

NR_key_name: B55348D08682B9C48525651C004B9C76
SendTo: CN=Peter Voth/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Jessica DiFrisco/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/24/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 9:45:52 AM
ComposedDate: 09/24/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 9:45:09 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: