

NR_key_name: 9BB8C36AC763FF758525651D0074DEFC
SendTo: CN=Bob Skwirot/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Benjamin Rockwell/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/25/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 5:18:48 PM
ComposedDate: 09/25/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 5:16:33 PM
Subject: A little levity from your CIA crew
TO: BENJAMIN_rockwell @ jfk-artb.govcc. (bcc: BENJAMIN ROCKWELL/ARRB)FROM: ROCKWELL @ gw1sz.circ.gwu.edu
@ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT Date: 09/23/97 07:50:11 PM ASTSubject: Evolution (fwd)>>>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 request that we approach the National>Science Foundation's Phylogeny Department
Record
Body:
recstat:
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: