. How many meetings were there at Tampico?	7
5. How many suit try-ons were there?	7
6. What day did P&G leave?	9
7. How many days later did BH depart?	9
8. Where was the rendezvous to be?	9
9. How long was BH away from Yakima?	10
10. Was BH's employer on strike during the filming?	10
11. Did BH ever see Patterson after the filming?	11

~~~~~

## 1. When was BH first approached about suit wearing?

### JULY OR AUGUST

**BH** – "It was July or August of 1967. Gimlin said that Roger was going to make a film, and they needed someone to wear a suit."

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 342

### SEPTEMBER

**Rob McConnell** – "When was the first time you ever heard of Bigfoot?"

**BH** – "Actually, it was in 1967 about September. ... Roger come up with the big scheme, you know, and he needed some big hefty guy, a stout guy like me, to wear the suit, so he contacted Bob, and asked if Bob would talk to me."

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

**Comment:** *Actually*, the first time he ever heard of Bigfoot in connection with Patterson was in May or June, when BH & "the boys" were actors in Patterson's Bigfoot Documentary, which was shot behind his house southwest of Tampico over the course of three days. There's a photo of the actors on horses in Long's book, on p. 39. Other pages where the Documentary is discussed are 46, 71, 109-11 & 228-29.

~~~

1. Was BH concerned about possible illegality?

UNCONCERNED

Jeff Rense – "You were aware then that you were participating in what could have been—I don't know if you knew how big—but certainly a fraud."

BH – "It didn't, you know, bother me at the time. I didn't care what they done with the film they made. Just so I got my thousand bucks."

– Jeff Rense radio show interview, March 1, 2004

BH – "It [wearing the suit] didn't matter to me. I was twenty-six years old. I didn't give a damn about anything."

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 344

CONCERNED

BH – “I went up to Roger’s place, which is about 14 miles above our place here, and he asked me if I would wear the suit, and I said, ‘OK, as long as nothing’s illegal I’ll do it for you.’ ”

–XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

Comment –Given BH’s “I didn’t care” attitude expressed in box 1, he would not likely have inserted the “not-if-it’s-illegal” proviso described in box 2. In other words, it’s more likely that he’s changed his story than just added a detail, because it’s incongruous. But, even if the latter is all it was, adding-on still amounts to suspicious “embroidery” –especially because it’s image-polishing embroidery.

~~~

1. Did BH agree to wear the suit before, or while at, Tampico?
2. How many meetings were there at Tampico?
3. How many suit try-ons were there?

BH has contradicted himself on all three questions:

- 1 He’s said he agreed to wear the suit before he met Patterson in Tampico; but he’s also said he didn’t agree until he got there.
- 2 He’s said the first meeting at Tampico involved only a meeting of the minds; but he’s also said it included a suit try-on as well.
- 3 He’s said he tried-on the suit once; but he’s also said twice.

1. AGREED TO WEAR BEFORE TAMPICO MEETING

2 MEETINGS

1 TRY-ON

**BH** – “I never really talked to Roger. The first time I had sat down with him was at Tampico. ... He wasn’t trying to sell me on the thing.”

**Long** – “Because you had already agreed to wear the suit?”

He [BH] nodded affirmatively.

**BH** – “It was to seal the deal. He wanted to make sure I would do it, and I wouldn’t tell anybody... I promised him. ... Shortly after that they had the suit done. They said I had to go up to the South Fork and try on the suit and make sure it fit ... ”

.....

[at the 2nd meeting:]

"Finally he said, 'That's perfect, that's the way I want it.' "

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 343-44 & 346

**Comment:** No second try-on was described—it would have been superfluous in light of BH's "perfect"—and five lines later Long's book moves on to describing the preparations for the meetup in Bluff Creek.

## 2. AGREED TO WEAR WHILE AT TAMPICO

### 2 OR 3 MEETINGS

#### 2 TRY-ONS

**Rob McConnell** - "Tell us how you met Roger Patterson."

**BH** - "Gimlin said they were going to make a movie of this Bigfoot suit. He said they were going to sell it to the movie people and make a lot of money. He asked me to see Patterson, so I went to his place.

"He said, 'We'll give you \$1000 to wear the suit—it won't take over ten minutes.' So I agreed to do it. I tried the suit on at his place a couple of times."

[It's not specified if the first try-on occurred then and there.]

- XZone radio interview, December 7, 2006

**Comment:** Why has Heironimus added a second try-on? Maybe because he (or one of his advisors) realized it would make a more believable account if there had been a second fitting. It's implausible that his suit fit tightly without it.

To repeat my comment under item #1, BH "met" Patterson months earlier, in May or June, during three days filming his "Documentary."

## 3. AGREED TO WEAR WHILE AT TAMPICO

### 1 MEETING

#### 1 TRY-ON

**BH** - "I went up to Roger's place, which is about 14 miles above our place here, and he asked me if I would wear the suit, and I said, 'as long as nothing's illegal I'll do it for you.' ... [more chit-chat in the same vein follows]

"So I tried the suit on. He showed me how he wanted me to walk. And I passed his inspection. He said, 'that's the way I want it—perfect.' And so I went home."

- XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007;

[Similarly, on the Jeff Rense show (March 1, 2004), BH said he made the agreement **at** Tampico, not **before**.]

**Comment:** Seemingly the try-on mentioned in box 3 just above occurred at the same meeting where he agreed to wear the suit. But in Long's book, p. 346, he said that it happened at a subsequent meeting (see the last paragraph of text-box 1, on the previous page).

**Incidentally,** here's a little bit of embroidery (an added detail not mentioned initially) about "adjustments." It meets his need for a more plausible story—one in which some "fitting" of the suit was done:

**BH** — "And I agreed to try the suit on. And he done a few adjustments there."  
—Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

~~~

- 1. What day did P&G leave?**
- 2. How many days later did BH depart?**
- 3. Where was the rendezvous to be?**

BH has been all over the map on these three questions:

- 1 He first said P&G left Friday or Saturday; then he said Sunday.
- 2 He first said they left four or five days before him; then he said two days; then three days; finally it was one or two weeks.
- 3 He first said the rendezvous was Willow Creek, then he changed it to Weitchpec.

Note: I've calculated the number of "days later" (after P&G's departure) that BH departed as follows:

- 1 Saturday makes sense as the day BH's mom saw the suit, because that was likely her shopping day, and because BH would more likely have slept in on a Saturday than a weekday.
- 2 Therefore he drove home on Friday.
- 3 Therefore he slept Thursday night in Eureka, which was the day of the filming.
- 4 Therefore he drove down the day before, on Wednesday.

Wednesday would have been October 4. (Wednesday matches one of the days BH gave as his departure (in the 3rd text box below).

**P&G LEFT FRIDAY OR SATURDAY
(SO BH LEFT 4 OR 5 DAYS LATER, TO AGREE WITH A WEDNESDAY FILMING)
MEETUP AT WILLOW CREEK**

BH – “They told me how to get there. ‘Go to ... Willow Creek.’ I think Roger and Bob left on a Friday or Saturday.”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 347

**[day P&G left was not specified—MONDAY IMPLIED]
BH LEFT 2 DAYS LATER
MEETUP AT WEITCHPEC**

BH – “They picked up a horse of mine and told me to come down in a couple days later and ... to meet me at a gas station outside of town, in the little town [indistinct] Weitchpec.”

