Holstonia Bigfoot Investigations
Genesis Series No. 3

Conservation Biology, Ethics, and the Human Dimensions of a Putative Relict Homo Species

Daniel H. Kegley
holstonia-investigations.org
Version of Record: This document constitutes the authoritative version of this work. Please cite the version available at holstonia-investigations.org. Revised editions, if issued, will be explicitly identified.

Dedicated to the memory of Dr. Jeff Meldrum and Dr. Jane Goodall

Abstract

The possibility that a relict *Homo* species persists into the present raises substantial conservation, ethical, and cultural considerations. Unlike conventional wildlife, a hominin species occupies a unique position in biology, anthropology, and law. This paper synthesizes principles from conservation biology, environmental ethics, Indigenous knowledge frameworks, and human–wildlife conflict research to propose a precautionary ethical framework for study and protection. We examine implications of rarity, crypticity, behavioral avoidance, potential endangerment status, and the challenges of conducting research without increasing risk to survival. We also explore human sociocultural responses, land-use impacts, governance dilemmas surrounding disclosure, and responsible communication. The paper argues that a conservation-first approach is warranted even in the absence of formal recognition, and it outlines research norms emphasizing non-invasive methods, harm minimization, and Indigenous partnership.

1. Introduction

Conservation biology is often described as a “crisis discipline,” obligated to make decisions under uncertainty because delays can be irreversible (Soulé, 1985). If a relict *Homo* species exists, the ethical stakes intensify: the subject is simultaneously “wildlife” in ecological terms and potentially “kin” in moral terms, forcing conservation practice to confront boundaries between species protection, person-like moral status, and governance legitimacy (Mace, 2004; Soulé, 1985).

Papers 1–3 develop biological plausibility using ethology and ecology; Paper 4 extends the inquiry by asking what follows ethically if the hypothesis is taken seriously as a conservation-risk scenario. Even when an entity is unconfirmed, *risk-based* conservation reasoning can be appropriate when (a) hypothesized populations are small, (b) disturbance could raise mortality, and (c) disclosure could trigger exploitation pressures (Soulé, 1985).

2. Conservation Status and Biological Vulnerability

If a relict *Homo* species exists and is low-density, its conservation profile would resemble the most vulnerable classes of large, slow-reproducing mammals: low effective population size, high sensitivity to habitat fragmentation, and elevated risk from rare but consequential human-caused mortality events (Soulé, 1985; Mace, 2004).

2.1 Population vulnerability

Small populations face compounding risks from demographic stochasticity, genetic drift, and Allee effects—risks that intensify for species with long lifespans and low reproductive rates (Soulé, 1985). If Paper 3’s low-density assumptions are even approximately correct, conservation planning would need to presume *high endangerment sensitivity* (Soulé, 1985).

2.2 Habitat threats

Habitat loss and fragmentation are among the primary drivers of biodiversity decline and extinction risk, especially for wide-ranging species dependent on large contiguous landscapes (Cardinale et al., 2012). Road networks increase access, disturbance, and mortality risk while reducing functional connectivity (Cardinale et al., 2012).

2.3 Human impact

Large-bodied species can persist alongside people, but persistence depends on governance, tolerance, and conflict mitigation (Chapron et al., 2014). Human predation and persecution pressures often differ qualitatively from nonhuman predation: humans disproportionately remove adult "reproductive capital," and risk can be concentrated through sporadic but severe events (Darimont et al., 2015). For a hypothesized relict hominin, even a few mortalities could be population-level events.

---

3. Ethical Considerations in Studying a Relict Hominin

3.1 Personhood vs. wildlife designation

A hominin hypothesis invites ethical pluralism: different moral frameworks may assign elevated status relative to typical wildlife, especially if cognition, sociality, and cultural transmission are plausible (Soulé, 1985). This does not require resolving "personhood" legally in order to adopt a conservative field ethic: **minimize harm under uncertainty**.

3.2 The moratorium principle and "do no harm" field ethics

Conservation practice commonly restricts close-contact methods when a population is rare, disease-sensitive, or vulnerable to disturbance. Great-ape best-practice guidance emphasizes distancing, controlled visitation, and biosecurity because human proximity itself can be a threat vector (Macfie & Williamson, 2010). While a relict hominin case would be novel, the underlying logic generalizes: **increased contact increases risk** (Macfie & Williamson, 2010).

