

TO HIS HOLINESS FRANCIS
CANONICAL COMPLAINT
in the cause of
DAVID ROEMER
-against-
CARDINAL TIMOTHY DOLAN
under canons 279, 766, 779, 781, and 1188 of the 1983 Code of Canon Law

Most Holy Father:

This document serves as my formal complaint and request for penal sanctions against **Cardinal Timothy Dolan**.

Cancellation of Shroud of Turin Slideshow

On March 30, 2012, I arrived at the Church of St. Paul in the Archdiocese of New York with a slide projector and slides to present my slideshow/lecture about the Holy Shroud (Appendix I) to a group of parishioners who were assembling to attend a religious retreat. To my dismay and chagrin, I found out that the pastor cancelled my presentation. In doing this, the pastor deprived his parishioners of the blessings that come when a certain prayer is said before the Holy Shroud or a picture of it. I am accusing the pastor of violated Can. 1188 ("The practice of displaying sacred images in churches for the reverence of the faithful is to remain in effect.") and Can. 766 ("Lay persons can be permitted to preach in a church or oratory, if necessity requires it in certain circumstances or it seems advantageous in particular cases...").

The pastor apologized for withdrawing the invitation, and explained he thought I supported the authenticity of the Holy Shroud because I am on the Shroud Speaker Directory of the Shroud of Turin Website (www.shroud.com/speakers.htm). The pastor said the Resurrection of Jesus involved the production of radiation and that this same radiation discolored the blood-stained long and narrow piece of linen that is the Holy Shroud. In short, the pastor cancelled my slideshow because I was giving evidence that the Holy Shroud is not authentic. In doing this, the pastor violated Can. 279 §1 ("They are to avoid profane novelties and pseudo-science.").

Historical and Scientific Background

In the 19th century, it was generally understood that the Holy Shroud was the work of a medieval artist, as can be seen from the entry on the Shroud of Turin in the 1912 edition of the Catholic Encyclopedia (www.newadvent.org/cathen/13762a.htm). The following quote explains why it is injudicious to express the belief that the Shroud is authentic to someone who does not have the gift of faith. Mueller, Marvin, "The Shroud of Turin: A Critical Appraisal," *The Skeptical Inquirer*, Spring 1982, p. 27:

There are only three classes of possibilities for the image formation: by human artifice, through natural processes transferring the image to the linen from a real crucified corpse, or by supernatural means. Of the third, not much can be said, because then all scientific

discussion and all rational discourse must perforce cease...But a lot can be said about natural processes. In terse summary, they can be ruled out definitely by the quality and beauty of the shroud image.

In the 20th century, scientific and historical investigations support the theory of Robert Drews (*In Search of the Shroud of Turin: New Light on Its History and Origins*, 1984) that Gnostics created the Shroud of Turin in the 1st or 2nd century using a crucified victim or volunteer and methods that have been lost to history.

In the 21st century, Thomas De Wesselow (*The Sign: The Shroud of Turin and the Secret of the Resurrection*, 2012) and John Loken (*The Shroud Was the Resurrection: The Body Theft, the Shroud in the Tomb, and the Image that Inspired a Myth*, 2006) argue that the Shroud of Turin is authentic in order to prove that Christianity is a myth.

Refusal to Review Slideshow

On April 12, 2012, I wrote to Bishop Dennis Sullivan, Vicar General of the Archdiocese of New York, and accused the pastor of the Church of St. Paul of desecrating the Holy Shroud. I also criticized three other officials of the archdiocese for giving me a runaround about my slideshow/lecture. Bishop Sullivan ignored my request to give my presentation to Catholics knowledgeable in fundamental theology. On September 5, 2012, Cardinal Dolan wrote to me saying, "Until the Church has made a final pronouncement on the authenticity of the shroud, with more pros than cons at this time, why would a pastor want to sponsor an event that debunks the shroud."

On November 19, 2012, I wrote a letter to the Pontifical Council for Promoting New Evangelization criticizing Cardinal Dolan, Bishop David Ricken, Chairman of the Committee of Evangelization and Catechesis of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Archbishop José Gomez of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Cardinal Francis George, and Cardinal Donald Wuerl, and Archbishop Vignano, papal nuncio to the United States, for suppressing my slideshow. On October 3, 2013, the Under-Secretary of the Pontifical Council for Promoting New Evangelization, Msgr. Graham Bell, advised me to file the complaint with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

By failing to correct the pastor of the Church of St. Paul, I think Cardinal Dolan is guilty of violating the same canons violated by the pastor. By refusing even to consider supporting my slideshow, Cardinal Dolan is violating Can. 279, §3 ("They are also to acquire knowledge of other sciences, especially of those which are connected with the sacred sciences, particularly insofar as such knowledge contributes to the exercise of pastoral ministry.") and Can. 779 ("Catechetical instruction is to be given by using all helps, teaching aids, and instruments of social communication which seem more effective so that the faithful, in a manner adapted to their character, capabilities and age, and conditions of life, are able to learn Catholic doctrine more fully and put it into practice more suitably.")

Unethical Conduct of Bruno Barberis

The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers was persuaded by the Italy Section of the IEEE to sponsor a conference titled "Workshop of Advances in the Turin Shroud

Investigation” that was held at Bari, Italy, on September 4, 2014. In May 2014, I submitted a paper to the organizers of the conference (Appendix II) titled, “Science, Metaphysics, Philosophy, Theology, History, and the Holy Shroud.”

On June 30, 2014, I got an email rejecting my submission with many references to Catholic doctrine but no mention of the difference between faith and reason. The email was sent by Bruno Barberis, who is a science advisor to the Papal Custodian of the Shroud of Turin.

I filed a complaint against the conference organizers with the Ethics and Members Conduct Committee of the IEEE on July 22, 2014. My pending allegation is that the conference rejected my paper, not because of its scientific merit, but because it presented scientific evidence that the Shroud of Turin is not authentic and that the organizers of the conference were engaging in pseudoscience (Appendix III). The IEEE has not yet made a decision, however, shortly before the beginning of the conference, the IEEE withdrew its sponsorship. Had the IEEE not discovered that it was being deceived, the papers that were accepted and presented would have been published in the IEEE Xplore Digital Library and had the status of being peer-reviewed.

My complaint against Cardinal Dolan with Your Holiness is the same as my complaint against Bruno Barberis, et. al., with the IEEE. Both are rejecting my analysis of the history and science of the Holy Shroud without rational justification with the goal of causing people to think the Holy Shroud is authentic. Prof. Barberis is guilty of pseudoscience and Cardinal Dolan is guilty of misrepresenting our salvation history. Our salvation history includes an historical event (Resurrection of Jesus) and a miraculous artifact (Shroud of Turin). Cardinal Dolan is conflating the two signs and thereby distorting and misrepresenting the reasons and signs God has given us to believe in Jesus.

It is well known that most members of the IEEE do not have the gift of faith, however, no educated person questions this organization’s dedication to truth in science and history. Because of Prof. Barberis’s association with the Papal Custodian of the Shroud of Turin, his repudiation by the IEEE is a scandal that harms the Catholic Church. Cardinal Dolan’s statements and actions concerning my slideshow are scandalous for the same reason. Cardinal Dolan is violating Can. 781 (“Since the whole Church is by its nature missionary and the work of evangelization must be held as a fundamental duty of the people of God, all the Christian faithful, conscious of their responsibility, are to assume their part in missionary work.”)

