

"Religion and science are the two great sister forces which have pulled, and are still pulling, mankind onward and upward"

UCCR

Union of Catholic Christian Rationalists

Robert Andrew Millikan
(1868 – 1953, Nobel laureate in physics)



[Home](#) | [UCCR](#) | [Newness](#) | [Science](#) | [History](#) | [Historicity](#) | [Secularism](#) | [Bioethics](#) |

Search in UCCR:



International MBA Madrid

A year of transformation, creation & innovation at IE Business School. landings.ie.edu

News

[Actualities](#)

[Faith & Science](#)

[Faith & History](#)

[Faith & Historicity](#)

[Faith & Secularism](#)

[Bioethics](#)



MBA for
forward
thinkers

Lead Digital
Transformation
with the Global
MBA in IE
Business
School.



landings.ie.edu

Shroud of Turin: "False Bloodstains"? The only falsehood is the new study

20 July 2018



Exactly 40 years ago, in 1978, the **Shroud of Turin** was deemed "fake" because McCrone affirmed (erroneously) that there were no traces of blood on the linen iron oxide and vermillion pigments. Yesterday, after bitterly swallowing that, yes, two notorious sceptics of the authenticity of the Shroud concluded, though, **unrealistic** as compared to the position of a crucified person.

In the last hours, we have been overwhelmed with requests to answer and published on the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*. However, in principle, **all** **re** **welcomed**, both in favour or against the authenticity of the Shroud (which Church, obliges to consider authentic). Of course, when all the mediatic app

synchrony about the "falsity" of the Shroud without this conclusion being even held by the study (where we only read "un" when we read that the author is, as usual, the chemist of Pavia **Luigi Garlaschelli** (scientific director of the CICAP, the Ita investigation of claims by the pseudosciences), who has already failed similar experiments on the Shroud, then the suspicion of i

Analysing the research with accuracy and objectivity, we read that the two researchers used a **mannequin** by pouring – thr blood imbued added with an anticoagulant to observe the direction of the blood flow and comparing its pathway with the one of image. Garlaschelli himself, afterwards, poured some blood – always added with the anticoagulant – on his wrist. To obta Shroud's, they concluded, the arms should have been **in an almost vertical position**, which is why the media deduced the "ho

What clearly makes the **experiment unreliable** is the persistent mistake by Garlaschelli of comparing two "objects" with **differ** we compare different situations, it is obvious and logical that the results will be different; it would be – really, this time – unrea be identical. Even physicist **Paolo di Lazzaro**, research manager of the Frascati Center of Research and Vice Director of the Sindonology, **claimed** so: «You can see it well in the film that accompanies the research: the blood from the cannula flows on way, to the point that it almost looks like colored water. This is due to the presence of **anticoagulant**, which is essential to pre the bag. But this fluidity of the blood used for the experiment **has nothing to do** with the situation of the crucified man of the . Shroud had been subjected to stress», to repeated traumas observable from the very Shroud image. «As a result, this person's **viscous than normal** and therefore the pathways of the streams coming out of the wounds may have taken very **different di** the fluidized blood used in this experiment».

A second variable that **modifies the blood pathway** is the difference in the speed at which a liquid is introduced into th Garlaschelli's arm as opposed to the one at which the **blood comes out of the wounds** of a crucified man or, alternatively, resolutely, on the cloth, in the hypothesis of subsequent additions by a forger. This is a data **that is unknown** and, for reproduced in an experiment. «Does it seem like a scientific criterion to take a mannequin – like the ones used to display cloth and a sponge soaked in fake blood attached to a piece wood that is pressed on the right side of a dummy to see where the si **commented** Emanuela Marinelli, a famous Italian expert, surprised with the lack of professionalism. «It suffices to pay, and i explained Marinelli – «and you also find someone who publishes them».

It is not over. **The third huge mistake** is to have compared the smooth skin of Garlaschelli and the plastic mannequin with t Man. The latter, as always shown by the Shroud image, presents a **cutaneous surface** full of dirt, encrustations, lacerations and wounds. It is normal, therefore, that the blood flow behaves differently and takes different directions. Always Di Lazzaro thing is the **clean and intact skin** of Professor Garlaschelli, who lent his body for the experiment, another is the swollen dehydrated man. On the Shroud, we found **traces of soil**, to testify that the skin of the man of the Shroud was dirty due to re, the crucified one had to be sweated, dirty with soil, swollen with hematomas and encrusted with blood from the whip-inflicted the blood flows being identical would **have been unrealistic** – not their being different.

Thus, concluded Di Lazzaro, «before drawing any conclusions, a serious scientist must take into account the experiment parameters», and the **differences between reality and what he wants to reproduce** in an aseptic lab. «We cannot say i flows are not congruent with the position of a crucified man **if we do not take into account** the conditions of the dehydrated viscous blood and the swollen, dirty and sweaty skin. For this reason, I believe that the results of this research should be i preliminary, waiting for an experiment that attempts to reproduce the spots visible on the Shroud using parameters of blood i that they want to reproduce. In fact, this article by Borrelli and Garlaschelli does not **answer (and indeed reinforces)** **the con**

[Privacy & Cookies Policy](#)

experts in 2014.» Yes, because, among other things, the study **dates back to four years ago**, when it was presented, without Conference on Forensic Medicine in the USA: «*Even then*» – says the physicist of Aeneas – «*there were considerable concerns validity of the results. Now that same study, with the addition of some new experiment, has been published*».

[In 2014](#), the couple **Garlaschelli&Borrini** had already attempted to take the long shot by saying that Jesus would have been behind his head in a "Y" shape and not in a "T" one, so as to conclude that the imprint of the body present on the Shroud did not fit classical representations of the crucifixion used traditionally in the time of Jesus. In **2009**, the always indomitable Garlaschelli joined the **Union of Rationalist Atheists and Agnostics** (UAAR) to create a **"second" Shroud** by using pigments, chemical paints and a hypothetical medieval forger. The result was so disappointing and different from the original, that even atheist mathematician **Odifreddi** (honorary president of the UAAR, by the way) [distanced himself](#) from it; the chemist of the CICAP was so much concerned ([here an example](#)), that the experiment sunk into oblivion.

In conclusion, the authors of the study **have not talked about "false bloodstains"** as reported by the news agencies (and then, other, by the main newspapers), but at the most about an **unrealistic bleeding** on the Shroud as compared to what happened in reality. And it is an obvious and foreseeable conclusion, since **the experiment was not ethically correct** and is **methodologically flawed**: comparison of two different substances (blood added with an anticoagulant, in a lab), two different surfaces for the dripping (dummies, tumefactions, wounds, and lacerations, in a lab) while overlooking important variables that may have altered the blood direction, people having touched the body of the Shroud's Man after his death, his being wrapped in the same linen cloth, his forearms during the suffered tortures, etc. Studies of professional researchers are really welcome, whether sceptical or not. But, please, never work only as mannequin.

Editorial staff

Share on:     

Related Posts



«If science exists, this means that there's a Logic», fame physicist said



Genesis is not in contradiction with science



Frans De Waal and the "morality in animals" attempt



Shallice, a neuropsychologist: «mind isn't a product of neurons»



Faith and Science



«The stars? Refer to man's destiny», says famous astrophysics



Faith & Science (news archives)



Faith and Historicity

Comments Feed for this article

Facebook comments

0 Comments



Add a comment...

Facebook Comments Plugin

Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked *

Comment

Name *

Email *

Website

☐

Save my name, email, and website in this browser for the next time I comment.

Post Comment

« [Transgender volleyball player? «Death of sport», influential physiologist says](#)

