

A Critical Analysis of Claims of a Patterson–Gimlin Film Hoax as made by Heironimus, Morris, Long, & Korff

By Steve Kulls

The 1967 Patterson–Gimlin film (PGF) remains the most famous Bigfoot footage. Over the years, various individuals have attempted to discredit the film as a hoax, most notably Bob Heironimus (who claims he wore a Bigfoot suit in the film) and Phillip Morris (who claims he supplied that suit), as well as author Greg Long (whose book *The Making of Bigfoot* argues the film was staged) with assistance from Kal Korff.

However, a close examination of their claims reveals serious inconsistencies, lack of evidence, and clear biases. This Critical Analysis visits these problems in detail to show that the hoax accusations fail to credibly debunk the Patterson–Gimlin film.

1. Bob Heironimus: Inconsistent and Contradictory Statements

Bob Heironimus stepped forward decades after the film, claiming he was the man in a Bigfoot costume. From the start, his story has been riddled with **inconsistencies and changing details**:

- **Contradictory Descriptions of the “Bigfoot” Suit:** Heironimus’ descriptions of the alleged costume have changed over time. In early accounts, he claimed the suit was made from *horse hide*, even asserting that Roger Patterson had “skinned out a dead, red horse” to create it. He described the hide as heavy (estimating 20–25 lbs.) and foul-smelling. Later, after contact with costume-seller Phillip Morris, Heironimus’ story shifted to say the suit was made of *Dynel*, a synthetic fur cloth. These two descriptions are completely at odds, a smelly, 25-pound horsehide versus a lightweight synthetic fur, undermining Heironimus’ credibility. Even Greg Long admits in his book that Heironimus and Morris “describe different ape suits in many respects,” including the material (horsehide vs. Dynel).
- **Discrepancies in Suit Construction Details:** Beyond the material, Heironimus has given conflicting details about the suit’s design. He initially described a two-piece outfit; a top (like a shirt) and separate bottom that tied with a drawstring, with hands and feet attached to the arms/legs of the suit. In contrast, Morris claimed his gorilla suit was a one-piece jumpsuit with separate gloves and feet, zippered up the back. Long speculated Patterson might have modified Morris’s suit to attach the hands and feet but offered no evidence for this claim. Furthermore, Heironimus never described being measured or fitted for any alterations. Notably, Heironimus even changed his story about the boots he wore at one

point he said he used hip waders “that go up to your waist,” but later he claimed they were only knee-high irrigation boots. Such flip-flops on basic details (suit material, construction, boots) indicate that Heironimus’s narrative evolved to fit new information, rather than being a consistent firsthand account.

- **Lack of Knowledge About the Filming Location and Conditions:** Investigators have pointed out that Heironimus’s recollections of the film shoot don’t line up with known facts about Bluff Creek. For example, Heironimus has described the day of filming as “*really, really hot*,” saying he was sweating inside the suit. Weather records for the region on October 20, 1967 (the film date) show it was a cool day (approx. 55°F). Locals also note that Heironimus’ claimed travel time to the film site was unrealistically short (about 40 minutes), whereas it takes several hours, suggesting he had never actually been there. Heironimus could not even identify the exact location or route to Bluff Creek when asked. No witnesses in California recalled seeing any third person with Patterson and Gimlin during the expedition, and Patterson’s widow as well as Bob Gimlin flatly say Heironimus’s story is false. If Heironimus truly had been present, he should have demonstrated clearer knowledge of the events and location, instead his vague or incorrect recollections cast doubt on his claims.
- **No Contemporary Evidence of His Role – Only Late “Confessions”:** Importantly, Heironimus never produced the alleged costume (he claims it was returned and disappeared) and no photographs or diary entries from 1967 substantiate his involvement. His name did not surface publicly in connection to the film until around 2002. Heironimus has asserted he stayed silent for decades because he *expected payment* and feared legal trouble for fraud. Yet it’s known that he privately boasted about “being Bigfoot” to friends as early as 1967. His own mother and nephew recall seeing a gorilla suit in his car shortly after the film date, and a friend says Heironimus confided the hoax to him within weeks. In fact, people in Heironimus’s hometown of Yakima reported that for years he talked about finding a way to make money off the Bigfoot film “like his famous neighbor did.” This contradicts his claim of staying silent out of fear as he was willing to talk when it suited him, yet he never sought any official acknowledgement until decades later when a book deal beckoned.
- **Admission of Financial Motivation:** When he finally went public, Heironimus openly admitted money was a driving factor. In a 2004 interview with *The Washington Post*, he lamented, “Somebody’s making lots of money off this, except for me,” and then added, “Sure I want to make some money. I feel that after 36 years I should get some of it.” In another filmed interview, when asked why he was coming forward after so long, Heironimus responded, “All these people have been making money off that footage for years. It’s my turn now.” Such statements strongly suggest that profit, not just altruistic

truth-telling, spurred his “confession.” Indeed, he received paid media appearances and was featured in Greg Long’s book, opportunities that only arose once he claimed to be “the man in the suit.” This financial incentive casts doubt on his credibility and creates a clear motive to fabricate or embellish a hoax story.

In summary, Bob Heironimus’s narrative is erratic and unsubstantiated. Key details about the supposed suit have shifted notably over time, aligning conveniently with information provided by others (like Morris) rather than consistent personal memory. He has demonstrated poor knowledge of the actual circumstances of the PGF encounter, and by his own words he was motivated by money and resentment at being left out. These inconsistencies and admissions undermine Heironimus’s claim that he was the Bigfoot in the Patterson film. As Canadian researcher John Green bluntly said about the Heironimus tale: “It’s all [expletive]”. Even Bigfoot skeptics acknowledge that Heironimus’s story is not airtight – it relies entirely on his say-so and has “dozens and dozens of inconsistencies.”

2. Phillip Morris: No Evidence for the “Costume Supplier” Claim (and a Shady Track Record)

Another pillar of the hoax theory is the claim by Phillip Morris, a costume vendor, that he sold Roger Patterson the ape suit used in the film. Morris, owner of Morris Costumes in North Carolina, has repeatedly asserted he was the secret source of “Bigfoot.” However, Morris’s account is unsupported by hard evidence and his credibility is tainted by questionable business practices in other ventures.

- **No Receipt, No Records, No Physical Proof:** Morris alleges that in 1967 he sold an off-the-shelf gorilla suit to Patterson for \$435. Yet he has never produced any documentation of this sale like, no invoice, order form, receipt, or shipping record bearing Patterson’s name. Morris himself admitted he has “no records” of Patterson (or anyone on his behalf) purchasing a suit but insists he “remembers” selling it. This memory surfaced *more than thirty years* after the fact, which by itself is dubious. Additionally, the original costume has never been located or authenticated. Patterson died in 1972, and no Bigfoot costume was found among his possessions. If Morris did provide a suit, one would expect some paper trail or a surviving example of the same model costume. Instead, the claim rests solely on Morris’s late assertion that he recognized the Bigfoot in the film as one of his own products.
- **An Implausible “Recognition” after Decades:** Morris says that when he saw the famous footage on television, he immediately *recognized his suit* and realized Patterson had hoaxed the world. This claim strains credulity. The Patterson creature (“Patty”) displays anatomy and movement that many experts consider highly unusual for a mere costume. For Morris to positively identify *from grainy footage* a generic gorilla suit he purportedly sold by mail order (one of many he made and sold in the 1960s) is highly