Cognitive Dissonance and the Shroud of Turin

The author of the review of the paper I submitted to the conference is clearly a believing Christian, just as Thomas De Wesselow and John Loken are sincere about Christianity being a myth. They both think, to quote Cardinal Dolan, that there are “more pros than cons” supporting the authenticity of the Holy Shroud. The reality is that there is very little evidence for the authenticity of the Holy Shroud and very much evidence it is the work of craftsmen or artists. My review of a book about cognitive dissonance attempts to explain why some Christians think the Holy Shroud is authentic (Appendix IV). In the case of members of the Catholic clergy, there is added scandalous possibility that they don’t care whether or not the Holy Shroud is authentic. This is the impression I get from the behavior

of members of the clergy in the Metropolitan Archeparchy of Philadelphia, Archdiocese of Colorado Springs, Archdiocese of Brooklyn, and Archdiocese of New York.

Metropolitan Archeparchy of Philadelphia

On December 2, 2013, the Director for Evangelization for the Ukrainian Church in Philadelphia sent me a letter stating:

I have received your letter and email regarding the Shroud of Turin slide show which you have offered to present. We appreciate your offer but have already profited from the expertise of Russ Breault, of Atlanta Georgia, whose expertise provided us with an excellent and inspiring presentation for those pilgrims who have visited with us. We view the Shroud of Turin with the same sentiments as the late Pope John Paul II had shared in his visit to Turin: *“The Shroud is an image of God’s love as well as human sin... the imprint left by the tortured body of the Crucified One, which attest to the tremendous capacity for causing pain and death to one’s fellow man, and stands as an icon of the suffering of the innocent in every age” Pope John II*

On February 15, 2014, I sent a registered letter, return receipt requested, to Archbishop Sviatoslav Shevchuck in Kiev about Bishop Stefan Soroka’s lack of interest in the Holy Shroud and lack of understanding of our salvation history owing to his reliance on Russ Breault. There has been no response from Archbishop Shevchuck.

Catholic Archdiocese of Colorado Springs

Bishop Michael Sheridan is the keynote speaker at the St. Louis Shroud Conference to be held on October 9 to October 12, 2014. The conference committee rejected my request to make a presentation. In a telephone conversation with one of the committee members, I was told that my presentation was rejected because there is more evidence that the Shroud is authentic than there is that Gnostics created it. This is the abstract I submitted to the conference:

According to Robert Drews (*In Search of the Shroud of Turin: New Light on its History and Origins*), Gnostics in the 1st or 2nd century created the Holy Shroud using a crucified victim and methods that have been lost to history. Saying or implying that the Holy Shroud is authentic misrepresents our salvation history and shows a lack of understanding of the cosmological argument for God’s existence.

The Holy Shroud is a scientific sign or reason to believe in Jesus analogous to the discovery of microwave background radiation in the 1960s. In the 1920s, it was discovered that the universe was expanding and a Catholic priest invented the theory of the Big Bang. According to this theory, the universe began to exist 14 billion years ago as a particle smaller than a grain of salt. Within seconds, electrons and protons were formed. After 500,000 years, hydrogen atoms were formed and photons of a particular wavelength were emitted. Relativistic effects cause these photons to appear as microwave radiation.

The cosmological argument of Thomas Aquinas, as explained by Etienne Gilson, is based on the existence of finite beings and the assumption or hope that the universe is intelligible. I consider the Big Bang evidence that the universe is not intelligible. However, the Big Bang

is a reason to believe in Jesus because Jesus was a Jewish prophet and the Bible is filled with the idea of the pre-existence of God.

I wrote the following letter to Bishop Sheridan on May 8, 2014:

Dear Bishop Sheridan,

I just spoke to Mark Antonacci (636-938-3708), who is on the committee of the St. Louis Shroud Conference (Oct. 9 to Oct. 12, 2014) that rejected my request to be a presenter. He very clearly stated that there is more evidence the Holy Shroud is authentic than the theory presented in my slideshow/lecture (<http://www.holyshroud.info>), which is that Gnostics created this official relic using methods that have been lost to history. He thought there was so little evidence Gnostics were involved that it did not deserve to be presented at the conference. This means the presenters at the conference will be misrepresenting our salvation history.

I have asked the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith to correct Cardinal Timothy Dolan for his handling of an incident that occurred on March 30, 2012, at a parish in Manhattan. See: <http://newevangelist.me/2012/10/02/the-truth-about-the-shroud-of-turin/>.

I arrived to present my slideshow, and the pastor cancelled it. When I complained to Bishop Sullivan, the Vicar General, he said the matter did not concern him. Cardinal Dolan sent me a letter saying I was “debunking” the Holy Shroud.

I want to meet with the referees of the conference and explain to them why people who think the Holy Shroud is authentic should keep it to themselves. I am mailing this with a certificate of mailing in the event I decide that the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith is not doing its duty. If this happens, I will file a complaint with the Holy Father against Cardinal Müeller. I am sending this to the Custodian of the Shroud because his advisor is a scheduled presenter.

Very truly yours, David Roemer

Faxed to Cesare Nosiglia (011.515.63.38) and 719-636-1216

I wrote this letter to Cardinal Dolan and Bishop Sheridan on August 25, 2014:

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Your Eminence,

I am writing to ask for an appointment to explain to you why you are quite mistaken in thinking there is evidence that the Shroud of Turin is authentic. I’ve enclosed the letters I sent to the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (2/21/14) and the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Apostolic Life (8/20/14) about this matter. As it stands, I think you and Bishop Michael Sheridan of the Diocese of Colorado Springs are guilty of violating Canon 279 §3, which concerns your duty to “acquire knowledge of other sciences, especially of those which are connected with the sacred sciences....” Bishop Sheridan is supporting the St. Louis Shroud Conference 2014, which, like the 2014 IEEE Workshop on Advances in the Turin Shroud Investigation, accepts only presentations that promote the authenticity of the Holy Shroud.

If we can't resolve this conflict between us, I'll be filing a canonical complaint against you with the Holy Father. If you refuse this invitation for a meeting, I will consider it evidence of lack of sincerity and lack of respect for non-clerical members of the Catholic Church.

Asking the blessing of Your Eminence, I am, Yours respectfully in Christ,

David Roemer

Sent by registered letter, return receipt requested

cc Very Rev. Michael Sheridan

Catholic Diocese of Colorado Springs

Sent by registered letter, return receipt requested

Appendix I (<http://www.holyshroud.info>)

Slide # 1: The Shroud of Turin was exhibited in 1978. It is a 14-foot piece of linen cloth with a mysterious head-to-head image or imprint of Jesus on it after He was crucified.

Slide # 2: The Holy Shroud, as it is called, is thought to be the same linen burial cloth referred to in the Gospels. Mark, Ch. 15:

⁴³ Joseph of Arimathea, a distinguished member of the council, who was himself awaiting the kingdom of God, came and courageously went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus. ⁴⁴Pilate was amazed that he was already dead. He summoned the centurion and asked him if Jesus had already died. ⁴⁵And when he learned of it from the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph. ⁴⁶Having bought a linen cloth, he took him down, wrapped him in the linen cloth and laid him in a tomb that had been hewn out of the rock. Then he rolled a stone against the entrance to the tomb.

Slide # 3: This 17th century painting shows how the ventral and dorsal images of Jesus were formed.

Slide #4: You can see the blood from the crown of thorns, the lance thrust, and the crucifixion nails, as described in the Gospels. The blood marks are red, the body image is made of different shades of yellow, and the linen is whitish.

Slide #5: You can see marks from the scourging of Jesus as well as the blood coming from the lance wound.

Slide #6: A sign is a reason to believe God has communicated Himself to mankind. The discovery in the 1960s that the universe began to exist 14 billion years ago is also sign because the Bible says God created the universe from nothing. John Paul II, 1998:

Therefore, it is right to foster an awareness of the precious value of this image, which everyone sees and no one at present can explain. For every thoughtful person it is a reason for deep reflection, which can even involve one's life. The Shroud is thus a truly unique sign that points to Jesus, the true Word of the Father, and invites us to pattern our lives on the life of the One who gave himself for us.

