The 2002 Report on Dmitry A. Kuznetsov is in two Parts:

Part I: The imaginary scientist. (A biography of Kuznetsov up to 2001.)

Part II: The Kuznetsov dossier. (The evidence of scientific fraud in papers from

1989 to 2000.)

The original Report was published in Italian in 2002.

Part I The imaginary scientist

Gian Marco Rinaldi gmrinaldi@alice.it Online here in July, 2013

This is a translation (with some slight adaptations) of: G.M. Rinaldi, Lo scienziato immaginario. *Scienza & Paranormale*, 45, May/June 2002, pp. 20-33.

Notes marked with asterisk have been added in 2012.

- §1 Mice and dinosaurs
- §2 A bibliographical mishap
- §3 The ancient linens
- §4 Misadventure in Connecticut
- §5 He tries again
- §6 How to upset the Secret Service...

In autumn 2000, while I was conducting a critical review of studies on the Shroud of Turin, I got in touch by mail with Dmitry A. Kuznetsov, a Moscow biochemist who in recent years has been a champion of the cause of the "sindonologists" (the supporters of the authenticity of the Shroud, a relic which they suppose to be the burial cloth of Jesus). After the linen of the Shroud had been radiocarbon dated in 1988 and assigned to the Middle Ages, he claimed to have experimentally demonstrated that the radiocarbon date was wrong and that the relic could actually be more ancient and could date from the time of Christ. He stood out, among other sindonologists, for having published his experimental reports, between 1994 and 1996, in high-level scientific journals.

I was interested in his biography, which was quite eventful, as we shall see, and asked him some information. He kindly replied and sent me a large envelope (adorned with 176 postage stamps!) containing a detailed curriculum, a series of photographs, copies of three degree or doctorate diplomas, various other documents and copies of some recent publications. One of these, a paper which had been published shortly before in an English journal, left me wondering. Kuznetsov said that he had experimented on ancient textile samples of Irish provenance. From the details he provided, it seemed to me incredible that he could really have obtained those textile samples. I started investigating. With the help of many correspondents in Ireland, I collected what appears to be sufficient evidence of scientific fraud: According to the

information I received, Kuznetsov had never had those samples available, thus the experimental report had been fabricated by him. Meanwhile, as the clues were accumulating, I wrote him several times asking for an explanation, but he did not reply.

Given the results of the Irish investigation, I went on to consider the series of papers that had been published by Kuznetsov in 1994-96, those who had given him fame among the sindonologists. In some of these papers, Kuznetsov said to have experimented on samples of ancient textiles from various museums of Moscow and other cities. To begin with, I tried to get in touch with those museums so as to have it confirmed that the textiles had been supplied. In the end, what I found was that not only the textiles but even the museums did not exist. At this point, doubting of everything, I tried to verify whether two Russian scientific institutes, in Krasnodar and in Protvino, where part of the experiments should have been performed, did exist or not. For what I have found, it does not seem that the institutes exist. Lacking those museums and those institutes, Kuznetsov could not have conducted the experiments as reported.

Our hero was not new to such enterprises. Back in 1994, he was at the center of a scandal that ended the brilliant career that he had begun in a quite different field. Also of this we shall speak

Let's start by telling the adventurous story of his life. Then, in the second part of this report, we detail the evidence we have collected about his scientific frauds.

§1 Mice and dinosaurs

Dmitry Anatolievich Kuznetsov (1) (b. 1955) graduated in medicine in Moscow in 1978. Subsequently he earned both doctoral degrees which are available in Russia, "Candidate" and "Doctor", in biology and biochemistry.

(1) Russian: Дмитрий Анато́льевич Кузнецов. When writing in Latin alphabet, he often uses the form "Dmitri Kouznetsov". Here I have chosen to adopt the form which generally is most frequenly used in texts in English, "Dmitry Kuznetsov".

In the 1980s he works first as an assistant at the Sechenov Medical University, then in the toxicology laboratory of the Moscow City Station for Sanitation and Epidemiology (1*) (we may use "City Station" for brevity). He is married with children. He publishes an extensive series of papers and seems to pursue a regular career in medical research. (1**) But there is something unusual for a Soviet scientist: he professes creationism (2) and adheres to the Baptist religion

- (1*) This is the English denomination as given by Kuznetsov in his papers of this period. To-day the denomination is slightly changed and literally translates as "Center for Hygiene and Epidemiology in the City of Moscow".
- (1**) In 1983 Kuznetsov was a winner of the Lenin Komsomol Prize. This Prize was awarded annually to young authors in various fields ("Komsomol" is a Russian abbreviation for Communist Union of Youth). In 1983 the winners for the section of Science and Technology were about 130.

(2) With creationism, in this context, we refer to the "scientific" arm of some Christian (Protestant) sects, mostly present in the United States, which maintain religious fundamentalist positions and claim that the text of the Bible should be taken as literally true. In particular, they take as literally true the Biblical story of the six days of creation. These creationists assert that the text of Genesis is not only to be believed on faith, but can be demonstrated by scientific methods. There are various forms of creationism, but the associations and the persons with whom Kuznetsov was involved, mainly adopt the most radical and "literalist" version: the universe was born a few thousand years ago, God created one by one all plant and animal species, there has been no evolution of species in the Darwinian sense, the fossil remains are those of animals which perished in the Biblical Flood, the Grand Canyon was excavated in a few months by the retiring waters of the Flood, and so on. It is a total overturning of all sciences, from astrophysics to geology and biology.

In the Russia of the time, it was not advisable for a scientist, for the success of his career, to adhere to a Christian religion, especially if it was an American variant. (2*) As to being a creationist, this is not an advantage for a scientist anywhere in the world. For a Russian enterprising man, however, there could be some attractive opportunities. Certain American Protestant organizations had long considered Russia, along with other communist countries, as a mission territory. In the late 1980s, with the advent of Gorbachev, they had the possibility of a more active proselytizing. If only they could convert the generations grown in State atheism, those Americans were willing to invest some money. So, a Russian scientist, if ready to lend himself to the cause, could hope to receive funding for conducting research in line with the creationist theses and for organizing and divulging creationism at home, and perhaps could hope to leave Russia and go to America. It would seem that Kuznetsov was quick in seeing the opportunities that were opened to him.