suspect, especially with no records to corroborate the sale. Even Greg Long noted significant differences between Morris's standard gorilla suit and what Heironimus described/pictured. For example, Morris's suit used Dynel fur and came with separate hands and feet, whereas Patty exhibits attached hands/feet and other modifications that *no one* has proven were made. Morris later tried to demonstrate a similar suit for documentaries, but the results were unconvincing as the suit looked obviously fake and failed to replicate Patty's look and gait (which is why Long and Heironimus floated additional modifications and accessories like football shoulder pads to explain Patty's features). In fact, at one point Heironimus and Morris collaborated to create a "*replica*" *Patty suit* for a TV news segment, which Morris then offered to sell for \$7–8,000. Tellingly, this replica was far more elaborate (latex enhancements, custom fitting) than the simple \$435 gorilla suit Morris originally claimed Patterson bought. The need to build a new, expensive suit to mimic Patty highlights that Morris's off-the-rack costume was never capable of fooling anyone, undermining his story that such a suit was the film's basis.

- **Changing and Opportunistic Story:** Originally, before linking up with Morris, Bob Heironimus had claimed the suit was handmade (the "horse hide" tale). Only after Morris came forward did the story pivot to fit Morris's narrative of a store-bought costume. This sequence suggests Morris's and Heironimus's accounts were retrofitted to support each other, rather than independently verifiable. It's also telling that Morris waited until 2002 (when Long was researching his book) to publicly claim involvement despite the PGF's fame since 1967. By his own admission, Morris had been aware of the film and suspected it was his suit for decades. Why stay silent so long? Morris implied he didn't want to undermine a "good mystery" for Bigfoot enthusiasts, but skeptics suspect he saw an opportunity for free publicity in hitching his name to the famous film. Indeed, after the story broke, Morris basked in media attention and as noted, even tried to market "Bigfoot" costumes based on the notoriety. This opportunism raises doubts about his motives.
- **Prior Questionable Business Dealings:** Phillip Morris's ethics and honesty in business have been challenged before, which bears on his credibility now. Notably, Morris Costumes was involved in a high-profile lawsuit in the late 1990s over unlicensed Barney the Dinosaur costumes. Lyons Partnership (owners of Barney) sued Morris Costumes and its owners (Phillip Morris and Amy Morris) for producing and renting out knockoff "Barney" suits under names like "Purple Dino" and "Duffy the Dragon," alleging willful copyright and trademark infringement. A federal judge found that Morris's costumes infringed Barney's likeness (though he stopped short of awarding damages, ruling the infringement wasn't willful). In other words, Morris's company profited from unauthorized copies of a famous character. This case (Lyons Partnership v. Morris Costumes, 1999) suggests a willingness on Morris's part to mislead customers and push legal boundaries for profit. Additionally, Phillip Morris attempted to claim credit for

inspiring the “Dr. Evil” character from the *Austin Powers* films asserting that Mike Myers’s villain copied Morris’s own decades-old local TV persona “Dr. Evil,” and even demanding compensation for this supposed likeness. That claim was dismissed as baseless, with the film’s producers easily showing that Myers developed Dr. Evil independently. The pattern is clear: Morris has a history of making grandiose claims against famous pop-culture icons (Barney, Dr. Evil, Bigfoot), either to protect a financial interest or to grab a bit of the spotlight. Each time, the claims have been thin on evidence. This track record of dubious assertions and legal run-ins calls into question the trustworthiness of Morris’s Bigfoot tale.

In sum, Phillip Morris provides no concrete evidence that he supplied a Bigfoot costume to Patterson, only his unverified recollection. His description of the suit conflicts with other aspects of the hoax narrative, and he has a personal incentive to promote the story (selling costumes and seeking notoriety). Combined with his past business of selling knock-off costumes and making opportunistic claims, Morris’s account is far from credible. Even some skeptics caution that Morris’s story, while tantalizing, “does not... disprove” the Patterson film by itself, especially in absence of the actual suit. Without physical proof or documentation, Morris’s allegation remains an unproven story that fails to conclusively explain how the film was faked.

3. Greg Long’s *The Making of Bigfoot*: A Predetermined Narrative and Biased Methods

Journalist Greg Long published *The Making of Bigfoot* (2004) as an investigative exposé intended to settle the hoax question once and for all. The book centers on Heironimus’s confession and a litany of negative portrayals of Roger Patterson. While Long gathered many interviews and pieces of circumstantial information, his research and writing exhibit clear bias and a “predetermined narrative” essentially, he approached the project convinced that Patterson was a fraud and Bigfoot a sham, and he selectively framed evidence to fit that conclusion.

- **“On a Mission” to Portray Patterson as a Conman:** Numerous sources, including some whom Long interviewed, have criticized his one-sided depiction of Roger Patterson. Long painted Patterson as “a cheat, a liar, and a thief,” focusing on instances where Patterson allegedly failed to repay debts or borrowed equipment without returning it. Residents of Yakima who spoke with Long later complained that their comments were distorted or taken out of context to make Patterson look bad. According to these locals, Long seemed determined to cast Patterson as a “petty criminal,” harping on his financial troubles while ignoring mitigating facts. For example, Patterson was dying of cancer not long after the film was made (he passed away in 1972), which left some personal debts unpaid, hardly unusual for someone struck down in his 40s. As one observer noted, many people who die young leave “loose ends and debts. Does that make them petty criminals? Greg Long would have you think so.”

- Long's book repeatedly emphasizes Patterson's monetary debts and disputes, implying these were the driving force for a hoax. This character assassination overshadows a more balanced view of Patterson as a passionate, if imperfect, researcher. The bias is evident in Long's approach: he reportedly told Yakima residents that Patterson "made a heap of money" from the film and that Long was seeking anyone who "*was owed money by Patterson or who would bear witness against him.*" In other words, Long was actively soliciting negative testimonials, priming sources to think of Patterson in terms of who he cheated. This agenda likely skewed the testimony he gathered.
- **Selective Use of Testimony & Ignoring Contrary Evidence:** Long's narrative relies heavily on interviews with people recalling events 35+ years in the past – memories that are naturally fallible and susceptible to influence. Yet he tends to accept and highlight statements that support the hoax scenario, while downplaying or excluding those that don't. For instance, he gives weight to claims that various people "heard about" a Bigfoot hoax in Yakima in 1967, or saw an ape suit in a car, etc., as "corroborating" evidence. But these are all unverified anecdotes that could easily be cases of retroactive hearsay or mistaken memory (small-town rumors often take on a life of their own). Conversely, Long did not meaningfully include viewpoints from Patterson's defenders or neutral experts. He never interviewed Bob Gimlin (Patterson's partner and the only other eyewitness to the filmed creature) for the book, likely because at the time, Gimlin was not speaking to the press. However, Gimlin and Patterson's widow Patricia Patterson were very alive and have since vehemently denied Heironimus's story. Both would have been available to a serious investigator for comment, yet their rebuttals are essentially absent from Long's work. Additionally, the book gives short shrift to the physical evidence that supports the film's authenticity (such as the detailed footprint casts, the biomechanics analysis of the creature's movement, etc.). Long essentially dismisses any evidence of Bigfoot's reality and instead zeroes in on building a hoax case through character witness accounts and circumstantial tidbits. This imbalance shows that Long was not conducting an objective inquiry but rather building a prosecution case in the court of public opinion.
- **Framing Everything as Part of the Hoax:** At times, Long's determination to fit facts into a hoax narrative borders on the absurd. For example, he learned that Roger Patterson had come across a Bigfoot sighting story by William Roe (a Canadian prospector) that Patterson found inspiring. Long dubs Roe's account "the script" for the Patterson film, insinuating that Patterson choreographed the hoax to match it. But just because Patterson was aware of other sighting reports (a normal thing for any researcher) doesn't mean he committed fraud. This reasoning illustrates confirmation bias as Long interprets every piece of Patterson's background (interest in making a documentary, financial struggles, enthusiasm for Bigfoot lore) as evidence of guilt, rather than alternative explanations. As skeptic writer Sharon A. Hill observed in her review of *The Making of Bigfoot*, Long's book piles on "pickup truck loads of circumstantial evidence" and tangential side-stories,

but in the end “the true bottom line is not clear. There is no Bigfoot suit.” Despite all of Long’s efforts to frame Patterson and Gimlin as hoaxers, he failed to produce the single most convincing piece of evidence: the alleged costume itself. Hill notes that while the book might sway an undecided reader toward thinking the film *could* be a hoax, it is *not definitive* and crucially, no physical proof of a hoax is ever presented

- **Tone and Bias Acknowledged by Skeptics:** Even those inclined to doubt the Patterson film have recognized Long’s bias. Hill remarked that the book could have been better if it were shorter and less bogged down by irrelevant travelogue details, more evidence that Long was perhaps trying to pad weak evidence with colorful storytelling. She also pointed out that Long included superfluous tales (like a side story about a western town and band anecdotes) with no clear relevance, which diluted the impact of the factual core. This suggests Long was more interested in creating a dramatic narrative than a tightly focused analysis. More bluntly, Bigfoot researcher Matt MoneyMaker labeled Long, Heironimus, and Korff “the parasitic trio,” noting they gambled on Gimlin never speaking out while they smeared him and Patterson. Indeed, once Bob Gimlin did begin publicly refuting their claims, it exposed how one-sided Long’s investigation had been. John Green, after reading Long’s book, flatly called it “bullshit” and predicted “libel actions flying”. While no libel suit materialized (in the U.S., you generally can’t libel the dead, and Patterson was deceased), Green’s reaction underscores how unconvincing and slanted Long’s case appeared to those familiar with the subject.

In the end, Greg Long’s *The Making of Bigfoot* comes across as a prosecutor’s brief against Patterson rather than an impartial investigation. The bias is clear in the way evidence is cherry-picked and interpreted only in the light most favorable to the hoax hypothesis. The book provided a veneer of legitimacy to Heironimus’s and Morris’s claims by packaging them in a detailed story, but when scrutinized, it fails to deliver a knockout blow. As Hill noted, a decade after its publication “nothing new [has] come to light” and the PGF is “disputed same as before”. In other words, Long’s biased exposé did not settle the matter; it simply added one controversial (and questionable) account to the lore. Without corroboration by physical evidence or truly reliable witnesses, *The Making of Bigfoot* ultimately relies on assumption and insinuation, literally a house of cards that collapses when its key sources (Heironimus and Morris) are themselves discredited by their inconsistencies and lack of proof.

4. Kal Korff: A Dubious Collaborator with Fantastical Credentials

Any discussion of the Long/Heironimus hoax narrative must include Kal Korff, who played a behind-the-scenes role in publicizing and shaping the story. Korff is credited by Long as having helped track down witnesses and piece together the hoax claims, and he appeared in media coverage of the book around 2004. However, far from adding credibility, Kal Korff’s involvement is a major red flag. Korff is a self-styled “investigator” known in UFO and

paranormal circles and has a long history of publicity stunts, false credentials, and bizarre claims that utterly undermine his reliability.

