August 6, 2025

SPECIAL POSTING (Next regular weekly posting likely to be on August 14th)

1 ITEM ONLY: RECENT PAPER TITLED "Image Formation on the Holy Shroud—A Digital 3D Approach" by Cicero Moraes

*This paper was in the peer-reviewed journal *Archaeometry* and got a lot of media coverage. There have been numerous rebuttals already from pro-authenticity researchers.

*The paper, published on July 28, can be downloaded (at a cost) at:
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/arcm.70030

*Typical popular media coverage article: https://www.livescience.com/archaeology/shroud-of-turin-wasnt-laid-on-jesus-body-but-rather-a-sculpture-modeling-study-suggests

*Typical popular media rebuttal: https://www.uccronline.it/eng/2025/08/03/was-the-shroud-laid-on-a-sculpture-a-study-full-of-errors/

*The Centro Internazionale di Studi sulla Sindone and the Diocesan Commission for the Shroud immediately released statements

* The Diocesan Commission for the Shroud Press Release

*Centro Internazionale di Studi sulla Sindone Press Release

*Article by Brazilian sindonologist:

A Critical Analysis of "Image Formation on the Holy Shroud—A Digital 3D Approach" by Cicero Moraes: Fundamental Methodological Flaws and Scientific Oversight

Author: Otangelo Grasso, written with AI assistance
Date: 4 August 2025
Journal: Response to Archaeometry Publication (First published: 28 July 2025)
Executive Summary
This peer review provides a comprehensive analysis of Cicero Moraes' digital simulation study 1 that attempts to demonstrate the Shroud of Turin's image resulted from contact with a medieval bas-relief sculpture rather than a human body. While Moraes' application of open-source digital tools represents a technological innovation, his study suffers from fundamental scientific flaws that render his conclusions invalid. Most critically, Moraes ignores the

established requirement that any viable formation theory must simultaneously satisfy over 80 documented physical, chemical, and forensic properties—a mathematical impossibility for any medieval artistic technique.

Understanding Moraes' Stated Objectives

Primary Research Goals

Moraes explicitly states his study aims to:

- Create digital comparison models: Generate 3D simulations of cloth contact with both a human body and a low-relief sculpture
- Analyze contact patterns: Map fabric-surface interactions using open-source software (MakeHuman, Blender, CloudCompare)
- Demonstrate artistic feasibility: Prove that medieval artists could have created the Shroud image using bas-relief techniques
- Refute body-contact theory: Show that cloth wrapping a human body would create distortions not seen on the Shroud
- Support medieval dating: Reinforce the 1988 carbon-14 dating placing the Shroud's creation between 1260-1390 AD

Methodological Scope Limitations

Moraes acknowledges significant limitations in his approach:

"The study does not address physical or chemical aspects related to the image's formation, such as the presence of pigments, microscopic analyses, or material properties of the fabric, nor does it investigate the dynamics of bodily fluids, such as blood flow. The focus is strictly methodological, centered on digital modeling and the comparative evaluation of the observed contact patterns."

This admission reveals the fundamental flaw in Moraes' methodology: he deliberately excludes the most important scientific evidence that distinguishes the Shroud from any known artwork. By limiting his analysis to geometric modeling while ignoring physical and chemical evidence, Moraes commits the equivalent of studying the Mona Lisa solely through digital reproduction while ignoring paint analysis, canvas composition, and brushstroke patterns.

The 42 Scientific Requirements: Moraes' Critical Oversight

The Unified Scientific Framework

Recent comprehensive analysis has identified 42 specific physical, chemical, and forensic requirements that any valid Shroud formation mechanism must simultaneously satisfy. These requirements represent fundamental properties documented through decades of scientific investigation:

The 42 Critical Requirements Include:

- Image Formation Properties: Superficial depth (0.2 micrometers), blood precedence, single-sided imaging, 3D encoding, photographic negative characteristics
- Chemical Composition: Complete absence of pigments, binary fibril oxidation states, molecular-level precision, selective cellulose targeting
- Blood Evidence: Human blood composition, proper clotting patterns, blood-first chronological sequence, forensic accuracy
- Physical Characteristics: Orthogonal projection, distance correlation, uniform

technique, no thermal damage, environmental stability
• Forensic Documentation: Anatomically accurate trauma patterns, scourge wound characteristics, crucifixion-specific injuries