Through the contacts he established with American creationists, Kuznetsov obtained funding for conducting an experiment that should bring evidence in favour of their theses. Experimenting on brain cells of field voles (small mice), he said he had found evidence against Darwinian evolution. Such a result seemed destined to be published in one of the magazines that the creationists printed for their own exclusive use, but Kuznetsov managed to publish his paper in 1989 in a qualified journal, the *International Journal of Neuroscience*. He took advantage of a privileged situation, as we shall see in Part II, because he enjoyed the esteem of Sidney Weinstein, the editor of the journal (although Weinstein was not himself a creationist). Weinstein offered to Kuznetsov the possibility of his first visit to America, welcoming him as a guest in his small private laboratory in Danbury (just north of New York, in the state of Connecticut).

The paper about voles appeared towards the end of 1989, while the Berlin Wall came down. Also for the life of Kuznetsov, this was a turning point. A paper like that, which exceptionally for the creationist literature had been published in a "real" scientific journal, earned him much prestige among creationists and served as an immediate springboard. He left his job at the Moscow City Station and started an international career as a creationist propagandist.

In subsequent years, Kuznetsov published some articles in creationist literature (about these I have not investigated). He traveled through America

for conferences, congresses and seminars. He was appointed Adjunct Professor at the Institute for Creation Research (ICR), probably the most famous association of its kind, based near San Diego, California. (2*) He went to Australia for a series of lectures at several universities. At home he was active in promoting the diffusion of creationism, as he could soon avail, with the final fall of the regime in 1991, of a full freedom and a renewed passion of his countrymen for all religions, even exotic ones. He founded in Moscow a small group of creationists. (2**) He organized two creationist conferences in 2002 and 2004. He took the initiative to publish Christian (American) books in Russian translation, collaborating with the Protestant Christian publishers of Moscow. He kept a column in a Protestant magazine printed in Russian in St. Petersburg.

(2*) Now the ICR has moved to Dallas, Texas. One can see their tenets here: http://www.icr.org/tenets/

(2**) The "Moscow Creation Science Fellowship" had its address in Moscow at 25-44 Menzhinski Str., and this was the home address of Kuznetsov at the time. After the creationist organizations repudiated Kuznetsov in 1995, his activity in that field has been nearly forgotten. In a page in the Archive section of this website, I have collected a number of surviving documents which illustrate what was the position of Kuznetsov as a creationist.

From 1990 dates the beginning of the collaboration of Kuznetsov with his friend Andrey A. Ivanov, a physicist who probably had himself been working at the City Station in Moscow. Kuznetsov and Ivanov gained gratitude from the creationists when they were able to rejuvenate the age of dinosaurs. According to creationists, of course, dinosaurs lived together with men from the day of creation until the day of the Flood, ie, according to the Biblical calendar, up to a few thousand years ago. But paleontologists place dinosaurs, in round numbers, a hundred million years ago. Kuznetsov told some American creationists that Ivanov in Moscow had a new method for dating fossils. The creationists supplied some samples of fossilized dinosaur bones to be dated. The result was an age between ten and thirty thousand years. (2***)

(2***) I quote, for example, from a newspaper article with the title "Creationists say dinosaurs lived with man" (*Columbus Dispatch*, November 3, 1991): «A Columbus creation science group says Soviet tests confirm dinosaurs and humans were contemporaries as recently as 10,000 years ago, some 66 million years after dinosaurs were supposedly eliminated in a mass extinction. Soviet scientists Dmitri Kouznetsov and Andrey Ivanov said the tests showed samples of dinosaur bones were 9,800 to 30,000 years old. Ivanov, a researcher at Moscow State University, used a technique called laser mass spectroscopy, which measures small quantities of chemicals, to analyze samples of the bones.»

§2 A bibliographical mishap

In 1993 we find Kuznetsov at a congress in Rome. Here there are no religious Protestants but we shall see that this is his first entrance in the service of a Catholic relic, the Shroud of Turin. He travels also to Oregon for a creationist

conference, then prepares to arrive in Sweden for a lecture tour. The trip to Sweden will be fatal to his career as a creationist.

On the eve of his arrival, the Swedish creationists were active in advertising their champion. There was even a parliamentarian who urged the Government to consider creationism more favourably in school curricula, and in support of his peroration quoted the Russian scientist who had brought experimental evidence against evolution. This attracted the attention of Dan Larhammar, a member of the organization of Svedish skeptics as well as a professor of biology at the University of Uppsala. A local creationist gave him the 1989 paper about mice. Larhammar examined it, and it was the end for Kuznetsov as creationist.

Professor Larhammar found various and serious shortcomings in the content of the article, of which we are not concerned here, but this in itself would not have been enough to undermine Kuznetsov among the creationists. Larhammar found something worse, about which the creationists could not remain indifferent. In the article, in relation to important aspects of the experimental procedures, there were references to papers published in the literature. Whenever Larhammar tried to procure the cited papers, he realized that they were untraceable and even some of the journals did not seem to exist. (3) It was as if Kuznetsov had conducted some experiments following the procedures described in papers that had never been published.

(3) Kuznetsov had not been lucky in the choice of the titles he had invented for the journals, one of which was indicated as *Upsala University Research Reports*. Larhammar could forgive the error in the spelling of the name of his city, but not the fact that, as he could easily check, in his university such a journal had never been published. Neither he knew the *Scandinavian Archives of Molecular Pathology*, where there should bave been a paper by his Gothenburg colleague Holger Hyden (1917-2000), a noted scientist. Larhammar asked Professor Hyden and he said he had never published that paper and did not even know the journal. (Kuznetsov loves to take a risk because Hyden was a member of the Editorial Board of the same journal where the 1989 paper had been published and it could well happen him to browse that issue and have a look at the bibliography).

Larhammar tried to contact Kuznetsov for asking an explanation but did not succeed. Kuznetsov was untraceable. Neither Weinstein, the editor of the journal, when informed of the situation, was able to trace him. Then Larhammar wrote a note presenting his criticism and sent it to Weinstein who published it immediately. (4) It was in March 1994. From Kuznetsov never came a rejoinder.

(4) D. Larhammar: Lack of experimental support for Kuznetsov's criticism of biological evolution. *International Journal of Neuroscience*, 77 (1994), 199-201.

Larhammar had not conducted a systematic search about all of the references in the bibliography of Kuznetsov's paper. He confined himself to a check of the most relevant cases and spotted eight fake references, enough to irreparably discredit the author. An American creationist, Paul Nelson found three more, bringing the number to eleven. As we shall see in Part II, the number is still higher.

Kuznetsov had been unwary in inserting so many fake references in the

bibliography. The creationists did not forgive him. For some months they remained silent, hoping perhaps that the exposure by Larhammar, which had appeared in a specialized journal, passed unnoticed. The following spring, however, Larhammar published an article in two magazines with wider circulation, where he summed up the story in less technical language. (4*) The news spread. Kuznetsov was fired from his position as adjunct professor at ICR, no one called him for more talks, and some of the creationist groups dissociated publicly from him. (5)

- (4*) D. Larhammar: Severe flaws in scientific study criticizing evolution. *Skeptical Inquirer*, Vol. 19, n. 2, March-April 1995.
- D. Larhammar: Severe flaws in a scientific study by D. Kuznetsov criticizing evolution. *Creation / Evolution*, Vol. 14, n. 2 (Issue 35), Winter 1994, 1-3.
- (5) An Australian association, the Creation Science Foundation (CSF), dissociated itself from Kuznetsov with a few lines in its periodical *Prayer News* (May 1995). The note was written by Carl Wieland, who in 1991 had invited Kuznetsov to Australia and had published an interview with him. Wieland gives two reasons for the decision to dissociate. In addition to the episode of the fake references, he refers, without details, to "financial matters":
- «For well over a year now, CSF has had increasing concerns regarding certain financial matters involving Dr Dmitri Kouznetsov of Moscow, who has spoken in Australia on our behalf in 1991. While our investigation continued, we gave Dr Kouznetsov ample opportunity to clear his name. In spite of his repeated assurances (to us and other concerned creationists) that he had the evidence to clear himself, he had repeatedly failed to provide it.»

I have tried to learn more about these financial matters. I have received two letters from an Australian creationist and from a British one, who have told me similar episodes in which each of them was involved. Since these episodes have not been made public so far, I abstain from giving details.

Our story should end here. After such a setback, there could not be a future for Kuznetsov as a scientist and not even as an exponent of a pseudoscience. Instead, the story is not over, it is just at the beginning.

§3 The ancient linens

In 1988 the then Bishop of Turin gave small samples of the fabric of the "Holy Shroud" to three laboratories specialized in radiocarbon dating (Carbon 14), wich found a date around 1300 AD, in accordance with the historical knowledge on the first appearance of the relic but in contrast to the desire of those who would like to consider it as the authentic burial cloth of Jesus with his image imprinted on it. The "sindonologists" unanimously refused to accept the verdict of radiocarbon dating, but for some years were disoriented and uncertain about the reason to be offered to explain the result of the three laboratories. (6)

(6) On the Shroud and its devotees, see Scienza & Paranormale, n. 19 (in Italian).

Among the various explanations that were proposed, there was a singular one by Marie-Claire van Oosterwyck-Gastuche, a Belgian scholar who had moved to France. Given that the Shroud had been involved in a fire in 1532, Gastuche has suggested that the high temperature had altered the isotopic composition of the carbon atomes in the textile, producing an enrichment in the isotope 14 and consequently the "wrong" result of dating. Gastuche is a member of a small group of French Catholic fundamentalists who preach the "inerrancy" of the Bible, or that the Bible can not err. Another member of the same group is a well-known creationist, Guy Berthault (b. 1926). He is a wealthy businessman who chairs a foundation in Meulan, near Paris, through which has funded research on creationism. In particular, Berthault is popular among creationists for having financed a sort of experimental simulation of the Biblical Flood: by spreading amounts of sand in large tanks, crossed by currents of water, he has concluded that it is not true that the geological strata that are lower should be the older with respect to the layers that are above, thus freeing creationist geologists from any stratigraphic constraint.

Berthault met Kuznetsov for the first time in 1992 at a congress of creationists near London. That was the period when Gastuche elaborated her theory of the fire, but she was not able to perform experiments to prove the hypothesis, and then Berthault decided to entrust Kuznetsov with the task. At the end of 1992, Berthault went to Moscow along with a few Americans to promote the fortunes of creationism in Russia, and there he met again Kuznetsov and his friend Ivanov. He agreed to finance them for conducting an experimental verification.

The two Russians started to work immediately. We can imagine that if they had managed to shift the age of the dinosaurs of a hundred million years, it was easy for them to shift the age of the Shroud of a thousand years only. Already at a congress of sindonologists held in Rome in June 1993, Kuznetsov read a report (co-authored by Ivanov) in which he described some experiments with which he could ensure that the Shroud is actually much older with respect to the age found by the radiocarbon laboratories, and that it may well date from the time of Christ.

The report was subsequently printed in the volume of the conference proceedings, but for Kuznetsov it was not enough to be present in the little-known publications of the sindonologists. As he had done in 1989, he wanted to publish in leading scientific journals, an achievement which would ensure a quantum leap in his prestige among the sindonologists. Moreover, he did not limit his interests to the mere problem of the dating of the relic: he inserted the work in a broader context, building for himself a patent of expert in ancient textiles and trying to earn a role in the research community of archaeological chemists.

During 1994, within a few months, Kuznetsov (together with Ivanov and a third, phantomatic author) prepared three complex experimental reports. Not only he demonstrated in various ways that the Shroud could be older than it had been dated by radiocarbon, but gave a display of inventiveness in opening new avenues in the study of the cellulose of ancient textiles. He sent the articles to respected scientific journals (the first ones were sent in March, just as Larhammar published his critical note in the *International Journal of Neuroscience*). He sent each article simultaneously to more than one journal. He obtained a total of seven publications that appeared between late 1994 and early 1996. Next year, in April 1995 (while the second version of Larhammar's

article appeared in the *Skeptical Inquirer*), he attended an important conference of archaeological chemistry in California, presenting two of the same reports, and managed to have both papers published in the volume of the proceedings. So he obtained a total of nine published papers out of three reports. An analysis of these papers will be found in the second section of Part II of the present report. As we shall see, there are reasons to suspect that Kuznetsov and his colleagues had never conducted the experiments as described. Since in all papers there are acknowledgements for funding received from private donors, one might suppose, if our suspicions prove to be founded, that the authors have chosen the most economical way to perform the experiments, i.e. they have not performed them at all and have kept the money for themselves.

During the same months when the journals of chemistry and archaeology accepted the papers for publication, Kuznetsov was in the eye of the storm among creationists for the emerging scandal of the fake bibliography in his 1989 paper. He did not tell that story to his new colleagues in the fields of archaeological chemistry and of sindonology and apparently none of them was aware of his past curriculum. His name and his surname are very common in Russia and the coincidences of names are possible. If anyone noticed that there was a Dmitry Kuznetsov blamed for a fake work on mice, how could he imagine that he was the same Dmitry Kuznetsov who worked on ancient textiles? The first Kuznetsov was a biologist, the other an archaeological chemist. The one was a creationist and a Protestant, the other was interested in a Catholic relic. The two careers were too different to belong to one and the same man!

Kuznetsov soon became a champion of the cause of the sindonologists who exploited his presumed experiments to support their contention that the medieval result of the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud was wrong. Thus Kuznetsov, in his activity as a propagandist and lecturer, passed on without interruption from creationism to sindonology. He continued his trips to America, where in particular had the support (at least initially) of a Colorado sindonologist, John Jackson, who was well known in the field since in 1978 he headed a team of American scientists who went to Turin to conduct investigations directly on the Shroud. Kuznetsov found another friend in Alan Adler, also a member of that expedition. Adler was a biochemist at Western Connecticut State University, based in Danbury, the same city where Weinstein had his laboratory.

If his fortunes among the sindonologists were predictable, it is surprising that Kuznetsov could be successful even in academic circles as an expert in the chemistry of textiles. In 1995 he participated, as we know, in an important conference of archaeological chemistry in California. Later in 1995 he attended a meeting on dating and preservation of ancient textiles at Duke University, North Carolina, and held lectures and seminars at the University of California, Los Angeles, at the University of North Texas, Denton, at the US Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, at St. Louis University and Washington University, both in St. Louis, and at the US Textile Research Institute in Princeton. Subsequently he was hosted for speeches at the University of North Texas again, three times at the University La Sapienza in Rome, at Yale University and even at the University of Al Aim in the United Arab Emirates.

Kuznetsov also toured Italy with great success. One can read in a sindonology magazine (*Collegamento pro Sindone*, March-April 1996) the report of a tour of lectures on the Turin Shroud in February 1996, with two lectures in Rome, to begin with, then in Varese, Turin, Livorno, Pisa, Florence, ending with a congress in San Marino. (6*) The article speaks of halls packed "beyond belief". In Varese, in particular, the hall could not contain the 600 attendees and many had to follow the lecture while standing in the lobby. There were also "countless news reports," dedicated to him at that time.

(6*) Here is a video of a lecture in Rome (in English with Italian translation). Kuznetsov begins to speak at minute 20. Unfortunately, toward the end the audio has a disturbing noise.

http://blip.tv/sindone-tv/il-test-al-carbonio-e-la-sindone-3655725

Also in Italy, apart from the Shroud, Kuznetsov succeeded in presenting himself in academic circles as an expert in archaeological chemistry. According to his curriculum, he was hosted in 1995 and 1997 for seminars at the Faculty of Chemistry of La Sapienza, the first University of Rome. Always in Rome, in 1996 he attended an International Seminar on Materials and Thermal Properties in Cultural Heritage. Still in 1996, according to his say, he held seminars at the Turin Polytechnic and at the University of Florence. Moreover he said to be a member, and the coordinator for Russia, of "Musis", a science museum in Rome. Finally, in his bibliography he cites two reports presented at Villa Gualino, Turin. I have not checked all these episodes, but it seems that, after America, his favorite place at the time was Italy. (7)

(7) It is true that Kuznetsov attended the congress and seminars held in Rome. I have not checked for Turin and Florence. The Director of Musis, Luigi Campanella, tells me that Kuznetsov has no official duties at the museum but it is true that in the past he has collaborated. As for Villa Gualino, this Turin centre hosts many conferences and it is not easy to do a check. Kuznetsov cites two reports in 1997 and 1998, in a series of conferences on "Biotechnology and the preservation of cultural artifacts." At Villa Gualino in fact there is a "Foundation for the biotechnologies" which holds conferences. I wrote to the secretaries (Elena Spoldi and Emanuela Massa), but they phoned me that they do not know the name of Kuznetsov and have not found publications of his in the proceedings of the conferences.

The success among the sindonologists was not everywhere equal to that obtained in Italy or America. There was also somebody who expressed criticisms, for example in France. Moreover, Kuznetsov aroused discontent with a fraudulent financial maneuvering. Ian Wilson, a prominent sindonologist and the Editor of the *Newsletter* of the British Society for the Turin Shroud (BSTS), published a note about it in 1996. (8) It had happened that Kuznetsov had manifested the intention to publish, in Russian translation, a book by Wilson on the Shroud. He obtained a copyright permission from Wilson and used it to convince some American sindonologists to advance money, promising a handsome profit from book sales. The book was never printed and the money did not return back.

(8) I. Wilson: "Russia's Dr. Dmitri Kouznetsov: Can he any longer be believed?" *BSTS Newsletter* n. 44, November/December 1996. I quote some passages from Wilson's editorial which is online here:

http://www.shroud.com/bsts4405.htm

«[...] He asked me to send him a copy of my book *The Turin Shroud*, as published by Gollancz in 1978, which I duly supplied. Then in the Spring of 1995 he called to say that he was hoping to get the book published in Russian. This I warmly welcomed [...].

«My reaction was accordingly one of unguarded pleasure when in early September 1995 Dr. Kouznetsov phoned to say that he already had thousands of advance orders for the book, and all he needed from me, and very urgently, was a simple statement granting him the Russian language copyright. [...] «The same day I faxed him agreeing to this, at his request simultaneously sending the signed original by air mail to Moscow. [...] [I suggested] that he prepare a simple contract, as would be normal in the West. This he promised, also promising the book's publication in the May of this current year, 1996 [...]. «In the event this was Kouznetsov's last communication to me. [...] «But then in March came news that he had been hawking my granting of the Russian language rights letter among several Americans interested in the Shroud. I learned that he had offered these Americans very large profits in return for their funding the publication of this translation, and that sums of many thousands of dollars per financier had changed hands. My suspicions aroused, I faxed Kouznetsov immediately requesting an explanation, only again to receive no reply. When the American financiers, alarmed by my concerns for them, raised their own queries, they were initially reassured by Kouznetsov that the book had been published on schedule, that copies would shortly be sent to them and that their money was safe.

«However, as at the date of publication of this present Newsletter no copy has been received by them, no profit-sharing has taken place, and the communication lines to Dr.Kouznetsov's Moscow office, however active previously, have all fallen silent.»