Slide #7: The quotation mentions only the body image. The blood marks are anatomically and historically accurate and increase the difficulty of explaining the image. *Physics Education*, 2005:

There have been many attempts to simulate the image on the Turin Shroud, including a painting being impressed onto a cloth in a manner similar to brass rubbing. A judgment of success can only be subjective, but to date no reproduction has been able to produce the 3D nature of the image with the level of detail in negative! With our 21st century technological sophistication, we are so far defeated.

Slide #8: The Catholic Church grants indulgences to Catholics who say this prayer before a picture of the Holy Shroud. Pope Pius XI, 1934:

O Lord, Who in the most Holy Shroud, which enfolded Thy adorable Body on being taken down from the Cross, hast left manifestations of Thy presence here below and evident tokens of Thy love, by the merits of Thy holy passion and out of regard for this venerable linen which served for Thy burial, mercifully grant, we beseech Thee, that in the resurrection we also may share in that glory, in which Thou shalt reign for all eternity. Amen.

Slide #9: This is a 14th or 15th century medallion sold to pilgrims who visited the Holy Shroud in Lirey, France. It shows the coats of arms of Geoffrey de Charny and his wife, Jeanne De Vergy, the first owners of the relic. It is not known how this couple of modest wealth obtained possession of it.

Slide #10: The Catholic Church has always supported the veneration of this relic. On June 5, 1357, twelve bishops signed a document granting indulgences to pilgrims for visiting the relics at the church in Lirey. Bishop Henry de Poitiers, 1356:

You will learn what we ourselves learned on seeing and hearing the letters of the noble knight Goeffrey de Charny, Lord of Savoy and of Lirey, to which and for which our present letters are enclosed, after scrupulous examination of these letters and more especially of the said knight's sentiments of devotion, which he has hitherto manifested for the divine cult and which he manifests ever more daily.

Slide #11: This peer-reviewed article refutes the theory that the Holy Shroud is a medieval painting that transformed into its present mysterious condition due to the ravages of time. *Thermochimica Acta*, 2005:

Preliminary estimates of the kinetics constants for the loss of vanillin from lignin indicate a much older age for the cloth than the radiocarbon analyses...Pyrolysis-mass-spectrometry results from the sample area coupled with microscopic and microchemical observations prove that the radiocarbon sample was not part of the original cloth of the Shroud of Turin. The radiocarbon date was thus not valid for determining the true age of the shroud.

Slide #12: That the blood marks are not smeared and the image is so detailed means that the Holy Shroud is a work of human ingenuity, rather than a naturally occurring imprint of a crucifixion victim.

Slide #13: This is a computer recreation of the face image. The computer assumed that the image was determined by the distance between the body and a parallel plane.

Slide #14: The high position of the blood flows on the hand and the two angles that the blood flowed are examples of the anatomical accuracy of the Holy Shroud. The two angles might be the result of the victim changing his position in an effort to breath or the removal of the nail from the hand.

Slide #15: The marks from the scourging show that two people, on either side of the victim, were carrying out the torture.

Slide #16: The marks on the back correspond to those that would be made by a Roman flagrum whip.

Slide #17: This photograph shows that the body image it is a superficial coloring that appears only on one side of the cloth.

Slide #18: The blood marks are not superficial but are caused by the remnants of blood. The blood soaked through the cloth and appears on both sides.

Slide #19: Linen is made from the flax plant which produces cells 1 to 7 centimeters long and 0.010 to 0.015 millimeters in diameter (like very thin human hair). This is a photograph of one of the cells. It consists mostly of cellulose, the nucleus of the cell having disappeared after doing its job. The fiber-cell is white but is discolored to yellow at certain points. The body image is the result of different shades of yellow. In a black and white photograph, the silver particles in high concentration appear black. In different concentrations, the silver particles appear as shades of gray.

Slide #20: In the 1980s researchers argued that the discoloration was caused by something that degraded the cellulose. This peer-reviewed paper shows that this theory is still considered. *J. Imaging Science and Technology*, 2010:

The faint yellowed body image embedded into the linen cloth of the Turin Shroud has peculiar chemical and physical characteristics that at the moment cannot be replicated all together in laboratory. The authors present experimental results of ArF excimer laser irradiation (wavelength 193 nm) of a raw linen fabric, seeking for coloration similar to that of the Shroud image. The authors achieved a permanent yellow coloration of linen as a threshold effect of the laser beam intensity and number of shots. Most important, the authors have achieved for the first time a submicrometer depth of coloration of the outermost part of the fibers, leaving a colorless fiber medulla.

Slide #21: A new theory is that the discoloration doesn't come from the cellulose but from starch and sugars coating the cell-fibers at the surface of the cloth. "The Shroud of Turin: An Amino-Carbonyl Reaction (Maillard Reaction) May Explain the Image Formation," *Melanoidins*, vol. 4, 2003:

We can now formally propose a completely natural hypothesis for image formation. Impurities in ancient linen could have been suspended by the surfactant property of a *Saponaria officinalis* washing solution and they would be concentrated at the cloth surface by evaporation. Reducing saccharides would react rapidly with the amine decomposition products of a dead body.

Slide #22: The research in this paper supports the theory that starch and sugars on the two surfaces of the cloth are responsible for the body image. *Journal of Optics A: Pure and Applied Optics*, 2004:

This work analyses the first photographs of the back surface of the TS, made available by the Archdiocese of Turin. The double frontal and dorsal image of a man, imprinted on the front surface, is very faint. The body image on the bs is even fainter; i.e., signal-to-noise ratio is about 0.5. For this reason, image processing was necessary to highlight body features, and an ad hoc image enhancement procedure was developed.

Slide #23: I could not see the image on the “Non visible side” even though it was computer enhanced. This diagram shows that the threads in the cloth are 0.25 mm, which means they consist of about 100 cell-fibers.

Slide #24: Another famous image of Jesus is the Image of Edessa, which disappeared from history in the 13th century. There is a lot of evidence that the Image of Edessa and the Shroud of Turin are one and the same. *The Image of Edessa*, Mark Guscini, 2009:

Once again, it should be stressed that there are no artistic representations of the Image of Edessa as a full-body image or with bloodstains, and the majority of texts make no reference to either characteristic; but at the same time it is undeniable that at some point in the history of the Image of Edessa, some writers were convinced, for whatever reason, that it was indeed a full-body image on a large cloth that had been folded over (possibly in such a way that only the face was visible), and that it did contain bloodstains.

Slide #25: Edessa was an independent kingdom from 163 B.C. to 242 A. D., and was the first kingdom to convert to Christianity. Moslems conquered Edessa in 639 A. D. In 944 AD, after protracted negotiations with Byzantium, the Image of Edessa was transferred to Constantinople. This painting is from the 11th century and shows the Holy Shroud being given to the Emperor of Byzantium.

Slide #26: This is the first historical reference to the Image of Edessa. Edessa was actually evangelized in the late 2nd century. That Jesus communicated with the King of Edessa (King Abgar V) in the 1st century is just a legend. *Ecclesiastical History*, Evagrius Scholasticus, 595 AD:

So, when they came to complete despair, they brought the divinely created image, which human hands had not made, the one that Christ the God sent to Agbar when he yearned to see Him. Then, when they brought the all-holy image into the channel they had created and sprinkled it with water, they applied some to the pyre and the timbers [siege mound]. And all at once...the timbers caught fire...

Slide #27: This is a picture of King Abgar V getting the Image of Edessa.

Slide #28: This quotation indicates that the Image of Edessa was considered to be a painting in the 3rd and 4th centuries. *The Teaching of Addai*, 400 AD:

When Hanan the archivist saw that Jesus had spoken thus to him, he took and painted the portrait of Jesus with choice pigments, since he was the king's artist, and brought it with

him to his lord King Abgar. When King Abgar saw the portrait he received it with great joy and placed it with great honor in one of the buildings of his palaces.

