

Fatima Fraud: Our Case for an Impostor Sister Lucy

October 2019

* Bibliographical note: Relevant Fatima quotations and material are taken from Br. Michel de la Saint Trinite's authoritative three-volume work *The Whole Truth About Fatima*, Carlos Evaristo's published work on YouTube, and the Vatican website.

Introductory Remarks

The Founding of Sister Lucy Truth

Sister Lucy Truth (SLT) was conceived in 2017. In 2018 it was established as a tax-exempt nonprofit organization for educational purposes. All tax-deductible donations to this organization go specifically to its stated purposes.

The Purpose of SLT

The purpose of SLT is to discover the truth concerning the life and person of Sister Lúcia dos Santos of Fatima. Specifically, using the latest scientific means and expert consultation to find out whether or not there was the substitution of an impostor for the real Sister Lucy of Fatima during the years after 1958.

The Three Phases of SLT's Plan

First phase: to gather scientific evidence and expert analysis on the various aspects of Sister Lucy available on the internet, in authoritative biographies, as well as handwritten samples.

There are still many reports coming in and to be commissioned. Ideally, a DNA sample of Sr. Lucy will be obtained, which may be compared with her living relatives.

Second phase: to present the evidence before an internationally based private investigator to solve what happened to the real Sr. Lucy.

Third phase: to have the evidence published by mainstream Catholic media platforms and spread awareness among Church hierarchy.

Purpose of This Current Presentation

The principal purpose of this document is to present the scientific and expert evidence gathered so far and demonstrate how conclusive it is regarding the existence of the impostor Sr. Lucy. Its secondary purpose is to spread awareness of this important work and to ask for financial and spiritual support. It should be noted that SLT depends entirely on the generosity of donors. Without donations, the project cannot move forward.

The Problem of Sr. Lucy and Fatima

The Demand for a Reasonable Explanation

The identity of Sr. Lucy is tied up with the history of the Fatima apparitions and the authenticity and importance of the Secrets revealed to the seers. Strikingly, it seems to be the case that the transition from the real Sr. Lucy to the new “Sr. Lucy” closely parallels the transition from the traditional Catholic faith to the new postconciliar faith. The events culminating in 1960 and thereafter demand a reasonable explanation and renewed examination! The following points cover the evolution of the “message of Fatima” and reveal to any sensible observer that something clearly went wrong regarding the Vatican and the message of Fatima in the years following 1960.

Relevant Biographical Details of Sr. Lucy

Sr. Lucy was born on March 28, 1907 just outside Fatima. Publicly her death was on February 13, 2005 at the age of 97 in the convent of Coimbra.

For brevity, we will bullet point the major points of the Fatima timeline:

- Apparitions of the Angel occurred between the spring and fall of 1916.
- Six apparitions of Our Lady occurred between May and October 1917 to Lucy and her cousins, Jacinta and Francisco Marto, on the 13th day of each month.
- **The third apparition on July 13, 1917.** Here Our Lady reveals the Secret of Fatima, which is in three parts, and promises the miracle of the sun in October.
 - The heart of the Secret, the remedy, is a very specific request: The solemn and public Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart, in union with the bishops of the whole world, and the Communion of Reparation on First Saturdays, which the Holy Father must promote. The good and bad consequences of the Secret hinge on fulfilling this request.
- Basic messages of Our Lady of Fatima are tied up with the Secret she reveals to the children. The urgent and immediate calls for penance and prayers, the request of the Consecration and the Communions of Reparation, do not make sense outside of this context! This is no generic call to holiness. It is specific for our times, concerning the life of the Church and the fate of the world.
- **Miracle of the sun** occurred on October 13, 1917, perhaps the most witnessed miracle in history.
- The apparitions at Pontevedra occurred between 1925-1926
- The apparition at Tuy in 1929
- On October 13, 1930, José Alves Correia da Silva, bishop of Fatima, formally approves the Fatima apparitions as worthy of belief with Pope Pius XI's approbation.
- The apparition at Rianjo in August 1931
 - Here Our Lord famously compared His ministers, the Pope and bishops, to the King of France, complaining: “They did not want to heed My request. Like the King of France they will repent and do so, but it will be late. Russia will already

have spread her errors throughout the world, causing wars and persecutions of the Church. The Holy Father will have much to suffer.”

- Sr. Lucy receives papal permission to transfer to the Carmelites in 1948.
- The text of the Third Secret is transferred from Leiria to Rome in April 1957.

The Last Public Interview of Sr. Lucy

Sr. Lucy’s last public interview was with Fr. Agustín Fuentes in December 1957, 8 months after the transfer of the Third Secret from Leiria to the Vatican. After this interview, Sr. Lucy was not allowed to be interviewed anymore for the next several decades. The interview was not published until June 1959. Fr. Fuentes described Sr. Lucy’s appearance as “very sad, pale, and drawn.” She told Fr. Fuentes:

*Believe me, Father, God will chastise the world and **this will be in a terrible manner. The chastisement from Heaven is imminent.** The year 1960 is on us, and then what will happen? **It will be very sad for everyone,** and far from a happy thing if the world does not pray and do penance before then.*

A Series of Foreboding Events

Then followed a series of disturbing events casting a foreboding shadow over the legacy of Fatima as 1960 approached. Two weeks after Fr. Fuentes’ interview was published, the diocese of Coimbra released a disconcerting note publicly disavowing Fr. Fuentes along with the following words of correction, supposedly from Sr. Lucy:

I know nothing, and could therefore say nothing, about such punishments, which are falsely attributed to me.

The note closes with these words of finality:

Sister Lucy has said everything she believed it her duty to say about Fatima; she has said nothing new....

Later that year, John XXIII made absolutely no mention of Fatima on September 13, 1959, the anniversary of the fifth apparition, when Italy was formally consecrated to the Immaculate Heart, much to everyone’s shock.

Sr. Lucy was not seen publicly until May 13, 1967 on the 50th anniversary of Fatima with Paul VI, then May 13 in 1982, 1991, and 2000 with John Paul II. Strikingly, in her 1967 appearance before the world, “Sr. Lucy” appeared jovial and in good health!

1960 Arrives

Everyone was eagerly expecting the revelation of the Third Secret. But on February 8, 1960, the Portuguese news agency A.N.I. in Rome released a statement, received anonymously from “Vatican sources,” saying,

It is most probable that the Secret of Fatima will remain, forever, under absolute seal.

No one from the Vatican, not even John XXIII, openly assumed responsibility, yet clearly the authorization was from John XXIII. John XXIII and Paul VI, in all of their public talks and writings, never made even the smallest reference to the Secret of Fatima. It would not be mentioned officially until 1967 by Cardinal Ottaviani, speaking on behalf of Paul VI.

One of the incredible portions of that 1960 press release contained a public disavowal of the trustworthiness of the three shepherd seers, even though the Church had already formally approved of Fatima and declared it “worthy of belief.” This was practically a complete contradiction to the Church’s former position.

The results were devastating across Christendom. There was mass disillusionment and disappointment, which did great harm to devotion to Our Lady of Fatima. Articles were quickly published in 1960 that reprimanded the “morbid curiosity” and “alarmism” of the Fatima devotees. These articles also then introduced the now-persistent division between the “message of Fatima,” meant for the public, and its Secret, meant for the Holy Father alone.

John XXIII and the “Prophets of Doom”

John XXIII made the announcement for an ecumenical council on January 25, 1959. Vatican II opened on October 11, 1962 (now 57 years ago as of this writing), at which John XXIII made his infamous remarks denouncing the “prophets of doom.” We quote those words extensively here so that their full relation to Fatima may be felt:

It sometimes happens that We hear certain opinions which disturb Us—opinions expressed by people who, though fired with a commendable zeal for religion, are lacking in sufficient prudence and judgment in their evaluation of events. They can see nothing but calamity and disaster in the present state of the world. They say over and over that this modern age of ours, in comparison with past ages, is definitely deteriorating.

We feel that We must disagree with these prophets of doom, who are always forecasting worse disasters, as though the end of the world were at hand.

Present indications are that the human family is on the threshold of a new era. We must recognize here the hand of God, who, as the years roll by, is ever directing men's efforts....

