

2015 09 07 Monday David Paulides Missing People

AB: “David received his graduate and undergraduate degrees from the University of San Francisco and has a professional background that includes twenty (20) years in law enforcement, and senior executive positions in the technology sector.

In 2010 it seems a ranger at a National Park informed him of a series of unusual disappearances that occurred in National Parks. And this started an investigation into people that have disappeared in National Parks and [National] Forests. The result was that David has now written five (5) books – all entitled *Missing 411* – 1) Western U.S.; 2) Eastern U.S.; 3) North America and Beyond; 4) The Devil’s in the Details; and 5) A Sobering Coincidence.

David Paulides, welcome to the program!”

DAVID PAULIDES

DP: “Pleasure to be here, Art! Thanks.”

AB: “Good to have you.” ... I guess you’ve made the rounds of the talk shows ...?

DP: “It’s been goin’ on about five (5) years, and I’ve talked to your compatriots out there.”

AB: “Unfortunately, I have not caught you. I don’t listen to other talk show hosts, because I’m always scared that I’m going to pick up something from them and then subconsciously grab onto it and repeat it, and I don’t want to do that.

So I’m a neophyte in terms of ... you know, I have a general idea of what you talk about ... but if somebody was brand new like me, how would you start with them?”

DP: “I was in a National Park doing research on a peripheral topic one time. I was gettin’ followed around the park by a couple of park rangers ... At the end of the day I left the park. A couple hours later I get a knock on my door. It’s one of the rangers in plainclothes. He says: ‘Dave, I know who you are. I know your background. And I have some information that somebody like you ought to get ahold of.’

So I invited him in. Spoke to him for several hours and he stated that during the last several rounds that he had been at different parks in his career, park leaders had talked about disappearing people. ... At the front

end, there's always seven (7) to ten (10) days where there's a lot of exposure, a lot of press, a lot of search efforts – and at the end of that period of time – there's nothing (!) ... There's no follow-up, no effort to find the person – in fact, there's nothing that they could find after that. ... They themselves try to find information about the people they were looking for, and *they themselves were somehow restricted in getting much of the information they were looking for (!) ...*

The other part of it was that some of the locations where people disappeared from didn't make a lot of sense to him. ... [S]ometimes they would disappear right in the middle of humanity in a park and other times they'd disappear in the middle of nowhere, but there was no consistency that he could tell from it. But the consistent part that he was concerned about – and other rangers were concerned about – was the lack of follow-up, the lack of effort after people disappeared, the lack of accountability after they disappeared, et cetera.”

AB: “Okay, you were a cop?”

DP: “For twenty (20) years.”

AB: “Regular cop?”

DP: “I worked street crimes, detective, SWAT Team ...”

AB: “Okay.”

DP: “Three (3) or four (4) detective units.”

AB: “Regular cop. All right, you said they were concerned about the lack of follow-up, right?”

DP: “Correct.”

AB: “When somebody disappears in a National Park, jurisdictionally who does it belong to?”

DP: “So the National Park Service has a group of between six [hundred] (600) and seven hundred (700) full-time sworn law enforcement officers that are trained by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. These people are very well-trained, probably better than half the police officers in the United States. These people are full-time law enforcement rangers in the parks carrying guns with the responsibility of law enforcement. They have a hierarchy inside the Park Service of chiefs, directors, assistant directors, et cetera.

They understand policing very well. They understand the sense of accountability. They're a large organization, and you see 'em at the park every once in awhile driving around. They write tickets, they make arrests – they have a division inside of them called Special Agents, and Special Agents are the detectives within the Park Service, that do the follow-up detective work.”

AB: “They're federal, right?”

DP: “Oh, yeah.”

AB: “So it is their jurisdiction – nobody would come marching in from local county or any other jurisdiction at all? (Except, maybe the FBI, I guess, if it was bad enough ...).”

DP: “Yeah, and the FBI in some of these instances was invited in. But you're right, they [NPS cops] hold the primary jurisdiction. They do invite Search and Rescue operations from nearby counties to come in – other times they don't let anybody in. There's no consistency there, but you are correct in your assumption about jurisdiction.”

AB: “Okay, but if they were coming to you with concern about the lack of follow-up, why weren't they looking in the mirror?”

DP: “I didn't understand that at the beginning, but after I started to look into it, it becomes pretty obvious the mentality and kind of the approach of the Park Service. Just Google search “National Park employees complaints” ... Let's say – there's an aura inside that system that isn't healthy.

And the way they treat their own employees is pretty despicable. ... There was a Park Ranger in Arizona who disappeared – he was never found! They refused to pay that Ranger's wife his salary and benefits – saying he just left the park. She had to go to federal court to sue them for the benefits!”

[JS Note: Mr. Paulides does *not* herein give a full accounting of the Paul Fugate case, but only a partial rendering. For a full accounting, see David Paulides, *Missing 411: Western United States and Canada*, pp. 183-86].

AB: “Oh my! ... Okay it sounds to me like the problem is inside of their policing organization.”

DP: “Absolutely! ... The frontline rangers that you see around the park ... are 'salt of the earth' people – They are the best of the best! Really nice, wholesome folks.”

This kind of mentality and the responses we got to our Freedom of Information Act requests are policies made by the high administration in the parks.

* * *

AB: “Okay. Now here I guess is where you can tell me a couple of the wilder stories – I would like to know what makes these disappearances so bizarre?”

DP: “When we started this, we were trying to determine where the majority of these disappearances were occurring, so we filed a series of Freedom of Information Act requests against the Park Service asking for their list of missing people inside their system ...”

AB: “Umm-hmm.”

DP: “Seems like a natural, easy thing to go through. Well, several weeks later I got a call from an attorney inside the Park Service asking me why I wanted that information.”

AB: “Really? I mean, why should you even have to file a Freedom of Information Act to get this information in the first place?”

DP: “You’re singing to the choir here, Art! I’m with you one hundred percent (100%).”

AB: “So anyway, you were forced to do it – and you did it ...”

DP: “Knowing a little bit about the law, that’s an inappropriate question to ask anybody, and in fact, in the Freedom of Information Act they can’t ask that question and use it as a determining factor if they give you the information.”

“And I said: ‘Why are you even asking me? It’s a mundane request. I’m just interested.’ And he said: ‘I need to know.’ [So I said:] ‘Fine, we’re just doin’ research.’”

AB: “Right.”

DP: “And he says: ‘Well, we don’t have any lists.’ And I said: ‘What do you mean you don’t have any lists?’ He said: ‘We don’t keep track of missing people inside our parks.’ And I said: ‘How can that be?’ And he says: ‘Nope, we don’t have any lists.’”

Well, at the time I was a published author, so I said: ‘Okay, I want an author’s exemption, because I’m published – I want the list!’ He says: ‘We’ll have to get back to you.’”

AB: “With a list that they don’t have?”

DP: “Well, I’m askin’ them to do the job [create the list] now ...”

“About a month, month and a half later, I get a contact – this time” ... I was told that my books weren’t in enough libraries to qualify for the exemption.
...

AB: (laughs). “Can I just curiously ask how many libraries one has to be in to qualify?”

DP: “Oh, that’s the million dollar (\$1,000,000) question ...”

AB: (laughs). “Okay.” ...

DP: So then “I said: ‘Okay, tell me how much money it’s gonna cost to get the list from Yosemite and from your entire system?’ She [the supervisor] says: ‘Okay, I’ll hafta get back to you. Another four (4) or five (5) weeks go by and she says: ‘Well, Dave – the list from Yosemite is gonna cost ya thirty-four thousand dollars (\$34,000) ...”

AB: “What!”

DP: “And the list for the entire system is gonna be \$1.4 million dollars (\$1,400,000) ...”

AB: “What? What are they faxing it ... in gold? (!)”

DP: (laughs).

AB: (laughs).

DP: “I didn’t write a check – that’s for sure. ...”

AB: “Good!” ...

DP: “That outlined some important points: It was pretty obvious from the getgo they didn’t want that information getting out.”

AB: “Apparently not.”

DP: “And in talking to some of the best journalists I could find, every one

said: ‘Dave, they’re outright lying – there’s no way they don’t keep track of missing people in their system.’ And I tend to believe that, because over the last six (6) years now, people have sent me a series of lists that the Park Service keeps. One of them is a list of movies that have been filmed in the western U.S. National Parks since the 1940’s.”

AB: “Okay.”

DP: “So they find value in that, but they don’t find value in knowing where missing people were located (?)”

AB: “I’ve got to back up and ask, because it just blows my mind – *How could the list cost that much?* ... Surely you asked?”

DP: “Well, they told me that” it would be research costs ...

AB: “Boy, that’s just incredible (!), but okay ... did you finally secure a list or the list?”

DP: “Well, it’s a real slippery slope, Art, because after digging through the policies, procedures, and how the National Park handles missing people – after ten (10) years, they have a category called ‘Missing: Presumed Dead,’ which technically after ten (10) years, you’re no longer missing ...”

AB: “Right. Got it. ... Did we finally get a number of all categories – missing, presumed dead, whatever else ...?”

DP: “No, no, they refused to work it. And I decided, along with a series of other people, that what we would do – we would one by one do the best we could do – going through archives and finding the number of missing people at the different locations – National Parks, Monuments, et cetera.”

AB: “Okay.”

DP: “And at this point it branched out to also U.S. National Forests, because at this point, a lot of things happened right on that periphery. And we’re at about sixteen hundred (1600) people in North America.”

AB: “Wow! ... that would be your number – sixteen hundred (1600) – yes?”

DP: “Oh no, no ... I mean, it’s probably double or triple that!”

AB: “Okay ... all right, ... now ... if you take that number and apply it to the number of people that visit our National Parks by percentage, and then you look at North America, let’s say (because we can probably get the

stats best for North America) and compare it to the number of people missing in North America for any given year, do we see a difference?”

DP: “First of all, the number would be infinitesimal compared to the number of people who would visit the Park ...”

AB: “Yes, yes, of course, but by percentage?”

DP: “Again, I don’t want to make that, because we truly don’t know. At this point I’d be playing into their hands by giving you a number.”

AB: “Well, that’s [true]. But I was just trying to get a [comparison] ... if it’s larger than the national average of the number of people who go missing every year ... or not? What would be your guess?”

DP: “Oh, I’m sure it’s way less, because the numbers that you read about in the newspapers and the magazines, and the FBI statistics are very skewed.”

AB: “It’s true.”

DP: “One runaway disappears six (6) times in a year – that’s six (6) different missing people that go into the statistics ...”

AB: “Okay. That’s true.”

DP: “So it’s a very skewed number. It’s only the number where it says “suspicious unknown perpetrator,” which is only about 1.5% of all disappearances and missing people.”

AB: “All right, let’s move on then to what makes these disappearances so puzzling?”

DP: “So after reading thousands of reports and going over many, many articles – and just grabbing anything we can – we started to find that certain things come out at you that are abnormal. We first set the criteria at rural disappearances, no suspects on the case, the person can’t have a history of mental illness, it can’t be a voluntary disappearance, there’s no evidence of a criminal attack or human predation, and” lack of a scent trail of the victim for bloodhounds (or other canines).

“Many of the times – if they’re found alive or deceased – the victim is missing clothes or shoes. Depending on the geographical area ... boulder fields and berries are involved. And soon after the victim disappears, bad weather is often associated with the disappearance. If the victim is found, they’re often found near rivers, creeks, and bodies of water. And a

majority of the incidents occur in a timeframe between four (4) to five (5) p.m. or slightly later.

If the missing is located, they are often found unconscious or semi-conscious, and later on when they're questioned the majority of these victims can't remember what happened, where they went, or how they disappeared."

AB: "Wow!"

DP: "In an abnormal number of times, where a doctor or the parents talk about it, they talk about the person having a fever – a low-grade fever. And – this one will blow your mind – the missing are most often found in an area that had been searched many, many, many times before – sometimes dozens of times. And Bam! – they're all of a sudden right there."

AB: "All right, well you've sort have moved it almost to the paranormal. With these facts alone, I'm not jumping to the paranormal – I'm just saying that it seems impossible." ...

DP: "One of the last things is that there's a geographical clustering of these [missing] people. There's fifty-two (52) clusters of missing people in North America.

When the people are found – whether they're deceased or alive, and they go through an autopsy or a doctor's examination, the other thing on this is that many times the medical examiner can't determine the cause of death – which is pretty strange."

AB: "It's very strange ... it does occur – sometimes they are stumped and they don't know what killed somebody, but they ... do call it a 'natural death.' ... And yeah, this is very weird stuff to be sure."

* * *

AB: "If you decided to take your own life – for whatever rational or irrational reason you might have – a National Park would be a pretty place to do it, yes?"

DP: "Sure, but if there's ever any indication that the person had a mental illness or was about to commit suicide, it would not be one of the cases that we would consider or wrote about."

AB: "Does any of this lead you to the conclusion that you could be dealing with a serial killer or even a series of serial killers?"

DP: Without directly answering, DP brings up the fact that he lives in Colorado and probably eighty percent (80%) of people on the trail carry a gun.

“Many of the stories about people in my books involve people that are last in line or first in line on a hike and get out of sight momentarily, and disappear, and are gone.”

AB: “If you were a serial killer, you’re going to pick somebody last in the line, right?”

“You’d grunt, you’d scream, you’d do something if somebody grabbed you ...”

DP: “Absolutely you would! And that’s another thing – there’s a complete absence of yells for help, calls for help in these cases we’re talkin’ about right now.”

Aud: “Please ask David about the condition of the feet. What condition their feet are in when they are found – they are often found without their shoes – though miles and miles away from the[ir] last known position over very rough terrain.”

DP: “Well, that’s a million dollar (\$1,000,000) question that I ask myself of all the time. And the reality is, is that you’ve got to understand the mentality of the search and rescue people.”

AB: “Okay.”

DP: “They don’t think anything strange is going on. They don’t think anything unusual has happened. They just think the person’s missing.

And many times the news broadcast will show somebody walking back with no shoes, and nobody ever thinks to ask them what happened or thinks to say how did you lose your shoes – the question is not asked, because these people are not criminal investigators – they’re not thinking along the lines that you and I are right now. And I don’t blame them for that – search and rescue people are ninety-five percent (95%) volunteers.”

AB: “Since all this publicity – you’ve had book after book – I wonder how the National Park Service has reacted to this publicity you’ve generated?”

DP: “I can tell you right now we’re in the middle of making a film about these disappearances and we met a family at Mesa Verde National Park and they told us the story about their Dad who disappeared. While we were in the park, we were with the victim’s family and they wanted to interview the Chief Park Ranger and the Superintendent about the disappearance ...”

AB: "Right."

DP: The family "went to the front desk, and those two individuals would not even come to the front desk and talk to those people. And that type of mentality toward a victim's family, when they've lost their Dad in that park was absolutely unbelievable."

AB: "Was it your name that got the inattention?"

DP: "We hadn't even been in there. We were standing outside and they walked in ..."

AB: "Since you've written these books, with respect to you – how has the National Park Service been treating you? They can't be happy."

DP: "Well, no ... we continue to file Freedom of Information Act requests for reports on missing people inside their park ... They classified me last year as what's called a 'commercial requester.' I've never heard that before. And because of that they quadrupled the fees that they would charge the normal public for everything I wanted."

AB: "Ai, yi-yi!"

DP: "As an example, there was a case where a park ranger disappeared for ten (10) days inside Rocky Mountain National Park. He disappeared and was found dead. I made a request for that report – they said it was going to cost seventy-five hundred dollars (\$7500)."

AB: "God! Whatever happened to law enforcement cooperation?"

DP: Was told by a retired National Park Service Special Agent – Dave, it's very easy to explain: "A complete lack of integrity."

* * *

DP: "So why haven't other people looked at this? Something called 'plausible deniability.' Meaning, in our world we've been told it's normal for people to go down a trail and disappear, and never be found."

AB: (laughs). "Really?"

DP: "And that's the way it goes, because you only hear about these people for a couple days, a couple of reports. Once they're missing and they're never found, you never hear about it."

AB: “Disappearing I understand. Getting lost I understand. Not finding a trace of the individual I don’t understand.”

Aud: Asks that DP tell a story of a little girl who was fed berries by a wolf.

[JS Note: This was the 1868 Michigan case of Katie Flynn – see David Paulides, *Missing 411: Eastern United States*, pp. 54-57].

AB: “The impossible brings you to the paranormal, or at least it eventually gets you there. And I’m not trying to jump there, but you’re not leaving me much choice.”

DP: “But there is a distinct lack of consecutive disappearances in one location. I call it the ‘Hopscotch Effect.’ ... But having a series in a row in one location does not happen.”

As I’ve stated in every interview I’ve ever done, and I’ll be glad to say it here, is that: “I encourage everybody to go to the National Parks. Don’t ever walk alone on a trail. Personally, I always carry a gun when I’m in a National Park. I always carry a personal transponder device. And in all the research and in all the cases I’ve ever read, Art, I’ve never found a case where somebody disappeared *carrying a gun AND a personal transponder device.*”

AB: “Good advice. And carrying a gun in a National Park is perfectly legal, yes?”

DP: “As long as you have a carry/conceal weapons license that’s applicable to the state that the National Park’s in, you can carry it in the park.”

AB: “Okay. ... You’ve certainly given me very recent ones ... it’s ongoing. It’s still going on now ... right?”

DP: “And that’s what I want people to understand. When you read the books, these are historical lessons. I have cases going back to 1752 that match this profile. So it happened a long time ago [and] it’s happening today.” ... The best I can tell it is *more common* today. ... And it’s disconcerting to say the least.”

AB: “I wonder if it is a world-wide phenomenon?”

DP: “Absolutely!”

AB: “And you say that because ...”

DP: “I’ve got cases in nine (9) countries.”

* * *

AB: I got a really weird email from someone who claims they're encountering 'staircases' in the middle of National Parks. "Now why would staircases be in National Parks?" I also got a photo of staircases on a truck bed and I heard that National Park Rangers were alerted of these staircases and "told not to touch them. I don't know what that means. I don't know whether you've ever heard of that before – have you?"

DP: "I've heard both sides of this: Some people saying it's a hoax, some people saying that it's true. I don't know what to believe about it ..."

AB: "Okay."

DP: "But with the number of people in the woods with a cellphone, you would think there would be a whole lot more pictures of these floatin' around if it was true."

AB: "You would think? You certainly would think so."

Aud: Ask him about the case of Dennis Martin and what he was told by Dennis' father about the FBI agent on the case.

AB: "That resonate?"

DP details the case of Dennis Martin from David Paulides, *Missing 411: Eastern United States*, pp. 136-53.

AB: "Oh my God! You're describing every parent's nightmare."

* * *

AB: "In how many cases that you've investigated, David, has a medical examiner actually been able to come up with a cause of death?"

DP: "There's been more than a few, and usually it turns out to being hypothermia."

AB: "I would think perhaps stroke and heart attack, that kind of thing as well, people not used to the exertion ..."

DP: "Actually I've never seen a stroke determination ..."

AB: "Really?"

DP: "... and there may be a heart attack, but I honestly don't remember one."

* * *

AB: "What about signs of foul play ... They're going to look for other signs of foul play, right?"

DP: "Absolutely." ...

"Many times they bring in enough search and rescue people that they're walking shoulder to shoulder through these areas ..."

AB: "Right."

DP: ... and they wanta make sure they don't miss anything."

AB: "How many cases are there where they are found and they can't remember what happened?"

DP: "Oh, there's a few!" [DP details the story of a woman in Arkansas (?) hiding from pursuers].

* * *

DP: "These aren't human to human crimes. There's no evidence of anything other than maybe this [Dennis] Martin case where there was a human involved. There's no secret trail, there's no tracks leaving the area ... There's no evidence that the person even left the region. ... So I know people will regularly go to this place in their mind because it's a comfort place, because what I'm explaining is very uncomfortable ...

But I have never had anybody who's read the stories come back and thought a human did it. Ever!"

AB: "No, it really doesn't make sense." ...

DP: "I have more than probably two (2) or three (3) dozen cases of two-year old, three-year old, four-year old kids disappeared and were found thousands of feet uphill from where they disappeared from or many, many miles from the location they disappeared from. So the idea that these kids got from A to B on their own – once you read the facts – it's impossible!"

AB: "Impossible is the word ... That's what keeps drawing people back I think too – including me to the paranormal aspect of this, because there's no rational explanation otherwise. None! I mean there simply isn't. These kids can't do that!"

* * *

Aud: "Have you contacted either your congressman (senator or representative) or the Department of the Interior's Inspector General for help in getting your FOIA requests approved?"

DP: "The Inspector General, to the best of my knowledge, plays no role in appealing or approving this. There's an appeal process and it's been upheld twice that I didn't get the report. All they have to say it's an 'open case' and because of investigation reasons they don't want to release it. And these are just straight missing persons cases, whereas another National Park would give me the exact same circumstances and give me the case on a missing person. Yosemite will never give up a case. On anything. So there's no consistency at all in the Park Service."

AB: "All right, might as well give it a try ... you must have some personal 'hunch' ... but I guess you don't want to take a shot, do you?"

DP: "As I stated earlier, what I may have thought at the end of the first book – we've run two (2) marathons as we get to the fifth book now ... Do I have any positive, physical evidence as to what's done it? No ... no! Ladies and Gentlemen: There's a group of people sitting on the periphery who are just waiting for me to say something so that they could pounce on and destroy the reputation of my organization."

AB: "Sure."

DP: "I've stated nothing but facts in five (5) books, and I've told people to the best of my knowledge what to do if they go into the woods. Carry a firearm. Carry a transponder. Don't walk alone. Don't let your kids go out of your sight. Keep everyone close. Now the reality is, if I was sure that I knew what was happening – I would step up and say it. I'm not going to compromise my own ethics and guess. My guess at the end of the first book won't be my guess today. And my guess today won't be the one I'm gonna give you two years from now."

AB: "Umm ... all right. Your guess after the first book – what would that have been?"

DP: "It's irrelevant."

AB: (laughs). "Yeah, I do understand. ... I guess we just wait for evidence, but a lot of times with the paranormal, that just never comes. Never."

* * *

AB: "I guess better to break the law [by taking an illegal gun with you into the wild] than to end up another of David's stories."

Do you have anyone who's read all these books of yours who may have a pretty good idea of what's going on?

DP: "No."

AB: (laughs).

DP: (laughs). Art, everthing you can think of, I've heard 'em all. "When you get down into the minutiae of all of it, there's one factor that doesn't make sense depending on the suspect that they pick."

AB: "Uh-huh."

DP: "And I'm not trying to be evasive ... A lot of people think there could be multiple things going on."

* * *

DP: "Law enforcement people and search and rescue people don't need help. ... The general mentality – the reason they're there – is they know a lot more than you."

AB: "I know as a parent, if I had a child that disappeared – as you have been describing these disappearances – I would not rest for all the rest of my life until I had some sort of resolution to it. I mean, without a body, without a trace, these people seem to be gone. I can't imagine parents giving up. So I'm sure you've run into that, right?"

DP: "Oh absolutely! Imagine that you're at the location where your son or daughter disappeared and you have to make the decision to leave – you're essentially giving up ... And I've met a few of these people, and it just destroys you as a human being just as you described."

AB: "Yes. A parent would never give up. They would always be thinking that little Johnny would show up suddenly smiling ... but that doesn't happen, so these people are left with nothing ... Even the worst ones, a body is finally found and there's some sort of closure – bad as it may be. ... But with nothing, that's a hard life to imagine."

* * *

DP: "Jurisdictional issues on searches: I can't tell you the number of times that victims and victim's families – they're missing a loved one and they want special resources brought in ... and the local search and rescue group plays "King of the Hill" and says: 'Nope! No more people are comin' in!'"

AB: "That's right ..."

DP: “Nope! No more resources we’re gonna use!’ And I cannot tell you the number of times I’ve heard from families about ‘It’s obvious they needed more people, they needed fresh [canines] because the dogs were tired, and they wouldn’t entertain it, and they wouldn’t bring more people in, and they acted as though they were the “King of the Hill.” I’ve heard this so many times, and I know search and rescue protocol, and it doesn’t make any sense why the people are acting in this manner when you’re in the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth day of search, when you need to cover a massive amount of area at that point, why you’re not calling for more help? (!)”

AB: “Yeah, jurisdiction is always kind of a weird thing. I worked with police for several years as a 9-1-1 dispatcher, and ... I guess it’s just part of being human.

People claim their own territory. They want to hold on to their own territory. They don’t want additional people in.”

Aud: (to DP): “Why go on these shows and talk about all this if you’re not going to offer any opinion? Granted he doesn’t want to affect his credibility, but then why go on? Just let your books speak for themselves.”

AB: “It is very frustrating is what he says ... It is frustrating, and yet I understand why you will not reach out with an opinion based on facts that seem impossible.”

DP: “So if there’s no hard evidence to say what’s happening, then you’re guessing.”

AB: “Right.”

DP: “Do you see any scientists out there in the academic world ‘guessing’ about a hypothesis? I don’t think so.”

AB: “No.”

DP: “And in your world of cryptozoology, paranormal ... I think people are so used to people making outrageous claims ...”

AB: “Yes.”

DP: “... that it’s abnormal for somebody to come along and say: ‘Wait a minute! I want to wait and see where this goes ... I want to accumulate actual evidence whether it’s circumstantial or not before I stick my credibility and integrity on the line.’ To me it’s amusing that people are

demanding or they say that they want to have an answer ... because I don't have a good answer!"

AB: "Actually they do understand. They do understand what would happen if you would say what you might say ... and you're so right! You would be dismissed immediately by a large portion of the law enforcement community ... and nobody would ever pay any attention to you any more ... It would happen. I don't disagree with that. And I don't disagree with the man who writes: 'It is frustrating to be presented with the impossible and not to be able to venture even an opinion, virtually. I get the problem.'"

Aud: "The fact that they [the government] lies to the families indicates to me that they probably know who's responsible."

AB: "Well, that's actually a pretty good question ... David, do you think that indicates that they do have knowledge about what it is, or is it just a complete lack of knowledge, and so like you, they're not willing to touch it?"

DP: "I think that the people that are your contact points at the park – the Superintendent, the Chief Ranger – I really don't think they know. But I do think they're walking to the orders of somebody higher up." The superintendent may just be a pawn.

Aud: "I think it's going to be revealed because if you notice, more and more truth is coming out all the time ..."

AB: "Well, I hope you're right – I really do."

Aud: What is the ratio of male to female 'abduction' [sic] from the National Parks?

AB: "Okay, the ratio of males to females ..."

DP: "Probably eighty (80) [to] twenty (20)."

AB: "More males?"

DP: "Yeah."

AB: "Wow! Really!"

* * *

DP: "There's a series of deaths in Manchester, England – men disappeared and they were found in the canals. ... It's still happening right now, and the community is up in arms. There's a lot that have disappeared since

2009 and have been found in the canals. ... Many times they can't determine the cause of death, in every instance there's no witness to what happened. ... It doesn't make a lot of sense, because in those canals you can stand up in them."

Aud: "I firmly believe that the government knows what's going on. I think because it's taking place in National Parks, it could possibly be connected with underground bases – that's where they're taking the victims, and possibly using them for scientific studies. And that's not even throwing out the possibility of the possible treaty they have with the beings to allow that to happen at a certain percentage."

AB: "Well you know all that sounds pretty crazy until you realize the government has experimented on its own people. There's a lot of history, for example. ... You go, 'Oh no, our government can't do that,' and yet they did. So you just can't rule it out."

Aud: Have any Native Americans reached out about the missing? Have any remote viewers contacted DP about the missing?

AB: "Remote viewing does seem to be real. Some people have this talent." It would be interesting to involve them in some of these cases.

DP: "Absolutely. I'm one of these guys that has a open mind on that stuff. I have an open mind on all these elements that could be related to what's happening here. And I'm not one to discount a psychic. I'm not one to discount remote viewing. I think it's all plausible.

AB: "Well it is, and they might come up with something that might lead us somewhere ...

The whole thing, David, is fascinating. ... It has been an absolute pleasure having you on and puzzling us all. ... These people are gone, and if you have to force documents out of the government's hands, then how many are there really?"

* * *