



Tomasz Q. Pietrzak

Short
cryptozoological
practise

Tomasz Q. Pietrzak

Short cryptozoological practise

2014

***short booklets about natural
anthologies***



Number of booklet (GNHI NB) GNHI 332-540-20
2014 copyright by Tomasz Q. Pietrzak & gnhi
edit: Gabinet of Natural History Inquiries



Memo on ethnoknown populations

Recent finding of relatively widespread large animals must convinced us that many enigmatic creatures remain to resolved, in particular relatively rare ones. I assume therefore that so-called unknown endemics and relicts belonging to terrestrial large animals are relatively present, including species significantly charismatic. Hence, there is possibility for conducted significant discoveries even in nowadays. There are some tips for cryptozoological research devoted these discoveries.

Cryptozoology is old continent-origin sort of investigation devoted apparently unknown animals. This kind of research was separated of zoology in half of XX century (Heuvelmans 1958). Classical cryptozoology is disquieting. New lines is folk work with ethnic groups and extensive field monitoring. It is supposedly effective survey in modern cryptozoology. This paradigm is one sort of advanced zoological investigations in a changing world. Following authors and cryptozoology researchers shaped rules in cryptozoological investigation (Raynal 1989, Coleman & Clark 1999, Shuker 2003, Naish 2010, Rossi 2012). Everyone has, in a fact



own, proper or not theory. But in the zoological nature cryptozoology is one, based on ethnosurvey and physical evidence. Moreover, this scientific survey should be change with the time, like other studies, and not remains yet somewhere in XIX century.

Main thought of cryptozoological works in modern times is zoological discoveries and conservation of those new discoveries. Better life of ethnic groups and save their culture is very important issue. Proper cryptozoology is, after all peculiar branch of ethnozoology (Arment 2004). Cryptozoologist are at first ethnozoologist that can studied new kinds of animals being proposed by folk-taxonomy, and compared it to scientific known populations.

We are, unfortunately almost known that many species will have been forfeit. Although, we save as much as possible. Remember, main devotion of cryptozoology is especially populations (species live as populations). Intention of cryptozoology is searching unknown populations. We looking for species being proposed to be extinct. At first if we try to searching extirpated animals we need to rediscovered their populations. Some animals are believed to be, despite that inconclusive statement, recognize as extinct. So-called in



popculture cryptozoology is in fact object of psychological research than developed socio-biological study.

Whose are in fact lurking animals? This creatures are suspect to be ethnoknown & unknown by zoology (Arment 1995, Raynal 1999). These are animals not yet identified by scientific methods. We are currently not sure about their positon in zoological systematic, because lack of hard evidences. They exist in space, alike other species. Species being not described by science exist as populations, therefore we should to looking for unstudied and lurking populations in remote parts of world in the name of cryptozoology. It is hard and difficult work, being extremaly dangerous. Our assumptions will be based on hard evidences via confirmed populations living in isolations.

Surmises towards selected “unknown animals”?

If you want to be cryptozoologist you must to have basal education in ethnozoology, which is base for professional cryptozoology. I think ethnozoology is good start in our investigation. "Cryptozoology" in this case is actually



"auxiliary designation" for studying unknown for science folklore guys. In this term cryptozoology could be in fact replaced by other designation - "zoology". But apart of that name, cryptozoology is devoted for zoological discovery. So it is unofficial name for this kind of investigation. Although this work is important only if posses proper critical activity.

In folk taxonomy existed two kinds of animals

We call them as folk animals. Some folk animals are known both in folk and scientific taxonomy. Another group is gathered those animals known only in folk taxonomy (Berlin 1966). We can those called as animals of cryptozoology. We are sure it is quite pretty group of creatures. Unknown folk taxons are those alleged animals that can be never-before-seen by anyone and undescribed by scientist as well. Some visions on category of cryptids and was provide by Eberhard (2005) and Raynal (1989) etc.

Cryptozoological method given by Raynal (1989) and Heuvelmans (1988) are virtually slightly obsolete and for-now we should changes cryptozoological work as to more comprehensive field-based, changes with time and competitive.



Nowadays, we distinguish a few kinds of cryptozoology, some of them are controversial branch of ethnozoology.

A) **Pseudoscientific cryptozoology** is those for whom, uncertain observation of shadow of "ape-man" around the forest is proof for it existence. So-called cryptids can be studied as normal animals, without meaning that they actually non-exist. In the same way we can study or searching e.g. dragons and two-legged lizard-horse in forest patches or the lake monsters. It can even, of course use scientific methodology in data modelling or protocols for detection. Finally, it is studies those creatures rejected for very long time to be existed in space and time in a given areas. We can cultivated another one pseudoscientific when testimones or folk taxonomy is treated as definitely biased.

B) **Speculative cryptozoology** is those for whom anecdotal data is essential or sufficient for doing "research" on reports e.g. unidentified water creatures etc. It could use statistic methodology to compare the data or speculate on possibility origin of testimonies. It is also just gathered the reports or knowledge and then consider into.

C) **Proper cryptozoology:**
Protodiscoveries (ethno-zoological discoveries)



is known as donor to **Scientific field crypto-zoology** which is based on folk taxonomy and looking for physical proof. It is complex of rapid investigations of ethnoknown animals and zoological discoveries. Therefore it is devoted to original and real cryptozoology in field. It is sadly, the rarest variant of cryptozoology of all. It could be treated as scientific. It is often used by zoologists but most of them does not call it as crypto-zoology. Concludes, interchangeably we could treated these investigations in mainland Europe as cryptozoology and zoology, and in Great Britain, Australia or in US as zoology vs cryptozoology. Unfortunately many dilettantes does not proper understand foundation of cryptozoology.

In the further consider on this material I will be work out only on third kind of cryptozoology (C).

Testimonies of unfathomable animals

In term of cryptozoology and ecology we distinguish a few theoretical molds. E.g. cryptids are "strange or no" creatures known in popculture, being classified as so-called "unknown or rejected for science" . More properly we described them as **ethnoknown** but



unknown for science animals, that are main object of cryptozoological study. Ethnknown or anecdotal animals are those called in folk taxonomy (Berlin 1966, Douglas & Atran 1999).

Uncorrect unrecognized sibling species or their populations without developed molecular base could be called as hiding in plain sight or **hidden/cryptic species** (e.g. Trontelj & Fiser 2009). We need to awake that there are much more sort of populations that are much more **difficult-to-discover** than these just **hiding in plain sight**. Autochtonic humans posses traditional or indigenous knowledge for animals not-yet-recognized. These are totally new to people and there are other phrases for them. Between them are those known as **never-before-seen species**. We looking for as well **lazarus taxons** (e.g. Wignall & Benton 1999) being identified as extinct for thousand of years and are accidentally or not rediscovered in modern times.

Some species are **crypsis forms**, therefore they posses appearance to avoid them recognize in environment. **Elusive species** (e.g. night insectivores), especially prevalent in mammals are those shy and difficult to study in field. We looking for also **missing species** being undescribed by science.



How we can detect **hard-to-discover species** that are especially elusive and live in very low density in remote parts of the world? It is very intriguing aspect, in which way, we can help doing these discoveries by exploration. At first we should to know that ethnoknown undescribed species, colloquially known by someone as cryptids are great chance to conduct tedious survey in given areas in respect of new discovery. Detection of elusive species that is ethnoknown and then difficult to recognize because of possible low density and elusive activity (e.g. living in hard-to-explore areas, night activity, arboreal lifestyle, see Brussard 1986). Unknown animals live especially in small populations.

We can in cryptozoology apply RAP Rapid Assessment Program that could be implemented to whole fauna, as well as for specific ethnoknown creatures in the given regions (see e.g. program of CI). On the base of protocol for detection of ethnoknown "cryptids" we conduct rapid surveys. Of course we have initial selection for possibilities e.g. drops doing any extensive or rapid surveys on alleged pop-known lake monsters, gigantic dinosaur or bigfoot. We focus rather on ethnoknown local animals that can occupy remote areas and water resources



around primitive villages or not. We need to know that cryptozoology is interdisciplinary framework. Main cryptozoological work should be focus on relative rapid zoological discovery with the participation of long-lived ethnoknown testimonies, known as folk taxonomy.

Albeit, if we prefer ethnic-based studies (as many so-called cryptozoologists), we can do our quantative non-pseudoscientific studies under ethnozoological research towards folk-taxonomy. In region preferred by us we can do ethnozoographic studies, despite low fauna assemblage. If, we like to work with humans we can studied psychological-antropological portrait of humans as well as folk-taxonomy studies in ethnic groups e.g. in conurbations, small villages.

Protocol for detection:

Our research in field could be spit into two main method: ethnic and physical. Ethnozoographic research is targeted to folk taxonomy and described as community-based survey (Diamond 1989). Another one, physical is divided to collecting biological samples and intensive research in field to confirm in rapid way the local population. We need biological samples for



species identifications. Additionally, I thought much of "true undescribed animals" are virtually barely known even for locals.

Evidences for rarities:

We should to develop programs for detecting any unknown animals (in forms of detect rare animals) . These are known by autochtons where they live, but these must be animals impacted or being rare in the region. In region not yet explored by zoology it is believed to exist animals very rare and uncommon. It is endangered animals.

Cryptids (unknown to zoology) are in fact not yet discovered (e.g. Heuvelmans 1986). These creatures live in remote regions are ethnoknown - could be officially supposed as extinct or non-recognized

- some are not yet known by human, hence are not cryptids at all.

They are animals that came from from shadow. Their discoveries are conducted by field monitoring. Not yet-evident animals despite live in areas for quite long time these are not known for inhabitants. Otherwise is where humans are



absent. There could exist animals large and devastating. They are on the verge of extinction as well.

We don't have yet hard evidences in form e.g. camera traps records. Why, in view of, these creatures become endemic relicts, occupy in very low density and lead elusive lifestyles. In fact, those are elusive species. These extremely endemic forms are moreover charismatic, peculiar and distinct to other and could be representant even different lineages. They have critical population size. Ideal habitat are those undestroyed and untouched by civilization. Many so-called unknown form can live in forgotten areas, known as disrupted by human conflicts.

Population-based cryptozoology

degrees of knowledge towards populations:

Unstudied - poorly-known because of lack of research, unknown - unknown because of lack research or insufficient sampling effort, lurking - these hard-to-discover or searching by insufficient sampling effort.

Unstudied populations are around,



elsewhere where was not studied by researchers (i.e. Kunin & Gaston 1997, Yu & Dobson 2000) . These **forgotten populations** are known to exist but was never studied in the term of biology or ecology. At first we must get to know that there exist another one kind of populations that are not so always on the verge of extinction. They are hidden and we don't know that they exist as well. Of course, these populations can be classified to known already species, but live in yet unexplored habitats. We must get to know that populations hidden can live in unexplored regions. They are live in low or high abundance, this not have importance, because regions where they occurring was never previously studied extensively. The second one hidden populations are those believed to live in low abundance. Animals of that populations are active during at night or are hidden in difficult-to-explore habitats for years (see Brussard 1986). True is that, that they live in low abundance or not. Virtually, there are so-called variants of these populations known as mixed variants of hidden populations living in space.

What are mixed variants of hidden populations? Those believed to live both in low abundance or in hard-to-explore habitats (Thompson 2004). In the science of



cryptozoology there are unfortunately lack of original methodology. Cryptozoological investigation use methods well known in ethnography or paleontology. We must already know that there exist another great time used for cryptozoological investigation known as cryptoecology. This is undescribed methods used both with cryptozoological (known as ethnozoographic or eclipsazologic). Firstly cryptozoology is based on unknown populations, actually not species. In the space exist only populations of existent specimens in space and time.

We can developed population-biased cryptozoological research. We use ethnotestimonies devoted animals being recognized by autochtons. Finally, those animals are either autochtons.

Therefore, our main cryptozoological research is conducting cryptozoological work devoted autochtonic populations. Some of these populations are belonging to genetic species, some are cryptic species, some are totally different animals that are recognized as ferrified for locals. The third one could be enigma of cryptozoology, because them are suppose to live in place disturbed and unstudied previously.

Most folk animals being supposedly



believed to be unknown remain only as folk memory (e.g. Miskelly 1987). A few research surveys are devoted populations not yet identified. There are unfortunately only a few those problems that is still continued.

Cryptozoological research is known well in mainland "old continent", where this kind of investigations was born and have strong ground opposite to other cryptozoological studies anywhere. It should be note that conservation programs in cryptozoology, believed to be holistic approach to biological problems is not yet correctly understand. Cryptozoology is not only folklore. It is at first biological investigation. Cryptozoology known as monster hunting or mythology reading are in a fact not investigation cryptozoology but could be investigation of history of culture. Main aims is finding undescribed species, nor cinema survey throughout years.

Proper cryptozoological is as assumptions for undescribed species. It is not usually practicable. Because, folk-taxonomy is sometimes difficult-to-recognize (Durkheim & Mauss 1963, Rabbit 2002), hence proper identification to unknown species on the base on alleged sighting is not possible. Otherwise, it when locals posses skins or at least skull of



alleged unknown species. It is then known to be confirm status via DNA studies and intensive monitoring in located areas.

Advanced cryptozoology/zoology is known as detection monitoring of fauna/ remnant populations and is classified as cryptozoological analysis, rather as using the same convergent methods to those ecological. In practice, distinct population-based cryptozoology and species-based cryptozoology are virtually should be studied as one. Actually representants of totally new lineage could be discovered as ancient lineages or primitive animals. It is believed to be unrecognize many distinct lineages (represented by species) that existed in small populations .

I known there exist mystery animals being known by locals by folk taxonomy. But after all is it not easier going to a field and setting up camera traps for confirm unknown or hidden populations? Perhaps, albeit existing within cryptic diversity, distinct species is impossible to confirm by non-biological samples. It is most intriguing to searching and collect skins and skulls of unidentified specimens, previously harvested by locals or by an accident (e.g. Bauer & Russel 1988, Hocking 1992). **Finally, cryptozoology is not apart work but another activity within zoological research, thus**



professional cryptozoologist should have proper education in ethnozoology and taxonomy.

Intact forms of terrestrial vertebrates

We call them in a such way, to distinguish them between other forms known in modern taxonomy. Intact forms are yet unknown for ethnic groups and hence they exist for very long time in endemic regions. They are not yet supported by any monitoring research and surveys.

Unknown fauna in undisturbed regions

Fauna in undisturbed and forgotten regions is vital kind of rare and magnificent animals as regions not yet studied extensively. Animals not yet supported by extensively research can live as abundant species. They are at first:

endemic
could be large or relatively not
could be common or rare
prefer day-time activity
known in folklore: they are known by locals



Non-speculative modern cryptozoology

Classical cryptozoology never will be treated seriously without hard physical evidences. Cryptozoology is actually, not beautiful literature or hunter stories, however can be based on this. Physical evidence is basal proof of population existence in a given area (e.g. Rich et al. 1985, Hocking 1992). Otherwise cryptozoology is not metodological or even theoretical because it moves single cases without falsifiable possibility. Our cryptozoological records must be confirmed physically by others. Most of amateur-eyewitness accounts in suburbia or civilized countries are in fact error-biased and could be recognize sadly, as worthless in cryptozoology. Although it is object of study of proper ethnozoology. Adequate knowledge is provided by ethnic groups, because they known local fauna quite good for quite long time. Their knowledge could be known as folk taxonomy.

Of course, there exist in confirmed areas single alien animals known as out-of-place, but they are not important in the field of zoology. These animals exist only as specimes in short-



time. For cryptozoology important are breeding populations. Some branches of monitoring, which is not cryptozoological (as foundation by undescribed for science), studied unknown populations of known-for-science species including for alien species or for conservation purposes.

Cryptozoological is study of quite distinct population to another one populations, so distinct to be recognize as another species. We can of course, develop new branch of ethnozoology that focus essentially for conservation for all distinct populations in cryptozoological analysis.