Slide #29: This quotation pushes the possible date of the Image of Edessa into the 2nd century. *Against The Heresies*, St. Irenaeus, 180 AD:

They call themselves Gnostics and possess images, some of which are paintings, some made of other materials. They said Christ's image was copied by Pilate at the time that Jesus lived among men. On these images they put a crown and exhibit them along with the images of the philosophers of the world, namely, with the image of Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest. Toward these [images] they observe other rites that are just like those of the pagans.

Slide #30: Gnostics thought you got to Heaven, not by being good, but by being bad. Gnostics may have been capable of crucifying someone in the 1st or 2nd century in order to create an imprint of his body. If so, the technique and skills they used to do this have been lost to history. *Against The Heresies*, St. Irenaeus, 180 AD:

Therefore, they say that the souls must have experience in every kind of life and in every act by means of transmigration from one body to another, unless some soul would preoccupy itself once and for all, and in an equivalent manner do in one coming [into this world] all the deeds—deeds which it is not only wrong for to us to speak of and to listen to, but which we may not even think or believe that such things are done among people who live in our cities. The purpose of this, according to their writings, is that the souls, having had every experience in life, may at their departure not be wanting in anything; moreover, they must take care lest they be again sent forth into a body because something was wanting to their liberation.

Slide #31: There is evidence that there were a lot of Gnostics in Edessa in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Edessa mosaic, AD 208 to 278:

Whoever despises
the expectations of [his] last [days]
And mourns [his] first [days]—
He shall have a goodly latter end.

“The sentiment, that only the man who scorns long life and repents of his youthful errors may deem himself worthy of life after death, is expressed skillfully.” (J. B. Segal, *Edessa: The Blessed City*, p. 34)

Slide #32: This is a painting from the Catacomb of Commodilla in Rome, 350 AD. It shows a bearded long-haired Jesus, just like the Image of Edessa and the Holy Shroud.

Slide #33: This is from a painting in the Tomb of the Aurelii in Rome, 250 AD. According to Robert Drews (*In Search of the Shroud of Turin: New Light on its History and Origins*), “It is not known that the Aurelii were Gnostics, but they do seem to have been a para-Christian family, and in the first half of the third century there were a good many Gnostics in Rome.”

Slide # 34: The conflict about the authenticity of the Holy Shroud is another instance of the conflict between certain scientist and certain religious people about science and religion. In

my opinion, this conflict is caused by a lack of understanding of the mind-body problem. The highly intelligent author of the above quote has a blind spot because he only grasps two solutions: materialism and dualism. There is no evidence supporting these solutions. Conflict, anxiety, inhibition, and bias prevent the author from grasping the solution supported by the evidence and judged to be true by rational people: It is a mystery. One way of expressing this is to say: Humans are embodied spirits. Neil Campbell, author of *Biology*:

And certain properties of the human brain distinguish our species from all other animals. The human brain is, after all, the only known collection of matter that tries to understand itself. To most biologists, the brain and the mind are one and the same; understand how the brain is organized and how it works, and we'll understand such mindful functions as abstract thought and feelings. Some philosophers are less comfortable with this mechanistic view of mind, finding Descartes' concept of a mind-body duality more attractive.

Appendix II Science, Metaphysics, Philosophy, Theology, History, and the Holy Shroud

Abstract—This paper examines the differences between the methods of inquiry called science, metaphysics, philosophy, theology, and history in the context of investigations of the Shroud of Turin.

Keywords—Big Bang, cosmological argument, Resurrection of Jesus, faith, Shroud of Turin, Gnostics

I. EVIDENCE AGAINST AUTHENTICITY

Robert Drews (*In Search of the Shroud of Turin: New Light on Its History and Origins*, 1984) gives a lot of evidence that Gnostics created the Shroud of Turin in the 1st or 2nd century using a crucified victim or volunteer and methods that have been lost to history. Thomas De Wesselow (*The Sign: The Shroud of Turin and the Secret of the Resurrection*, 2012) and John Loken (*The Shroud Was the Resurrection: The Body Theft, the Shroud in the Tomb, and the Image that Inspired a Myth*, 2006) give evidence that the image on the Shroud of Turin was created mysteriously while it covered the crucified body of Jesus. Many people judge the Holy Shroud to be authentic even though images are always created by human beings and no one has been able to explain how a corpse could produce such a detailed blood-stained image on that large piece of linen. The authors, by the way, are using the authenticity of the Shroud to give an historical explanation for the Resurrection of Jesus.

II. STRUCTURE OF THE HUMAN MIND

There are five different methods of inquiry that are involved in the study of the Shroud of Turin: science, metaphysics, theology, history, and philosophy. These methods of inquiry are rooted in the structure of the human mind and in the types of questions human beings ask.

The scientific method is the result of a philosophical inquiry and reflects the way the human mind is structured. At the lowest level are observations, which require paying

attention. At the level of inquiry, humans ask questions about their observations. Humans want to know the cause of things, the relationship between things, and the unity between things. Extremely intelligent humans invent theories or hypotheses to answer these questions. At the level of reflective judgment, humans marshal the evidence and decide whether a theory is true or just probable. This level requires being rational. The fourth level is deciding what to do with our bodies, which requires being responsible.

III. METAPHYSICS, SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY, AND THEOLOGY

This is an example of a scientific question: Why is the sky blue? A metaphysical question is: What is knowing the sky is blue? Knowing the color of something means more than that light is entering your eye and a signal is going to your brain. It means an *awareness* of this. Scientific questions arise from observations made with our senses. Metaphysical questions arise from our ability to transcend ourselves and make ourselves the subject of our own knowledge. The question about *awareness* is equivalent to: What is the conscious knowledge of humans as opposed to the sense knowledge of animals? The theory or answer supported by the evidence and judged to be true by rational people is that it is a mystery. This can be expressed by saying humans are embodied spirits or that the human soul (*form*) is spiritual. We can comprehend what a human being is because we know everything we do and everything that happens to us. But, we can't explicate or define what a human being is.

Many people confuse metaphysics with philosophy. Philosophy is a method of inquiry that transcends a more fundamental method of inquiry. Historiography and the scientific method are both examples of philosophy because they are above history and science.

In metaphysics, finite beings exist because humans have free will. Free will means we possess a center of action that unifies us with respect to ourselves and makes us different from other human beings. A finite being is a composition of *essence* and *existence*, and an infinite being is a pure act of *existence*. In Western religions, we call the infinite being *God*.

Theology is the study of God's revelation to mankind through the prophetic religions of the Near East, the mystical religions of India, and the wisdom religions of China. Theology involves a different kind of knowledge than metaphysics, science, or history. The knowledge of theology is called *faith* and the knowledge of the other three methods of inquiry is called *reason*.

IV. THE BIG BANG

Faith, science, and metaphysics are intertwined by the discovery of cosmic background radiation in the 1960s. In the 1920s, it was observed that the universe was expanding and physicists asked why. An astronomer, who happened to be a Catholic priest, invented the theory that the universe began to exist 14 billion years ago and was once smaller than a grain of salt. I am using this phrase not to ridicule the theory, but because of a calculation I did using the size of a *grain of salt*. The universe consists of hundreds of billions of galaxies with hundreds of billions of stars each. The density of the universe is small because all this mass is distributed over a large volume. If you compress Earth into a volume the size of a grain of salt, the density becomes 7.10^{29} times greater than its real density of 5.5 grams per cubic centimeter. If you compress all of the galaxies into a sphere the size of Earth, you increase the density by a similar amount.¹

Five hundred thousand years after our known universe began existing, electrons and protons formed hydrogen atoms and emitted photons with a specific energy. This is the radiation that was discovered in the 1960s. Scientists now judge the theory of the Big Bang, as it was derisively called, to be true.

Many people consider the Big Bang evidence of God's existence. This is not consistent with the cosmological argument, which is based on the assumption or hope that the universe is intelligible and the insight that a finite being needs a cause. My understanding is that the Big Bang is evidence that the universe is not intelligible which means it is evidence that God does not exist.

However, the Big Bang is an object of study in theology because the Bible says God created the universe from nothing. This is a *reason to believe* God inspired the human authors of the Bible because the human writers knew nothing about the expanding universe. It is not *evidence* for revelation because *evidence* is part of science, metaphysics, and history. Instead of *evidence*, theology has *reasons to believe* and *signs*.

We can see the truth of the metaphysical proposition that God exists just as we can understand why the sky is blue. We can criticize the judgment, intelligence, and knowledge of people who deny or don't admit metaphysics leads to God's existence or don't know that density fluctuations, not molecules, cause the sky to be blue. We can't criticize the judgment of those who do not believe the Bible is the word of God. In faith, we know something is true because God is telling us. In reason, we know something is true because we can see the truth of it. Faith is both a decision and a gift from God.

HISTORY AND SCIENCE

Scientists ask questions about things that exist. Historians ask questions about past events, which only exist in the minds of historians. There are different criteria for deciding which questions scientists and historians should try to answer. For example, it is an historical fact that Jesus was a healer and exorcist who did not charge for his services. This raises the question: Did Jesus heal anyone? However, this is not a good historical question because there are no before and after x-rays and other medical records from the 1st century.

The Shroud of Turin, on the other hand, is an artifact. It actually exists, and the question of how the image was created cannot be dismissed as not being a good scientific question. It is just like the question: What caused the Big Bang? In both cases, scientists should do their best to come up with a hypothesis.

¹ I assumed the volume of a grain of salt is 1.5 cubic millimeters, and the universe is a sphere with a radius of 14 billion light years. For the mass of the universe, I assumed it is equivalent to the mass of 10^{21} suns. The mass of the sun is 333,000 times greater than the mass of Earth, which is 6.10^{24} kilograms.

Appendix III IEEE Ethics Complaint

Affidavit

State of New York, County of Kings

My current legal name is David Roemer, and I am retired. I am presently 72 years old, and my current address of residence is 345 Webster Ave., Apt. 4-0, Brooklyn, New York 11230.

1) I am a member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (No. 93091561).

2) I believe the members of the IEEE named in this document are guilty of behaving unethically, and am asking the Ethics and Member Conduct Committee to investigate this allegation and take the appropriate action.

3) I submitted the enclosed paper to an IEEE conference that requested philosophical papers, and received the enclosed rejection letter. On July 17, 2014, I emailed these two documents to the Vice President of Publication Services and Products, Gianluca Setti, with an account of my attempts to persuade the Italy Section and the conference organizers to accept my paper:

Dear Dr. Setti,

The rejection notice is dated June 30, and I responded as follows on July 4:

Dear Dr. Barberis and Dr. Lattarulo,

I'd appreciate your reconsidering your decision. I find the review unintelligible. If you don't reconsider, I'll be sending copies of this review, along with my paper, to all the members of the ATSI committee.

I want to go to Bari, give my paper, and answer any questions you might have about my submission.

I also emailed Amir Sandler, a Committee Member from Israel, who said that the reviewer gave "sound reasons." This was my response, which I also sent to Ermanno Cardelli, another Committee Member:

Dear Dr. Sandler,

I don't think there is any "sound reason" in the reviewer's comments about my submission. In fact, I consider the review so absurd that it raises ethical questions about the committee's commitment to the integrity of science and the ethical code of the IEEE. I have these comments to make about the review:

"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."

My paper argues that the Holy Shroud was created by Gnostics in the 1st or 2nd century. Using the word "fake" to describe this theory of Robert Drews betrays an irrational emotional attachment to the theory that the Holy Shroud is authentic. Gnostics venerated Jesus as a wise man and created the cloth out of veneration and with a desire to tell the story of Jesus' passion.

"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."

The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is both an object of faith and an historical event. As an historical event, it refers to the renewed fellowship of the followers of Jesus after the

crucifixion. As an act of faith, it refers to the belief that Jesus is alive in a new life with God. The “stockpiled evidence” supports the Gnostic theory as well as the authenticity theory. My paper explains why the idea that the Shroud is authentic is irrational.

“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.”

It is hardly a guess to say that the Holy Shroud was created by human beings. All images are created by humans. It should be the foundation of any inquiry into how the Shroud was created.

“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!”

An honest and rational review would attempt to understand the connection I tried to make between the Big Bang and the Holy Shroud.

“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.”

This is not a critique of my explanation of the difference between science, metaphysics, philosophy, theology, and history.

“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.”

The author is not answering my explanation of why the Shroud is not authentic.

“Supportive of the above detrimental judgment 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.”

My paper explains why the Big Bang is evidence that God does not exist. A reasoned review, and not an emotional tirade, would attempt to refute my explanation.

On July 7, I got this email from Ermanno Cardelli:

Dear Dr. Roemer,

I have turned your mail to the organizers of the Symposium. I am not in charge for the

paper rejection issue, but I'm certain the Publication committee will properly address your complaints.

On July 9, I got this email from Dr. Barberis and Dr. Lattarulo:

Dear Dr. Roemer,

Your paper #1569970437 ('Science, Metaphysics, Philosophy, Theology, History, and the Holy Shroud') submitted to the IEEE 2014 Workshop on Advances in the Turin Shroud Investigation has been rejected because of all the Reviewers provided us a negative assessment about the scientific content. Please note that, according to the IEEE rules, we are not able to reconsider your paper for presentation at the Workshop.

This was my response:

Dear Bruno and Francesco,

What rule is that? It may be inappropriate to overrule a review that is within the bounds of reason. However, in this case, the reviewer is rejecting my paper because it explains why the Holy Shroud is not authentic. If the reviewers for this workshop are emotionally attached to the authenticity of the Holy Shroud, all of the papers accepted are tainted. I consider it my Christian duty to advise the editor of the IEEE Xplore Digital Library of this shortcoming of ATSI 2014.

I explain in my paper that it is the job of scientists to explain the Big Bang and how humans created the image on the Holy Shroud. Your conduct is similar to the unethical behavior of Richard Sternberg, who edited a peer-reviewed article about evolutionary biology that was published in the *Proceedings of the Biological Association of Washington* ("The origin of biological information and the higher taxonomic categories"). It was a review article about the Cambrian explosion, and at the end of the article the author plugged the theory of intelligent design (ID). The peer-reviewers thought this was a harmless philosophical addendum that did not detract from the scientific value of the paper. It became the first peer-reviewed science article arguing in favor of ID. Dr. Sternberg behaved unethically because he should have deleted the reference to ID, or consulted with another editor. He was publicly criticized for his behavior. He could not be fired because his 9 to 5 job was with the Smithsonian Institute.

What happened to him at the Smithsonian Institute shows how much scientists, at least in the United States, hate pro-religion pseudoscience. The title alone of a 26-page congressional report criticizing the Smithsonian Institute tells the whole story: "Demotion and Harassment of Scientist Skeptical of Darwinian Evolution" (December 2006).

On July 14, 2014, I got this email from Dario Petrie:

Dear Dr. Roemer,

I am very sorry that your paper couldn't be accepted for presentation at the ATSI 2014 Workshop. This was because all the Reviewers provided a negative assessment about the scientific content of your submission.

However, because of your previous email, I asked a further independent assessment of your paper. This further Reviewer fully agrees with the previous ones.

As a consequence, according to the rules of peer review conferences, there is no way to reconsider your paper for presentation at the Workshop.

4) On July 21, 2014 I sent this email to Dr. Setti:

Dear Dr. Setti,

I tried calling you at +39 0532 974997 (Ferrara) +39 051 2095405 (Bologna), but could not get through. There is some additional information I'd like to give you about Bruno Barberis.

Dr. Barberis is a science advisor to the Papal Custodian of the Shroud and is scheduled to give a presentation about the Shroud at a conference in St. Louis, Missouri, from October 9 to October 14, 2014 (<http://www.stlouishroudconference.com/>).

I submitted an abstract of a presentation, and it was rejected. No written reason was given, but one of the Committee Members of this conference (Mark Antonacci) told me over the phone that my presentation was rejected because I was not advocating the authenticity of the Shroud. I complained about this to Dr. Barberis in an email on May 7, 2014, and asked him to withdraw his participation in this conference.

I developed a slideshow about the Shroud three years ago (<http://www.holyshroud.info>). Timothy Cardinal Dolan of New York and many other Catholics have suppressed my presentation because I don't promote the authenticity of the Shroud. I filed a complaint against Cardinal Dolan with the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith in Rome and against Dr. Barberis with the Papal Custodian of the Shroud (Archbishop Cesare Nosiglia). All of this correspondence is at:

<http://newevangelist.me/2012/10/02/the-truth-about-the-shroud-of-turin/>

I consider the following quotation from an article Dr. Barberis wrote proof that he is not qualified to evaluate scientific papers about the Shroud of Turin:

"It appears to me that until now all the proposed theories, interesting ones in themselves, have always come up lacking either because they were not correlated by serious experimental verification or because such verifications have demonstrated the physical and chemical features on the obtained images to be very different from those present on the Shroud's image."

(http://www.sindone.org/the_holy_shroud__english_/news_and_info/00024401_The_Shroud__Make_over___science_or_marketing.html.)

What Dr. Barberis is saying is that any theory about the origin of the Shroud must be supported by "experimental evidence." This means is that he is excluding non-experimental evidence. Non-experimental evidence that the Shroud is the work of artists or craftsmen is that blood marks on the Shroud are not smeared. The blood coming from the thorns in Jesus' head flows in narrow streams as blood tends to flow out of small wounds. The other bit of non-experimental evidence is the detailed nature of the image. It is a true image with shading, not an outline.

Saying the Shroud is authentic is like saying the sculptures on Mount Rushmore were created by wind erosion.

5) My accusation against the Italy Section and the conference leaders is that the conference was organized to generate peer-reviewed science articles supporting the authenticity of the Shroud. The motive behind this is to provide evidence supporting the New Testament stories that a prominent Jewish citizen provided a tomb for the crucified Jesus, a burial cloth covered the corpse of Jesus in the tomb, and the tomb was found empty on Easter morning. My paper argues that it is very unlikely that the Shroud touched Jesus, and this is why the conference rejected it. This implies that all the papers submitted have been judged on how much the paper supports the New Testament stories. In my opinion this makes the entire conference an exercise in pseudoscience. This conference undermines the integrity of science, and diminishes the value of conference papers published by the IEEE.

6) I am willing and able to attend any meeting where my allegations against the Italy Section are investigated

I hereby state that the information above is true, to the best of my knowledge. I also confirm that the information here is both accurate and complete, and relevant information has not been omitted.

Signature of the Individual
Date: 7/22/14

Notary Public
Mahmood Amer

Letters to Joseph Kalasky from David Roemer

July 29, 2014

My allegation against Gianluca Setti, Bruno Barberis, Francesco Lattarulo, Amir Sandler, Ermanno Cardelli, and Dario Petrie is that they are using the IEEE conference in Bari to promote the absurd idea that the Shroud of Turin is authentic. The enclosed article (Tristan Casabianca, "The Shroud of Turin: A Historiographical Approach," The Heythrop Journal, 2013) is in favor of this pseudoscience and reveals the motives and reasoning behind it.

The article is based on a book titled, "The Resurrection of Jesus: A New Historiographical Approach," and I have enclosed a copy of my review of this poor exercise in Christian apologetics (<http://www.newevangelization.info/licona.html>).

I have also enclosed an article I wrote that was published in Spero News on January 18, 2008. This article explains why the Shroud is not authentic. I wrote it before I found out about the book I referred to in my IEEE submission which argues that Gnostics made the unusually shaped piece of linen to tell the story of the crucifixion of Jesus (<http://www.newevangelization.info/shroud.html>).

August 1, 2014

I read Bylaw I-110 and Policy 7.10 and understand it to mean that the preliminary investigation should only involve determining whether there is a cause of action and whether the complaint can be proven.

The cause of action is that Bruno Barberis and Francesco Lattarulo are selecting papers submitted to an IEEE conference, not on their scientific merit, but on whether the paper supports the Biblical stories saying Jesus was buried in a separate tomb (not in a common grave for criminals) on Friday, his body was covered with a linen cloth, and the body was not in the tomb on Sunday morning.

I feel my affidavit and the documents I mailed on July 29, 2014, proves that this allegation can be proven and in fact proves it. I think your report of the preliminary investigation should be given to the president of the IEEE before the conference is over and the damage to the IEEE is done.

August 4, 2014

I think it might help to if I spelled out the relevance of "The Shroud of Turin: A Historiographical Approach" by Tristan Casabianca (Heythrop Journal LIV (2013), pp. 414-423) which follows the reasoning in the book, "The Resurrection of Jesus: A New Historiographical Approach," by Michael Licona.

The Resurrection of Jesus is both an historical event and an object of faith. As an object of faith, it means believing Jesus is alive in a new life with God and if you follow Jesus the same good thing can happen to you. As an historical event, it refers to the renewed fellowship of the disciples of Jesus after the crucifixion. This historical event is sometimes referred to as the Easter experience. These two works spell out the way many Christians relate to the Resurrection of Jesus.

Licona and Casabianca both understand that all historians agree that the Easter experience occurred within a few years of the crucifixion. Their response to this event is to ask what caused the Easter experience and to offer hypotheses. The explanation these apologists think is supported by the most evidence is what they call the "bodily resurrection of Jesus." By this they mean that a video camera could have recorded the corpse of Jesus disappearing without humans relocating the body. They assign a high probability to this explanation and call the total certitude that Jesus is alive a "leap of faith." Similar reasoning leads people to believe it is highly probable that the Shroud is authentic, and those who think it is a work of craftsmen or artists are being unscientific. This is why the reviewer of my submission was driven to refer to the Resurrection of Jesus and the doctrine called the Incarnation.

August 6, 2014

What follows is a link to an article written in Italy about the upcoming IEEE conference in Bari, Italy:

<http://shroudstory.com/2014/08/06/scientific-conference-on-the-shroud-of-turin/>

I think the article proves that the conference organizers are tricking the IEEE into publishing peer-reviewed articles that proselytize in favor of Christianity and against other religions.

August 11, 2014

I've enclosed a printouts of the three emails I sent to Gordon MacPherson. "Springer.pdf" is an example of the kind of garbage the IEEE will be publishing if the IEEE does not withdraw its sponsorship of conference #32930.

August 18, 2014

I have asked Howard Michel and Dom DeMarco for an appointment so I can explain why I think the IEEE should withdraw its endorsement of the ATSI conference (Advances in Turin Shroud Investigations). I've enclosed the email I sent Dr. Michel.

I've also enclosed the screenshot of my LinkedIn message from Jose Roberto de Marca asking for information. According to Dom DeMarco, it would be "inappropriate for the President to comment or intervene in an on-going process."

I've enclosed screenshots of my correspondence with Chris Brantley on LinkedIn. There is a perfect analogy between the theory that the Shroud of Turin is authentic and the theory of intelligent design. They are both examples of pro-religion pseudoscience. The ATSI conference organizers and participants are trying to prove the Shroud is authentic and are using the IEEE's reputation to bolster their religious enthusiasms.