– Jeff Rense radio show interview, March 1, 2004

**P&G LEFT SUNDAY
(SO BH LEFT 3 DAYS LATER)
MEETUP AT WEITCHPEC**

BH – “They [Patterson & Gimlin] wanted me to meet them at Weitchpec, California on a Wednesday. They left on a Sunday.”

– XZone radio interview, December 7, 2006

**-- [day P&G left was unspecified]
BH LEFT 7-14 DAYS LATER
-- [Meetup-place unspecified]**

Interviewer Jim Pearson (reporting what BH told him) – Heironimus loaned his horse Chico to Patterson and Gimlin, who left for California a week or two before Heironimus.

– “Coffee with Bigfoot,” *Marlene’s Upper Valley Press*, January & February 2007

~~~

## **1. How long was BH away from Yakima?**

## **2. Was BH’s employer on strike during the filming?**

Here’s the summary of differences in BH’s versions of these events:

- 1 First he said his days-away were three; then he said five days.
- 2 First he told Long he didn’t miss work because his employer was on strike; then he said he missed a week’s work (and pay).

**THREE DAYS**

-- [Work attendance unspecified—NO STRIKE MENTIONED]

**Greg Long**—Heironimus's part in the entire "operation" had taken three days.

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 350

[Days-gone unspecified]

**STRIKE**

**Greg Long**— "Bob Heironimus was not working at the time, Boise-Cascade was on strike; he had the time to go down there."

—videotaped speech to the Int'l Bigfoot Society in  
Portland, OR, March 27, 2004

[I think this was between 15 and 25 minutes into his  
talk.]

After I pointed out on Bigfootforums that there had been no strike at Boise-Cascade in 1967, BH changed his story:

**FIVE DAYS**

**NO STRIKE**

**Interviewer Jim Pearson**—Bob missed a week's work when he went down to California.

— "The Unmaking of Bigfoot," *Marlene's Upper Valley Press*, Jan. & Feb. 2007

**Interviewer Jim Pearson**—Bob had been stiffed to the tune of week's lost wages and a thousand bucks.

— "Bob Goes Public," *Marlene's Upper Valley Press*,  
Jan. & Feb. 2007

~~~

1. Did BH ever see Patterson after the filming?

NO—DIDN'T SEE LATER

Jeff Rense—Did they contact you after the film was processed ... ?

BH—No. I never saw Roger after that.

—Jeff Rense radio interview, March 1, 2004

YES—SAW OCCASIONALLY

Tom Biscardi—Did you ever bother him [Patterson] or keep pestering at him [for your \$1000]?

BH—I never run into him **very much**.

—Tom Biscardi radio-show, May 17, 2007

~~~~~

# Bluff Creek Contradictions

## Contents

12.	What was the mileage from the meet-up to Bluff Creek Road?.....	12
13.	And from there how many miles to the campsite? .....	12
14.	Was the filmsite right by the roadside?.....	13
15.	Who put the film in the mailing envelope?.....	14
16.	Who put the suit in the trunk?.....	14
17.	What were Patterson's track-stompers made of?.....	15
18.	Was a next-day film-announcement planned?.....	15
19.	Did a next-day film-announcement occur?.....	16
20.	Did BH sleep overnight in Eureka? .....	18

~~~~

1. What was the mileage from the meet-up to Bluff Creek Road?

2. And from there how many miles to the campsite?

Summary: first he said 3 + 4-5 (7.5); then 2-3 + 2 (4.5); then 5-10 + "long" (10-20).

3 MILES
THEN 4 OR 5 MILES

BH - "We drove, oh, it seems like about three miles out of town, and then we come to Bluff Creek Road and turned to the right and went up into the mountains there about, it seems to me like about four miles, maybe-five miles."

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 347-48

2 OR 3 MILES
THEN 2 MILES

Greg Long - He [BH] brought to the kitchen table a crudely drawn map. ... The map indicated he had traveled two or three miles west on the main highway outside Willow Creek; turned right-or north-onto the Bluff Creek Road; then drove two miles up a hill.

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 366

5 OR 10 MILES
THEN ? MILES (*unspecified*)

BH – “We drove maybe five or ten miles up the highway. I don’t remember exactly. We turned right onto a gravel road and pulled up this long hill.”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 404

~~~

## 1. Was the filmsite right by the roadside?

**YES –BY ROADSIDE**

**BH** – “We took the horses and the suit up the road to the place they had picked out for the filming. Got off the horses. We looked around there to check to see if anybody was around. Listened for any cars coming up the road, and heard nothing. So we went and right there, they put the suit on me. Told me to go across here this dry creek bed ...”

– Jeff Rense radio interview, March 1, 2004

**NO –OFF-ROAD**

**BH** – “And the next morning we ... saddled up the horses. I rode ... up to this place, and it was off the road quite a ways so nobody could see us –and had this place picked out. And they helped me get in the suit again.”

– Tom Biscardi radio interview, March 14, 2007

This change is suspicious because previously I, and others on BFF, had pointed out that Bluff Creek Road is hundreds of feet from the filmsite. So this change seems an attempt to patch a hole in his story.

But even if it isn’t, it’s a change about a circumstance that an actual participant would likely have remembered clearly. (Or, if he didn’t have a good recollection of it, he wouldn’t have definitively said “right there” (by the road) in one description, but “off the road quite a ways” in another, as though the incident was clear in his mind. Therefore –for either or both these reasons –this is a “major” change.)

**Incidentally**, on p. 348 of Long’s book **BH drew a map** showing the filmsite in relation to the road and the campsite. For some reason Long didn’t see fit to include it in his book, nor on his website, although it is a vital piece of evidence. It would resolve such questions as, *Was this site to the left or right of the road?* (A similar comment applies to BH’s map of his route from the meetup at the gas station to the filmsite, on p. 366. Both maps should be “put on the record” on Long’s website, NorthwestMysteries.)

~~~

1. Who put the film in the mailing envelope?

BH PUT THE FILM IN

BH – “Well, he had an envelope there mailed to Yakima, and he said, ‘Put the film in it, take this to Eureka, California, the post office.’ ”

– Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

PATTERSON PUT THE FILM IN

BH – “Roger already had an envelope, a package, pre-arranged. All he done was shove the film in it, I took it to Eureka and mailed it home.

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

~~~

## 1. Who put the suit in the trunk?

### PATTERSON & GIMLIN PUT THE SUIT IN

**Greg Long** – Patterson and Gimlin ... laid it [the suit] in the trunk of the Buick.

[This had to have been based on what BH told him.]

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 350

### BH PUT THE SUIT IN

**BH** – “I put the suit in the back of the car, my car.”

– XZone radio interview, December 7, 2006

**Comment:** On BigfootForums.com (BFF) I pointed out the contradiction above, whereupon BH corrected himself the next time he was interviewed:

### PATTERSON & GIMLIN PUT THE SUIT IN

**BH** – “... they put the suit in the car.”

– Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

~~~~

1. What were Patterson’s track-stompers made of?

STOMPERS WERE PLASTER

BH – “They said in the meantime they were going to take those plaster casts that Roger had and go back up and make the tracks that they wanted.”

– Seth Shostak interview, August 1, 2004

BH – “So they took their plaster casts out and went back and mashed ‘em down into there, you know, as I was going to Eureka. ... Roger had made those plaster casts. There were two or three guys around here that had those casts. One guy was named Prentis Beck.”

–Tom Biscardi radio-show, May 17, 2007

BH – “As far as the footprints go, after the film was filmed, we headed back to the car and they went back with the plaster casts, mashed them down in the white sand where I was walking through this creek bed.”

–XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

STOMPERS' COMPOSITION UNKNOWN

Henry May – “Don't you know that plaster is very delicate and that if you step on it, like if you're like 150 or 200 pounds, that you could break those casts?”

BH – “Well, they didn't break. I didn't stand on them myself. And I'm sure they didn't break.”

Rob McConnell – “Is it possible that the casts were made of some other material, besides plaster?”

BH – “There's been so many casts made, some of them even wood at around this part of the country. I don't know exactly what casts they had.”

–XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

~~~~~

## 1. Was a next-day film-announcement planned?

#### NO ANNOUNCEMENT PLANNED

**BH** – “They said they had to go back and make tracks. ‘We have to go back and make them. We'll either do it today, or tomorrow, and we're out of here and come home.’ ”

.....  
**Greg Long** – “Why do you think they asked you to take the suit with you?”

**BH** – “Well I don't know. I guess to get it home before somebody saw it. I never thought about it.”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 350

**Comment:** That statement, which BH attributed to Patterson & Gimlin (P&G) right after the filming, implicitly ruled out any film-announcement being in the offing. (They said they were going home right after making the tracks.) Furthermore, BH conspicuously failed to claim *knowledge* (the way he did later on the Tom Biscardi show, below) of any supposed planned

announcement of P&G's. He would have told Long about it if he'd had such knowledge. It's a "change of story" of the most suspicious sort.

**YES—NEXT DAY ANNOUNCEMENT PLANNED**

**BH**— "They were going to go downtown there to the local newspaper, media, or whatever and announce they had seen the Bigfoot. So they put the suit in my car so that nobody would see the suit in the back of the truck."

—Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

The most likely reason he changed his story is to patch up the hole I poked in it in my Amazon review of Long's book, where I pointed out (in item G) that it would have been senseless for Patterson to have given the suit to BH unless a film-announcement were imminent.

My Amazon review, "A Tale of Two Suit," is at [http://www.amazon.com/review/R3BPK2J31N7EW9/ref=cm\\_cr\\_pr\\_perm?ie=UTF8&ASIN=1591021391&nodeID=&tag=&linkCode=](http://www.amazon.com/review/R3BPK2J31N7EW9/ref=cm_cr_pr_perm?ie=UTF8&ASIN=1591021391&nodeID=&tag=&linkCode=)

~~~

1. Did a next-day film-announcement occur?

**NO NEXT DAY ANNOUNCEMENT
(THE FILMING WAS MUCH EARLIER THAN OCT. 20)**

Greg Long—Bob Heironimus ... told me that he drove to the Bluff Creek area in either September or October 1967. ... However, if Heironimus saw the Bigfoot Jamboree banner stretched across the highway upon his entrance into Happy Camp around the time of the Labor Day weekend [in early September], then Patterson shot his film long before October 20.

—*The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 420 & 421

**NO NEXT DAY ANNOUNCEMENT
(THE FILMING WAS MUCH EARLIER THAN OCT. 20)**

BH— "And it was hot, you know, around the first October, and I was sweating ... And after he got through filming ... there was a big hole there, and I jumped down that hole.

'Cuz it was first of October, which would be hunting season, in that part of the woods, and all the time walking down through there I was worried about somebody shooting me."

—XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

**YES—NEXT DAY ANNOUNCEMENT
(THE FILMING OCCURRED ONLY ONE DAY EARLIER)**

BH — "The reason I brought the suit home in the trunk of the car is because, after they went back and made the tracks, they headed for town to announce that they had filmed the Bigfoot... They didn't want anybody seeing that—maybe taking a chance on having somebody see it. So I brought it home in the trunk of the car."

Rob McConnell — "So you mean they announced that they had filmed Bigfoot before the film was developed?"

BH — "Uh, yes."

Rob McConnell — "Huh! Interesting. And did it catch on right away? Did the press gobble the entire story?"

BH — "Oh yeah, yeah. They ate that right up."

—XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

Comment: Patterson's announcement to the *Eureka Times-Standard* didn't occur until October 20, as its Oct. 21 story explicitly stated. So

It's not possible for BH to credibly revise his story to include an immediate announcement, because his "September or October" phrase (above) forecloses it. Once he allowed a September filming date as a possibility, he implied that there had been a lengthy gap between the filming and the announcement. Given that lengthy gap, his "or October" phrase implied a date only in the month's first half. E.g., in the "first or second week of October" (BH, Biscardi interview).

This fundamental story-change is very damaging to BH. It's obviously self-serving, because his prior version was so flagrantly implausible it had to be abandoned, for two reasons:

1. Because Lyle Laverty's testimony, which I elicited and posted, established that there'd been no tracks at the site before October 19.
2. Because Patterson wouldn't have given BH the suit unless he planned an immediate announcement to the press.

I suspect the reason BH initially adopted the delayed-announcement version was to accommodate Long's need for there to be a lengthy delay between the filming and the announcement. (That's because Long figured the film couldn't have been developed on Oct. 21.) My belief would be confirmed if the taped version BH told reporter Jim Gosney in 1981 is found to describe an immediate announcement.

PS: an October 19 filming clashes with BH's estimated 2-3 week gap:

BH – “The next day I drove home, and ... two or three weeks later, out came the movie, you know, on the television, the film.”

– PAX cable TV show “Lie Detector,” May 17, 2005

That’s because snippets from the film were broadcast nationally in late October, according to Morris (p. 448). (And also according to a Bigfooter, whose name I’ve lost, who posted a recollection of it to a Bigfoot e-mail list.) In other words, the delay was ten days at most.

~~~

## 1. Did BH sleep overnight in Eureka?

### YES – SLEPT OVERNIGHT

**Greg Long** – He stayed overnight in Eureka, and he remembered renting a room in a small building whose siding was made of logs. The next day he drove home to Yakima.

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 350

### NO – DROVE HOME

**BH** – “I took the film to Eureka, mailed the film, and took off for home. ...”

– XZone radio interview, December 7, 2006

**Interviewer Jim Pearson (reporting what BH told him)** – Bob started for home, stopping in Eureka to mail the unprocessed 8mm [sic] film to Yakima. He drove straight through, parked his mother’s Buick, and went to bed.

– “Coffee with Bigfoot,” *Marlene’s Upper Valley Press*, January 2007

**Comment:** On BigfootForums.com I pointed out the contradiction above, whereupon BH corrected himself in his next interview:

### YES – SLEPT OVERNIGHT

**BH** – “I took it to Eureka and mailed it, stayed overnight there.”

– Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

**Comment:** It’s hard to justify this story-change as an innocent mixup, because—among other things—if he’d slept in Eureka, he’d have driven home in daylight three-quarters of the way. If he’d driven straight home from Eureka, he’d have driven home in darkness three-quarters of the way. That difference would have left an impression in his memory and made it hard to forget what time he left.

(The above assumes a 3PM start from Eureka, based on a noon departure from the filmsite. BH estimated the filming occurred between 11 & noon, in his first XZone interview, December 7, 2006.)

\*\*\*\*\*

## Confidentiality & Confession-Related Contradictions

### Contents

|                                                                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 21. Did BH promise Patterson absolute secrecy? .....                                  | 19 |
| 22. Did BH go to the Idle Hour bar?.....                                              | 20 |
| 23. Did he implicitly “reveal” the hoax to his buddies? .....                         | 20 |
| 24. Did he explicitly “tell” anyone there about the hoax? .....                       | 20 |
| 25. How soon did BH’s buddies realize the suit’s purpose?.....                        | 22 |
| 26. Did his mom, Opal, ask BH about the suit?.....                                    | 23 |
| 27. Who leaked the news about the suit?.....                                          | 23 |
| 28. If asked, “Was it you in the suit?”, when did BH first say “Yes”?.....            | 24 |
| 29. Did BH talk to the media prior to seeing <i>World’s Greatest Hoaxes</i> in 1999?. | 25 |
| 30. Did BH “come forward” with money in mind? .....                                   | 26 |
| 31. Does BH have scruples now about hoaxing film-viewers? .....                       | 27 |
| 32. Is BH willing to take another lie detector test?.....                             | 28 |