Moraes' Selective Evidence Approach
Moraes' study addresses fewer than 10% of these documented requirements, focusing solely on geometric contact patterns while ignoring the 90% of evidence that eliminates medieval artistic creation:
Requirements Moraes Addresses:
• Geometric cloth-body interaction (partially)
• Absence of lateral imaging (misinterpreted)
• Distance correlation with brightness (ignored)
• Orthogonal projection properties (misunderstood)
Critical Requirements Moraes Ignores:
Superficial depth requirement: Image confined to 0.2 micrometers of fibril surface—impossible with any bas-relief contact method
Binary fibril oxidation: Each fibril either completely oxidized or untouched, creating halftone effect through density variation
Complete absence of artistic materials: Zero traces of paint, dye, pigment, or binding medium despite extensive STURP analysis

Blood-image chronology: Blood deposited before image formation, with no image beneath bloodstains
Molecular precision: Selective targeting of specific cellulose components while leaving other materials unaffected
3D information encoding: VP-8 Image Analyzer reveals three-dimensional topographical data encoded in image intensity
Photographic negative properties: Appears as photographic negative—concept unknown in medieval period
Non-thermal formation: No fluorescence under UV light, unlike genuine fire damage from 1532
Distance correlation: Image intensity correlates with cloth-to-body distance, not contact pressure
Mathematical Improbability of Moraes' Bas-Relief Theory
The Binary Fibril Challenge
Shroud image formation operates through binary fibril states—each individual fibril is either completely oxidized (yellowed) or completely unmodified, with no intermediate states. This creates a halftone effect at the microscopic level where image darkness is determined by the number of oxidized fibrils per unit area.
Statistical Analysis:
• Image-bearing fibrils: Approximately 4.65 million individual fibrils in the body image areas
• Binary control requirement: Each fibril requires precise binary decision (oxidize or leave untouched)
• Probability calculation: Random success probability ≈ 10^-1,400,000
• Information content: Equivalent to 14.5 megabytes of three-dimensional anatomical

data

Any bas-relief contact method would require:
• Individual fibril-level precision at 0.2 micrometer depth
• Selective molecular targeting without affecting adjacent materials
• Binary oxidation control mechanisms unknown to medieval chemistry
• Encoding of 3D anatomical information through contact pressure variations

Convergent Improbability Analysis
Moraes' bas-relief theory must simultaneously achieve:
• Binary fibril control: 10^-1,400,000 probability
• Chemical precision: Selective cellulose oxidation without pigments
• Blood integration: Coordination with pre-existing blood patterns
• 3D encoding: Distance-to-intensity correlation through contact
• Anatomical accuracy: Forensic precision in trauma documentation

Fundamental Flaws in Moraes' Methodology
1. The "Agamemnon Mask Effect" Misinterpretation
Moraes correctly identifies that wrapping cloth around a 3D body creates distortion (the "Agamemnon Mask effect"), but fundamentally misinterprets its significance. Rather than supporting his bas-relief theory, this observation has been recognized by Shroud researchers for decades as evidence that the image formation was not a simple contact process.
The absence of such distortion on the Shroud supports sophisticated formation theories such as physicist John Jackson's "collapse theory"—where instantaneous dematerialization would explain:
• Why only frontal features are captured (body disappeared before wrap-around)
• The vertical collimation characteristics observed in the image
• The orthogonal projection without perspective distortion
• The encoded 3D information without contact-induced deformation

2. Digital Simulation vs. Physical Reality
Moraes' digital cloth simulation cannot replicate the actual physical and chemical processes that created the Shroud image:

• Oversimplified physics: Digital cloth behavior cannot account for 0.2-micrometer fibril-level interactions
• Missing chemistry: No simulation of the binary oxidation mechanism that created the actual coloration
• False correlation: Visual similarity in digital simulation does not prove formation mechanism
• Scale mismatch: Macro-level contact modeling cannot explain micro-level precision requirements

3. Selective Evidence Presentation
Moraes commits fundamental scientific errors through selective evidence presentation:

• Cherry-picking supportive studies: Cites researchers who support medieval dating while dismissing STURP's comprehensive findings
• Ignoring contradictory evidence: Focuses on geometric problems while ignoring chemical and forensic evidence
• Accepting questionable dating: Uncritically accepts 1988 C14 results despite documented contamination evidence
• Mischaracterizing opposition: Dismisses authenticity researchers without addressing their scientific arguments

Specific Scientific Refutations

1. STURP's Definitive Chemical Analysis

Moraes' bas-relief theory is categorically eliminated by STURP's findings frm 120 hours of direct analysis:

• Zero artistic materials: No paint, ink, dye, igment, or binding medium detected using multiple analytical techniques
• Molecular-level precision: Image formation limited to top 0.2 micrometers of individual fibrils
• Binary oxidation states: Each fibril either completely modified or completely untouched

• No transfer evidence: No crushing, directional marking, or tool signatures from bas-relief contact

Any bas-relief technique requires detectable transfer mechanisms—rubbing with pigments or thermal contact—neither of which are present on the Shroud.