To put an end to his fortunes among sindonologists, was not a scientific but a judicial circumstance. It happened in Danbury, Connecticut: his American parable came to an end in the same city where he had first landed a decade earlier

§4 Misadventure in Connecticut

In the late summer of 1997, Kuznetsov went to Danbury, apparently with the intention to settle there. He might have two reasons for choosing this place. Perhaps he hoped to obtain a job at the local university (Western Connecticut State University), where his friend, the sindonologist Alan Adler, was emeritus teacher of chemistry. Or he intended to work in the private laboratory of Sidney Weinstein. (9) In December he was arrested for theft and forgery of checks. As reported in the local newspaper, the *News-Times*, (10) in October on three different occasions Kuznetsov went to a bank and cashed three checks (for a total of many thousand dollars), using forged signatures of Ruth and Warren Wilson, (10*) a couple of Virginia Beach from whom the checks had been stolen some time before. The news spread among the sindonologists, who felt embarrassed in learning that the savior of the Shroud was in jail for fraud. His fortunes declined, and gradually his name came out of the limelight.

(9) In a 2001 interview to a Russian newspaper (the *Moskovsky Komsomolets*, quoted later in this text), at the time of the espionage affair, Kuznetsov said that in

1997, at the time of his arrest, he was professor of biochemistry at Western Connecticut State University. He referred also to Weinstein as his director. I have not found confirmations. Adler died in 2000 and I could not question him, but I suppose that if Kuznetsov had ever had a job at the university, he would have mentioned it in his curriculum. As to Weinstein (who now resides in North Carolina), he writes me that in 1997 Kuznetsov had no positions in his laboratory (Neurocommunication Research Laboratories, Danbury). However Kuznetsov should have had some reason to remain in Danbury for many weeks while his family was in Russia.

(10) The *News-Times* covers, with its local chronicles, the area of Western Connecticut (including both Danbury and Bridgeport, the city where Kuznetsov was kept imprisoned). I have taken from this newspaper the information about the court case. In its website, www.newstimes.com, the newspaper has an archive (free) with an efficient internal search engine. See the May 25, 1998 article by Karen Ali, "Man could have bad-check charges erased", and the June 28, 2001 article by Michael McKinney, "Tobin accuser linked to area." A brief note of 11 December 1997, "Arrest made in bad-check scheme", with the news of the arrest, is no longer available in the archive but it was quoted by Ian Wilson (*BSTS Newsletter*, 47, May/July 1998) and is online at www.shroud.com/bsts4702.htm. It says that other checks, stolen from the same couple of Virginia Beach, emerged in the neighboring states of New York and New Jersey, but the police of Connecticut did not investigate out of state. (10**)

(10*) Rev. Warren Wilson was a minister of the United Methodist Church.

(10**) To-day (2012) the archive of the newspaper is no longer accessible. I copy some passages from the article of 11 December 1997.

«DANBURY - A 42-year old Moscow native, who recently moved to Danbury, was jailed on a \$100,000 bond yesterday, charged with writing bad checks at a Bethel bank.

«Dmitri Kouznetsov, of White Street, was arrested on a warrant charging him with attempted first-degree larceny, first-degree forgery, third-degree larceny and first-degree attempted larceny for his dealings at a First Union Bank branch. Police said Kouznetsov had in his possession three checks that had been stolen from a Virginia Beach, VA couple. He allegedly made the checks out to himself and deposited the money into an account he had opened at the branch. Kouznetsov told bank officials that he needed a local account for business purposes.

«Police said checks stolen from the Virginia couple have also surfaced in New York and New Jersey. More than \$20,000 was cashed in these cases, according to an arrest warrant. Police did not elaborate on the out-of-state cases, but said that the suspect used names similar to Kouznetsov and that the scheme worked in a similar manner.

«At Kouznetsov's arraignment yesterday, bail commissioner John Foulner said the defendant was trying to start up a business in the area. He had been living in Danbury for about two months, Foulner said.

«From several interested parties it is understood that Dr.Kouznetsov is currently awaiting trial at the Bridgetown Correctional Facility, Connecticut, and is the subject of further investigations.»

Kuznetsov remained in jail for months, awaiting trial: he did not possess the money for the requested bail of a hundred thousand dollars. Towards the end of May 1998, shortly before the date fixed for the trial, he was finally released from prison. He availed of an opportunity which in America is sometimes offered to those who commit an offense for the first time. He was admitted to an "accelerated program of rehabilitation", ie a kind of probation, or parole, for

six months, within which he had to repay the stolen money, in addition to providing 150 hours of unpaid work at the service of the society (as he was a scientist, the judge ordered him to give lectures at schools or universities). For those who successfully complete the probationary period, the offense is decriminalized. Kuznetsov, however, did not fulfill the requirements of the court. When called again for giving account to the judges, after six months, he did not appear at the hearing. Then it was issued against him a new arrest warrant with a bail of \$ 65,000. The latest information I have on this story dates back to late June 2001. At that time, according to press reports, Kuznetsov was still wanted as a fugitive from the police of Connecticut. (11)

- (11) See the article of June 28, 2001, cited in footnote (10). At the same date, the news that Kuznetsov was wanted for violating the terms of his probation was also reported, beyond the local press, in a dispatch from the Associated Press, "Tobin accuser is wanted as a fugitive in Connecticut", which can still be read at www.boston.com/news/daily/28/tobin_28.htm (the electronic service of the *Boston Globe*). (11*)
- (11*) I copy the first part of the *Boston Globe* article, 28 June 2001 (the second part refers to the Tobin affair, see below).
 - «Tobin accuser is wanted as a fugitive in Connecticut
 - «The Russian scientist who has accused Fulbright scholar John Tobin of trying to recruit him as a spy is wanted in Connecticut for violating his probation on a larceny conviction.
 - «Dmitri Kouznetsov was placed on probation after being convicted in 1997 for using thousands of dollars in stolen checks to open a bank account in the state. He was held for pretrial until May 21, 1998, at the Bridgeport Correctional Center, according to court records obtained by *The News-Times* of Danbury. «A Danbury Superior Court judge on May 25 that year granted Kouznetsov a special form of probation known as accelerated rehabilitation. That meant Kouznetsov's record would be wiped clean if he paid back the checks and did 150 hours of lecturing at Connecticut colleges.
 - «"Accelerated rehabilitation can be applied for and granted to anyone who the court finds is not likely to offend again and the crime is not of a serious nature," said public defender Rosemarie Chapdelaine, who represented Kouznetsov. "In the large scheme of things, it was not an unusual disposition for this type of case."
 - «But Kouznetsov failed to appear for a required check-in with the court on Dec. 3, 1999, and Bethel police issued a rearrest warrant that carries a \$65,000 bond, according to the court clerk's office and Bethel police.»