~~~~~

1. Did BH promise Patterson absolute secrecy?

YES –ABSOLUTE SECRECY PROMISED

BH – “[Patterson said,] ‘Don’t reveal this to **anybody**. This is top secret.’ ... He wanted to make sure I would do it, and I wouldn’t tell anybody, either then or after the film was made. I promised him.”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 343

NO - BH MERELY PROMISED HE WOULDN'T TELL THE MEDIA

BH - "I'd promised them [P&G] I would not tell **the media** or the news or the television or any of these people."

- Seth Shostak's "Skeptical Sunday" Internet radio show, August 1, 2004; a similar statement was made in the Jeff Rense interview on March 1, 2004

Comment: His second, revised version of what he promised Patterson made it retroactively OK for him to have displayed the suit to his buddies and to have told Hammermeister.

~~~

- 1. Did BH go to the Idle Hour bar?**
- 2. Did he implicitly "reveal" the hoax to his buddies?**
- 3. Did he explicitly "tell" anyone there about the hoax?**

**NO BAR / NO SHOW / NO TELL**

**(BH DIDN'T GO TO THE BAR, SO HE COULD REVEAL NOTHING)**

**BH** - "I mailed the film, I stayed there [in Eureka] overnight, I started back the next morning, I got home - 14 hours or whatever it was later - and I kind of went in the house and went to sleep."

- Jeff Rense radio interview, March 1, 2004

**YES - BAR / ? / ?**

**(BUT DIDN'T REMEMBER REVEALING THE SUIT)**

**Long** - "Do you remember talking to the guys at the Idle Hour Tavern?"

**BH** - "I just don't remember." He shook his head. "I just don't remember." He was genuinely puzzled.

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 405 (see also pp. 370-71)

**Comment:** There's a good reason he didn't tell Long that he'd shown off the suit the night he returned: because then Long would have asked the supposed witnesses if that was when and where they saw it, and they'd have denied it. They'd have said, as Hammermeister told me, that they'd seen it years later. (Provided Long interviewed them without BH present, which he failed to do with Hammermeister.) After Long was off his case, his current version emerged:

**YES -BAR / YES -SHOW / NO TELL**  
**(BH DELIBERATELY REVEALED THE SUIT,**  
**BUT TOLD NO ONE ITS PURPOSE)**

**BH** - "The next day I drove home, and uh, I went to the local watering hole where all us guys hung out. And ... uh, I lifted the trunk up and said, uh, take a look at this. I didn't tell them what it was ... I said just look at this and do not forget what this looks like."

- *Lie Detector* TV show, May 17, 2005

**BH** - I promised him I wouldn't tell anybody. I didn't tell anybody it was a Bigfoot suit.

- Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

**Comment:** I believe the reason he said "I didn't tell them what it was" was to mesh with his claim to Long that he didn't remember  *talking*  about the suit in the bar. That non-denial denial deceived Long implicitly by failing to answer what Long was really asking - *Did you let the cat out of the bag?* Long couldn't have known to specifically ask if BH had *silently* given his buddies the bit of knowledge they needed to make the connection on their own. So BH didn't come clean; instead, he responded only the question's literal meaning, dancing around the point of the inquiry. This failure to correct an interrogator's misperception is deliberately misleading, and therefore counts as lying. It contradicts his supporters' claim that he's "made a full confession" and "has nothing to hide."

**YES -BAR / YES -SHOW / YES -TELL**  
**(BH DELIBERATELY REVEALED THE SUIT,**  
**AND TOLD HAMMERMEISTER ITS PURPOSE)**

**BH** - (paraphrased) "I showed Hammermeister the suit the night I returned."

- personal communication to Roger Knights, April 11,  
2006

But he *told* Hammermeister what the suit was for when he showed it to him. Here are Hammermeister's statements from Long's book:

**Hammermeister** - "He told me he did it, and he didn't want it spread around for awhile. ... he had the suit and he trusted his friends, and he showed us ... and there was still supposed to be payola on this thing, and he didn't have it."

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 398

**BH** - (quoted by Hammermeister) "That's what I wore when we went down and did our thing."

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 397

**BH** – (paraphrased) “Although Hammermeister recently told you that the suit show-off event occurred at least a year after I returned from Bluff Creek, his recollection was faulty. He’s just admitted that to me.”

–personal communication to Roger Knights, April 11, 2006

**Comment:** BH has managed to get his friend to change his story; or his friend has spontaneously realized his *faux pas* and changed it on his own. I’m not surprised, because it would be fatal to BH’s fable if it were to come out that BH had been showing it off around town for years, after he’d told Long that Patterson had retrieved the suit two days after the filming.

But in doing so he’s jumped out of the frying pan and into the soup. I.e., he’s contradicted his repeated assertions that he “told” no one at the bar about the suit. And he’s provoked my riposte: ***Will Hammermeister take a lie detector test at my expense?*** I’ll also give him \$200 for his time. This offer extends to any other of my suit-witnesses whom BH has induced to recant, as well as to his nephew John Miller, a supportive but “very bashful” suit witness. (Contact Randy Ruegsegger at 509-248-1100 / [RandyRuegsegger@Yahoo.com](mailto:RandyRuegsegger@Yahoo.com) / 413 N. 2nd St. / Yakima, WA 98901. RR was recommended by BH’s retired examiner, Jim McCormick.)

**NO – BAR / NO SHOW / NO TELL**

**(BH DIDN’T GO TO THE BAR, SO HE COULD REVEAL NOTHING)**

**Jim Pearson** – Bob, a twenty-six-year-old bachelor who lived with his mother, drove straight home in her car, parked it and went to sleep.

“The Unmaking of Bigfoot,” an interview of BH in January and February 2007 issues of *Marlene’s Upper Valley Press*

**Comment:** Now we’re back to square one.

~~~

1. How soon did BH’s buddies realize the suit’s purpose?

2-3 WEEKS LATER

BH – “Well, two or three weeks later, out came the movie, you know, on the television, the film. They said, ‘Ah ha! That’s what you were doing.’”

–*Lie Detector* TV show, May 17, 2005

AT ONCE

BH – "I said, "Take a look at this. ... Do not forget what this looks like. Well, right away, they knew right then, what I'd been doing."