2. Blood Evidence Contradicting Artistic Creation

Moraes completely ignores the blood evidence that fundamentally contradicts medieval artistic creation:

• Genuine human blood: Type AB with human male DNA confirmed through multiple independent analyses
• Forensic accuracy: Blood flow patterns consistent with crucifixion wounds and gravitational effects
• Chronological sequence: Blood deposited before image formation, with no image beneath bloodstains
• Natural clotting: Proper blood coagulation and serum separation patterns

No medieval artist would apply real human blood before creating an image, nor would they achieve the forensic precision documented in the blood patterns.

3. Carbon Dating Contamination Evidence

Moraes uncritically accepts the 1988 C14 dating while ignoring substantial evidence of sample contamination:

• Rogers' definitive proof (2005): Mass spectrometry demonstrated the C14 sample contained medieval repair materials, not original fabric

• Statistical manipulation exposed: FOIA requests revealed withheld data that would have invalidated the 95% confidence claim

• Alternative dating methods: WAXS analysis indicates first-century dating, though Moraes dismisses this without methodological critique
• Vanillin absence: Original fabric lacks vanillin in lignin, indicating age greater than 1300-3000 years

Contemporary Replication Failures

Modern Artistic Attempts

Moraes fails to address that despite centuries of attempts using modern technology, no scientist or artist has successfully replicated even a subset of the Shroud's 42 documented properties:

• Garlaschelli (2010): Required multiple techniques, failed to achieve blood-image chronology, and produced detectably different chemical composition
• Laser experiments: Cannot achieve binary fibril control or selective molecular targeting
• Thermal methods: Leave fluorescent signatures absent from the Shroud
• Chemical treatments: Cannot replicate the precise oxidation pattern or avoid detection

Technological Impossibilities

Even with modern technology, creating an image meeting all 42 requirements remains impossible:

• Fibril-level precision: No method exists for individual fibril targeting at 0.2-micrometer depth
• Binary control mechanisms: No technology can achieve selective binary oxidation states
• 3D information encoding: No contact method can encode distance-to-intensity correlations
• Chemical selectivity: No process can target specific cellulose components while avoiding detection

Historical Context Errors

Medieval Capabilities Overstated

Moraes significantly overstates medieval artistic and technical capabilities:

• No microscopy: Microscopes invented in 1590s—no knowledge of fibril structure
• No chemistry knowledge: No understanding of molecular oxidation or binary states
• No photographic concepts: Photographic negative properties unknown until 19th century
• No 3D mapping: No technology for encoding three-dimensional information

Epitaphios Comparison Invalid

Moraes' comparison to Byzantine epitaphios cloths demonstrates fundamental misunderstanding:

• Visible artistic materials: Epitaphios are clearly embroidered or painted with detectable pigments
• Symbolic representation: Artistic interpretation, not forensic documentation
• Single-sided imagery: Show only frontal images, lack the dorsal image of the Shroud
• No 3D properties: Lack photographic negative and three-dimensional characteristics

The chronological evidence suggests the Shroud influenced epitaphios development, not vice versa.

Scientific Method Violations

Burden of Proof Reversal

Moraes commits a fundamental scientific error by shifting the burden of proof. Rather than explaining how medieval artists could create an image with no detectable artistic materials while achieving fibril-level precision, he argues that digital simulations prove artistic creation is theoretically possible.

Proper scientific methodology requires physical evidence to drive conclusions, not theoretical models that ignore 90% of the documented evidence.

