

ATSI 2014 <cdyer@conferencecatalysts.com>
to: David Roemer <davidmihjng@gmail.com>
date: Mon, Jun 30, 2014 at 8:54 AM
subject: [ATSI 2014] Your paper #1569970437 ('Science, Metaphysics, Philosophy, Theology, History, and the Holy Shroud')

Dear Dr. David Roemer:

We regret to inform you that your paper #1569970437 ('Science, Metaphysics, Philosophy, Theology, History, and the Holy Shroud') cannot be accepted for publication in the Proceedings of IEEE 2014 Workshop on Advances in the Turin Shroud Investigation.

We received a large number of papers this year and were unfortunately not able to accommodate all submissions. We look forward to your attendance at this year's conference and participation in future IEEE workshops.

Should you wish to attend and enjoy the excellent program, please register for the conference at: <http://dee.poliba.it/atsi2014/index.htm>.

The reviews are below or can be found at <https://www.edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1569970437>, using your EDAS login name davidmihjng@gmail.com.

=====
Review 1
=====

> *** Appropriate: Is the content appropriate for the conference themes?

Reject (1)

> *** Content: How would you rate the quality of the technical/management content of the paper?

Reject (1)

> *** Recommendation: Do you recommend acceptance or rejection?

Reject (1)

> *** Guidance: Please provide specific recommendations that you would like to suggest to the author for improving the paper.

The paper contains a series of confuse considerations in the field of the philosophy od science which have nothing to do with the Shroud and the research on its image.

=====
Review 2
=====

> *** Appropriate: Is the content appropriate for the conference themes?

Weak Accept (4)

> *** Content: How would you rate the quality of the technical/management content of the paper?

Reject (1)

> *** Recommendation: Do you recommend acceptance or rejection?

Reject (1)

> *** Guidance: Please provide specific recommendations that you would like to suggest to the author for improving the paper.

Let's bring to the heart of the problem regarding the quality of the submitted paper: all aspects of the TS invariably calls into question the person of Jesus Christ. The fact that the TS has been conserved up to now could either imply that it is a fake that goes far back in time or it is the true linen in which the corpse of Jesus Christ was wrapped. Provided the second hypothesis, corroborated up to now by stockpiled evidence, is assumed, then the resurrection of Jesus Christ could tacitly be understood, because if it didn't the TS would have been destroyed in the brief course of the corpse corruption. Of course, this is only an example of reasoning. Note that even the scientific thinking advances, as the case may be, involving educated guesses, with all due respect to those which turn off immediately with apodictic - paradoxically non-scientific - pose when the above-mentioned guesses apply, say, to the Shroud. What exactly regards Jesus Christ as Son of God, namely His identification with the risen Lord, invariably needs to be referred to His incarnation. This applies to any investigation, irrespective of whether the investigator is a worshipper or not. Contrary to a stagnant gnosis, there is a general consensus on regarding incarnation even from some attainable, practical aspects. This is the case when attention is paid to the available attestations of personally or collectively tangible, palpable, detectable, intelligible experiences, as well as purely terrestrial events and circumstances. As a consequence, any sagacious investigator that deals with this sensitive topic prefers not to get the still unresolved, vague - to the point of boredom! -, misleading problem, say, of the Big Bang in place! The resurrection and what revolves around this crucial event - this is the case for the Turin Shroud - has nothing to do, let's say with different words, with the "Chief World Systems" and cannot give someone room to slightest hints, sterile and pointless appraisals, as well as pseudo-philosophical lucubration to any large extent. What is conclusively demanded is that the author might be prone to appropriately propose any starting conjecture, at will, before working out a self-consistent view of the matter; if not, the approach runs the risk to be a waste of time. Unfortunately, this is the case for the paper at hand.

Roughly but bluntly speaking again, what caused the Big Bang, as well as taking a philosophical hike on derived issues, is not concern of this forum unless the investigation is, hypothetically speaking, so revised as to resolutely point, here and now, toward substantial, mature, convincing arguments focused on tentatively proving whether the TS is a fake or not. Since this is not realistically happening with reference to the paper under examination, then it is to be rejected without a second thought.

Supportive of the above detrimental judgement are the following specific details:

- there is a broad and valuable consensus in supporting the existence of God exactly through the Big Bang theory! This should have been adequately considered in the submitted paper, whatever the author's persuasion;
- the author seems to get theology and religions history mixed up.

Regards,
Bruno Barberis, Francesco Lattarulo
IEEE ATSI 2014 General Co-Chair