3.3 Invasive vs. non-invasive methods

Given uncertainty and potential moral status, ethical practice should prioritize methods that reduce disturbance while still producing analyzable data: passive acoustic monitoring, remote observation, trace documentation, and habitat modeling. Unmanned aircraft systems can reduce field risk but also create disturbance; wildlife applications should explicitly evaluate behavioral response and risk tradeoffs before use (Christie et al., 2016).

3.4 The disclosure dilemma

Public disclosure can create "gold-rush" dynamics: increased visitation, harassment, and conflict pressures. Conservation history shows repeated tensions between protection goals and human interests, including situations where conservation interventions

themselves produce harm or displacement (Redford & Painter, 2006). A cautious disclosure posture is therefore not anti-scientific; it is a harm-reduction strategy under credible risk (Redford & Painter, 2006).

---

4. Indigenous Perspectives and Cultural Considerations

Indigenous knowledge systems often emphasize relational ethics, responsibility, and long-term observation in place—approaches that can complement Western ecological monitoring (Berkes, 2012; Kimmerer, 2013). At the same time, "integrating" Indigenous knowledge into Western categories can become extractive if governance and sovereignty are ignored (Agrawal, 2002).

4.1 Respect for sovereignty and Indigenous knowledge governance

Ethically defensible research must treat Indigenous nations as rights-holders and co-governors, not merely "stakeholders." Data stewardship should be negotiated through consent-based agreements and governance norms that protect culturally restricted knowledge (Agrawal, 2002; Carroll et al., 2020).

4.2 Cultural impacts of discovery

Formal recognition (or even public controversy) can distort sacred narratives, invite unwanted attention to sensitive places, and generate external claims of "discovery" over beings long acknowledged in Indigenous traditions (Berkes, 2012; Kimmerer, 2013). Conservation practice should therefore incorporate cultural impact assessment as part of ethical review (Agrawal, 2002).

4.3 Restorative science

A "restorative" model treats Western science and Indigenous governance as complementary systems, with shared decision-making and benefits that flow back to communities and lands (Berkes, 2012; Carroll et al., 2020).

---

5. Conservation Policy and Management Implications

5.1 Provisional conservation status under uncertainty

Because taxonomy is foundational to legal protection yet often lags ecological reality, conservation planning sometimes must proceed with precautionary measures even when

classification is unresolved (Mace, 2004). The operative ethical test here is not “Is the species recognized?” but “Would specific actions plausibly increase risk if the species exists?”

5.2 Habitat protection strategies

For a low-density, disturbance-sensitive population, management would prioritize habitat connectivity, reduced access pressure in core areas, and seasonal restrictions in biologically sensitive periods—strategies consistent with broad conservation practice for vulnerable large mammals (Cardinale et al., 2012; Chapron et al., 2014).

5.3 Legal classification challenges

Protected-area governance and conservation often intersect with human rights and sovereignty. Conservation policy that ignores these dimensions can produce conflict and ethical failure (Redford & Painter, 2006). A relict hominin scenario would amplify these tensions and demands explicit legal scholarship and Indigenous governance leadership (Carroll et al., 2020; Redford & Painter, 2006).

5.4 Science governance

Oversight should include conservation biologists, primatologists, bioethicists, and Indigenous authorities, with clear protocols for data handling, disclosure review, and harm minimization (Carroll et al., 2020; Macfie & Williamson, 2010).

---

6. Human Dimensions and Conflict Mitigation

6.1 Types of human–hominin interactions

Human–wildlife conflict research shows that conflict is not only biological; it is shaped by perception, rumor, media incentives, and governance legitimacy. For a charismatic and controversial subject, misinformation and exploitation pressures are predictable human responses (Redford & Painter, 2006).

6.2 Managing public perception

Communication should emphasize *non-disturbance norms* and discourage “verification tourism.” Where human visitation is possible, disease-risk logic from great-ape management provides a relevant caution: proximity can harm the animal population even without direct violence (Macfie & Williamson, 2010).

6.3 Conflict mitigation framework

Mitigation would include: reporting pathways that discourage doxxing of locations, anti-harassment norms, and coordination across land managers and Indigenous authorities. Where technology is used (e.g., drones), disturbance evaluation should be explicit and conservative (Christie et al., 2016).

---

7. Recommendations and Conclusions

7.1 Conservation-first mandate

If the hypothesis is taken seriously, survival risk outweighs scientific curiosity; conservation biology explicitly prioritizes preventing irreversible loss under uncertainty (Soulé, 1985).

7.2 Non-invasive study requirement

Preferred methods: passive acoustics, distant observation, trace documentation, and habitat modeling; avoid capture, pursuit, habituation attempts, and any approach likely to increase contact frequency (Macfie & Williamson, 2010).

7.3 Indigenous partnership standard

Indigenous nations should be treated as co-governors and co-authors of policy where relevant, with data governance aligned to Indigenous data sovereignty principles (Carroll et al., 2020).

7.4 Precautionary habitat protection

Conservation should focus on core habitat integrity and connectivity, consistent with biodiversity-function evidence and large-carnivore coexistence findings (Cardinale et al., 2012; Chapron et al., 2014).

7.5 Ethical disclosure protocol

Disclosure should be staged, reviewed, and justified using a harm-reduction framework, acknowledging documented tensions between conservation goals and human impacts (Redford & Painter, 2006).

Conclusion: A relict *Homo* hypothesis, if treated as a conservation-risk scenario, warrants a precautionary, culturally respectful, and non-invasive research approach grounded in established conservation biology and ethical governance frameworks.

References (APA 7th)

Agrawal, A. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and the politics of classification. *International Social Science Journal, 54*(173), 287–297.

Berkes, F. (2012). *Sacred ecology* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Cardinale, B. J., Duffy, J. E., Gonzalez, A., Hooper, D. U., Perrings, C., Venail, P., Narwani, A., Mace, G. M., Tilman, D., Wardle, D. A., Kinzig, A. P., Daily, G. C., Loreau, M., Grace, J. B., Larigauderie, A., Srivastava, D. S., & Naeem, S. (2012). Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature, 486*(7401), 59–67.

Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Figueroa-Rodríguez, O. L., Holbrook, J., Lovett, R., Materechera, S., Parsons, M., Raseroka, K., Rodriguez-Lonebear, D., Rowe, R., Sara, R., Walker, J. D., Anderson, J., & Hudson, M. (2020). The CARE principles for Indigenous data governance. *Data Science Journal, 19*, 43.

Chapron, G., Kaczensky, P., Linnell, J. D. C., von Arx, M., Huber, D., Andrén, H., López-Bao, J. V., Adamec, M., Álvares, F., Anders, O., Balčiauskas, L., Balys, V., Bedő, P., Bego, F., Blanco, J. C., Breitenmoser, U., Broseth, H., Bufka, L., Bunikyte, R., … Boitani, L. (2014). Recovery of large carnivores in Europe's modern human-dominated landscapes. *Science, 346*(6216), 1517–1519.

Christie, K. S., Gilbert, S. L., Brown, C. L., Hatfield, M., & Hanson, L. (2016). Unmanned aircraft systems in wildlife research: Current and future applications of a transformative technology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 14*(5), 241–251.

Darimont, C. T., Fox, C. H., Bryan, H. M., & Reimchen, T. E. (2015). The unique ecology of human predators. *Science, 349*(6250), 858–860.

Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants*. Milkweed Editions.

Lunstrum, E. (2014). Green militarization: Anti-poaching efforts and the spatial contours of Kruger National Park. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 104*(4), 816–832.

Macfie, E. J., & Williamson, E. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Best practice guidelines for great ape tourism*. IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group.

Mace, G. M. (2004). The role of taxonomy in species conservation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 359*(1444), 711–719.

Redford, K. H., & Adams, W. M. (2006). Wildlife conservation and the rights of indigenous peoples. *Conservation and Society, 4*(1), 1–10.Soulé, M. E. (1985). What is conservation biology? *BioScience, 35*(11), 727–734.