August 18, 2014

On May 8, 2014, I filed a complaint (see enclosure) against Bruno Barberis, a general chair of the IEEE-ATSI-2014 and a science advisor to the Papal Custodian of the Shroud of Turin (Cesare Nosiglia), for participating in the St. Louis Shroud Conference to be held on October 9, 2014. Like the ASTI conference, the St. Louis conference rejected my submission because I argued that the Shroud was not authentic.

The abstracts of the papers presented in St. Louis have been posted and this will give you some idea about the papers that will be presented at ATSI-2014. I recommend that you read the following abstracts at

<http://www.stlouishroudconference.com/program/title-of-abstract>. My comments are beneath the titles:

dating-the-shroud-of-turin-weighing-all-the-evidence

In 1988, a carbon dating procedure authorized by the Catholic Church indicated that the Shroud was created in the middle ages. This dating has been thoroughly discredited because of the choice of the sample tested and the historical evidence that the Shroud predates the middle ages. This paper will only remind people who think the Shroud is authentic of their great victory over the 1988 setback. What this paper does is create a straw man. People are being led to believe that the choice is between the authenticity of the Shroud or its middle age date. The papers of this conference completely ignore the theory of Robert Drews that Gnostics created the Shroud of Turin in the 1st or 2nd century using a crucified victim or volunteer and methods that have been lost to history. There are a number of other papers in this conference that have no purpose other than to refute the 1988 fiasco. They are:

spectroscopic-analyses-of-fibers-from-the-shroud-of-turin-what-do-they-mean

the-halo-around-the-head-in-the-image-of-the-man-on-the-shroud

study-of-shroud-feature-evidence-using-video-and-photogrammetric-analysis-methods

the-future-of-research-on-the-shroud

the-hypotheses-about-the-roman-flagrum-some-clarifications

the-shroud-and-the-iconography-of-christ

modern-scholarship-and-the-history-of-the-turin-shroud

the-full-length-history-of-the-turin-shroud

constantinople-documents-as-proof-of-the-shroud-in-edessa

the-enigma-of-the-apparent-age-of-the-shroud-of-turin-given-the-1988-radiocarbon-dating

This article reports evidence of spontaneous human combustion.

the-origin-of-rogers-raes-and-c14-samples

This article argues that there should be a new radiocarbon dating of the Shroud.

natural-manufactured-or-miracle

This paper give evidence for “Near Death Experiences.”

speculations-on-the-14th-century-origins-of-the-turin-shroud

I can't comment because I found the abstract unintelligible.

earthquake-induced-piezonuclear-reactions-and-the-image-on-the-shroud-of-turin-critical-remarks

This abstract is based on the paper published by Springer (DOI 10.1007/s11012-013-9865-x) titled “Is the Shroud of Turin in relation to the Old Jerusalem historical earthquake.”

My opinion is that the editor of this article had a responsibility to make changes that the peer-reviewers and authors may have overlooked. This is the same mistake Richard Sternberg made, as I mentioned in the affidavit I sent to the IEEE (see “Sternberg peer-review controversy” in Wikipedia).

These are excerpts from the first and third paragraphs:

After the first photographs of the Shroud, taken by Mr. Secondo Pia during the Exposition of 1898 in Turin [1], a widespread interest has been generated among scientists and curious to explain the image formation and to evaluate its dating.

Starting from the first photographs of the Shroud, which highlighted a figure of a human body undraped with hands crossed (Fig. 1), a large debate on the mechanism that may have produced such an image has been conducted in the scientific community.

The paper does not address the question of how the image was formed. The paper only states that neutron radiation may have caused the discoloration of the shroud fibrils. This quote is from the second paragraph:

In this work, the authors consider that neutron emissions by earthquake—as for the conventional gadolinium-like neutron imaging technique— could have induced the image formation on Shroud linen fibres through thermal neutron capture on nitrogen nuclei...

The editor should have replaced the phrase “image formation” with the phrase “changing the color of the fibril from white to yellow at those points on the fibril where the image exists.”

The article says the source of the neutrons in an earthquake is the crushing of stones. The authors call the process “piezonuclear fission,” and there is a lot of controversy about it. See:

<http://www.scienceonthenet.eu/content/article/embarrassing-piezonuclear-affair>

biophotonic-hypothesis-of-the-turin-shroud

As with the article about earthquakes discussed above, this abstract refers to “image formation,” but in fact only discusses the discoloration of the linen fibrils. This means there are five the kinds of radiation that are used to explain the discoloration: photons from the transformation of the corpse of Jesus into a spiritual body, neutrons from an earthquake, corona discharge, alpha particles, and biophotons.

about-the-second-image-of-face-detected-on-the-turin-shroud

The “second-image-of-the-face” is really, I think, the third image. The first image is only on one side of the linen. The second image is on the other side, and is not visible to the naked eye. However, this faint image can be detected with computerized image enhancement. I personally could not see even this enhanced image, which is why I did not include it in my slideshow. Apparently a third image was detected in this way. The author of the article is skeptical about this third image, but not the second.

charge-separation-as-the-mechanism-for-image-formation-on-the-shroud-of-turin

This paper advances the theory that the discoloration of the fibrils, misleadingly referred to as the image, was caused by an electric field.

the-alpha-particle-irradiation-hypothesis-part-i-entering-johns-gospel

John’s gospel is the most Christian and least Jewish of the four gospels. It supports the doctrine of the Incarnation. The author is saying we can understand the image by reading John’s gospel, not the Jewish gospels.

the-alpha-particle-irradiation-hypothesis-solving-the-mystery-of-the-shroud

This is part ii of the above paper. I can’t tell if the author is seriously supporting the theory that the discoloration was caused by alpha particles or making fun of this theory.

new-discoveries-on-the-sudarium-of-oviedo

The Sudarium of Oviedo supposedly covered the face of Jesus when he was being transferred from the cross to the tomb. The author considers the connection between the two to be evidence of the Shroud’s authenticity.

the-mandylicon-or-the-story-of-a-man-made-relic

The author disputes the theory that the Shroud of Turin is the Image of Edessa, called also the Mandylicon.

theology-of-the-shroud

The author states that the Shroud is almost certainly authentic. I am sure the author thinks it is almost certainly true that Jesus' corpse transformed into a "spiritual body" on Sunday morning. In other words, he thinks it is highly probable that a video camera could have recorded Jesus' appearances and the disappearance of the corpse. This means he is criticizing the historical judgment of people who do not agree the bodily resurrection of Jesus, which is how they think of the Resurrection, is highly probable. This is why he feels justified in criticizing the scientific judgment of people who think the Shroud is a work of human ingenuity.