A reporter of the *News-Times*, Michael McKinney, has collected information from the lawyer who defended Kuznetsov, Rosemarie Chapdelaine. (12) Towards the end of 1998, after having returned to Russia, Kuznetsov wrote to Chapdelaine promising that he would honor the obligations. In a letter dated October 6, he assured that he would return to America to perform the 150 hours of lessons and to provide "somehow" to pay the sum he had to give back. He said however that he had difficulty in transferring money abroad from Russian banks, and that he hoped to receive, directly in America, certain sums from his publishers in Greece and Italy (I do not know to which publishers he might refer).

(12) See the same article by McKinney of 28 June 2001, already cited in previous footnotes.

In a letter dated November 12, Kuznetsov wrote that he was aware of having to resubmit to the court but that unfortunately, the conditions imposed by the judge were not completed. He complained that his passport had expired and that bureaucratic delays had prevented him from coming to America for the 150 hours, but added that he had finished writing a book and had held more than 40 hours of free classes in Italy and Russia, noting that "perhaps this will be of some help." He also said that, because of the banking crisis in Russia, his money account had been frozen, but he hoped to receive the fees that expected by his publishers in Greece and France.

From these letters one gets the pathetic image of a Kuznetsov who is disarmed and unable to meet its commitments. The judicial misadventures, however, did not hinder his initiative. He did not lose heart and got busy, among other things, in trying to come back again among the sindonolgists, an attempt that at that point might seem impossible

§5 He tries again

To refurbish his image, Kuznetsov found again an audience in Italy and published an article (in Italian) in the magazine *Kos* (13) (January/February 1999, pp. 14-16), with the title "Two new elements in the dating of the Shroud". The subtitle explains: "A Russian biochemist, specialist in the analysis of ancient textiles, has identified the limitations of the standard techniques for radiocarbon dating when applied to products containing cellulose."

(13) Kos, "journal of medicine, culture and humanities", is a high-level non-technical monthly, published by "San Raffaele" a hospital and a major medical research center in Milan. The journal has an international scientific committee with respected names in the fields of science and culture.

In the article Kuznetsov summarizes his previous work on the Shroud, and then goes on to announce a major advance: he has invented a new method of dating that does not require to destroy a piece of fabric:

«Some months ago we patented in America a new nondestructive method for dating textiles. This is an important innovation and a marked advantage if compared to all methods, including ours, used until now [...] there is no need to emphasize the importance of the thing, as we often deal with ancient or very ancient textiles».

The implication is clear that a similar method would be ideal for dating the Shroud. Kuznetsov seems to be cautious:

«If today I were asked to directly study the Shroud, I would not accept because I should need at least another four years to develop the method.»

Perhaps I am insinuating, but this could be a means to get funding for four years of (presumed) work before having to present the results. He concluded by saying that his researches «give us enough confidence to say that the Shroud is significantly older than the Middle Ages.»

Whether Kuznetsov was or not intentioned to become a candidate for dating the Shroud, he was so understood by the Catholic newspaper *Avvenire*, which on February 9, 1999, published an article by Pier Giorgio Liverani with the title: "Shroud: the revenge of Carbon 14". The subtitle: "A Russian expert would have discovered a nondestructive method for dating the Holy Shroud." The article opens:

«In a few years we might finally date the Shroud of Turin with certainty, using - this is the singular novelty - the same method, but now much improved, of radiocarbon (the famous 'C14'), which, used improperly, generated the big misunderstanding of the 'medieval fake'. This is the perspective opened up by a Russian scientist, Dmitrij Kuznetsov .»

The article concludes: «The way for correcting a glaring scientific mistake is open.»

The promise of the new method might seem just a futile attempt to ingratiate himself again with the devotees of the Shroud, but really the dynamic Kuznetsov published in the following year, 2000, a scientific paper in a British journal where he presented his new methods for the dating and also for the conservation of ancient textiles. They were chemical, enzymatic methods (nothing to do with radiocarbon). With this we shall deal in the third section of Part II of the present report. We shall see that here too there are indications that Kuznetsov's paper describes experiments that he had never performed.

According to what he stated when writing to me in 2000, at the time Kuznetsov was also busy with other projects. He wrote articles on the philosophy of science. He had published two books (in Russian), one on "Biochemistry of beauty" and another on "Aesthetics of scientific conventions". (13*) He was also a consultant for museums and auction houses.

(13*) I do not know if these books have really been published. I copy an addendum that Kuznetsov had written at the end of the curriculum he sent me in 2000.

«Concerning the most recent publications, I would proudly recall two ones, both in Russian (fortunately or unfortunately, who knows...):

«(#1) Kouznetsov, D.A. (1999). *Biochemistry of the Beauty*. Parnas Press: St. Peterburg, 206 pages.

«This monograph deals with the modern advanced techniques developed in the 1980s-1990s by biochemists and immunologists for dating and conservation tests on the art items (pigments and cements mostly, some cellulose structure as well.).

«(#2) Kouznetsov, D.A. (2000). *Aesthetics of Scientific Conventions: From Poincaré to Lakatos*. Parnas Press: St. Peterburg, 317 pages.

«This book is devoted to a very peculiar area of modern philosophy of science known as the *conventionalism*. A textbook for graduates specializing in natural sciences who, nonetheless, are also interested in philosophical views on science and its limits.»

I do not know what were the prospects for Kuznetsov if I had not started to

investigate, from Autumn 2000, on evidence of possible scientific frauds in his papers. Already in the first months, as growing evidence was accumulating, I might have occasion or need to talk about it in the letters that I exchanged with many correspondents. Among them there were many scientists, there were persons in touch with creationists or sindonologists, and there were persons in the museums of Moscow. I suppose the news circulated to some extent. I think that the situation of Kuznetsov was becoming difficult, in the course of 2001, but I have not had any news about him since then, apart from the unexpected story that remains to be told.

§6 How to upset the Secret Service ...