Correlation vs. Causation Fallacy

Moraes assumes that because his bas-relief simulation produces visual results somewhat similar to the Shroud image, this proves the Shroud was created using bas-relief techniques. This fundamental logical error ignores:

• The absence of physical evidence for bas-relief creation
• The presence of characteristics incompatible with any contact method
• Alternative explanations that better account for all documented properties
• The mathematical improbability of achieving the required precision

Conclusion: Fundamental Inadequacy of Moraes' Approach

Moraes' study, while demonstrating innovative use of digital simulation tools, fails catastrophically as a scientific analysis of Shroud image formation. By deliberately excluding the physical and chemical evidence that distinguishes the Shroud from any known artwork, Moraes reduces a complex forensic and archaeological question to a simple geometric modeling exercise.

Critical Deficiencies:

• Addresses fewer than 10% of documented requirements: Ignores 90% of scientific evidence
• Eliminates contradictory evidence a priori: Methodology designed to exclude inconvenient findings
• Misunderstands fundamental image properties: Treats complex molecular processes as simple contact mechanics
• Violates scientific methodology: Uses theoretical modeling to override physical evidence
• Ignores mathematical improbability: Fails to address the statistical impossibility of medieval creation

The Unavoidable Scientific Reality:
Any valid formation theory must simultaneously satisfy all 42 documented properties of the Shroud image. Moraes' bas-relief hypothesis fails to explain:

• The complete absence of artistic materials after extensive analysis
• The binary fibril oxidation mechanism requiring molecular-level precision
• The blood-image chronological sequence incompatible with artistic creation
• The encoded three-dimensional information without contact distortion
• The photographic negative properties unknown in the medieval period
• The mathematical improbability of achieving fibril-level accuracy through contact

While digital simulation techniques have value in archaeological research, they cannot substitute for comprehensive scientific analysis of physical evidence. Moraes' study represents a methodological regression that ignores decades of advanced scientific investigation in favor of simplified geometric modeling.
The Shroud of Turin continues to challenge our understanding precisely because it exhibits properties that transcend both medieval capabilities and current technological limits. Any serious scientific analysis must address this fundamental reality rather than selectively ignoring the evidence that makes the Shroud unique among historical artifacts.
Final Assessment: Moraes' study fails to meet basic scientific standards for archaeological and forensic analysis, providing no valid evidence against Shroud authenticity while ignoring the overwhelming physical and chemical evidence that eliminates medieval artistic creation as a viable explanation.
1. Image Formation on the Holy Shroud—A Digital 3D Approach https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/arcm.70030

*Rebuttal by Dr. Jeremiah Johnston, Ph.D.: https://www.theblaze.com/align/shroud-of-turin-debunked-not-even-close-heres-the-truth

*Rebuttal article by American sindonologist Russ Breault:

A response to a new article by Cicero Moraes of Brazil entitled, ***"Image Formation on the Holy Shroud- a Digital 3D Approach."***
Published in Archaeometry, July 2025.

By Russ Breault

8-5-25

The focus of this paper is to discuss how certain new digital software techniques have been used to emulate how the Shroud of Turin was wrapped around a three-dimensional human form and whether it could be the result of an actual body or only the work of an artist.

While the techniques employed are new, they offer very little new information that we didn't already know from all the experiments that were done in preparation for the Shroud of Turin Research Project (STURP) in 1978 and subsequent research following the project's conclusions published in 1981.

The extreme either-or proposition continues to perplex researchers, even those using the latest technologies. Simply stated, the Shroud is either the actual burial cloth of Jesus or it must be the work of an artist. There is nothing in between. However, the results of the Shroud Project, after 120 hours of hands-on analysis, were definitive. There is no visible trace of paint, ink, dye, pigment, or stain to be found on the linen that could account for the image. Secondly, the image is purely superficial and penetrates only the top one to two microfibers of the cloth, not threads. Each thread is composed of approximately 200 microfibers, meaning the Shroud image penetrates only about 1% of a single thread. Adding to the complexity is the fact that the image density is the same wherever it is observed on both front and dorsal images.

With regards to the recent article, Moraes proposes that the image could not have draped a full human form as once the cloth is pulled flat the image would be highly distorted with the face looking like a round dinner plate as opposed to the correct proportions of the face seen on the Shroud. Therefore, they conclude that it could not have wrapped a three-dimensional human form. However, this is a conundrum that we've known about since the beginning of Shroud research and is precisely why physicists and other Shroud researchers have described the image as being "vertically collimated," meaning that the image forming process appears to be perpendicular to the cloth itself, it is not a radial phenomenon.