At first we need to know that anyway classical, species-based cryptozoology is looking for breeding populations recognizing as undescribed species. But in modern times zoology notes on evolutionary-distinct populations, hence another one population-based cryptozoology should be notes on conservation-worthy.

Unstudied populations of animals are being investigated. Alleged records are of course great additional data. At first we carry out interviews on ethnoknown animals and use hunter stories to our further investigations. In a fact, cryptozoology in modern times is field-based ethnozoological



investigation, linked face-to-face conservation and field physical monitoring of larger animal forms.

We use tools in analysis of monitoring e.g. camera traps detectors, monitoring video recorder, skin and skull, collect for scientific analysis (noninvasive monitoring). Alleged informations of folk taxonomy provided by direct talking are useful, but unsufficient . We must possess hard evidence. Research need physical proof, otherwise it will be gathered within pseudoscientific or speculative studies.

Basal cryptozoological studies steps (without technical-social developments) is covered with eco-ethno studies (Thompson 2004, Berlin 1992) and should be recognized as:

- continuous folk interviews with locals on fauna (ethnoknown animals)
- select suitable areas
- rapid monitoring survey (.e.g. using visible observations, camera traps, track transects, catch-traps)
- physical evidence support i.e. skin, skull or hairs for DNA.
- long term intensive and extensive studies using
 - *ethnointerviews elsewhere
 - *invasive and noninvasive methods



Basal education in animal identification is needed for further studies in cryptozoology. We can detect populations of species using detectors (e.g. traps, video traps) and then studied extensively remote regions, that supported unstudied populations, including new distribution records of animals (e.g. Köhler et al. 2004, Muller 2012). Additionally, we can studied, of course, whole local faunal assemblages.

These regions are not yet studied before or was studied using detectors. Physical evidence is another proof very important as we need for describing new species holotype as biological evidence.

Camera traps is using as tools for conservation cryptozoology when we would like to recognize ethnoknown rare animals in regions where it population was unknown for specialist.

Proposal program for ethnoknown hidden-for-science animals is needed to perform logical activities. Collected alleged data using interviews with locals provide us basal sources. Conduct expeditions to other villages in search of physical evidence in form of skins or skulls is another important step in cryptozoological survey. Setting up priority areas for short-term monitoring in using large bait stations for confirm existence of



hidden species is one of the important activities for studies of hidden species or populations in remote areas.

Monitoring tools: camera traps, video traps, scat collection - noninvasive. Additionally leg-hold traps, cage traps - invasive monitoring for biological source in form of e.g hairs for DNA analysis.

At first we need possess basal education in zoological knowledge. Secondly step is establish small groups or organisations. Next one, conduct ethnozoology studies on folk-taxonomy. Rapid survey monitoring in alleged regions is essential for hard confirm of living population (Wang et al. 2004, Butchart 2007).

If we does not need this kind of investigation in our research, this mean that our research is only delusion speculative nor cryptozoological. Intention of Bernard Heuvelmans (e.g. 1958) was only show for us many cratures of folklore. It was only speculative vision of cryptozoology. Some of these creatures, especially terrestrial living in Africa and Asia could was unknown for scientists. But of course not all. We must account because main proof of cryptozoology should be in a fact biological samples. Cryptozoology is based on folklore, but it is concerning strong, physical, biological



ethnoknown species.

Further cultivation of cryptozoology should be linked with broader research based on non-speculative physical, biological evidences and photographic evidence from camera traps or cameras. We have also, hard-communications for existence unknown species, nor folkloric creatures of well-known animals in a given areas. It is easy to find that in e.g. Europe non-exist large animals in size of deer to be unknown of science. There could be at most unknown populations of well-known species. We must although remember that there are so many extremely endemic, lurking populations of animals in the size of horse and giant lizards, elsewhere in areas believed to be remote or disturbed by conflicts.

cryptozoological pre-studies

We spending time in libraries with looking for a report of non-identified animals and clean them easily from mythology and cosmology. We check the sighting report and alleged publications in places for this purposes designed. Additionally we can ask persons knowledgeable on given case. We can attempt to checking of



newspapers, old books and publications for confirm previously unrecognized cases of animals lurking and not yet recognized like those already discovered e.g. *Afropavo congensis*, any small rodents or not unrecognized properly yet like gray cat's skull, russian mysteries among skins, scientific-worthy observations. There are of course, plenty of cryptic animals against other that are distinguish from another by plain sight.