January 2001 in Voronezh, a city in central Russia. John Tobin, an American student, is detained by the police while leaving a night club (14). They search him and find a minimal amount of marihuana. Maybe he really had it, or, as he will claim, it had been slipped into his pocket by the policemen. He is arrested and sentenced to three years and one month on charges of obtaining, possessing and distributing marijuana. The sentence is later reduced to one year. After six months in prison, in early August Tobin is released for good behavior. He returns to America and is received in triumph to his home town in Connecticut. American diplomacy had moved up to the highest level: Colin Powell (Secretary of State) had spoken about this case with his Russian colleague Ivanov, and finally President Bush himself, in July, raised the case in his meeting with Putin in Genoa. (15)

- (14) The American press has given extensive coverage to the Tobin case. During those months, in 2001, accessing the websites of American newspapers one could find many articles. Even today there are numerous articles available, but some newspapers give access to their archives only after subscription.
- (15) As regards the involvement of Bush, the newspapers reported the statement which was issued by James Maloney, a deputy from Connecticut in the Congress in Washington, who was very active in trying to secure the release of Tobin. See, in the *News-Times*, the article by McKinney for July 24, 2001: "Bush asked Putin to free Tobin, Maloney says."

Tobin was a native of Connecticut and the aforementioned local newspaper, *The News-Times*, gave him ample space in its news. Fortunately, the archive of its website, www.newstimes.com, has free access. Inserting the name Tobin in the internal search engine, for the year 2001, one gets all the articles, in number of about seventy, covering in detail the whole story. All the news that I report (apart from those taken from the Moscow newspapers that I quote below) may be found in this series of articles (as well as in many articles in other newspapers that all came out with similar accounts). In particular, with regard to Kuznetsov, you can see in the *News-Times* some articles by Michael McKinney: "Tobin Accused again" (June 27), the already quoted article of 28 June, and an interview with Tobin afther his return home, "The final word" (August 19). Tobin describes the visit to his cell of Kuznetsov, together with two agents of the FSB, as the "darkest moment" of his imprisonment.

A long article by Matthew Brzezinski, "John Tobin's road from Middlebury to a Russian prison", with a general summary of the story (almost to its conclusion), appeared on July 29, 2001 in The *New York Times* (Magazine Section). To access the archive of this newspaper a registration is needed, but the article was reproduced in full in another website where it is still available (15*): www.mapinc.org/ drugnews/v01/n1372/a04.html?182.

(15*) In 2012 some of the newspaper articles, including this one, are no longer freely available online.

So far, this might seems to be a minor incident occurred to a naive young man, were it not that, rightly or wrongly, the Russian Secret Service, the FSB (for "Federal Security Service," in part heir to the KGB), held suspicions about Tobin which could cost him a much more serious penalty. At the end of February 2001, in fact, while Tobin was in jail awaiting trial, the FSB spokesman in Voronezh, Pavel Bolshunov, publicly declared that the young man was suspected of being an agent of the American Secret Service who had been sent to Russia under the pretext of study purposes, but actually as a step of his apprenticeship to "study" as a spy. At present, however, the FSB did not seem to have concrete evidence against him.

There was a turn towards the end of June. Bolshunov communicated to the press and on television that a witness had appeared who was able to confirm the suspicions of the FSB, i.e. to prove that Tobin was an agent of the American FBI. All American newspapers came out with alarmed titles, fearing the indictment of Tobin for espionage.

Who was this witness so dangerous for Tobin? Yes, here he was again: he was Kuznetsov. He remembered, as he claimed, that while he was in prison in Connecticut in 1998, had been visited by a young secret agent of the FBI who promised favors in exchange for cooperation with the Americans Secret Service. Kuznetsov had refused and later returned to Russia. Now, in May 2001, he had seen a television news on the Tobin case and had recognized him as the FBI agent. Then he had turned to FSB telling the story. The FSB officials took him seriously enough to take him to Voronezh (nearly 500 km south of Moscow), for a confrontation with Tobin. The American denied having ever met Kuznetsov, but Kuznetsov confirmed that he was a hundred percent sure that this was the same man who had tried to recruit him three years before. I have procured the translation of an interview published in a Moscow newspaper, the Moskovsky Komsomolets of 26 June 2001, under the title "Poison for Mr. Tobin", where Kuznetsov himself gives his version of the story. He is presented by the newspaper as one of the leading specialists in toxicology, known throughout the world, who was in America, at the time of his arrest, as a professor of biochemistry at Western Connecticut State University. He says that he had been unjustly arrested on charges of financial fraud and was later released because the charges turned out to be unfounded. His bank accounts were blocked and he could not pay the bail to be released, nor could he afford to hire an attorney. One day, shortly after his arrest, the guards woke him up at seven in the morning and brought him into the office of an officer of the prison, where a young man was sitting in a suit and tie. He was just Tobin, even if under a false name. The officer introduced him as an FBI agent interested in Kuznetsov's case. Tobin showed a badge. Kuznetsov and Tobin

were left alone and spoke, in Russian, for two hours. Tobin came to visit him other times. What did he want from Kuznetsov? He asked to provide information about other Russian scientists, colleagues of him, those in Russia or those who had emigrated to America, and about their research (in a field like toxicology that could have military implications). In return Kuznetsov was promised that his bank accounts would be unlocked, so that he could pay the bail and a lawyer. He refused. He was also offered to earn money while in jail by writing reviews of papers of toxicology. This he accepted. He was provided with a package of articles, each of which made reference to his own research, and he wrote the reviews that were paid one hundred dollars each. So far, the Moskovsky Komsomolets.

How credible is this story? At a minimum, it contains exaggerations. Kuznetsov has never been a world-renowned toxicologist, and at any rate in 1998 had already left that field of reseearch since several years. It is unlikely that he had ever been a professor in an American state university, or he would have written it in his curriculum. It would not seem that the charges of financial fraud against him turned out to be unfounded, if, as we have seen, a judge in Connecticut has again issued an arrest warrant. It can be doubted that Kuznetsov had so much money in his bank account to be able to pay the bail (150,000 dollars, according to him), in addition to the services of a good lawyer. It would be hard to find a packet of toxicology papers that all contain references to his research. It should be added that Tobin, in 1998, was only 21 years old, an age too young to take on operational roles in the FBI. We may add that, needless to say, the offices of the FBI, as reported by all the American newspapers, immediately denied to have ever had Tobin at their service.

