

LETTERS

From Emanuela Marinelli, Collegamento Pro Sindone, Via dei Brusati 84, 00163, Rome

Thank you very very much from me and Dr. Petrosillo for what you wrote in the last Newsletter [no. 26] about our book.

My audience with the Pope was fantastic. A quarter of an hour in which we had the possibility of saying, in a few words, all we know on the radiocarbon 'affaire'. I was aware of being there on behalf of all sindonologists of the world struggling for the truth. The Pope heard us with great attention and interest, encouraging us to continue. During the summer he read our book, and the effect is readable in the August 18 Vatican Bulletin. I have to thank very much all my friends, sindonologists of all the world, like you, for helping me in this work for the truth.

Soon, probably in March, our book will be printed in French, by Fayard, 75 Rue de Saints Péres, 75006, Paris, France, and in English, by De La Salle Brothers Publications, Stella Maris College, Gzira, Malta, with the help of Brother Michael Buttigieg.

From Professor Harry Gove, Nuclear Structure Research Laboratory, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627

I must say I was both astonished and amused that you drew the conclusion from my article in *Radiocarbon* ['Recent Publications', *Newsletter* no. 26, p.17], that I and my fellow nuclear physicists thought we were being provided shroud samples to test the AMS method. Representatives of the original seven laboratories and the British Museum went to some thought and care at the Turin Workshop to devise a procedure to carbon date the Turin shroud that would be as credible as possible to both scientists and the general public.

You should remember that the seven labs included two that did not employ AMS. Six of the labs had already participated in an interlab comparison devised and monitored by the British Museum. There was no need for us to engage in another such comparison. The three labs that finally carried out the measurements did so fully aware that their every move would be open to discussion and criticism. I noted in my article 'Probably no sample for carbon dating has ever been subjected to such scrupulously careful examination and treatment, nor perhaps ever will again.' They did so to produce a believable answer for the date on which the flax from which the Shroud's linen was made was harvested, and not to provide a further validation of the AMS method.

The AMS method had been fully tested before the shroud measurements were made. Despite my personal feelings concerning Luigi Gonella I give him credit for picking AMS labs only to date the shroud. It demonstrated that he believed the AMS technique was sound. Certainly he and the members of the three AMS labs he selected never considered the task to be one of testing that method. To suggest that it displays either a misunderstanding on your part or a deliberate attempt to misinform the readers of your Newsletter, most of whom will never actually read my article

[*Ed.*: Professor Gove has taken rather seriously a point I actually made somewhat lightly, hence the exclamation mark in the original review. He omits to mention that the British Museum six lab intercomparison produced one rogue result, also his own early concerns that something similar might happen with the AMS work on the Shroud by Oxford, Arizona and Zurich. This was why he vaunted the Shroud carbon dating as the AMS method's 'greatest public success'. By implication, therefore, he and the three laboratories perceived their method, every bit as much as the Shroud, to be on public trial. I stand 100% behind the point I made.]