

**NR\_key\_name:** 05E7500867C749AF8525651C0054E151  
**SendTo:** JDIFRISCO @ JUNO.COM @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT  
**CopyTo:**  
**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**  
**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R econd/O=ARRB  
**From:** CN=Jessica DiFrisco/O=ARRB  
**DisplayFromDomain:**  
**DisplayDate:** 09/24/1997  
**DisplayDate\_Time:** 11:27:29 AM  
**ComposedDate:** 09/24/1997  
**ComposedDate\_Time:** 11:27:07 AM  
**Subject:** More Spam: Evolution and Railroads  
TO: JESSICA DIFRISCO/ARRBCC. FROM: BENJAMIN ROCKWELL/ARRB Date: 09/24/97 09:13:42 AMSubject: MORE  
Spam: Evolution and RailroadsTo: Benjamin\_Rockwell @ jfk-arrb.govcc: (bcc: Benjamin Rockwell/ARRB)From:  
rockwell @ gwis2.circ.gwu.edu @ 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  
Record  
**Body:**  
**recstat:**  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**