

Recently I found a blog with the following headline: It was about an article that I posted on this site.

The site added their title which suggested that Richard Stubstad had “Leaked information” about someone else’s work. Below is the original article in question and followed by Mr. Stubstad’s rebuttal to the questionable and biased headline attached to his work.

Leaked Erickson Project Bigfoot DNA Study: 97% chance that sasquatch in fact does exist

Here's the article from Richard Substad:

I know most of the “players” involved in the DNA work; in fact, I have helped in some of the analyses from a statistical point of view. I have no prejudice as to whether the sasquai exist or not, but from the DNA I have seen and analyzed, I’ll give it a 97% chance that sasquatch in fact does exist (therefore no caps on the words sasquatch or the plural form sasquai).

As far as the exact race or species – I primarily have seen only some of the mtDNA sequences; that part is 100% Homo sapiens sapiens (assuming the samples I have seen are not hoaxes). Still, sasquatch could possibly be a hybrid species that is reproductively viable.

I doubt that Dr. Ketchum’s is the only DNA lab working on “Bigfoot DNA.” I believe (but don’t know for sure) that at least one, and possibly two or three others labs, are also working on Bigfoot DNA.

I favor the new hominid designation: “Homo sapiens sesqueqiencis”, in part in deference to a Plains American Indian tribe’s spelling of sasquatch and in part in deference to the newly-discovered ability of Neanderthal Man to mate with Cro Magnon et al., thus officially Neanderthal is now called: “Homo sapiens Neanderthalensis” (with a capital “N” because Neanderthal Man is reportedly extinct).

Based on the mtDNA of several purported sasquatch samples, statistically the “sapiens” part of the above-suggested Latin name is 97% certain.

Unless the whole thing is one huge and well-coordinated hoax.

I doubt it; some of the sasquatch players who have provided confirming samples would never cooperate with one another – never in a million years.

For you skeptics, put that in your pipes and smoke it.

In rebuttal, Richard Stubstad wrote the following:

I hadn't noticed this post even though it involves some of the materials I have written.

A few "issues":

- 1) This wasn't intended to be a leak. Since I am no longer working with Dr. Ketchum according to her own personal desires, I am simply reporting on the work I did, without assistance, on the mtDNA analysis of the first two unspecified mtDNA samples.
- 2) Dr. K is incorrect; I'm not at all "misinformed" about her ongoing DNA work on various purported sasquatch samples; I'm not informed whatsoever, much beyond what I have already stated.
- 3) What I stated was not the result of Dr. K's own work; she merely provided the mtDNA sequencing that others (who provided samples) had paid for. I also paid for some of the testing involved out of my own pocket.
- 4) Dr. K did not initially notice the close connection between Samples 1 and 2; I did the statistical analysis and told her, quite openly, of the statistical results since we and several others were intimately involved in this exciting and cooperative research when it started.
- 5) Within a short period of time, she excluded me from what quickly turned into "her" project, along with several others. She told me that her lawyer(s) told her to do so. This does resemble the smell of blood, eh?

6) I already stated I know very little about the nuDNA results; even though I (and others) paid for both the mtDNA and nuDNA testing. She has not informed anyone else I know about of the actual DNA sequences from either the nuDNA analyses or much about any further mtDNA results, also presumably upon the advice of counsel.

7) I doubt that a "one woman show" will do much if anything to convince the scientific community (through a peer reviewed paper, as originally agreed to in partnership with Dr. K about the existence of sasquatch).

8) A peer-reviewed scientific journal article generally involve at least a half-dozen, sometimes even two dozen or more, co-authors. That approach would work if carried out properly and objectively, but how are we to get that far without cooperating amongst ourselves in the sasquatch/bigfoot research community, let alone with other "neutral" and objective co-scientists?

9) I never stated that the Erickson Project was involved; in fact I didn't state WHO was involved at all. Only that two DIFFERENT and totally disparate groups or individuals were involved with the first two samples tested. See the two links below for clues about whom Dr. K may now be working with:

<http://www.olympicproject.com/id15.html>

http://www.nabigfootsearch.com/bigfoot_dna.html

10) To my knowledge at least, neither of the two above links are associated whatsoever with the Erickson project. It remains to be seen who ends up in the tent aiming out or outside the tent aiming in, to put it politely. For more information about the Erickson Project, see link:

<http://www.sasquatchthequest.com/>

11) If you read the materials on this link, then you know pretty much what I do about the Erickson project. Again, I do not know to what extent Dr. K is still connected to the Erickson project, or the other two projects listed under #10 above, or all three of the above (highly doubtful).

12) Lastly, for more information on some of my own analyses (this is NOT a "leak" about anyone else's work), see the link:

<http://www.sciencealivenews.com/>

Richard Stubstad, P.E.
Engineering and Statistical Consulting