It is not clear that Jesus was buried in a separate tomb. According to John Dominic Crossan of the Jesus Seminar, Jesus' body was put in a mass grave for criminals and devoured by dogs. This means there was no empty tomb on Sunday morning. A Catholic biblical scholar, Raymond Brown, argues that it is historically certain that Jesus had a separate tomb. However, Brown does not think it is an historical fact that the tomb was empty. But there is no disagreement between Brown and Crossan about the Resurrection of Jesus. They both agree that within a few years of the crucifixion, the disciples of Jesus renewed their fellowship and started Christianity. There is, however, a conflict between Crossan and Brown because Brown has the gift of faith and Crossan thinks Brown is irrational. I mention this because conflict produces anxiety and inhibition is a defense mechanism against anxiety. Religion inhibits people from thinking rationally and intelligently.

nazah-the-unveiling-of-a-hidden-purpose-for-the-shroud

The author says that the pollen on the Shroud proves it is authentic. It only proves the Shroud was made near Jerusalem in the 1st or 2nd century.

the-shekinah-glory-of-the-lord-and-the-shroud-of-turin

This paper implies that the image on the Shroud is miraculous.

a-galatian-sojourn-of-the-shroud-of-turin-pollen-paul-and-a-public-portrayal-of-christ

This paper will argue that early missionaries used the Shroud to prove Jesus rose from the dead. Atheists use this scenario to explain how the myth of the Resurrection got started.

science-and-semantics

This abstract states that there is evidence the Shroud image was created by "UV or particle radiation emanating from a stationary or disappearing human body."

shroud-science-and-faith-dialogue-or-conflict-quot

The author of this is Bruno Barberis. He repeats the same misleading statement that permeates the papers being presented. He says scientists have been studying the image on the Shroud for years. They have not because every rational person knows craftsmen or artists create images. There is one exception. On April 21, 1902, Yves Delage, an internationally acclaimed zoologist, told the French Academy of Science in a lecture that ammonia vapors from the decaying body of Jesus created the image. Members of the audience shouted out "traitor" and shook their fists. For his safety, Delage had to make a quick exit from the auditorium. The scientific work Barberis is referring to is just about what caused the discoloration of the linen fibrils.

mcnp-analysis-of-neutrons-released-from-jesus-body-in-the-resurrection

This abstract says “that a very small fraction of neutrons in the body of Jesus were emitted from the body as it disappeared in the resurrection.”

hypothesis-that-explains-the-shroud-s-unique-blood-marks-and-several-critical-events-in-the-gospels

One of the reasons rational people think the Shroud is a work of craftsmen is that the blood marks are not smeared. The abstract said the blood marks were formed because the body appeared outside the cloth, but the blood remained in the cloth. I consider this disingenuous because no mention is made of the fact that the blood marks are not smeared. There are two other abstracts that repeat this misinformation:

a-critical-re-evaluation-of-the-shroud-of-turin-blood-data-strength-of-evidence-in-the-characterizat

joseph-m-gambescia-m-d-and-the-position-of-the-feet-on-the-shroud-of-turin-the-history-of-an-investi

an-artist-explores-the-facial-image-of-the-shroud-of-turin

I did not understand this abstract.

Appendix IV: Cognitive Dissonance and the Shroud of Turin

What follows is a review of a book titled, *Mistakes Were Made (but not by me): Why We Justify Foolish Beliefs, Bad Decisions, and Hurtful Acts*, by Caroll Tavris and Elliot Aronson:

One of the book’s many examples of bad behavior is Oprah Winfrey’s public support of *A Million Little Pieces* by James Frey, which was a literary fraud. It was a mistake any talk show host could make, but Oprah tried to justify her mistake on the Larry King show and made a number of irrational statements, such as “truth isn’t important.” Tavris and Aronson say there is a “pyramid of choice” that King and Winfrey were on top of because they had similar moral values. After Winfrey made her mistake, however, she descended into a position of moral inferiority. Her subsequent public apology drew much praise because it is so unusual for people to admit they made a mistake.

The authors analyze this kind of behavior with the theory of cognitive dissonance, which has “inspired more than 3,000 experiments that, taken together, have transformed psychologists’ understanding of how the human mind works”(location 226). The theory is that Oprah suffered mentally and emotionally because her idea that the book was good was inconsistent with reality, and she diminished her suffering (at first) by making self-justifying statements. The following quote from a famous psychoanalyst shows that anxiety or stress can inhibit a person from thinking intelligently and rationally:

Let us consider for example, a person listening to a paper and having critical thoughts about it. A minor inhibition would consist in a timidity about expressing the criticism; a strong inhibition would prevent him from organizing his thoughts, with the result that they would occur to him only after the discussion was over, or the next morning. But the inhibition may go so far as not to permit the critical thoughts to come up at all, and in this

case, assuming that he really feels critical, he will be inclined to accept blindly what has been said or even to admire it; and he will be quite unaware of having any inhibitions. In other words, if an inhibition goes so far as to check wished or impulses there can be no awareness of its existence.”(*The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, Karen Horney, M.D., New York: Norton, 1937, p. 55)

In religion, there are three fundamental truths that cause anxiety or cognitive dissonance: 1) The existence of God. 2) The Resurrection of Jesus. 3) The non-authenticity of the Shroud of Turin.

Existence of God

We know that God exists because of the arguments of Thomas Aquinas and Étienne Gilson: Finite beings (humans) exist. Finite beings need a cause. Ergo, an infinite being (God) exists. You can see that this argument is actually a proof by considering the question of whether or not humans have free will.

Evidence for free will is that slavery is illegal, but it is not illegal to own animals and breed them for food. This might suggest that people who think humans do not have free will have bad judgment. However, there is no need to make a decision about this question. No one is arguing that slavery should be legalized because humans are no better than animals. It does not show poor judgment to speculate about whether or not humans have free will and to play the devil’s advocate by promoting the philosophy called *positivism*. However, concerning the question of God’s existence, there is a decision that has to be made: Is there life after death? Will we pay for our sins after we die? It is because of the need to make this decision that one’s statements and thoughts about God’s existence can reflect poorly on one’s character.

The following four statements are knowledgeable, intelligent, rational, and honest ways to justify deciding that life ends in the grave:

- 1) God has not given me the gift of faith.
- 2) The concept of God is contradictory.
- 3) If God cared about our welfare, He would not cause so much suffering.
- 4) The argument for God’s existence is not persuasive.

It is irrational to say, “I don’t believe in life after death, because God does not exist.” When a person says this they are going down the “pyramid of choice” for the sake of self-justification. The statement is absurd because it makes no sense to consider whether there is life after death if God does not exist and to consider whether or not God exists if you are not trying to decide if there is life after death.

Resurrection of Jesus

The Resurrection of Jesus is an historical event. The followers of Jesus dispersed in fear and disappointment after the crucifixion but renewed their fellowship within a few years and swore up and down that Jesus appeared to them after he died.

The faith of Christians is that Jesus is alive in a new life with God and if you follow Jesus the same good thing can happen to you. There is a gap between this belief and the historical event. This gap is widened because there are many presumably knowledgeable, intelligent, rational, and honest people who do not believe in life after death.

This does not cause me any stress because I understand that most non-believers are not knowledgeable because they don't know the argument for God's existence. They are not intelligent because they don't understand why humans are embodied spirits. With the exception of Jean-Paul Sartre, who said "man is a useless passion," they are not rational about the meaning of life. They are not honest because they use the spurious refutation: "Who made God?"

Many Christians alleviate the stress by asking what caused the Resurrection of Jesus. This question can't be answered because the gospels were written many years after the Resurrection. But if you assume the question is a good one, it justifies inventing hypotheses to answer the question. The two most common hypotheses are: 1) The followers of Jesus were hallucinating. 2) There occurred a bodily coming-to-life of Jesus, that is, a video camera could have recorded the event. The next step is to assume a high probability for the resurrection theory and low probability for hallucination theory. These probability assumptions are accompanied with the explanation that those who don't agree are materialists, agnostics, or atheists. This reasoning transforms faith in Jesus into an historical event, albeit only a probable event. The gap between this highly probable event and faith is closed with the idea of a "leap of faith." The net result, however, is self-justification and putting non-believers on a low level of the "pyramid of choice."

The Shroud of Turin

The Shroud of Turin contains a blood-stained image of the front of Jesus and the back of Jesus. It is clearly the work of craftsmen or artists who used a crucified victim or volunteer and methods that have been lost to history to tell the gospel stories about the crucifixion of Jesus. The evidence the Holy Shroud never touched Jesus is the unusual dimensions of the linen cloth, the non-speared blood stains, and the existence of a detailed image. The Holy Shroud is a sign or reason to believe in Jesus, but many Christians prefer to think it is evidence supporting the theory of the bodily Resurrection of Jesus.