Moraes assumes that the image, if it were the result of a miraculous light generating event, must have produced a radial phenomenon if it indeed wrapped a full three-dimensional body. The lack of which means it must be a painting. Based on that assumption, the author dismisses the possibility of the cloth being authentic because the image is clearly not the result of a radial event. The absence of the sides of the face, the sides of the body, and the top of the head support this understanding. We have known this for years.

The author then shifts gears and proposes that the Shroud image correlates with having been draped over a bas relief sculpture. This also is not a new proposal and has been discussed by world-class artists such as Isabel Piczek, who once said that if the Shroud image is the result of a bas relief, then it would have been one of the most miraculous sculptures ever made. The best example of a bas relief is a simple coin, such as with an American quarter where we see the image of George Washington somewhat elevated above the background of the coin. The problem with bas relief is that it presupposes either a rubbing technique with the use of pigment or the use of heat as a way of lightly scorching the cloth—also known as the "hot statute theory." However, neither theory holds up under close analysis as there is no evidence of pigment having been applied to the cloth.

Regarding bas relief and the use of heat, we know the Shroud was damaged in a fire that occurred in 1532 leaving a pattern of burns which all fluoresce under UV fluorescence proving they are the direct result of heat. The coloration of the image appears like a faint scorch, however, unlike the burns, it does not fluoresce. Therefore, even though the image appears like a scorch, it is not the result of heat.

We are now back to assessing how this image could have been formed without the use of artistic substances and without the use of heat, while displaying a phenomenon that is vertically collimated and not a radial projection.

As one considers the resurrection as a possible cause of the Shroud image, a prominent theory is one offered by theoretical physicist John Jackson, co-founder of the Shroud Project in 1978. He proposed "the collapse theory" which postulates that as the body of Jesus was instantaneously converting to a volume of light, it became "mechanically transparent." Since light has no mass, the cloth under the weight of gravity began to descend through the body to a depth of about 8mm until the body itself vanished. The elegance of this theory is that it would account for how only the front facial features are captured and not the sides because it is not based on a radial projection. The body would have disappeared within a couple seconds. This "fall through" approach may explain why we see the large orbits of the eyes, elongated fingers and other structures such as the roots of the teeth. Is it possible that images of flesh and bone are expressed simultaneously?

This nearly instantaneous transformation of the body correlates very well with research published in 2011 by physicist Paulo Lazzaro in a peer reviewed journal. The experiments he conducted using high power ultraviolet lasers show how a 40-nanosecond burst from a UV laser against a control sample of linen achieves the same superficial depth and coloration seen on the Shroud while generating minimal heat. This experiment corresponds with Jackson's theory and explains how the image would appear vertically collimated and not a radial phenomenon as with a projection hypothesis.

These concepts are only theoretical. We would never be able to replicate the resurrection in a laboratory setting. The work of Cicero Moraes offers no new information that we didn't already know before. The only thing new is the use of digital simulation. The riddle remains unsolved.

Moraes also assumes the C14 date range of 1260 to 1390 is correct despite many new tests to the contrary including Wide Angle Xray Scattering which compares the amount of natural aging found in fibers from the Shroud correlate with a linen sample found at Masada circa mid-first century. Nor does he address the new evidence proving the sample used in 1988 was highly contaminated which caused the British Museum to withhold data from Nature which published the results in 1989. When the fudged data is added back in, the sample does not pass the statistical test as a viable, homogeneous sample fully representative of the entire cloth. The dating results would never have achieved their coveted 95% confidence. It once again calls into

question the sample location chosen from a corner edge held and handled hundreds of times prior to 1694 as it was manually held up for public viewing. This unconscionable blunder resulted in a high probability of contamination and repair. This fraudulent withholding of data was exposed because of a FOIA request and published in *Archaeometry* in 2019.

The author's clear acceptance of the questionable carbon date caused him to reference 14th century funerary art as having inspired the unknown artist who allegedly created the Shroud. Known as an "epitaphios," it is a large, embroidered cloth showing the front image of the crucified Christ with the arms across the pelvis as seen on the Shroud. It is most associated with the Orthodox church and is used as part of a liturgical procession on Good Friday. Usually embroidered on cloth, there are also painted versions, but no version exists that shows both frontal and dorsal images as seen on the Shroud. The Shroud most likely influenced the development of the epitaphios tradition. To suggest the reverse, without the use of paint, ink, dye, pigment or stain seems exceedingly far-fetched. In fact, there is no known artist in the 14th century who had the artistic skills and medical knowledge to craft what is seen on the Turin Shroud today.

