



THE COMING OF THE QUANTUM CHRIST: *The Shroud of Turin and the Future of Science and Humanity.*

By John C. Klotz

Results of expert studies published in peer reviewed scientific journals establish by preponderant evidence that the Shroud of Turin is the burial shroud of Jesus of Nazareth. Detailed analysis of the image on the shroud supports the conclusion that the image was created at the time of his supposed resurrection.

Given current religious ferment, including the advent of militant atheism, what is the implication of this forensic evidence for the future, not only of religion, but of humanity?

Work in Progress

This is a work in progress. Any comments or criticisms are welcome. E-Mail me at johnklotz@johnklotz.com

I also maintain a blog:
<http://johnklotz.blogspot.com>

Please note the copyright notice below.

DEDICATION

TO THOMAS, THE APOSTLE WHO DOUBTED.

INTRODUCTION

(a) *Ignorant armies*

And we are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night.

Matthew Arnold
*Dover Beach*¹

We do not order our lives by proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Every day we make decisions after weighing the available facts. But almost always we have doubts. Fear the person who has no doubt. Think George Armstrong Custer. If we only acted in the absence of doubt, we would probably seldom act at all. Even Mother Theresa, who devoted her life to caring for the most desperate of the residents of the Calcutta slums, confessed to moments of black doubt.

Unfortunately, one of the hallmarks of the current era are people who profess freedom from doubt under circumstances where doubt would seem to be a reasonable proposition. On one hand we have newly militant atheists who are crusading against any form of religion and express no doubt about the absence of any God of any kind. They claim to arrive at their conclusions by the dispassionate application of the scientific method. Foremost among the militant atheists is Oxford Don Richard Dawkins whose literary rant against religion, *The God Delusion*, has sold more than two million copies since it was published in 2005.²

Opposed to the atheistic militants are, among others, creationists, be they Christian, Islamic or Jewish. To those fundamentalists, despite all the scientific evidence to the contrary, the world is a scant 6,000 years old and man walked with dinosaurs. Indeed, to some, the Grand Canyon is but an artifact of Noah's flood. They are but cat's paw for the atheistic militants who delight in demonstrating their absurdities. Nonetheless, the most potent weapon of the militant atheists, aside from acerbic wit, is their scientific credentials.

But putting aside the historically suspect tenets of the creationists, Dawkins - perhaps unknowingly - exposes the limited nature of his analysis during his use of

evolution to refute the existence of God. Although Dawkins is dealing with the most elemental questions of existence in his claim that God does not exist, he concedes that the most elemental level existence – existence at the quantum level – is inexplicable and beyond the comprehension of our minds.³ He states: “Perhaps there are some genuinely profound and meaningful questions that are forever beyond the reach of science. Maybe quantum theory is already knocking on the door of the unfathomable. But if science cannot answer some ultimate question, what makes anybody think that religion can?”⁴

Dawkins’ God is Darwin, and he finds in the process of evolution all the answers to the fundamental questions of existence including the nature of love. Everything evolved and there was no need for the intervention or existence of any God. But so intent is Dawkins on denying the existence of God that he dispatches in one disparaging sentence Jesuit Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's *The Phenomenon of Man*, a painstaking presentation of a convergence of religion and evolutionary science. Dawkins keeps his readers in ignorance of Teilhard's arguments and conclusions even though they relate directly to Dawkins anti-God thesis. Out of the clear blue sky, in reference to other theologians’ attempts to define God, he states his belief that they are sincere but mistaken.

He then trashes Teilhard:

“Nevertheless, I was irresistibly reminded of Peter Medawar's comment on Father Teilhard de Chardin's *The Phenomenon of Man*, in the course of what is possibly the greatest negative book review of all time: 'its author can be excused of dishonesty only on the grounds that before deceiving others he has taken great pains to deceive him-self.'”⁵

That is his sole reference to Teilhard. It neither rebuts Teilhard nor proves Dawkins’s point. What it demonstrates is a Dawkins rhetorical device to monopolize the reader’s intellect by excluding contrary analysis.

Another example of Dawkins’ rhetoric, starts by casting doubt on the existence of Jesus and concludes by refusing to find any validity in the New Testament at all:

“It is even possible to mount a serious, though not widely supported, historical case that Jesus never lived at all, as has been done by, among others, Professor G. A. Wells of the University of London in a number of books, including *Did Jesus Exist?*”

“Although Jesus *probably* existed, reputable biblical scholars do not in general regard the New Testament (and obviously not the Old Testament) as a reliable record of what actually happened in history, and I shall not consider the Bible further as evidence for any kind of deity.”⁶ (Emphasis added)

Nevertheless, Dawkins and Teilhard actually concur on the direction of science. Dawkins is confident that the existence of God could never be proven scientifically. Thus, he demands scientific proof before he will accept God’s existence.⁷ Teilhard, to the contrary, anticipated a convergence of science and religion leading to a scientific analysis of the actions and direction of God in creating the existence that we know.⁸

However, this book, and numerous other works, demonstrates that the same scientific method, to which Dawkins has pledged his fealty demonstrates not only that Jesus existed but that he was crucified, died and was buried. Shroud science also supports the fact of His Resurrection.

(b) Dubious?

There exists in Turin, Italy a religious relic known as the Shroud of Turin, the purported burial cloth of Jesus Christ. It has been subjected to the most rigorous scientific investigation of any religious relic in history. Since it was first photographed in 1898, it is estimated that substantially more than a quarter-million hours have been spent on scientific research into its bona fides. That research substantiates the Shroud’s identity as the burial shroud of Jesus Christ, and offers some evidence of his resurrection. Those are not conclusions that determinedly “scientific” militant atheists, like Dawkins, can accept.

The crucifixion and purported resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth are the central events in the religion of two billion Christians. Another one billion Muslims honor Jesus as a great prophet.

In this book, we shall explore the extent to which the scientific evidence concerning the Shroud of Turin establishes sufficient facts to resolve these mysteries. There are two important parts of the Shroud of Turin analysis. First there is a multitude of physical items including the nature of the shroud linen and its weaving, stains from blood and other human excretions, plant pollen, dust from the Middle East and other miscellaneous items. Second, there is the evidence supplied by the Shroud’s mysterious

image of a crucified man. The image concurs with the Gospel stories but science has thus far but unable to explain how it was created. Some explain the image by reference to a process originating at the quantum level of existence, the level of existence that Dawkins dodged.

We shall also explore the history of the Shroud (its provenance) although some of it has been clouded by the passage of time. However, the best evidence of the Shroud's authenticity is the Shroud itself and it is only with advance of the science in the last century that the dramatic proof of its authenticity has emerged. Could that not be "provenance" but "providence?"

(c) The Coming of the Quantum Christ

And there is more. Something's coming; something big. That something, as described by Teilhard, is a convergence of science and religion that is now inescapable. There has been for centuries a wary truce between science and religion. Scientists ducked the religious implications of their work by saying they were not involved in theology and theologians insisted on a division of labor which excluded the scientists from theology. No more.

Science is now dealing with two interrelated phenomena: the existence of human consciousness and the nature of existence of all matter at the quantum level. One scientific quandary: the nature and form of material existence is not fixed until it is perceived at the quantum level by an observer. Some scientists believe they have demonstrated that human consciousness can operate beyond the limits of time and space.⁹

The issue is the soul. Science attempting to explain human consciousness is science attempting to define the soul. Does our consciousness operate independent of time and space? Is there any scientific basis for eternal life? Is the Resurrection real?

The question of the soul and its survival beyond death has become a scientific issue. It has always been a religious one.

In the *Battle Hymn of the Republic*, Julia Ward Howe wrote:

In the beauty of the Lily Christ was born across the sea,
with a glory in his bosom that transfigures you and me.