– XZone radio interview, December 7, 2006

~~~

## 1. Did his mom, Opal, ask BH about the suit?

DIDN'T ASK

**Long** – "Opal estimated she found the suit at 10 AM the following day. ... Bob woke up later that morning or afternoon, but Opal did not confront him. ... The following morning ... Opal or Bob discovered that the suit wasn't in the [car's] trunk. But neither of them **ever** brought up the issue of why the suit had been in the trunk, or why or how it disappeared."

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 366

ASKED

**Reporter** – His mother, Opal, found the gorilla suit in the trunk of her Buick the next day.

**BH** – "It really scared her at first. She wanted to know what was going on and I said, 'You'll figure it out.' ' She saw the film on television and knew immediately."

– "Bigfoot†Hoax Goes in Halls of Hooey," Leah Ward, *Yakima Herald-Republic*, October 7, 2004

One day as he and his mother watched TV, the Bigfoot film clip came on. Opal looked at her son and said, "That's the costume that was in my car trunk, wasn't it?" Her son refused to answer.

– Jim Pearson, "The Unmaking of Bigfoot," one part of a 3-part interview series of BH in the January and February 2007 issues of *Marlene's Upper Valley Press*

~~~

1. Who leaked the news about the suit?

BH'S RELATIVES LEAKED

Long – "Who did you tell your story to first?"

BH – "My family, and then probably my wife's family. After my mom saw the suit, and it leaked out [from her] that it was in the back of the car, well, most people around here did know it."

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 356

Comment: The above implied that news leaked out because his aunt, nephew, and mom spread the word about an ape-suit in his trunk, in the wake of Patterson's announcement. That way BH would have been innocent of letting the cat out of the bag at the bar. That was what he wanted readers of Long's book to believe, because he was claiming at that point that he "didn't remember" revealing it there.

But in the quote below he changed his story so that the leak occurred via his deliberate boasting to his Idle Hour buddies. He had to do this to accommodate the numerous people who've seen him show off the suit. But he had to wait until Long was off the case—or at least after his book had been published—before he could make his concession—his modified limited hangout—to the facts.

BH'S BARROOM BUDDIES LEAKED

BH — "There was probably fifty to a hundred people that knew, when the first time they saw that film, that it was me. ... Because six people [in the bar] saw the suit, and it leaked out [from them] after that."

—Tom Biscardi Internet radio interview, March 14, 2007

~~~~~

### 1. If asked, "Was it you in the suit?", when did BH first say "Yes"?

#### ADMITTED IN 1969 OR 1971

**BH** — "After about four years I decided everybody knew that it was me anyway out where we lived out there. They would say, 'Was it really you?' ... And I'd say, 'Yes, it was.' I just let the cat out of the bag."

—XZone radio interview, December 7, 2006

**Tom Biscardi** —Why didn't you come forward a lot sooner?

**BH** —I did, actually. About a year and a half ... I got to where I didn't give a damn, you know? And I finally said, "Yes, it was me."

—Tom Biscardi Internet radio interview, March 14, 2007

#### ADMITTED IN 1999

**BH** — "Well, after I saw that television show called *The World's Greatest Hoaxes*, I decided then it was time to let people know that that was a hoax. A year and a half after we made the film, I never got paid, and I was waiting around to get paid. And I decided then, too, that if anybody asked me, 'Was it really you in the suit,' I didn't deny it, and I didn't say Yes or No. I'd given my word I wouldn't say anything about it."

—Tom Biscardi Internet radio interview, March 14, 2007

**Comment:** Here's a fair rephrasing of that statement: "*Until World's Greatest Hoaxes was aired (in December 1998) I didn't ever admit publicly—i.e., to inquiring strangers—that I'd been in the suit. It was a matter of principle.*" But in that same interview, and in an earlier one (first box), he flatly contradicted his statement that "I didn't say yes or no."

BH has often faced an awkward question: "It's been a number of years since Roger passed away, and any promise to him should have been over by then. Since you didn't get paid, why wait until just now?" (That question was in fact posed by call-in listeners to his two interviews.) He had a choice of two possible answers:

- 1 One reply was to stand on principle: *I was bound by my promise of silence to Roger.*
- 2 The other reply was to deny that he kept quiet: *Well, actually I did fess up, but nobody outside my neighborhood was paying attention.*

Both responses are tempting. But they're mutually exclusive: he must chose one and avoid the other. But BH succumbed to temptation.

A deceptive defense of BH's statement could be offered: That he initially adopted a *No Comment* policy, but gave it up after four years and just didn't spell it out in fine detail in his Tom Biscardi interview. Indeed, this is the only defense that *could* be offered.

But that is just a polite way of saying that he chose to conceal an awkward fact—i.e., be strategically economical with the truth—in order to duck a tough question.

~~~~~

1. Did BH talk to the media prior to seeing *World's Greatest Hoaxes* in 1999?

DIDN'T TALK TO MEDIA BEFORE 1999

BH — "I'd promised them I would not tell the media or the news or the television or any of these people."

— Seth Shostak's "Skeptical Sunday" Internet radio show, August 1, 2004

BH — "I kept this quiet for 35 years from the media, from the television people. Everybody around here knew it, but it was no big deal."

— Xzone interview, August 6, 2007

DID TALK TO MEDIA BEFORE 1999

Greg Long—Bob Heironimus opened up to a newspaper reporter [Jim Gosney] who befriended him and told him his story many times, starting in 1981.

—in "Q & A—The Making of Bigfoot," item #13, online at <http://.www.rense.com/general51/q.htm>

~~~~~

## 1. Did BH "come forward" with money in mind?

**YES—SOUGHT MONEY FOR HIS YARN**

The man [who was in the suit] wanted help in negotiating a deal for the rights to his story.

—David Wasson, "Bigfoot Unzipped," *Yakima Herald-Republic*, Jan. 30, 1999, quoting a press release from BH's lawyer, Barry Woodard of Zillah, WA

The Zillah lawyer's office has been inundated with calls from media outlets ... 'We're just sort of waiting for the dust to settle,' he said, explaining he and his client are evaluating offers.

—David Wasson, "Bigfoot believers say film no fake," *Yakima Herald-Republic*, February 4, 1999

**BH** [To Gimlin]—"It's time I made some money out of this thing. I'm blowing the whistle."

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 340

**Greg Long**—On October 24, 1999, I called Heironimus. ... "Hey, it's been nine months [since his attorney's press release on Jan. 30, 1999] and nothing's come out. ... Why hasn't anyone bought your story, Bob?"

.....

**BH**—"Well, we're trying," he said in a sing-song voice. "I'm not going to give it away."

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 313

**Greg Long**—Through the spring and summer of 2000 ... I thought often of Heironimus's bitter hold out, as he tried to milk a few last dollars from a dead man's scam.

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 314

**BH**—"I was never paid a dime for that, no sir," he said, adding, "Sure I want to make some money. I feel that after 36 years I should get some of it."

— "Man admits: I was 'Bigfoot,'" Richard Leiby, *Washington Post*, March 7, 2004

"Is Bob H. gaining financially from his 'confession'?"

**Greg Long** – "He is not. If there is a Bigfoot TV special, Bob Heironimus should be paid for something."

– Greg Long's Reply to John Green, on Long's site

"And then, shortly after the show [WGH] was on [which was broadcast on December 28, 1998] ... I get a phone call—from a lawyer ... who called me up and said ... 'I represent the guy who was in the suit, and it wasn't the guy you pointed to. ... And he'd be more than willing to go on television if we could strike the right deal.' "

– **Bob Kiviat** (producer of *World's Greatest Hoaxes*), on the Jeff Rense radio-show interview, March 1, 2004

#### NO—BH CAME FORWARD SELFLESSLY, WITHOUT MONEY IN MIND

**Tom Biscardi** – "What do you have to gain, financially, in this whole thing after all these years?"

**BH** – "Nothing."

– Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

**Rob McConnell** – "Once again Bob I just want to say that you have never had anything to personally gain from coming out and telling the truth, besides being an honest man."

**BH** – "Right. Just being honest."

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

**Rob McConnell** – "Number two, you do not have anything to personally gain from telling the truth except to be an honest person."

**BH** – "That's true."

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

~~~~~

1. Does BH have scruples now about hoaxing film-viewers?

NO SCRUPLES ABOUT HOAXING

Rob McConnell – If you had known after 35 years the film would be taken so seriously by so many, would you have done it?