There is one other significant paradox as it relates to the Shroud that is also conveniently not addressed in this paper. The cloth shows two sets of images; one is related to a pattern of blood stains correlating with the wounds of crucifixion and the other is the image of the man himself. The blood is already proven to be AB blood type and the exudate from actual wounds. We also know that there is no image under the blood, meaning the blood stains were absorbed into the cloth first followed by the image. This of course makes sense if the Shroud is authentic with crucifixion occurring on Good Friday followed by resurrection on Easter Sunday. However, it makes no sense as the work of an artist, and to this date no artist has ever attempted replicating the Shroud in this manner. Skeptics simply assume that this clear observation made by the blood chemists and others who were hands-on with the cloth must be incorrect. More likely it is an inconvenient truth.

To conclude, Cicero Moraes deserves credit for using new digital imaging software but unfortunately, he did not consider all the relevant data. This led him to an erroneous conclusion that was in sync with his preconceived assumption that the Shroud is merely the work of an unknown Medieval artist. This is a conclusion that was dismissed years ago by a team of 33 scientists who had unfettered access to the cloth for five days and spent three years assessing the data before publishing their results. Digital techniques have their place but are not a substitute for hard science.

Moraes, Cicero, Image Formation on the Shroud of Turin - a Digital 3D Approach (October 29, 2024). Available at
SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5003510 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5003510

Russ Breault is the president and founder of the Shroud of Turin Education Project, Inc. and the author of *Shroud Encounter: Explore the World's Greatest Unsolved Mystery.*
Contact him through www.ShroudEncounter.com

*Three YouTube video rebuttals:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W7gl5PscRNM (English)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iPswVSK8Zcg (English)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UQ1yUB4L81U (Italian)

*Short article by American sindonologist Guy Powell:

Responding to Negative Coverage About the Shroud

When negative articles about the Shroud of Turin appear—whether from medievalists, atheists, or skeptics—it's natural to feel compelled to defend the truth. But what's the best course of action? Should we reply directly on their platforms? Should we write rebuttals to the media? Or should we simply ignore it? I've considered all three options over time, and have often defaulted to silence for several key reasons: Why I've Chosen Not to Respond (So Far) 1. Scientific Accuracy Is Essential Every response we make must be rock-solid in its scientific grounding. Anything less weakens our position and gives detractors more ammunition. 2. Time and Energy Are Limited I can't realistically respond to every Tom, Dick or Harry—or Hugh, Dan, or Cicero— who rehashes the same disproven claims. Their volume is high, but the substance is often repetitive and shallow. A New Wave of Criticism: The Cicero Moraes Article The recent article by Cicero Moraes has stirred a new wave of criticism, and many are calling for a strong response. There is value in replying with calm, factual rebuttals. But we must be strategic. Those who have already decided the Shroud is a medieval forgery are almost always immune to proven evidence. Their eyes remain shut in darkness, even when presented with the truth. What Happens When We Engage on Their Platforms? When we comment, like, or share on a skeptic's blog, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter or TikTok, the algorithm rewards engagement—even if it's critical. As a result, we unintentionally amplify their message and increase its visibility. In many cases, the best response is silence, allowing the post to fade into digital obscurity and darkness. A Better Strategy: Tell Our Side of the Story Instead of responding directly on their turf, let's focus our efforts where they can have a greater impact: 1. Submit a factual, well-written rebuttal to the same editor or publication. Ask them to present both sides in a point-counterpoint format so readers can decide for themselves. 2. If the editor refuses, escalate the article to the Editor-in-Chief and request fair representation. 3. Repurpose the rebuttal and send it to other publications that have covered the Shroud. Here's How You Can Help: 1. Contact Editors Write directly to editors and publications when you see misinformation. Be polite, factual, and respectful. Our tone matters just as much as our content. 2. Help Build Our Media Database Please send me: o Links to both negative and positive articles about the Shroud o The name and contact information of the editor or journalist o The name and website of the publication This will help us create a database of media professionals who cover the Shroud—whether for or against—so we can build relationships and respond strategically. 3. Support Positive Coverage Like, share, and comment on positive articles and videos. Let's get the algorithms working in our favor.

Positive engagement boosts visibility and reaches more people. Let’s keep the momentum going. Let’s build our arsenal of truth. And above all, let’s continue to promote the Word of God through the witness of the Shroud. Thank you. Guy Powell (author@guypowell.com) Author: The Only Witness