- **Korff's Role in the Bigfoot Hoax Story:** Kal Korff took it upon himself to promote Bob Heironimus's confession in the early 2000s. He was instrumental in connecting Heironimus with media outlets and even appeared on television segments alongside him. In essence, Korff acted as a PR agent for the hoax narrative, helping to "shape the Heironimus story for the press." Given this role, it's important to scrutinize Korff's own credibility. Notably, respected radio host Art Bell once described Kal Korff as "the most brazen media deceiver in the country". This is not a trivial accusation as Bell was referred to Korff's tendency to inject himself into sensational stories (usually in the UFO field) and distort the truth for attention. The Bigfoot case appears no different: Korff saw an opportunity to latch onto a sensational claim (exposing the famous film) and gain notoriety by association.
- **False Claims of Elite Intelligence Credentials:** Perhaps the most egregious mark against Korff's honesty is his long-standing claim to be a "Colonel in the Israeli Special Secret Services." For years, Korff publicly portrayed himself as an officer working in counterterrorism for Israel – an extraordinary assertion that, if true, would mean he was a covert operative. This claim has been exposed as totally fabricated. Investigators and even casual bloggers eventually unraveled the truth: Korff never served in any official Israeli intelligence or military organization. What he did have was a stint as a security guard in the private sector, which he inflated into a make-believe title. Online records and testimonies suggest Korff worked as a low-level security officer (at one point a bank guard), and he grandiosely reinvented this role as being a "colonel" in a fictitious agency. One close observer mocked that Korff "went from [...] working as a security guard to becoming a 'colonel' in something that has never existed," calling it a case of "incredible delusion". In a video Korff himself posted, he even showed an ID card to a U.S. Embassy guard, claiming it was his Israeli Special Secret Services identification. It turned out to be his old media pass from a defunct magazine. In 2010, Korff was formally reported to the real Mossad (Israel's intelligence agency) as an imposter pretending to be their agent. Someone who concocts such an elaborate false persona is not a trustworthy source for an honest account of anything.
- **History of Dubious Claims and Personal Fraud:** Korff's tall tales aren't limited to his fake Israeli colonel status. He has boasted of having multiple PhDs (he has none), of being a computer scientist, a journalist, an anti-terror specialist, basically a litany of self-aggrandizing claims with little or no basis in fact. He has engaged in public feuds in the UFO community, accusing others of lying while himself being caught in lie after lie. For example, Korff once loudly accused a decorated WWII veteran and Roswell UFO witness of being a liar, while Korff himself was masquerading with a pretend military rank. The hypocrisy and compulsive dishonesty are well documented. In the context of

the Patterson–Gimlin film, Korff’s involvement taints the hoax theory significantly. He reportedly was heavily involved in assembling Long’s case, yet his presence prompted skepticism even among other skeptics. The Bigfoot Field Researchers Organization bluntly labeled Korff a “notorious publicity scam-artist” and pointed out his “delusional pathology”. In short, Korff appears to crave the spotlight and will say almost anything to keep himself in it.

- **Korff’s Influence on Long’s Research:** It’s worth noting that Greg Long partnered with Korff during his investigation. The two traveled and interviewed sources together (Sharon Hill’s review mentions “the pair checking into a hotel and talking over the evidence” in Nancy Drew fashion). This means that Korff’s confirmation bias and lack of scruples likely fed into the project. Any information Korff “found” or any witness he located must be viewed with suspicion, given his propensity to distort. For instance, the interviews with Heironimus’s family and friends in Yakima (claiming they heard of the hoax back in ’67) could well have been primed or influenced by Korff’s involvement. We know Korff is adept at manipulating narratives, it’s plausible he helped coach Heironimus and others on what to say, or selectively passed information to Long. Essentially, Korff’s participation raises the possibility that the hoax story was, at least in part, engineered by someone with a record of hoaxes. This is deeply ironic and undermines the entire “exposé.” If the goal was to reveal the truth, partnering with a chronic fabulist like Korff is a strange choice unless the goal was to create a splashy story regardless of truth.

In summary, Kal Korff’s association with the Patterson film hoax claims is a huge detriment to their credibility. His personal history of deceit, exemplified by the absurd “Israeli Secret Service Colonel” lie, shows he has little regard for truth. Far from being a whistleblower, Korff is exactly the sort of person who would *manufacture* or inflate a hoax narrative to gain attention. When evaluating the Heironimus/Morris/Long claims, the involvement of Korff is like a warning label: “*Caution – this story may be a hoax itself.*” If the accusers intended to be taken seriously, one of the worst things they could do is involve someone like Kal Korff. The fact that he was a key player in bringing forth the hoax allegation gives skeptics of the hoax (and supporters of the film’s authenticity) ample reason to doubt the entire tale.

