NR_key_name: 9A39E8493F7116328525651C00488DFD
SendTo: CN=Jessica DiFrisco/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Benjamin Rockwell/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 09/24/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 9:13:43 AM
ComposedDate: 09/24/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 9:12:29 AM

Subject: More Spam: Evolution and Railroads

@ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT Date: 09/23/97 07:50:11 PM ASTSubject: More Spam: Evolution and Railroads (fwd)>----->>#1>>>>Ok, the story behind this... There's this nutball who digs things out of his>back yard and sends the stuff he finds to the Smithsonian>Institute, labeling them with scientific names, insisting that they are>actual archeological finds. The really weird thing about these letters is>that this guy really exists and does this in his spare time!>>Anyway... here's a letter from the Smithsonian Institute from when he sent>them a Barbie doll head.>>>>------->>>>

Paleoanthropology Division Smithsonian Institute>> 207 Pennsylvania Avenue>> Washington, DC 20078>>>>Dear Sir:>>>>Thank you for your latest submission to the Institute, labeled "211-D, layer>seven, next to the clothesline post. Hominid skull." We have given this>specimen a careful and detailed examination, and regret to inform you that>we disagree with your theory that it represents "conclusive proof of the>presence of Early Man in Charleston County two million years ago." Rather,>it appears that>>what you have found is the head of a Barbie doll, of the variety one of our>staff, who has small children, believes to be the "Malibu>>Barbie". It is evident that you have given a great deal of thought to the>analysis of this specimen, and you may be quite certain that those of us who>are familiar with your prior work in the field were loathe to come to>contradiction with your findings. However, we do feel that there are a>number of physical attributes of the specimen which might have tipped you>off to its modern origin:>>>>1. The material is molded plastic. Ancient hominid remains are typically>fossilized bone.>>2. The cranial capacity of the specimen is approximately 9 cubic>centimeters, well below the threshold of even the earliest identified>>proto-hominids.>>3. The dentition pattern evident on the "skull" is more consistent with the>common domesticated dog than it is with the "ravenous man-eating Pliocene>clams" you speculate roamed the wetlands during that time. This latter>finding is certainly one of the most intriguing hypotheses you have>submitted in your history with this institution, but the evidence seems to>weigh rather heavily against it.>>Without going into too much detail, let us say that:>>A. The specimen looks like the head of a Barbie doll that a dog has chewed on.>>B. Clams don't have teeth.>>>It is with feelings tinged with melancholy that we must deny your request to>have the specimen carbon dated. This is partially due>>to the heavy load our lab must bear in its normal operation, and partly due>to carbon dating's notorious inaccuracy in fossils of recent>>geologic record. To the best of our knowledge, no Barbie dolls were produced>prior to 1956 AD, and carbon dating is likely to produce wildly inaccurate>results. Sadly, we must also deny your

recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N **DeliveryReport**: B

ReturnReceipt: Categories:

Body: