



AUGUST 6, 1981

6525 North Sheridan Road Chicago, Illinois 60626 (312) 274-3000

BULLETIN: New information on genesis of coin imprints on right eye of Man of Shroud
of Turin

FROM: Francis L. Filas, S.J.

Francis L. Filas, S.J.

I am sending this bulletin to all persons who purchased the three-dimensional photographs of the coin areas of the Shroud, since you also are purchasers of my Monograph giving the indisputable evidence that these marks represent (on the right eye) an identifiable coin of Pontius Pilate. I am also sending this to other parties who have legitimate interests in the validity of the Shroud. Since the list is too long of all those who purchased only the Monograph (within the past twelve months), I regret I cannot extend this bulletin to a wider audience, instead of only the "3D's."

Concisely put, I can now tell you the final answer to the question that puzzled me and many others, #6 on page 8 of the Monograph: "How is it that the imprints are hardly distinguishable enough to make a case when one inspects the original Enrie prints, yet they do show up on second through fourth and fifth generation copies?"

Enrie in 1931 made two closeups of the face: a full-size (identifiable by a 9-inch spread through the nose, between the two creases on the face); and an approximate 2/3 size (identifiable by a 6-9/16 inch spread through the nose, between the two creases on the face). The mistaken principle I used, and apparently everybody else in this field, was to go to the highest enlargement of the weave, in an attempt to get the clearest detail. But the Shroud fooled its friends again! I now can give you the known and accepted principle, justified by unanimous experience: The weave of the Shroud acts like the dots on a screen of a printed photograph. If we enlarge a "dotted screen" too closely, we get the dots that camouflage any imprints from the original photograph; but IF we enlarge the dotted screen without reaching the point of showing the space between the dots, THEN we have a fully filled-out enlargement, which we can enlarge again and again photographically and never get the obscuring dots again.

That is precisely what has happened here. The half-dozen lithographs which first put me on the trail of clear imprints of the Pilate coin (one of which is responsible for the very clear enlargement 5x life size, which you purchased: Photo "A") -- were good copies of the Enrie two-thirds face, NOT Enrie's full face. The hundreds of dollars spent in consultation with at least fifteen professional printers, engravers, photo people, computer-camera experts, ALL were spent on trying to make the weave drop out of Enrie's original FULL face. High contrast and multiple-generation enlarging did succeed in dropping out some of the weave and making clear the UCAI and lituus and clipped-coin to a partial extent, but nowhere near the clarity of the lithographs that faithfully reproduced Enrie's two-thirds face. Now, I have CLEAR enlargements made by Gamma Laboratories of Chicago (not made by myself, in case objectors raise the accusation that I alone get these results and no one else, as has already happened in the public prints): The case stands for itself on its own merits: The full-size Enrie face gives enlargements that make the UCAI and lituus discernible but only by reconstruction from the clear prints; the 2/3 size Enrie gives enlargements that not only make the UCAI and lituus discernible EASILY, but even the "U" with its faint limb on the reproductions is now clearly a FULL "U"!!!!!!

As I have followed as a consistent policy, I alone am responsible for the above statements, and I am deeply grateful to Rev. A. J. Otterbein, President of the Holy Shroud Guild, for having filled me in on the statistics of the Enrie photos. Neither he nor the Holy Shroud Guild nor the Shroud of Turin Research Project is responsible for this announcement. I stand by the evidence.



(Vern & Pat - 8/21/81)
SUNDAY EVENING August 16, 1981

TO: FATHER OTTERBEIN, VERN MILLER, JOHN HELLER -- for input to STURP

Dear Adam, Vern, and John,

6525 North Sheridan Road Chicago, Illinois 60626 (312) 274-3000

This will be an extremely lengthy input before it is finished, constituting my considered and final opinions after my most enjoyable stay at Santa Barbara as the guest of Vern. I am clueing John in to this round robin, in view of the fact that he deals with mathematical probabilities, and I am in hopes that he would make the point clear in any discussions on the coins that a mathematical probability-result is not something to be summarily passed over as non-significant, especially when it reaches the astronomical proportions involved here.

The coincidence of this moment is that within the last hour I have stumbled (again!) upon something wholly unexpected, yet potentially of enormous further value regarding the coin identification. You will recall that the coin of Pontius Pilate which I happen to have (given me two years ago by Bill Yarbrough) is of the crude type, with only the IOUKAISAROS inscription; it is not the more common and more expensive TIBERIOUKAISAROS, with a curly and graceful lituus.

