The RELICT HOMINOID INQUIRY 4:75-78 (2015)

Comment

NORMAL SCIENCE, REVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE
Notes on Bryan Sykes' *The Nature of the Beast*

Hominology research has been joined in recent years by two geneticists: Dr. Melba Ketchum of the USA and Dr. Bryan Sykes of Great Britain. This in itself is a major development, indicating that hominology is making progress and entering a promising stage. These notes are occasioned by Sykes' book *The Nature of the Beast* (London: Coronet, 2015), in which the author explains why he became engaged in cryptozoology-hominology and tells of his investigations. His very clear explanation of the aim and method of his work deserves great appreciation from hominologists, providing excellent lessons in genetics relative to hominology. I see this as the main asset of the book. Regrettably, being a novice in this field, Dr. Sykes presents a wrong picture of hominology's scientific status and situation, and it is on this aspect of the book that I intend to focus attention in my initial notes on the book.

On p. 10 we read the following: "In almost every book written by cryptozoologists, as those who study creatures 'unknown to science' are called, I encountered the complaint that they had been 'rejected by science.' As a scientist, I knew very well that science does not reject anything out of hand. Science is a way of trying to make sense of the world that relies on evidence. As such science is, at heart, a branch of philosophy, which is the reason practitioners qualify as PhDs – Doctors of Philosophy. Science is a philosophy based not on opinion or subjective judgment or orders from a higher authority or from God, but on evidence. I felt as though my profession was unfairly accused by the community of cryptozoologists."

Number one, Sykes does not differentiate cryptozoology and hominology. It's like not differentiate paleontology and paleoanthropology. Mammoth fossils are studied by paleontologists, Neanderthal and Gigantopithecus fossils by paleoanthropologists. On p. 163 the author defines cryptozoology: 'The search for animals whose existence is not proven'. While in a Press Release he presents his grand Project to which the book is devoted in this way: SCIENTISTS SEARCH FOR YETI DNA. The Oxford-Lausanne Collateral Hominid Project (p. 162). In cryptozoology, by his definition, we are after 'animals whose existence is not proven.' But in his Project he is in search of evidence for hominids whose existence is not proven yet to the scientific community (my addition). When Sykes deals with presumed evidence for the existence of unproven and unidentified hominids he works within hominology, and when he attempts to discover new species of bear in Nepal he is engaged in cryptozoology. As a matter of fact, the book deals mainly with unidentified hominids, not unidentified bears. The father of cryptozoology is Bernard Heuvelmans, the father of hominology is

Boris Porshnev. He wrote of the "emerging science of relict hominoids" in 1963. In 1972, after his passing, I coined and started using the term *hominology*.

The discrepancy of non-distinguishing between cryptozoology and hominology is felt throughout the book, as, for example, in this sentence: "Cryptozoology is not short of good stories, but none beats the case of the Pangboche Finger" (p. 191). The Pangboche Hand is clearly a hominid (human) hand, an object of anthropology, not zoology, so none of cryptozoology either. As a result, as soon as first DNA testing showed that the Pangboche Finger was 'human' (what else could it be?), it was rejected as evidence and not subjected to deeper analysis. Hominology has been suffering all along from this deplorable tactic of geneticists who are ignorant of our science.

At this stage, the similarity between cryptozoology and hominology, like between paleontology and paleoanthropology, is in methodology of investigation, in the sources of evidence, such as history, folklore, testimonials, sightings, footprints, etc. Hominology is still at a cryptoanthropological stage of development and this what makes it confused with cryptozoology. But the difference is clear and I hope to mention its further significance later.

Number two, the author uses the term science in the above cited passage in a strange way, as if anyone of our community accused science of misbehavior. I've never read that. Complaint is not against science, but scientists, the scientific community, or, more to the point, against the SCIENTIFIC ESTABLISHMENT. Evidence of its pressures, bans, rejections and misbehavior is galore and duly documented in the hominological literature. In Russia, this concerns the careers of, among others, such researchers as Boris Porshnev, Dmitri Bayanov, Igor Burtsev; in the US, Grover Krantz, Jeff Meldrum; in Canada, John Bindernagel. Said the latter in 1998: "In my own case I used to be very concerned about how my interest in the sasquatch, if made public, would affect my reputation as a wildlife biologist, and hence my employ-ability. When, after almost twenty-five years of research, I had reviewed enough evidence to be certain about the existence of the sasquatch, I finally came "out of the closet" with my interest in this species" (John Bindernagel, *North America's Great Ape: the Sasquatch*, 1998, p. 20). In 2010, the following is said in the Foreword of his book *The Discovery of the Sasquatch*: "Scientists who publicly express an interest in the sasquatch phenomenon risk doing serious damage to their reputations, and the institutions that employ them may frown upon even indirect associations with the subject."

Is this not in contradiction with what Dr. Sykes says about our situation in relation to science? And why did he feel as though his "profession was being unfairly accused?" Not clear at all. On the contrary, his interest in hominology and wish to help and contribute are highly welcome. But to be really helpful and fruitful he has to realize that he is still a student in our field, not a professor; in other words, still bound to do a lot of home work. That his efforts in this respect have not been sufficient so far is evident from the very subtitle of the book: The first scientific evidence on the survival of apemen into modern times. There is discrepancy here, too. If the statement is true, this means Dr. Sykes has proved the existence of relict hominids. But there is no such claim on his part in the book. So far Sykes is not even convinced the apemen really exist! Then what about the title of the volume – The *Nature of the Beast*? Non-existent beasts can't but be devoid of nature.

The heading of Chapter 14 is "Good Science, Bad Science." This true and proper distinction is useful for our theme. But immeasurably more proper and even crucial for us are the terms *normal science* and *revolutionary science*, as set out by Thomas

Kuhn in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 1962. The greatest scientific revolution occurred when scientists recognized that the Earth moves and goes around the Sun. Copernicus, Galileo, Bruno, Kepler and others were its first revolutionary scientists. It was a revolution in astronomy, in philosophy, in the worldview. Overcoming great resistance and suffering casualties, the revolution won and astronomy today is a normal science. Thus, sciences can turn from normal to revolutionary and vice versa.

A minor revolution in astronomy occurred in the 18th century when scientists learned, to their greatest surprise, that heaven is capable of "dropping" stones onto earth. This had been known to non-scientists throughout history but scientists viewed the notion as superstition. This is the most analogous case to what we experience in hominology (see my article "A Hominologist's View from Moscow, USSR" in *The Scientist Looks at the Sasquatch*, 1977). Meteoritics was a revolutionary science then and is a normal science today.

The greatest scientific revolution after the Copernican was the Darwinian, since it concerned the origin of man, being also a revolution in philosophy and the worldview. But unlike the Copernican revolution, the Darwinian has not won yet! And this is tragic for mankind. To give you just one example, Islamic fundamentalism, extremism and terrorism would have been impossible if all young people on earth knew the evolutionary origin of man.

The latter, after Darwin and Thomas Huxley, has been proven and substantiated by paleoanthropologists. Their discipline was also revolutionary in the beginning, a front line of Darwinism at the time, overcoming the resistance of conservative anthropologists and biologists of normal science. Today, paleoanthropologists are normal scientists and the main opponents of hominologists because hominology *is* a revolutionary science today, the front line of the on-going Darwinian Revolution.

The proof is in the oft quoted words of John Napier: "But if any one of them is real then as scientists we have a lot to explain. Among other things we shall have to re-write the story of human evolution. We shall have to accept that Homo sapiens is not the one and only living product of the hominid line, and we shall have to admit that there are still major mysteries to be solved in a world we thought we knew so well" (In his book *Bigfoot*: *The Yeti and Sasquatch in Myth and Reality*, 1973).

Time to quote Thomas Kuhn: "Normal science, the activity in which most scientists inevitably spend almost all their time, is predicted on the assumption that the scientific community knows what the world is like. (…) Normal science, for example, often suppresses fundamental novelties because they are necessarily subversive of its basic commitments." We understand, of course, that, saying normal science is often suppressive, Kuhn means normal scientists, not science. He means the scientific community which is acting on the assumption that it knows "what the world is like."

In their turn paleoanthropologists, engaged in their normal science, are acting on the idiotic assumption that all pre-sapiens hominids died out at the time shown by the last fossil findings, quietly ignoring the famous coelacanth case. They are quietly ignoring the fact that the central term of anthropology – *Homo sapiens* – was introduced not by them, but Linnaeus, as the opposite of *Homo troglodytes* (*H. t. sylvestris* and *H. t. nocturna*). No wonder hominology is subversive of paleoanthropologists' basic commitments. At the same time, it is paleoanthropologists who are recognized as the only experts and judges on the question of hominid extinction. That is why the scientific community is suppressive towards hominologists. This is the main source of all our problems and troubles. The problems and

troubles of a revolutionary science in confrontation with normal science, or to put it exactly, in confrontation with normal scientists.

Dr. Bryan Sykes, earlier engaged in normal science, has now stepped into the field of revolutionary science. The problem for him and for us is that he is not realizing this. To be successful and fruitful in this field he has to realize its revolutionary status and that the existence of living hominids, different from modern humans, has already been established. The legitimate experts and judges here are hominologists and nobody else. He quotes my words "Bones and DNA are not the only criteria of reality" (p. 255) and this is really so. What we don't know yet is the genetic identification of homins. Here the expertise of geneticists is badly needed. Naturally, such identification would facilitate recognition and acceptance of hominology by the scientific community. This is the priority, the number one task of world science.

Dmitri Bayanov, Science Director,
International Center of Hominology
Moscow, Russia