There are three possible alternatives. The first is that, neglecting some marginal exaggerations, the substance of Kuznetsov's story is true. Tobin, in fact, was not an ordinary student and the FSB had some reason to address their attention to him. He began, when still very young, his training in the most prestigious American military institutions. From 1994 to 1997 he passed from one to the other of four schools. He attended, among others, a course on how to conduct interrogations for the counter-espionage. He has followed, always in a military school, an intensive course of Russian and speaks it very well. He is a reservist in an intelligence unit of the Army. Then he went to a college in Vermont for a degree in International Affairs and spent a first period in Russia. In 2000, after graduating, he won a scholarship from the Fulbright Foundation and moved to the University of Voronezh for a doctorate in Political Science with a thesis on Russia's transition to democracy.

Tobin's home town is Ridgefield, not far from Bridgeport where Kuznetsov was imprisoned. One might think, as a hypothesis, that having heard that there was a Russian scientist in jail, in a precarious situation and therefore potentially subject to blackmail, Tobin was eager to test his ability in speaking Russian and in collecting information. However this hypothesis seems to be very unlikely.

A second alternative is that Kuznetsov has invented everything and on his own initiative presented himself at the FSB, offering a story that could earn him a moment of popularity and perhaps rewards in money or some favor. As a third alternative, finally, the FSB wanted to fabricate evidence against Tobin, for any reason, and made use of Kuznetsov instructing him about the version that he had to provide. We shall never know how things were going really.

On 26 June 2001, as we said, Kuznetsov's interview was published in the *Moskovsky Komsomolets*. Also a Russian news agency, Interfax, reported similar statements by Kuznetsov. Soon there were American journalists who tried to contact him for having further information, but he was nowhere to be found, and this is not surprising. Then the journalists searched for information about him in other ways. In the interview, Kuznetsov had committed an imprudence. He mentioned by name a couple of scientists, his friends, about whom Tobin wanted information. Some newspapers found it useful, conversely, to contact those scientists and ask information about the witness of the FSB. This was done in particular by the *Moscow Times*, a newspaper that is published in English in Moscow. From Moscow they telephoned to two scientists in America. In an article published on June 27, the day after Kuznetsov's interview, the journalist Ana Uzelac, based on information collected in America, gave a very bad portrait of Kuznetsov. (16)

(16) Ana Uzelac: "FSB spy charges may slap on Tobin", *The Moscow Times*, June 27, 2001. The article can be read online (after subscription): http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/fsb-may-slap-spy-charges-on-tobin/252897.html

One of the two interviewed scientists was Ted Sarafian, of Russian origin, a professor at the University of California at Los Angeles. He said that in the 1980s he worked in toxicology and had a suspicion that Kuznetsov had copied some passages from his papers. (17)

(17) It should be noted, however, that in a letter that he has written to me, Sarafian does not seem to give weight to the suspicions of plagiarism. Also an article in the *News-Times*, the already cited one of June 28, 2001, quotes a statement by Sarafian where he does not seem to express accusations against Kuznetsov.

More serious was Kuznetsov's choice to mention the name of Sidney Weinstein, the Editor of the *International Journal of Neuroscience*, the man who had opened him the doors of America many years before. When Weinstein answered the phone call from Moscow, he gave a horrible picture of Kuznetsov. Weinstein remembered the affair of the 1989 paper in his journal, of course, and moreover had been recently informed by me about the results of my investigation.

As Uzelac writes in her article (16), Weinstein called Kuznetsov "a liar and a thief". He said that Kuznetsov had turned from a promising scientist to an able fraudster. He explained that Kuznetsov had several times violated the scientific ethics, had published papers based on fabricated data and had cited non-existent journals. I quote from Uzelac's article:

« "I would have strong doubts about anything that Kuznetsov has to say on any subject," Weinstein said. "The man is a liar and a sociopath".»

Weinstein also gave an information that I did not know until then.

«He said Kuznetsov stayed at his home for a while in the late 1980s and left suddenly without returning \$36000 that he had loaned the Russian.»

If for the journalists of the *Moscow Times* only a few hours had been sufficient for collecting so disastrous news for the credibility of the witness, one wonders how the FSB could ignore them: this was not a fine figure for a counterintelligence service! The officials of the FSB had publicly divulged the allegations of Kuznetsov, risking a deterioration in the diplomatic relations between America and Russia, on the basis of his only word, without checking if he was reliable. From the people of an Intelligence Service, one expects first of all that they are able to gather information about their informants

The next day, June 28, the *Moscow Times* came out with an editorial entitled: "FSB Witness Must Make Putin Blush". (18) The Russian President Putin, as is known, made his career in the KGB, and later, before becoming President, he headed the FSB. Now the newspaper said that Putin should be ashamed for the behavior of his "colleagues" of Voronezh. I quote from the editorial:

«Now these tin-plated bureaucrats have trotted out a man named Dmitry Kuznetsov who claims that Tobin interrogated him more than three years ago when he was in jail in the United States on charges of embezzling grant funds from an American university. Kuznetsov claims that Tobin — who was 20 years old at the time — approached him in jail and tried to get him to work for the FBI. Tobin also quizzed him about a number of American professors who were his friends, Kuznetsov claims. «Instead of quietly investigating these seemingly improbable assertions and turning up testimony from Kuznetsov's American colleagues that he is a liar, a plagiarist, an unethical scholar and a thief, the Voronezh FSB

The Moscow Times concludes:

immediately went public with their "evidence."»

«OK. We live in a country where the justice system is so undeveloped that law enforcement officials are not worried about things like prejudicing cases or making specious public accusations. We know this. «But we are also living in a country where the president, the defense minister and other senior officials are proud products of the KGB and the FSB. Even if such embarrassing unprofessionalism by their provincial colleagues isn't enough to make them act, you would think it's sufficient to at least make them blush.»

(18) "FSB Witness Must Make Putin Blush" (Editorial). *The Moscow Times*, 28 June 2001. Available here:

http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/fsb-witness-must-make-putin-blush/252872.html

In Voronezh, the FSB officials must have read these articles, or have belatedly gathered information on their witness, because since then, to my knowledge, they have never mentioned the words of Kuznetsov nor have made other accusations of espionage against Tobin. We do not know if President Putin has

become red, with shame or anger, or if he was reminded of the articles of the *Moscow Times*, a month later, when President Bush raised the Tobin case during their meeting. The fact is that, within a few days, Tobin was freed and the affair ended. If Tobin, you never know, was really a spy, perhaps he owes his salvation to the fact that he had as his accuser a man with so little credibility as Kuznetsov.

Perhaps we may add a fourth alternative to those previously listed: Kuznetsov was paid by the American Intelligence for giving a testimony that would have rendered the FSB harmless!