BH – Yes, I would have, and I also would have demanded my money or I would have spilled the beans or told the media a month later.

– Xzone radio interview, December 7, 2006

YES –TROUBLED BY HOAXING

Rob McConnell –If you were to do it all over again, would you?
BH –Yah, I'd do it again, for the simple reason is, it wasn't against the law to do that. But: if I knew what was going to *become* of it, well I wouldn't do it again, no.
-Xzone radio interview, August 6, 2007

~~~~

**1. Is BH willing to take another lie detector test?**

**YES –BRING `EM ON**

**Greg Long** –He [BH] has said many times that he is willing to take many lie detector exams since he isn't lying.  
- "Challenge to John Green", 2nd section, "John Green's statements as Recorded on the Jeff Rense Show, March 14, 2004", item 15, Rebuttal, online at [http://www.northwestmysteries.com/makingofbigfoot/critics\\_johngreen.htm](http://www.northwestmysteries.com/makingofbigfoot/critics_johngreen.htm)

**NO –TWO TESTS ARE SUFFICIENT**

But when a lie detector examiner I'd contacted, Randy Ruegsegger, called BH in May 2006 and asked if he'd be willing to take a free conventional lie detector exam, BH declined, saying that he thought the two exams he'd already taken were sufficient.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Suit-Related Contradictions**

**Contents**

33. Was it easy to walk in the costume? ..... 29  
34. What extra material was glued onto the suit? ..... 29  
35. How big was the gap behind the eye-holes?..... 30  
36. How high were the boots inside the suit? ..... 30  
37. Were the Bigfoot's feet made of slippers?..... 31  
38. Was BH barefoot or shod inside the rubber boots? ..... 31  
39. Was there padding in the suit?..... 32

- 40. Were there any metal parts in the suit? ..... 33
- 41. Was the suit split around the waist or up the back? ..... 33
- 42. Was the suit removed from the trunk by BH's relatives? ..... 34
- 43. Was Patterson's suit-retrieval in Yakima surreptitious or not? ..... 36

~~~

1. Was it easy to walk in the costume?

WALKING WAS EASY

Long - "Did you feel comfortable and natural walking in the suit?"

BH - "Oh, yeah, it was easy, it was simple, yeah."

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 346

WALKING WASN'T EASY

BH - "I practiced the†Bigfoot†walk exactly the way Roger wanted it three times. It wasn't easy," he said.

- "Bigfoot†Hoax Goes in Halls of Hooey," Leah Beth Ward,

Yakima *Herald-Republic*, October 7, 2004

~~~

## 1. What extra material was glued onto the suit?

### OLD FUR COAT

**BH** - "Roger told my brother Howard he made the whole thing out of horsehide. Roger had skinned a red horse & attached or glued fur from an old fur coat onto the horsehide skin."

- *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 345

### HORSEHIDE

**BH** - "Now, he told my brother, Howard, that he skinned an old horse that died. [Indistinct] had a horse up there that kicked the bucket. And he took some of that hide and put it on that suit. Well, I think that was what I was smelling, when I told everybody that the suit stunk. I'm pretty sure that was the horsehide. Probably half rotten when he'd skinned it."

- Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

**Comment:** But it would make no sense to add horsehide patches to a Morris suit, from Patterson's point of view. It would give the suit a patchwork look. Horsehair is coarse, straight, and stiff, so it would clash with the fine, fluffy Dynel hairs on Morris's suit. Only from BH's point of view would such an addition serve a purpose: to rescue his claim that the suit stank. Without such add-ons, there'd be no reason for a Morris-made fabric suit with synthetic hairs to stink.

~~~~

1. How big was the gap behind the eye-holes?

2 "

Interviewer Jim Pearson – "Bob was peering through two slits a couple inches in front of his eyes."
– "Coffee with Bigfoot," an interview of BH in a January 2007 issue of *Marlene's Upper Valley Press*

1.5 "

BH – "There was an inch to an inch-and-a-half between my eye and the cutouts in the mask."
– *The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 355

1 "

BH – "'They [the "slits"] were about this far from my eyes.' He measured off an inch in front of his eyes."
– *The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 346

.25 " to .5 "

BH – "I had about a quarter or a half-inch of space in between the mask and my entire face."
["entire" was a bit slurred over–RK]
– Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

Comment: In that last quote, BH was describing the distance between his lips and the mouth of the mask. He was trying to minimize the distance on the Tom Biscardi show, to account for the fact that Patty's lips move—that is, he had a motive to "change his story." But, by saying "entire face," he implied the eyes as well, in contradiction to his earlier statements.

~~~

## 1. How high were the boots inside the suit?

### WAIST-HIGH

**BH** – “I ... slipped my legs into the legs of the suit, which felt like they were hip boots or wading boots ... that go up to your waist.”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 344

### KNEE-HIGH

**BH** – “Those were irrigation boots, you know, kind of like irrigators wear, up to about the knees. That’s why the calves stick out pretty good there.”

– XZone radio interview, December 7, 2006

**Comment:** On BigfootForums.com I pointed out the contradiction above, whereupon BH corrected himself in his next interview:

### HIP-HIGH

**BH** – “I had some kind of wading boots on, like hip boots...”

**BH** – “The waders came clear up to my hips.”

– Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

~~~

1. Were the Bigfoot’s feet made of slippers?

YES – SLIPPERS

BH – “I think the feet were made of old house slippers you used to see around that looked like a big foot with toes on them.”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 344

NO SLIPPERS

BH – “There were no slippers.”

– Jeff Rense radio-show interview, March 1, 2004

~~~~

## 1. Was BH barefoot or shod inside the rubber boots?

### BAREFOOT

**BH** – “I sat down on a log and took my boots off and slipped my legs into the legs of the suit.”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 344 [re the try-on in Tampico]

**Interviewer Keith Olbermann** – “Were there bare feet inside the costume or what was it?”

**BH** – “I was walking in my stocking feet inside my costume.”

– Countdown, an MSNBC TV show, March 22, 2004

**SHOD**

**Caller** – “Mr. Heironimus, were you barefoot or wearing shoes in the costume?”

**BH** – “I had shoes on.”

– Xzone radio interview, August 23, 2007

~~~

1. Was there padding in the suit?

NO PADDING (Implicit)

Long’s book devotes three and a half full pages to BH’s description of the suit (pp. 344-46 & 355), and Long repeatedly interviewed him four times about it. (Initially, and then on January 23, 29, and 31 of 2001—see p. 354.) None of Long’s printed questions asked about padding. Yet it’s inconceivable that he didn’t ask BH about it. Long didn’t skimp on probing this matter; he stated that he focused on trying to get all the detail he could out of BH (p. 354).

