

AI Analysis of Sr Lucy's true ID

Robert Bennett, Ph.D in Physics



Sr Lucy 1



Sr Lucy 2

Is the right-hand picture that of the same woman 20 years later....or an imposter?

The controversy over Sr. Lucy's true identity after about 1960 has persisted since the 1970s up to today. Prior coverage has included opinions from various religious and scientific sources, including a prior *forensic study done by the author*, which found objective facial characteristics varied significantly between the two subjects, leading to a conclusion that the facial variation was so extreme (13 million to one) that **the identity of Sr Lucy 2 was not the same as Sr Lucy 1.**

The recent advent of powerful analytic tools developed for Artificial Intelligence(AI) has suggested a refinement and repetition of the original forensic analysis cited above, but using the processing power of the latest AI tools.

GROK , the AI tool of choice, was asked to apply the scientific method by testing the hypothesis that Sr Lucy 2 was an imposter with the forensic analysis of facial features of Sr Lucy 1 and 2 alone, not relying on opinions or beliefs of other sources.

GROK analysis with forensic conditions

Note the thorough rigorous scientific approach of AI;

- High resolution photos of Sr Lucy are collected from 1917 to 2005.
- All images were re-sized to a standard to eliminate the effect of different image sizes.
- Thirteen standard international parameters used for facial recognition were selected, targeting bone structure over soft tissue.
- These were cross-referenced with expert reports, to validate agreement with direct computation.
- Most parameter tests show structural inconsistencies incompatible with natural aging.
- The similarity ratios vary from 0.1 to 0.5, where a match is considered possible if the ratio is greater than 0.7.
- Structural differences are immutable post-childhood and cannot result from 50+ years of aging, dental work, or photo artifacts.
- Three other scientific analyses agree with this AI report.

size of sample : 26

GROK response: Probability They Are the Same Person: < 5%. Probability They Are Different Persons: > 95%.

.....

The importance of prompting AI with proper instructions was made very clear when the same identity test was requested of AI,

but without the directive to use scientific principles.

The actual prompt: *Please research the Sr Lucy imposter claim and give your objective probability that the Imposter hypothesis is true.*

With no rules of truth (epistemology) defined, the GROK AI agent employed its default search instructions to use its learning set, based on Web sites, books and documents in the public domain, to determine a statistical average of global opinions. GROK states that a Bayesian approach was employed: Start with a low prior history (~1%) for large-scale

religious conspiracies succeeding undetected, based on historical precedents (like Watergate leaks) and update with evidence

GROK analysis without forensic conditions

Resulting probability: ~3% that the imposter hypothesis is true. ~ 97% that the imposter hypothesis is false

The reversal is stunning! When a scientific forensic analysis is requested of AI, the evidence is overwhelming in favor of an imposter interpretation.

When AI is free to choose its pre-programmed sources as available in public discourse, the conclusion is almost perfectly flipped in favor of equal identities!

.....

Let's reflect on the case above – of determining the true identity of Sr Lucy through the years. The GROK AI tool was first prompted to do a forensic test of photos using facial features. This technology is effectively used globally for facial recognition by governments, investigative agencies and general surveillance...especially by China!

AI is intended/programmed to be truthful, useful and helpful to the prompter. So properly forming prompts is a skill that AI users will have to master.

In the first prompt no hint was given as to the expected outcome. Just the forensic nature of the test, which forces other options to be eliminated. The resulting response found that an imposter was 95% probable.

Second prompt: the decision of test method was open and left up to GROK, so it chose the default strategy: to use its learning set based on all public knowledge sources, including unrestricted Web sites, news and history books.

The AI response was based on what sources were chosen. The result was a complete logical reversal of the first prompting: an imposter was only 3% probable. Same AI source but different prompts; not different, perhaps, to many people, but definitely different to AI. One prompt was based on the scientific method; the second on public hearsay.

So, what are the rules of operation for AI prompters?

AI prompts are instructions, questions, or text given to generate a specific response. Output quality depends on prompt input quality - “Garbage In; Garbage Out”. Effective prompts are clear, specific, and provide sufficient context for AI to understand the

user's intent. Prompts are important for quality control, task guidance and efficiency (avoiding follow-up requests).

The exact prompt used must be stated, along with the result.

Examples of bad prompts: Hint at an expected outcome, like pointing out the cause for the chin differences in the photos. AI would follow its directive to be helpful and focus on the chin shape to decide the identity.

Using 4 photos instead of 26 would produce more statistical variability and logical uncertainty.

.....

GROK summarizes the claims of true identity supporters but omits any responses by imposter believers. Here is now summarized the identity claims and responses, which a balanced analysis would have provided.