In preparing my notes for this presentation, I went back to a newly prepared 20" x 30" enlargement of the coin, so that I could measure as accurately as possible the tangential clip-line from 1 to 3 o'clock, that appears on both the Shroud and this coin. Since I received this enlargement just before I left for Santa Barbara, I had never had the chance to inspect it, short of using it on TV filming on last Tuesday. As I looked down on it from eye level, I was struck by apparent vestiges of letters in areas that to the naked eye seem to be eaten away by centuries of burial. The coin's letters that are still elevated are IOU; now, next to them to the right, looking like ancient archeological foundations seen from the air in the sea below, are an apparent "C", "A", and perhaps even an "I" -- doubtful on that.

This enlargement is $22\frac{1}{2}$ times normal size. The original picture was made by a professional local science photographer a year ago. The significance is this: I have had numismatists all over the country looking for a misspelled UCAI coin, for the properly spelled UKAI coin. With an apparently incredible added coincidence, the coin whose tangential clip matches the location and dimension of the boundary of the coin on the Shroud, would also give us an irrefutable example of a misspelled UCAI coin, matching even more exactly the other coincidences on the Shroud.

Scientifically, as I have always acted in this regard, I am going to proceed in two directions: first, to consult with my own numismatic expert, Michael Marx, and with the Numismatic Editor of the Chicago Tribune; second, to search around for an industrial X-ray testing company, to determine whether the stamping of the letters on the coin could have left a deformation in the lattice framework of the crystalline structure of the metal.

For your information, this coin is thoroughly authenticated as to its designs (by numismatists) and as to its content (by no less than Walter McCrone's laboratory: at 97% copper, 3% tin, with traces of other metals -- this is one of the reasons I have been torn apart internally in being forced to criticize Walter McCrone publicly for his local attacks on the Shroud, after his kindness in having this coin analyzed for me previously, and refusing all payment for the test.)



August 16, 1981

6525 North Sheridan Road Chicago, Illinois 60626 (312) 274-3000

Page 2: Adam, Vern, John Heller

No, let nobody start getting scared that Filas is calling up the AP and UPI to say that he has found the unusual coin existing in reality with the UCAI misspelling; there is a mountain of work ahead either to confirm what might be apparent, or not. The IOU are certainly letters NOT eaten away; it APPEARS that the photograph has caught the last remnants of the "C" and "A," and PERHAPS an "I" being eaten away. I intend to contact my numismatic expert, Michael Marx, as well as the Numismatic Editor of the Chicago Tribune, Roger Boye. For the moment, I have no more to say on this, but I think it should be a warning that STURP should not go out on a limb and say it sees nothing in my coin identification. If this is truly the UCAI on this actual coin, it is no longer necessary to postulate the misspelling; we have concrete evidence of the misspelling, and this is a coincidence that nobody anywhere could ever claim with the slightest shred of reason to find as noise and distortion on the photo weave. Maybe the "C" ultimately will turn out to be a "K" after all -- but you people are the first to know that it is possible that I am on the verge of a discovery of enormous consequence in further confirming the identification of the coin on the right eye. X-ray metal analysis should check the stamping.

To begin with, I write this with a constant sense of gratitude to STURP for what it has done for the Shroud, as I first said at Albuquerque long ago. I regret the difference of opinions, but if we are to search for the truth of the Shroud, there must be an unswerving dedication to follow the evidence, no matter where it leads, to face every problem squarely, and to note the pro's and con's for each argument.

In the following lengthy communication for STURP consideration before STURP puts out its final report in October, I am referring to objections against my coin identification under the general name of STURP, so that I will not mention any particular name, and while also understanding that not all STURP members deny the identification. I am following this procedure so as not to give personal offense to anyone, I hope.

I have no wish nor authority to influence any statement of STURP on my coin identification, but I do wish to suggest that it would be prudent not to burn all bridges. Too many people around the world accept my evidence. More than 1,000 Monographs are in circulation, with details; and instead of getting a swarm of objections, the denials of my coin theory have come almost exclusively from those who deny also the authenticity of the Shroud.

I also do not think it fair to me to have anyone from STURP say that my methods are not scientific. One of my major degrees is in the philosophy of science, and I have had a long list of math courses and have kept up on scientific orientation throughout.