If BH had answered Yes to “Was there padding?” Long would have printed that response. So the omission of a positive response implies that the answer was No. Even if Long hadn’t asked, BH would have volunteered the detail, if it were a fact.

In addition, BH initially said (below) that “no belt” was used, which is inconsistent with pillows being “strapped in.” (See the 2nd text box.)

NO BELT OR HARNESS

Keith Olbermann – “Were you wearing a belt or a harness of some sort to keep this costume in place?”

BH – “No, there was no belt.”

– Countdown, an MSNBC TV show, March 22, 2004

PADDING AND STRAPS WERE PRESENT

Morris – “To create that illusion [of a butt crack], Roger Patterson put two pillows in the rear end of the suit. ... I know that because I talked to Bob about it, and that’s what we did when we re-created the film. And absolutely—you can see what you think is the butt crack, and that’s the pillows in the back, that are strapped in.”

– Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007

Rob McConnell – “ Did you have to have stuffing inside? ”

BH – “ Oh yes, there was football helmets, pads, and an old football helmet for the head, and the legs had rubber boots in the legs for the big calves, and padding in the rear end there. ”

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

~~~

## 1. Were there any metal parts in the suit?

### NO METAL PARTS

**Long** – “ Do you remember seeing any clasps, any metal parts? ”

**BH** – “ No. ”

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 344-45

### ONE METAL PART

**Caller Sean Fokker** – “ So he’s saying he wore the Philip Morris suit. ”

**BH** – “ Yes, I did. .... It had a zipper .... ”

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

**Long** – The zipper, a heavy-duty type used in the 1950s and 1960s on the tops of convertible cars, was sewed on the back of the suit.

[By “ a powerful sewing machine ” at “ a tent-and-awning store. ”]

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 450

~~~

1. Was the suit split around the waist or up the back?

AROUND THE WAIST

Long – “ Describe the suit to me. ”

BH – “ It was made of three parts. It had the legs. It had a corset or middle piece between the neck and waist. And it had a head. ”

..... . .

Long – “ You put your feet inside big rubber boots that went to your waist? ”

BH – “ Yeah. All I can say is it felt like rubber boots. ... They helped me stand up. Roger and Bob slipped the torso part down over my head and shoulders. I raised my

arms up. I kind of wiggled into it. ... It was kind of like putting on a T-shirt."

.....
Long – "How did the bottom portion fit around your waist?"

BH – "I guess [guess?!] there was a kind of draw string."

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, pp. 344-45

BH – "They kind of helped me up and put the top on"

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 349

Long – Regarding the "Bigfoot's" legs, Heironimus repeated what he had said before, that they came to his waist....

– *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 355

UP THE BACK

Caller Sean Fokker – "So he's saying he wore the Philip Morris suit."

BH – "Yes, I did. It had a zipper going up and down the back."

– XZone radio interview, August 6, 2007

Comment – Morris made a "union suit" that had a step-in back with a metal-zippered opening (p. 449). Unlike the suit that BH initially described, it had no "torso part," no T-shirt-like "top," no "middle piece," no "draw string," and no (separate) "legs" that "came to the waist." Morris's torso and legs were a single unit, as in a romper suit.

GENERAL COMMENT: It's no good to say that BH was in and out of the suit within ten minutes so he might not have noticed its details. (See Long, p. 355.) According to BH's story, he was actually in and out of it once or twice more at Tampico, where he was interested enough in its effects to be involved in inserting a glass eye into it (pp. 402-04). That must have given him time to observe it laid out on the ground. And he handled the suit both when he put it in his trunk leaving Bluff Creek, and when he opened the trunk for Patterson later on. (It wasn't in its sack on either occasion.) He'd have paid enough attention to have observed a good deal – it wasn't a boring, routine item like a box of beans a warehouseman was putting on a shelf.

~~~~~

## 1. Was the suit removed from the trunk by BH's relatives?

NOT REMOVED BY BH'S RELATIVES

After Opal, BH's mom, discovered the suit in her trunk (p. 363), Long asked her:

**Long**—What did you do next?

**Opal**—I didn't do anything. I shut the trunk. ...

.....

"I've got something to show you," she said to Willa Smith [her sister-in-law] when she visited Opal that afternoon. When Opal opened the trunk, Willa jumped back in surprise.

**Long**—Did you tell her what it was?

**Opal**—Yeah, I said, "I don't know what. It's a suit. I don't know where it's come from."

Willa picked up the head and put it on.

**Long**—That must have seemed kind of funny to you, her wearing the head.

**Opal**—Oh, yeah! I wouldn't have put it on myself, but she did. We were laughing a little bit, because she was clowning out with it, you know.

**Long**—What happened next?

**Opal**—We put it [the head] back in the trunk, closed her up.

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 364

During the interval when it was open BH's 8-year-old nephew John Miller also examined the contents of the trunk. Here is his entire description of his interaction with the suit:

**Long**— "What do you remember?"

**John Miller**— "I just remember they had the trunk open, and I remember looking in there, and, "What's that!" and picking up and fooling with it. And I can remember finding the head and, being a kid, I just put it right on. It was hot. And it stunk. I can remember going up to the front porch and looking in the front window to see if somebody could see me. I was going to try to scare somebody."

He didn't remember Willa Smith putting the head on.

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 365

First, the above implies that the whole suit was not removed from the trunk, only the head. Second, because (I assume) BH and his lawyer checked out the chapters of Long's book concerning BH prior to publication, which included this chapter, he implicitly

endorsed the version above. Of course, he didn't have first-hand knowledge of what they did, supposedly being asleep while this was happening, but he endorsed the above as being what he'd heard from his relatives.

**MAYBE REMOVED BY BH'S RELATIVES**

**BH** - "My mother saw the suit, my nephew was there, and one of my aunts, which is deceased now, was there. They got the suit out—after they startled umm [indistinct] quite a bit—they got the suit out, tried—uh, the head of the suit out, and was looking at it. And that's when my aunt tried the head of it on, and my nephew. All of them tried the head of the suit on."

-Jeff Rense radio show, March 1, 2004

**BH** - "And my nephew tried the suit on—uh, the head of the suit on."

-Tom Biscardi radio show interview, 3/17/07

**Comment:** According to my theory of the case, BH had an ape-suit in his possession for a long time and displayed it from time to time, for instance to Garry Record. But, as described by Garry, it had no resemblance to Patty. If this is the suit his relatives saw, it would be awkward for BH if they saw the entire suit, because then it would be suspicious if they failed to describe it.

However, apparently these relatives did in fact examine the whole suit, because when BH was asked a question about it his initial, unguarded response was to acknowledge that fact, then take it back, as above.

However, when pressed about it, he took back his take-back:

**YES - WAS REMOVED BY BH'S RELATIVES**

**Jeff Rense** - "You said that your niece and your aunt, your mom got the suit out and were playing around with it?"

**BH** - "Yes, uh-huh."

-Jeff Rense radio show, March 1, 2004

**Comment:** My interpretation of his tap-dancing above is that when he's forced to give a straight answer, he is afraid to flat-out deny that the suit was removed from the trunk, for fear that Miller, if questioned, would contradict him. That's how it looks to me, from the hemming and hawing preceding the concession above.

~~~~~

1. Was Patterson's suit-retrieval in Yakima surreptitious or not?

SURREPTITIOUS RETRIEVAL (BH DID NOT OBSERVE THE SUIT'S RETRIEVAL)

Greg Long—Later, at night, Patterson and Gimlin, unseen, removed the suit from the trunk.

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 351

Greg Long—That evening Patterson and Gimlin returned Chico. With the car keys in the trunk lock or ignition, they opened the trunk & removed the suit. The following morning, Opal and Bob saw Chico in the pasture. Opal or Bob discovered that the suit wasn't in the trunk.

— *The Making of Bigfoot*, p. 366

RETRIEVAL WAS IN PLAIN VIEW

Jeff Rense—“And the suit was picked up out of the trunk of your car later on by Patterson?”

BH—“Yes. When they brought my horse back they took the suit out of the trunk of the car.”

.....
Jeff Rense—“All right. So what did they say to you? Job well done? Did they say anything like—they weren't doing high-fives back then I know—”

BH—“Well, they were picking their belts the way it turned out. The walk, you know, the way it was, the—”

—Jeff Rense radio interview, March 1, 2004

BH—“The last time I saw it was in the trunk of the car. They brought the horse back, they took the suit out, and that's the last I saw it.”

—Tom Biscardi-show interview, March 14, 2007;
(A similar remark was made on the *Lie Detector* show of May 27, 2005 & the *Xzone* show of August 6, 2007.)

Comment: The business of Patterson gaining access because Opal (his mom) accidentally left the car unlocked with the keys in the ignition (p. 365 of Long's book)—a version which Heironimus and his lawyer must have OK'd when they reviewed the manuscript for errors—becomes awkward to explain in light of this later version.

It seems to me that the sole reason for the first version, which implausibly required P&G to return after dark to remove their suit from the car—hoping the keys had been left in it to open the trunk—was to accommodate Opal's remembrance that P&G returned the horse but left without taking the suit (p. 385). That would be an accurate recollection, because P&G hadn't used the suit in Bluff Creek and would have tossed it back at BH.

(They couldn't retrieve the suit while she was watching because—another implausibility—they had supposedly removed

it from its sack before handing it over for shipping.) If BH hadn't gone along with Opal's version, a glaring contradiction would have been presented to Long. But later, when that awkward situation had passed, BH wanted to tell his radio audience a tale that wouldn't arouse their incredulity.

More importantly, two years after talking to Long (which was in 2002), it might have occurred to BH that he should revise his story and claim that he encountered Patterson right after the film arrived, so he could say he handed over the postal insurance receipt at that point. He might have realized that someone might ask what happened to the receipt. (I did that myself in item K of my Amazon review of Long's book.) He couldn't say he threw it away, because he said he wanted evidence, such as suit-witnesses, that he'd been in the suit. So he almost *had* to create a story-version in which the receipt could have been handed over.

Two days after the filming Patterson was in a position to demand its return. (Two days after the filming was too soon for BH to get suspicious about non-payment, and his residence with the receipt in it was right there, so BH couldn't have stalled for time.)

| |
|--|
| <p>As Sherlock Holmes would say, from these facts a certain inference seems undeniable.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">- Robert Anton Wilson</p> |
|--|

Blundering Bob's Bodacious Bloopers: A Summary

| | Items are chronological under each heading
Yellow highlighting marks major items.
Indentation or typeface= multi-part query. | Answer 1 | Answer 2 | Answer 3 | Answer 4 |
|----------------------|--|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------|
| YAKIMA EVENTS | | | | | |
| 1 | When was BH approached about suit-wearing? | July or Aug. | September | | |
| 2 | Was BH concerned about possible illegality? | NO | YES | | |
| 3 | Did BH agree to wear the suit before he went to Tampico, or while he was there? | Before | While there | While there | |
| 4 | How many meetings were there in Tampico? | 2 | 2 or 3 | 1 | |
| 5 | How many suit try-ons were there? | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| 6 | What day did P&G leave? | Fri. or Sat. | -- | Sunday | -- |
| 7 | How many days later did BH depart? | 4 or 5 | 2 | 3 | 7 to 14 |
| 8 | Where was the rendezvous to be in CA? | Willow Creek | Weitchpec | Weitchpec | -- |
| 9 | How many days was BH away from Yakima? | 3 | 5 | 5 | |
| 1 | Was BH's employer on strike while filming? | -- | Y (per Long) | (NO) -lost a week's pay | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| | | | | | |
| 1 | Did BH ever see Patterson after the filming? | NO | YES | | |
| BLUFF CREEK EVENTS | | | | | |
| 1 | <i>How many miles from meet-up to BC Road?</i> | 3 | 2 or 3 | 5 or 10 | |
| 1 | <i>How many miles from the BC Road to camp?</i> | 4 or 5 | 2 | -- | |
| 1 | Was the filmsite right alongside the road? | YES | NO | | |
| 1 | Who put the film in the envelope? | Heironimus | Patterson | | |
| 1 | Who put the suit in the car? | Patterson | Heironimus | Heironimus | Patterson |
| 1 | What were Roger's track-stompers made of? | Plaster | Plaster | Plaster | doesn't know |
| 1 | Was a next-day film-announcement planned? | NO | YES | | |
| 1 | Did a next-day film-announcement occur? | NO | NO | YES | |
| 2 | Did BH sleep overnight in Eureka? | YES | NO | NO | YES |
| CONFIDENTIALITY & CONFESSION-RELATED EVENTS | | | | | |
| 2 | Did BH promise Patterson absolute secrecy? | YES | NO | | |
| 2 | <i>Did BH go to the Idle Hour bar?</i> | NO | YES | YES | YES |
| 2 | <i>Did he "reveal" the hoax to his buddies?</i> | (NO) | No memory | YES | YES |
| 2 | <i>Did he "tell" any buddy about the hoax?</i> | (NO) | (NO) | NO | YES |
| 2 | When did BH's buddies get the suit's purpose? | 2 or 3 weeks later | | At once | |
| 2 | Did his mom, Opal, ask BH about the suit? | NO | YES | | |
| 2 | Who leaked the news about the suit? | mom & aunt | buddies | | |
| 2 | If asked, "Was it really you in the suit"? when did BH first say "Yes"? | 1969 or '71 | 1999 | | |
| 2 | Did he talk to the media before 1999? | NO | YES | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------|
| 3 | Did BH come forward with money in mind? | YES | NO | | |
| 3 | Does BH have scruples now about hoaxing? | NO | YES | | |
| 3 | Is BH willing to take another lie detector test? | YES | NO | | |
| SUIT-RELATED ITEMS | | | | | |
| 3 | Was it easy to walk in the costume? | YES | NO | | |
| 3 | What extra material was glued onto the suit? | Fur Coat | Horsehide | | |
| 3 | Were the Bigfoot feet made of slippers? | YES | NO | | |
| 3 | How big was the gap behind the eye-holes? | 2 " | 1.5 " | 1 " | .25-.5 " |
| 3 | How high were the boots inside the suit? | Waist-high | Knee-high | Hip-high | |
| 3 | Was BH barefoot or shod in those boots? | Barefoot | Shod | | |
| 3 | Was there padding or a harness in the suit? | NEITHER | NO Belt | BOTH (padding & strap) | |
| 4 | Were there any metal parts in the suit? | NO | YES (a heavy zipper) | | |
| 4 | Where was the suit split? | Around the waist | | Up the back | |
| 4 | Did relatives remove the suit from the trunk? | NO | MAYBE | YES | |
| 4 | Was Patterson's Yakima suit-retrieval seen? | NO | YES | | |