In *Doctor Zhivago*, the subtext of author Boris Pasternak was the transfiguring nature of the Christian myth whereby all of the acts of life including conception, birth, eating and drinking were transfigured because of the birth of the divine Christ: God became man. He writes of Zhivago's contemplation of his wife's pregnancy:

“The mother of God is asked to ‘pray zealously to her son and her God,’ and the words of the Psalm are put into her mouth: ‘My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior. For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden: for, behold from henceforth all generation shall call me blessed.’ It is because of her child that she says this, He will magnify her (‘For he that is mighty hath done to me great things’): He is her glory. Any woman could say it. For every one of them, God is in her child. Mothers of great men must have been familiar with this feeling, but then, all women are mothers of great men - it isn't their fault if life disappoints them later.”¹⁰

Teilhard described the step of evolution of the human species that separated it from the other animal species as that point when human consciousness developed the power of reflection, an awareness of self that describes the essential characteristic of the soul. The relevance of the biblical Genesis is that it reflects the earliest literate human attempts to explain that moment. While Teilhard was forbidden by the Vatican to publish during his lifetime, Pope Benedict XVI has cited him and his vision.¹¹

There may even being a synthesis between Dawkins and developing Christian theology in one respect. Dawkins' coined the phrase “selfish gene” to describe the driving force of evolution.¹² Orthodox Christianity has long looked to Genesis for an explanation of evil, calling Adam and Eve's disobedience of God the “Original Sin” which has scarred all humanity. Catholic scientist Dr. Daryl P. Domning, of Howard University, has defined original sin as “original selfishness” – one of, if not “the” driving force(s) of evolution.¹³

My best definition of love comes from a remark by Tennessee Williams: “The most important moments of life are those when we break out of our selfish shell and really sense the presence of another person.” In October 2007, reflecting on the death of my adult son Michael, I wrote a piece that explored the implications of that proposition using scientific metaphors.¹⁴ In the musical version of *Les Miserables* the lesson is sung “to love another person is to see the face of God.”

There may very well be a scientific explanation for love. Some scientists hypothesize that human consciousness is a quantum phenomenon. What Williams was describing may very well be defined as the phenomenon of quantum entanglement: the fact that two particles although separating by light years react to each other instantaneously because of a unique relationship. That interaction is instantaneous - beyond space and time. Einstein called such interactions “spooky action at a distance”¹⁵

There are other voices demanding our attention in addition to atheism and religious fundamentalism. Others seek to offer a vision of a love-filled humanity without the intrusion of two millennia of organized religion. In *The Third Jesus*, new age guru Deepak Chopra calls for a rethinking of the Christ’s message as a Third Jesus who is beyond creed or denomination and draws all into universal consciousness.¹⁶

Robert Wright, an evolutionary sociologist in *The Evolution of God*,¹⁷ traces the development of humanity’s understanding of God from earliest times to the present. Although he appears to be perched somewhere between agnosticism and atheism, he ultimately limns a philosophical direction for humanity that may not be so different, from Chopra, or Teilhard, or Benedict or St. Paul.

It was St. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians on love who concluded, that love never fails but will endure forever. Whether one believes that Christ is a historic personality, or just an empowering myth, the words of John the Evangelist define the Christian faith: “God is love.” It also defines where both Chopra and Wright are heading, whatever their words.

Is the prophesized Second Coming of Christ a metaphor for the advance of science into the realm of the soul - consciousness beyond time and space? Is science with its ability to advance humanity and its ability to also destroy, a metaphor for both Christ

and anti-Christ? Does the scientific study of Shroud of Turin open a door to quantum existence and the future, not just of science, but humanity?

Is this the coming of a quantum Christ?

END NOTES

¹ Michael Ruse, author of author of the *Evolution-Creation Struggle* (Harvard Press, Cambridge 2005) cited *Dover Beach* in the Prologue of his book. Its aptness to the struggle between Militant Atheists and religious faithful beyond evolution causes me to borrow it for this book.

² Dawkins, Richard, *The God Delusion*, (Houghton-Mifflin, New York 2005). The cover jacket for *Delusion* modestly describes Dawkins has “the world’s most prominent atheist.”