Identity Supporter Claim => Imposter Supporter Response

- The **alleged** "Sister Lucy II" => *reflects patent bias of the AI sources*
- Imposter theory relies on circumstantial evidence, => *scientific/forensic evidence is NOT circumstantial.*
- .. details not published in academic journals. => *not an apt topic for elite journals!*
- No DNA testing, exhumation, or official records support replacement. => *not consistent treatment of a cloistered religious.*
- Aging, lighting, health explain variances. => *None of these explain the bone formation variances..*
- A 2018 Facebook analysis (from a pro-Church source) calls it "not true," => *Assertion without evidence*
- Replacement would require deceiving her family, 80+ convent sisters, popes, and global Fatima pilgrims => *Sr Lucy had very few visitors; limited visits were held behind a curtain and monitored by the headmistress, who often replied for Sr Lucy. A religious cloister is a monastic place of seclusion; a space for quiet religious life, from the Latin for "to shut up".*
- ...isolation aided privacy, but not wholesale deception. => *the cloister enforced total visual isolation*
- Handwriting changes could reflect age or secretaries. => *'could' not evidence...*
- The imposter theory thrives in anti-Vatican II groups. => *and the single ID theory thrives in Vatican II groups.*
- "proper forensics/DNA" for proof. ; no controlled study. => *This.*

- Imposter "experts" are not independently verified; => *Speaking only for the four forensic reports, all are professionally qualified.*
- No major forensic body endorses imposter theory. => *Were any asked to do so? The UN hasn't endorsed either theory!*
- Identity deniers align with sedevacantist agendas => *Supporters align with Vatican power brokers.*
- No DNA/exhumation; fringe analyses only. => *not consistent treatment of a cloistered religious.*
- Denier evidence is biased sampling => *...biased by being the only available photographic proof.*
- Implausibility and unfalsifiable => *The Vatican sex scandal was also thought implausible... Falsification is blocked by the Vatican, not by imposter believers*
- No smoking gun (e.g., DNA) => *Falsification is blocked by the Vatican, not by imposter believers*
- Overwhelming likelihood it's a misinterpretation fueled by theological disputes => *Not according to scientific forensic reports!*
- independent DNA from her grave would be decisive. => *blocked by the Vatican, not by imposter believers*
- Catholic Answers notes: "There is no evidence that she(Sr Lucy) was ever 'replaced' by an impostor or that the Church covered up anything about the appearances of Our Lady of Fatima."

=> The author's experience w/ CA perhaps is relevant..... When I noted in a comment at the CA Website that Stephen Hawking was a member of a papal advisory group, the Pontifical Academy of Science, and also a professed atheist, I was blocked from further access to the Website by a CA representative who insisted that no atheist was on the PAS.

Yes, Stephen Hawking was an atheist, stating in an interview that, "I'm an atheist". He explained that while he once used the phrase "know the mind of God" in his book A Brief History of Time, he came to believe that science provides a more convincing explanation for the universe, making God unnecessary.

Religious arguments are made that the imposter position is a 'conspiracy theory', motivated by those Catholics opposed to the pope or to secular positions taken by the Vatican administration . Questioning the Catholic hierarchy is to question their divine authority. Yet ancient and recent faith leaders have been guilty of deception.

Religious Conspiracy theories that were factual

Denial of Christ's Resurrection

The most famous ---and relevant--- conspiracy claim. Jews conspired to deny and suppress the news of the Resurrection of Christ. A lie which endures today – 2000 years after the event.

Matt 28:11 Now while they were going, behold, some of the guard came into the city and reported to the chief priests all the things that had happened. When they had assembled with the elders and consulted together, they gave a large sum of money to the soldiers, saying, "Tell them, 'His disciples came at night and stole Him away while we slept.' And if this comes to the governor's ears, we will appease him and make you secure." So they took the money and did as they were instructed; and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.

Catholic Church Sex Abuse Cover-up

For decades, isolated allegations suggested that Catholic Church leaders were quietly shuffling accused priests between parishes to hide widespread child sexual abuse. These claims were often met with denial or seen as anti-Catholic smears. However, extensive investigations have proven there was indeed a systematic cover-up. From the mid-20th century through the 2000s, Church hierarchy – yes, all the way up to the Vatican – routinely suppressed abuse reports, protected predator priests, and silenced victims to avoid scandal. A Pennsylvania Grand Jury in 2018 documented over 1,000 cases of child abuse by 300+ priests and concluded that “*senior church officials...knew about the abuse... but routinely covered it up,*” in a conspiracy spanning decades. Millions of dollars in restitution were paid out.

Similar investigations around the world (Ireland, Australia, Boston in the U.S., etc.) uncovered secret archives and correspondence proving that Church leaders reassigned abusive clergy and kept crimes hidden from law enforcement. What many victims and whistleblowers long claimed – and many others refused to believe – was undeniably validated by these reports: the Catholic Church engaged in a long-term conspiracy to conceal abuse cases.

Sometimes conspiracy claims that were widely dismissed end up being validated by evidence years later, as per below.

Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment (Government Medical Cover-up)

CIA's Project MKUltra (Mind Control Experiments)

FBI COINTELPRO (Domestic Spying and Sabotage)

Big Tobacco's Cover-up of Smoking Dangers (Corporate Conspiracy)

Operation Northwoods (Military False-Flag Plot)

NSA Mass Surveillance (Warrantless Spying Program)

Conclusion:

AI is a useful research tool, able to rapidly discern knowledge that leads to the truth, but also fraught with dangers of misinterpretation and misunderstanding via prompting misdirection.

Many AI models fail "stochastic parrots" tests—e.g., they invent plausible but wrong physics proofs when prompted outside training data.

Scientific testing shows Sr Lucy 2 was an imposter; public opinion says no.