Conclusion

After examining the major players and elements of the Patterson–Gimlin film hoax claims, we find that the case against the film falls apart under scrutiny. Bob Heironimus’s story is riddled with inconsistencies, changing details, and admitted ulterior motives, making his claim to have worn a Bigfoot suit in 1967 highly suspect. Phillip Morris’s assertion that he supplied the costume is unsupported by any evidence and appears to be an opportunistic grab for credit, in

line with his history of questionable business tactics (such as peddling knock-off Barney costumes and making spurious intellectual property claims). Greg Long's book *The Making of Bigfoot*, while giving the hoax theory a sheen of investigative legitimacy, is undermined by clear bias as Long set out to prove a hoax and selectively framed evidence to fit that narrative, ultimately providing a lot of smoke but no fire (notably, no actual suit or smoking-gun proof was ever produced). Finally, the involvement of Kal K. Korff in propagating the hoax story injects a toxic level of unreliability; Korff's well-documented falsehoods and self-promotions suggest that the hoax narrative itself may be, at least in part, a concoction by individuals seeking fame or profit rather than a factual account.

Taken together, the claims of Heironimus, Morris, Long, and Korff do not credibly discredit the Patterson–Gimlin film. Each component of the hoax theory has serious flaws:

- The alleged hoax participants cannot keep their story straight (e.g. Heironimus's suit description changed drastically, and his knowledge of events is questionable).
- The supposed costume provider offers nothing tangible to support his tale and has a motive to lie (publicity and sales).
- The author/investigator driving the hoax narrative approached the topic with a conclusion in mind and filtered the evidence to suit that conclusion, rather than letting the evidence lead to an unbiased conclusion. The facilitator behind the scenes (Korff) has a personal history that suggests he is more interested in creating sensational stories than in uncovering truth.

Meanwhile, the Patterson–Gimlin film itself endures. In over fifty years, no one has produced a duplicate costume or an exact recreation of the film that matches its details, despite modern technology, a testament to how remarkable the original footage remains. Bob Gimlin, who was there, continues to stand by what he saw, and analysts point out aspects of the film subject's anatomy and movement that would be extremely hard to fake convincingly, even today. The hoax proponents have had to continually adjust their claims (adding new layers like shoulder pads, altered masks, etc.) in attempts to explain those details, which ironically makes their story *more* convoluted and less believable over time.

In the court of public opinion, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. The claim that the Patterson–Gimlin film was a hoax orchestrated with a man in a suit is certainly extraordinary, given the film's iconic status. Yet, as shown, the evidence presented by Heironimus, Morris, Long, and Korff is extraordinarily weak with inconsistent testimony, uncorroborated anecdotes, and suspect motivations. By contrast, the film's proponents ask us to believe only that Patterson and Gimlin filmed something unusual that day, a claim supported by the enduring, unrefuted footage and corroborating footprint casts.

In conclusion, the Patterson–Gimlin film has not been credibly debunked by these hoax allegations. On the contrary, the way Heironimus's and Morris's stories keep shifting, and the clear bias with which Long and Korff packaged those stories, give us more reason to question the accusers than to question the film.

Skepticism is healthy, but in this case the skepticism is best directed at the hoax claim itself. The Patterson–Gimlin film thus remains what it has always been: a fascinating piece of footage that, despite countless attempts, has not been proven a hoax.

References:

- Washington Post – “*Sasquatch Speaks: The Truth Is Out There*”, Reliable Source column (Richard Leiby), March 7, .
- Bigfoot Field Researchers Org. – “*Was the Patterson-Gimlin film ever proven to be a hoax?*” (Matt MoneyMaker, 2010).
- Wikipedia – “*Patterson–Gimlin film* .
- *The Making of Bigfoot* by Greg Long (2004) – as reviewed by Sharon A. Hill (2014) on *Doubtful* blog .
- *Kalisanidiot* blog – documentation of Kal Korff’s false “Colonel” claims and background (2008–2010).
- **Additional references:** Reddit analysis of Heironimus’s interview statements.
- *Lyons Partnership v. Morris Costumes* (4th Cir. 1999) .
- Art Bell’s description of Kal Korff.
- John Green and Bob Gimlin’s responses to the hoax claims.