The scientific method should not only be able to deny the truth of something it considers erroneous; it must also be able to show that the positive arguments for what is supposedly erroneous do not hold water.

This is where I find it inconceivable that STURP would say that my identification cannot stand up, on the score that CLEAR evidence of the coin imprints is not found in the original 1978 photographs. MY RESPONSES:

1) To say that all these imprints are noise in the weave, and a random distortion, flies in the face of more than the one chance in 6×10^{42} mentioned in my Monograph, on page 12. I can add even more: the clipped tangential line from 1 to 3 o'clock that is both on the Shroud and on the Pilate coin is unique: to be WHERE it is, 9 mm long, at a 30° angle away from the vertical, adds two more coincidences: to be located HERE, at THIS angle, requires the following additional calculation:

5 million square millimeters (approximately) are the area of the Shroud. For this boundary line of the coin to be located (for the sake of argument) within a ten square millimeter space over the right eye would be one chance in 10^5 .



August 16, 1981

6525 North Sheridan Road Chicago, Illinois 60626 (312) 274-3000

Page 3: Adam, Vern, John Heller

The tangential clip is 30° up from the vertical.

This means, for the sake of argument, that in any 360° such a line could swing in 6 different positions. That adds one chance out of 6.

Combining the chances for random occurrence of the UCAI and the lituus over the right eye (as calculated in my Monograph on page 11 and 12, we have this:

$(6 \times 10^{42}) \times (1 \times 10^5) \times 6 = 36 \times 10^{47}$ for the UCAI, the lituus, and the tangential clip line at 1 to 3 o'clock, all to occur as they are, over the right eye, by accident and random chance.

I find it utterly inconceivable that the scientific minds of STURP could decide on one chance in such an astronomical number -- far above a trillion cubed -- as the source for so complicated a pattern as appears in my coin identification.

The minimum for scientific method in refuting an objector is to know his position and his arguments. I have the uncomfortable feeling that STURP members have not taken the trouble to read my Monograph and to understand my arguments. They seem to feel that I am seeing apparent alphabetical letters in the weave. They seem to be ignorant that I am saying much, much more than that: yes, four alphabetical letters, BUT located specifically around an arbitrary ancient symbol (the lituus), PLUS a clear boundary line (which I call the tangential clip at 1 to 3 o'clock) that fits the actual Pontius Pilate coin.

How can the coincidences of dimensions, location, angular rotation, selection, and order all occur for these six factors by accident?

STURP has been the source of the statement: "I can find that pattern elsewhere in the weave, occurring by accident."

My reply is: Then, please do so. If any person, whether in or out of STURP, can find the UCAI, the lituus, the clipped line, all in proper size together and in proper angular rotation and relationship, any place else in the weave, I will immediately retract internationally anything and everything I have claimed on the coins. Why such a claim if it cannot be carried out? Why attempt to refute my certain evidence with a claim that has never been carried out -- and cannot be?

Please look at the string of difficulties from STURP sources that have been brought to my attention, and please note how I have responded to each of them, to no avail in changing the mind of the objectors:

A) FILAS GOT HIS MARKS FROM ONLY ONE LITHOGRAPH. (I produced at least six.)

B) FILAS GOT HIS MARKS FROM ONLY LITHOGRAPHS, AND THE MARKS ARE THE RESULT OF DISTORTION FROM THE SCREEN. (Nobody has ever shown how screens distort, except by way of helping cause further contrast.....And I have the indisputable evidence that I got my markings from the Enrie 1931 photograph, from the reversal of the face that is two-thirds life size, and that certainly had no screen dots.)

→ DIRECT!



August 16, 1981

6525 North Sheridan Road Chicago, Illinois 60626 (312) 274-3000

Page 4: Adam, Vern, John Heller

C) FILAS IS THE ONLY ONE WHO CAN GET THESE RESULTS: NOBODY ELSE CAN. (All my recent enlargements direct from the original Enrie reversal have been made by Gamma Laboratories of Chicago.)

D) NOBODY ELSE CAN SEE THE LITUUS: ONLY FILAS CAN. (Then why has it been accepted on dozens of TV programs, on the PBS documentary, where the outlines are shadowed in red so that the viewers see them clearly?)

