

Excerpt of email from Paul Maloney to Joe Marino on September 9, 2003

As it is currently written, I emphatically DO NOT support a fresh carbon dating of the Shroud at this time (...).

But I have had too much personal experience with trying to get the Turinese officials (...) to have an open mind toward proper and scientifically controlled testing and am therefore very very sceptical about future testing that, without a cogently, well-written proposal, we are doomed to failure.

Yours and Sue's work on the Rae's Corner, which you first made public at Orvieto in 2000 was, I thought then, and still think now, a seminal piece of work. Alas, it was dismissed by M. Flury-Lemberg. And, I think, many do not take it seriously yet. But some years ago I wrote a paper entitled "The Titanic Syndrome" which I submitted to a Spanish Language magazine (at their request) for publication (but which was not accepted) in which I argued that the reason the Titanic sank was because ship-building technology ran years ahead of metalurgical technology. I drew the analogy that radiocarbon technology in 1977 (when Gove first proposed the Shroud test) was years ahead of our understanding of textile technology as applied to the Shroud. Although I did not have access to the work you and Sue did at the time I wrote "The Titanic Syndrome" you have beautifully illustrated exactly and precisely the point I made in writing that article: that unless we understand the nature of the area we are radiocarbon dating-i.e. the "history" of the sample site, we are doomed. And this is also the exact argument of Marie-Claire Gastuche that if we do not know the "history" of a sample site, then the radiocarbon dating of that sample will be questionable.

Now, in retrospect, we can see why it failed. And if Luigi Gonella had had access to your studies, and if he had taken them seriously, I doubt very much that he would have used the Rae's Corner as his sample site. Still, I lay much blame on Gonella because during my face-to-face meeting with him on Saturday, Nov. 27, 1987 he refused to budge at my warnings and I knew then that we were headed for disaster. Even shortly thereafter, when I personally delivered my 26 page "white paper" to then Papal Nuncio Pio Laghi in Washington, D.C. for delivery to the Pope in the diplomatic pouch and sent copies of it to then Cardinal Ballestrero and Luigi Gonella, the latter was furious and completely dismissed my warnings as worthless--although that paper represented the distillation of my interviews with Garman Harbottle, Harry Gove, Henry Polach, Minze Stuiver, Stuart Fleming, Bob Otlet, Marian Scott (the latter being the statistician with the International Radiocarbon Calibration Programme based in Glasgow, Scotland). I had cautioned him that if he didn't handle things correctly he would have a political and scientific disaster on his hands. Gonella was so stubbornly committed to "saving" (spell that "conservation") the Shroud by sampling only the Rae's Corner that he lost the whole thing and we are where we are today by his ineptitude.

Thus, you can see why I oppose this project simply for psychological reasons. But there are internal reasons also. Bill wants to use the dusts and the excised materials from the Shroud. This is so susceptible to substitution that I dismiss it out of hand. We must require that all samples be removed directly from the Shroud in the presence of credible witnesses, that all such handling of each sample be video taped for the record, that such video tape be made available to the public for scrutiny, that a protocol be established and that that protocol be

adhered to rigorously and faithfully (instead of the cavalier manner in which it was abrogated in 1988!). Moreover, those dusts include material taken from the so-called "poker holes" for which we do not even have a single bit of scientific data for establishing a "signature" for those burnsites!!! These, therefore, ought to be excluded in any future testing (...).