They are not yet distinguished properly from another one, especially related taxons, because of lack of profound studies. They can be still found on museum's basement wardrobes, in the crowded markets or in private collection. They are almost everywhere as stuffed specimens. They are still non-properly identified to its real status in nature.

Ethnostudies

We spending time with locals and working with them in field. We following with them on hunting, gathering foods, working, culture meeting etc. We asking about local animal fauna and presenting them drawing and photos in our atlas(*using e.g. methods of Brent 1992*). We talking with animals on trail to remote areas and



we co-working with them on our project for ethnoknown animals of the region. We can recognizing and showing local fauna in field. Finally, we can publish checklist of ethnoknown animals in the region.

Expeditions vs passive monitoring to remote and forbidden parts?

Significantly, we need to possess good knowledge both in field and ethnostudies for proper identification of animals. Expeditions to remote or forbidden regions is conducted as important part in our research. But we need to know that expeditions are not the best way to recognize unknown animals. At first we need to setting system of monitoring of areas that are for our research quite important. We should to do at first set a long-term base in areas where alleged cryptids was described.

At first we know that trip continued to remote land could affected animals. They hide by us before we sight them. Animals escape from of our expeditions lurking in the bush and observing us. Therefore, they are not recognized by us properly. We bunching into small groups, 2-3 persons to checking selected areas to collecting



scats, plumage, scales, hairs, dead animals, signs, nests around bush. We occasionally, on worthy trails setting up camera traps, cage traps with bait stations, we select trap tracks and so on. For smaller animals we can setting pitfall traps. We install hair tubes or hair traps for collecting hairs of intriguing us unrecognized animals. Noninvasive method as hair traps are e.g. rolling up tape on trails, scratchy wires, bait resin on trees as well as other sources for biological samples like as saliva collector.

We can use extraordinary methods to catch rarities e.g. modified traditional snares without harmful for species (used e.g. in research on solenodon existence, Platt 2012). This could be used for identified region-specific areas for alleged folk or ethnoknown animals proposed as significant unrecognized. Very important is long-term monitoring, but due scant of funds work it is rarely conducted/practiced. Alternative and quite easy methods could be asking locals for hunters resources in forms of skins, plumage and skulls of living relicts in such families as mustelids or galliformes birds.



Applied cryptozoology

The main error of many cryptozoologist's work is weak applied methodology. The fact is existence of significant or charismatic species. But methodology used by cryptozoology researchers is unfortunately inadequate. Anecdotal reports are of course important as well as folksonomy. Long-term expeditions for selected areas and interviews with natives are significant part of cryptozoological research. But basal is biological sample what can convince all of the interested in the issue.



References:

Arment, C. 1995. The Search for Enigmatic Animals: A Guide to Cryptozoological Investigation Techniques. Privately published: Tipp City.

Arment, C. 2004. Cryptozoology: Science & Speculation. Coachwhip Publications, Landisville, Pennsylvania.

Bauer, A. M., A.P. Russell. 1988. Osteological evidence for the prior occurrence of a giant gecko in Otago, New Zealand. Cryptozoology 7:22-37

Berlin, B., Breedlove, D. E. & Raven, P. H. 1966. Folk taxonomies and biological classification'. Science, 154 : 273-275.

Brent B. 1992. Ethnobiological classification: principles of categorization of plants and animals in traditional societies. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Brussard, P. F. 1986. The likelihood of persistence of small populations of large animals and its implications for cryptozoology. Cryptozoology 5: 38-46.

Butchart, S.H.M. 2007. Birds to find: a review of 'lost', obscure and poorly known African bird species. Bulletin of the African Bird Club, 14, 138–157

Colemal, L., Clark J. 1999. Cryptozoology A to Z: The Encyclopedia of Loch Monsters, Sasquatch, Chupacabras, and Other Authentic Mysteries of Nature. NY: Simon and Schuster.

Diamond, J. M. 1989. The ethnobiologist's dilemma. Natural History 6: 26-30.

Durkheim, E., & Mauss, M. 1963. Primitive classification.



Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eberhart, G. M. 2005. **Mysterious Creatures: Creating A Cryptozoological Encyclopedia.** *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 19 (1): 103–113.

Goodman, S. M. and Hobbs, J. J. 1994. The distribution an ethnozoology of reptiles of the northern portion of the Egyptian Eastern Desert. *J. Ethnobiol.*, 14 (1): 75–100

Heuvelmans, B. 1958. **On the Track of Unknown Animals.** London: Hart-Davis.

Heuvelmans, B. 1986. **Annotated Checklist of Apparently Unknown Animals with which Cryptozoology is Concerned.** *Cryptozoology* Vol. 5: 1-26.

Heuvelmans, B. 1988. The sources and method of cryptozoological research. *Cryptozoology*, 7 : 1-21

Hocking, P. 1992. "Large Peruvian Mammals Unknown to Zoology," *Cryptozoology* 11: 38–50

Köhler, J.; Wagner, P.; Visser, S. & Böhme, W. 2004. New country records of *Adolfus africanus* (Sauria: Lacertidae) - a rain forest lizard with disjunct distribution? *Salamandra* 39 (3/4): 241-248

Kunin, W. E., & Gaston, K. J. 1997. **The biology of rarity: Causes and consequences of rare-common differences.** London: Chapman & Hall.

Miskelly, C. M. 1987. "The identity of the hakawai". *Notornis* 34 (2): 95–116.

Muller, N. 2012. **New Gouldian finches found in Kimberley.**
<http://www.australiangeographic.com.au/news/2012/01/new-gouldian-finches-found-in-kimberley/>



Naish, D. 2010. Tetrapod Zoology Book One. CFZ Press, Bideford.

Platt, J. R. 2012. Solenodon: 'Extinct' Venomous Mammal Rediscovered in Cuba after 10-Year Search.
<http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/extinction-countdown/2012/10/11/solenodon-extinct-venomous-mammal-rediscovered-cuba/>

Rabbit, J. 2002. Native and western eyewitness testimony in cryptozoology: In Eberhart, G. M. 2002. Mysterious Creatures: A Guide to Cryptozoology. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Raynal, M. 1989. Cryptozoology : science or pseudo-science ? Cryptozoology, 8 : 98-102.

Raynal, M. 1999. Madagascar "predicted" moth: An ill-known succes of cryptozoology. <http://cryptozoo.pagesperso-orange.fr/dossiers/moth.htm>

Rich, P.V., van Tets G.F., Knight F. (eds.) 1985. Kadimakara. Extinct vertebrates of Australia. Pioneer Design Studio, Melbourne

Rosenzweig, M.I. 1995. Species diversity in space and time. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rossi L. 2012. Criptozoologia – Animali misteriosi tra Scienza e Leggenda. Photocity Edizioni Open

Shuker, K. 2003. The Beasts That Hide From Man: Seeking the World's Last Undiscovered Animals. Paraview Press: New York.

Thompson, W.L. 2004. Sampling Rare or Elusive Species: Concepts, Designs, and Techniques for Estimating Population Parameters. Island Press, Washington, DC.



Yu, J. & Dobson, F. S., 2000. Seven forms of rarity in mammals. *Journal of Biogeography*, 27: 131–139.

Wang, J.Y., S.K. Hung and S.-C. Yang. 2004. Records of IndoPacific humpback dolphins, *Sousa chinensis* (Osbeck, 1765) from the waters of western Taiwan. *Aquat. Mamm.* 30: 187–194

Wignall, P. B., and Benton, M. J. 1999. Lazarus taxa and fossil abundance at times of biotic crisis. *Journal of the Geological Society, London* 156: 453–456

This material should be cited as:

Pietrzak, Q. T. 2014. Short cryptozoological practise. Short booklet series. gnhi publications. 32 pp.

gnhi work
gnhi.pl