E) FILAS GETS THE IMPRINTS ONLY BY ENHANCEMENT BY MEANS OF HIGH CONTRAST. (A copy from Enrie's reversal indicates the clarity on Enrie's 2/3-size face. It is true that repeated copying adds contrast and adds greater clarity; but how can enhancement be equated with distortion? If distortion occurs, from what source?)

F) THE FILAS IMPRINTS OF THE COIN DO NOT APPEAR IN THE 1978 PHOTOS. (This was why I spent August 12-14 with Vern at Santa Barbara. At least on SOME of his 1978 photos, I spotted the beginnings of the UCAI and lituus, and with added contrast, they became clearer.) (Does that mean that Enrie and Miller photos contradict each other?) (No!)

G) THE FILAS COIN IMPRINTS SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT CLEARLY PRESENT ON THE 1978 ORIGINALS. (Isn't this an extremely rash statement for a supposedly responsible scientist to make? Isn't it a case of appealing to the obscure, since no one reasonably can claim proof of ANY theory as to the cause of the Shroud imprints? What if a complicated process occurred whereby metal reacted with the cloth differently than organic flesh, and so, imprints on certain parts of the weave tended to drop out on high contrast copying, and other imprints from the metal remained? I do not say that is the answer, but it perhaps does demonstrate the rashness of an apodictic dismissal of the reality of the coin imprints just because STURP members cannot now find an explanation that is acceptable to them. Certainly, in all candor, STURP has not unlocked the mysteries of the Shroud.)

To go back to an old trite phrase, STURP seems to be saying that "the glass is half empty" by saying that STURP cannot understand where the imprints are contained in the original 1978 photos. Here, the concentration in the argument is on what appears to be missing.

Filas says that "the glass is half full." Here, the concentration in the argument is on what is absolutely present: the impossibility of accidental, random occurrence to the limits of 10^{47} as a minimum, while granting ignorance of any explanation as to why the imprints are obscure on SOME 1978 photos, and then come clear under high contrast.

H) ANY FILAS CLAIM THAT THE IMPRINTS COME FROM A THREE-DIMENSIONAL SOURCE (A COIN) IS TO BE DISREGARDED. (I marvel at the selectivity of this objection. The same electronic equipment that produces image analysis from outer space and presents accepted three-dimensional analysis of earth pictures, is now dismissed with a wave of the hand as unacceptable, because it supports the Filas coin imprints....And can STURP objectively prove that the relationship of density to distance does not exist on the Shroud as a possible genesis of Shroud imprints, including the coin?)

Thank You - Fr. Filas

MAILGRAM SERVICE CENTER
MIDDLETOWN, VA. 22645

 Mailgram®



4-0597938230002 08/18/81 ICS IPMENGZ CSP CGAB
1 3122743000 MGM TDBN CHICAGO IL 08-18 0750P EST

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, REV. FRANCIS L. FILAS
6525 NORTH SHERIDAN RD
CHICAGO IL 60626

THIS MAILGRAM IS A CONFIRMATION COPY OF THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE:

3122743000 MGM TDBN CHICAGO IL 136 08-18 0750P EST

ZIP

REVEREND A J OTTERBEIN
BOX 336

EPHRATA PA 17522

MY LETTER OF EARLIER TODAY TUESDAY IS ACCIDENTLY CONFUSING AT THE
CLOSE. IT SHOULD READ: "ANGLES OF LETTERS ON SHROUD IMPRINTS FIT
ANGLES OF LETTERS ON COIN, EVEN SPECIAL DISTANCE OF ICTA FROM TOP OF STA
FF". THIS AFTERNOON I BROUGHT THE 22 TIMES ENLARGEMENT TO MICHAEL
MARX. HE FULLY AGREES THE READING IS "UCAI". AT THIS POINT THE
COINCIDENCE OF THE MEASUREMENTS ARE SO CLOSE THAT WITH MARX I AM TEM
PTED TO THINK THAT THE PILATE COIN AND SHROUD COIN CAME FROM THE SAME
DIE. TOMORROW MARX'S EXPERIENCED NUMISMATIC PHOTOGRAPHER IS SHOOTING
THE COIN FROM ALL ANGLES AND RELIEFS IN HUGE ENLARGEMENTS. THIS WAY
WE WILL HAVE EVIDENCE FROM TWO INDEPENDENT PHOTOGRAPHERS. WHAT A
STUNNING FIND. I AM MORE OR LESS AWAY UNTIL LATE SUNDAY EVENING.
FRANK

19:51 EST

MGMCOMP