³ “Quantum mechanics” a theory of matter that is based on the concept of the possession of wave [properties](#) by elementary particles, that affords a mathematical interpretation of the structure and interactions of matter on the basis of these properties, and that incorporates within it quantum theory and the uncertainty principle—called also *wave mechanics* (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/medical/quantum%20mechanics>). The duality of the most elementary objects of material existence as both wave and particles, and the fact that they are not defined until observed banishes common sense from the equation. Nonetheless, calculations applying quantum mechanics are at the heart of modern physics and were essential to the development of nuclear weapons. Nonetheless Dawkins was correct when he wrote in *Delusion* that:

“[O]ur imaginations are not yet tooled-up to penetrate the neighbourhood of the quantum. Nothing at that scale behaves in the way matter—as we are evolved to think—ought to behave. Nor can we cope with the behaviour of objects that move at some appreciable fraction of the speed of light. Common sense lets us down, because common sense evolved in a world where nothing moves very fast, and nothing is very small or very large. At the end of a famous essay on 'Possible Worlds', the great biologist J. B. S. Haldane wrote, 'Now, my own suspicion is that the universe is not only queerer than we suppose, but queerer than we can suppose ... I suspect that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of, or can be dreamed of, in any philosophy.'...” *The God Delusion* (pp. 407-408). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Kindle Edition.

⁴ *The God Delusion* (p. 80). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Kindle Edition.

⁵ *The God Delusion* (pp. 183-184). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Kindle Edition.

⁶ *The God Delusion* (pp. 122-123). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Kindle Edition.

⁷ *The God Delusion* (p. 82). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Kindle Edition

⁸ Teilhard, Pierre de Chardin; Huxley, Julian; Wall, Bernard (2011-06-21). *The Phenomenon Of Man* (Kindle Locations 5193-5200). Evergreen Books. Kindle Edition:

“To outward appearance, the modern world was born of an anti-religious movement: man becoming self-sufficient and reason supplanting belief. Our generation and the two that preceded it have heard little but talk of the conflict between science and faith; indeed it seemed at one moment a foregone conclusion that the former was destined to take the place of the latter. But, as the tension is

prolonged, the conflict visibly seems to need to be resolved in terms of an entirely different form of equilibrium — not in elimination, nor duality, but in synthesis. After close on two centuries of passionate struggles, neither science nor faith has succeeded in discrediting its adversary. On the contrary, it becomes obvious that neither can develop normally without the other. And the reason is simple: the same life animates both. Neither in its impetus nor its achievements can science go to its limits without becoming tinged with mysticism and charged with faith.”

⁹ Mitchell, Edgar, et ano, The Quantum Hologram And the Nature of Consciousness, <http://journalofcosmology.com/Consciousness149.html>; Clarke, Chris; Kragh, Helge; Chopra, Deepak; Penrose, Roger; Joseph, R.; King, Chris; Kafatos, Menas; Mensky, Michael (2011-09-27). *Cosmology of Consciousness: Quantum Physics & Neuroscience of Mind* (Kindle Location 13). Cosmology Science Publishers. Kindle Edition.

¹⁰ Pasternak, Boris, *Doctor Zhivago*, (English Edition, Pantheon Books, New York, 1958) 281

¹¹ <http://nronline.org/news/ecology/pope-cites-teilhardian-vision-cosmos-living-host>

¹² Dawkins, Richard (2006-03-16). *The Selfish Gene: 30th Anniversary edition*. Oxford University Press. Kindle Edition.

¹³ Doming, Daryl, *Original Selfishness: Original Sin and Evil in the Light of Evolution* (Ashgate, 2006); See also <http://www.congregationalresources.org/sites/congregationalresources.org/files/EvolutionOriginalSin.pdf>

¹⁴ http://johnklotz.blogspot.com/2007_10_01_archive.html

¹⁵ In correspondence with a colleague, he referred to quantum entanglement as “*spukhafte Fernwirkung*.”

¹⁶ Deepak Chopra, *The Third Jesus* (Harmony Books, 2008 New York)

¹⁷ Robert Wright, *The Evolution of God* (Little, Brown, 2009 New York)