We cannot help but think of Sr. Lucy’s words spoken just 5 years before, fading yet still echoing in stark contrast:

God will chastise the world and this will be in a terrible manner. The chastisement from Heaven is imminent. The year 1960 is on us, and then what will happen? It will be very sad for everyone, and far from a happy thing if the world does not pray and do penance before then.

A Clear Historical Link Between Fatima and the Commencement of Vatican II

On October 13, 1962, the 45th anniversary of the miracle of the sun and two days after the ceremonial opening of the Second Vatican Council, the first working session began to approve the 168 pre-selected candidates for the ten conciliar commissions that would draft the council documents. Initially, the proposed members were those who had participated in the preparatory committees that had drawn up the 72 document schemata for the council discussions. These schemata had been screened and approved for doctrinal orthodoxy. But Cardinals Achille Liénart of Lille, France and Josef Frings of Cologne, Germany protested and motioned to delay the voting. This decision allowed a wider diversity of theological opinions to be included among the document drafters. In the end, over half of the elected commissions were chaired by formerly “suspect theologians,” who had been censured under Pius XII for their questionable theological positions. Because of this pivotal intervention by the liberal theologians of the so-called “Rhine alliance,” all of the 72 original schemata were abandoned and replaced with what would eventually become the finalized and approved documents of Vatican II.

Cardinal Ottaviani Changes the Message of Fatima

The message of the Vatican continually changed over the next few decades about what the “true message of Fatima” was. Originally, the heart of Fatima was the three Secrets and their repercussions for the life of the Church and the world, even if these secrets were not revealed until later. Then Fatima became a vague call for conversion, penance, and prayers. But the call for conversion and prayers are a result of the seriousness of what is revealed in the Secret! This propaganda also ignores the repeated warnings and complaints of Our Lady to Sr. Lucy regarding the Consecration of Russia.

On February 11, 1967, 7 years after the 1960 scandal and just three months before the fake Sr. Lucy’s public appearance, Cardinal Ottaviani, speaking for Paul VI, repeated that the Third Secret would not be revealed. He said the faithful should content themselves with the “public message” of prayer and penance. Notably he remarks,

*We must dispel the **fears** aroused by the Secret. Fatima is not an alarming message. It is a message of hope.*

Ottaviani claims that the Secret was meant only for the Pope. He says how John XXIII and Paul VI showed great wisdom in judging that it was not opportune to release the secret, even though Our Lady, the Queen of Prophets, instructed Sr. Lucy directly contrary to this supposed wisdom. He even claims that the prophecies of Fatima were being fulfilled before their very eyes, and that Fatima was an optimistic and hopeful message about ecumenism!

Sr. Lucy and “Diabolical Disorientation”

In a number of letters in 1970, “Sr. Lucy” coins the phrase “diabolical disorientation” and while discussing the importance of the Rosary and prayer repeats the notion that the Church has come under diabolical influence. She says that the Rosary is the most sure weapon and protection against this diabolical influence.

John Paul II Continues the Dilution of Fatima

In 1982, after his visit to Fatima, John Paul II makes the following statement at Coimbra:

The situation may appear desperate, and hint at a new ‘apocalypse.’ But in reality, this is not the case at all. For humanity of the year 2,000, there surely exists a hopeful outcome, and many reasons for hope.

Again the message of optimism, hope, and a general ecumenical spirit is promoted, always in the context of Fatima, but ignoring any mention of the Secret.

Cardinal Ratzinger’s 1984 Interview

Cardinal Ratzinger’s comments on the third Secret in a 1984 interview are vague and contradictory. Once Russia is brought up, however, Ratzinger refuses to continue on the topic. Notably, Ratzinger revised the original text to remove key information in the 1985 edition of that interview.

The Bizarre 1992–1993 Interviews

In her 1992 and 1993 interviews, translated by the Portuguese journalist and historian Carlos Evaristo, “Sr. Lucy” **contradicts almost everything that she had formerly said** and makes many other bizarre statements. Here she introduces a completely novel understanding of the Fatima message from everything she wrote about formerly, but one that is complementary to the propaganda of the Vatican.

1. She denies that the Third Secret was supposed to be revealed in 1960 even though it was she herself who had indicated that the secret ought to be revealed either by 1960 or upon her death, whichever came first.
2. She states, in agreement with the Vatican, that the Secret was only for the Pope, but he could have revealed it if he had wanted to.
3. She adds that she was opposed to its public revelation, in complete contradiction to everything that was stated by her and every bishop and theologian before 1960.
4. She declares that John Paul II’s consecration of March 25, 1984 was valid even though it involved only a majority and not all Catholic bishops.
5. She claims that John Paul II’s consecration avoided a nuclear war in 1985.
6. She says that Russia did not need to be mentioned explicitly by name in the Consecration since the year 1929 had passed and the errors of Russia had already spread.

These are striking contradictions for the seer who formerly complained over and over that Popes Pius XI and XII had not precisely followed the request of Our Lady in each particular step and detail!

7. She notes that Gorbachev was an instrument of God in the process of the conversion of Russia.
8. She clarifies that Our Lady never said the conversion of Russia would be to Catholicism nor even to Christianity. It would be a conversion from militant atheism to that of any country that respects the free will given to men by God, the freedom to choose between good and evil.

9. She also asserts that the annihilation of nations does not refer to actual nations or physical war, but a spiritual annihilation that was the result of atheistic Communism.
10. In this interview, “Sr. Lucy” also seems to know positively that heaven had accepted John Paul II’s consecration of the world. Yet when asked in 1947 about Pius XII’s 1942 consecration, Sr. Lucy admitted she did not know whether heaven had accepted it because it had not been revealed to her. Yet at that time, she had not hesitated to add that Pius XII’s 1942 consecration did not follow Our Lady’s request exactly.

“Sr. Lucy” would repeat her certitude about John Paul II’s consecration to Dr. and Mrs. Zugibe, who visited her in 2002 asking whether the consecration was completed.

11. “Sr. Lucy” further claims in this interview that the conversion of Russia has concluded because of the end of atheistic Communism.
12. Also she explains that World War II was a war against the Jews, who “continue to be a chosen people of God.”

This statement is very strange since Sr. Lucy had never before spoken of the Jews, yet here she approvingly uses the precise phrase that was promoted by the liberals and modernists in support of Jewish ecumenism!

13. She states that we are in the “Third Day of the Fatima Week,” which is ongoing.
14. “Sr. Lucy” explicitly claims that the “triumph of the Immaculate Heart has taken place”! It began when Our Lady saved John Paul II’s life in Saint Peter’s Square on May 13, 1981.
15. But then she renders this triumph meaningless by adding that “the triumph is an ongoing process.”

Ratzinger, as Benedict XVI, will flatly contradict this statement in 2010 by saying that the triumph of the Immaculate Heart has not yet occurred.

16. Lastly, “Sr. Lucy’s” closing message is: “He who is not with the Pope is not with God.”

The full details of this interview can be found published on Carlos Evaristo’s YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9fHmtZlbVbc>

Aftermath of the Interviews

This interview, the first extensive one since 1957, is so devastating to the Fatima message that most conservative and traditional proponents of Fatima clamored to excuse it away as a string of lies. For example, Christopher Ferrara spends almost 30 pages deconstructing the interviews, even putting “Sister Lucy” in scare quotes, yet he dismisses the notion of an impostor Sr. Lucy as an “implausible theory.” Others went so far as to slander Carlos Evaristo’s character and claimed that he had fabricated the answers.

Evaristo has publicly defended himself and his professional reputation and insisted that he accurately reported what “Sr. Lucy” said. Is Evaristo lying? Or should we take him at his word that he sincerely believed he was speaking with the seer of Fatima and faithfully reporting her words? If however Evaristo is telling the truth, which we have every reason to believe, how do we explain the extremely worrisome words of “Sr. Lucy,” which even Evaristo himself says contradicted what he had formerly understood about the Fatima message?

Sr. Lucy's Other Bizarre Behavior

There is the other bizarre behavior of the post-1967 Sr. Lucy that was not characteristic of the real Sr. Lucy. In her 1967 appearance, there is video footage of "Sr. Lucy" genuflecting before Paul VI, grabbing his hand, kissing it, and holding it. In 2000, she kissed the hands of John Paul II after receiving Communion. At the supposed revelation of the Third Secret, her happiness and gestures were awkwardly ostentatious. The Associated Press records have video of "Sr. Lucy" and John Paul II conversing in 2000, and she reaches out for John Paul II's hand and holds it as they talk.

The Release of the Third Secret

The Third Secret is released on June 26, 2000, accompanied by an incongruent "theological commentary" by Cardinal Ratzinger meant to "clarify" the content of the Third Secret. Early on, Ratzinger cites the Jesuit Fr. Edouard Dhanis, a Modernist who was famous in the 1940s and '50s for trying to debunk Fatima, specifically any messages from Our Lady to Sr. Lucy after 1917. Certainly it is not a good sign that Fr. Dhanis is the only Fatima expert that Cardinal Ratzinger thinks is relevant to cite. Ratzinger says the Third Secret can be a "genuine help in understanding the Gospel." This reverses the Vatican's message for the past 40 years, which adamantly claimed the Third Secret was for the Pope alone, and the "public message of Fatima" for the laity.

Interestingly, and more confusingly, on May 13, 2010 at the Shrine of Fatima, Ratzinger, speaking as Pope Benedict, said, "We would be mistaken to think that Fatima's prophetic message has been completely realized" and states that the triumph of the Immaculate Heart has not yet occurred. This contradicts what Sr. Lucy said in her 1992/1993 interviews.

The Silencing of Sr. Lucy

It is important to point that that Sr. Lucy could not remain silent about Our Lord and Our Lady's requests. Before 1960, like a true prophet of God, she repeatedly insisted in her letters that obedience to Our Lord and Our Lady compelled her to speak. The seer could not remain silent who did not hesitate to criticize each preconiliar pope who failed to heed Our Lord and Lady's requests. In 1928 she wrote how "Our Lord is profoundly displeased." In 1929 she let it be known that the Holy Fathers themselves would fail Our Lord as the king of France had failed Him. In a 1935 letter to Fr. José Bernardo Gonçalves she wrote,

Regarding the matter of Russia, I think that it would please Our Lord very much if you worked to make the Holy Father comply with His wishes.

When Fr. Gonçalves wrote back in 1936 asking whether it was still necessary to insist on this point, she answered,

Believe me, if it were not for the fear of displeasing Our Good Lord because of my lack of clarity and sincerity, I would never have decided to speak so clearly.

And like a gadfly, she continued to repeat and proclaim the renewed requests of Our Lord and Our Lady in letters all through the years between 1940 to 1952 and for the final time in 1957. At the end of 1957, she said in her interview with Fr. Fuentes,

Believe me, Father, God will chastise the world and this will be in a terrible manner. The chastisement from Heaven is imminent. The year 1960 is on us, and then what will happen? It will be very sad for everyone, and far from a happy thing if the world does not pray and do penance before then.

Not only was Sr. Lucy silenced, but Fr. Fuentes was publicly disavowed. The next bishop of Leiria, Msgr. João Pereira Venâncio, said in 1960 regarding the Third Secret: “I can say nothing.” Despite Msgr. Venâncio’s final attempt in a letter of May 17, 1960 to unite all the bishops of the world in preparation for the Consecration of Russia, John XXIII ignored it.

From then on, not only silence from Sr. Lucy, but any further word from her was in total agreement with whatever the Church hierarchy wished to say about Fatima and the Third Secret. Not only was the Vatican able to finally silence the seer who refused to remain silent, but they could have her agree with any change to the Fatima message they saw fit to promote. Her writings from after 1960 bear this point out. She called for complete obedience to the postconciliar popes. Her adulation of these popes culminated in her 1992/1993 interviews and her supposed approval of the interpretation of the Third Secret given in 2000, all of which make the Third Secret about John Paul II, the great hero of Fatima. How do we explain this complete change in Sr. Lucy’s behavior, which occurred precisely after her final interview was published in 1959?

A Problem in Need of an Explanation

The life of Sr. Lucy and the catastrophic changes in the Church over the course of the 20th century give rise to a problem that demands an explanation.

- How do we account for the complete change in Sr. Lucy after 1960?
- How do we account for the behavior of the Vatican and Church hierarchy remaining completely silent on the Third Secret for 40 years and promoting a propaganda campaign to create an entirely new understanding of Fatima, the understanding introduced by modernists and liberals, that waters it down into insignificance?
- How do we account for “Sr. Lucy’s” complete support of this propaganda as well as her requests for complete and blind submission to the postconciliar Popes when before 1960 she did not hesitate to repeat how the preconciliar Popes had failed to heed to Our Lady’s requests and how displeasing this was to Our Lord, Our Lady, and herself?
- More specifically, how do we account for the dramatic changes in Sr. Lucy’s behavior, in her appearance, and even in her handwriting?

Our Hypothesis

What is the most reasonable explanation based on the facts? **Sister Lucy Truth proposes that the best explanation that could account for these substantial differences in the behavior of Sr. Lucy is that she was replaced by an entirely different person, resembling her and acting in her name.**

Does the evidence suggest that a different person posed as Sr. Lucy after the 1960s? **Overwhelmingly YES.**

The Evidence

Overview of the Current Evidence

1. Multiple facial recognition analysis reports conducted by leading experts in the field including an analysis by a facial “super-recognizer.”
2. Plastic surgeon report by a world-class plastic surgeon.
3. Forensic art analysis by one the world’s foremost forensic artists.
4. Handwriting analysis by a leading forensic handwriting expert, who has provided a sworn declaration along with his analysis.
5. Dental analysis by a senior lecturer in periodontics.

Note, we will discuss the handwriting analysis at the end because the other reports focus only on Sr. Lucy’s physical appearance.

Dental Report

Dr. Ruud Karsten

Dr. Ruud Karsten is a senior lecturer at the Radboud University College of Dental Sciences in The Netherlands. Dr. Karsten's specialty is periodontics, the branch of dentistry concerned with the structures that support the teeth.

Background Biographical History

Sr. Lucia I had her upper teeth removed over the course of 1948 due to a severe inflammatory disease and replaced with an acrylic denture. Her dentist at the time was Dr. Alcino Magelhaes.

Report Findings

Based on the limited photographic evidence and the fact that both Lucys seem to have artificial teeth, Dr. Karsten concludes, "It is not possible to distinguish Lucia I from Lucia II" at least based on an analysis of the teeth alone.

However, Dr. Karsten notes the distinctly different shapes of the lower jaw of both Lucys. He notes that the extent of the difference between the two Lucys cannot be explained only by aging or by dentures and must therefore be a **natural, that is, genetic, difference**. Based on this significant difference alone, Dr. Karsten is confident that there are two Sr. Lucys. In a private email, he wrote:

Yes, for sure, overall I hold that there are two Sister Lucias, the one who saw the Virgin Mary in 1917 and ...the other who attended the 50th Anniversary of the Fatima Apparitions, which was in 1967...she being the Lucia who died in 2005.

Conclusions

If Dr. Karsten has concluded that age and dental surgery cannot account for the different appearances of the two Sr. Lucy's jaws, but that it must be a **natural difference**, then the most reasonable conclusion is that we are dealing with **two different people**.

A Possible Objection: Plastic Surgery

Couldn't plastic surgery alter the appearance of the jaw?

There will be a difference of opinion among two of our later experts, the plastic surgeon and the forensic artist. The plastic surgeon believes that a chin implant could account for the different appearance, but the forensic artist will deny this and further add, even if it such a drastic change could be achieved through plastic surgery, there would be no reason to offer it, nor would anyone desire it. We will return to this later.

Plastic Surgeon Report

Dr. Julio Garcia

Dr. Julio Garcia is a world-class, certified plastic surgeon. He was recognized by the International Association of Plastic Surgeons as a “Leading Physician of the World” and named a top plastic surgeon in the Las Vegas area in 2016. He is also the physician leader for the medical team attached to the Las Vegas SWAT Team.

Report Findings

Dr. Garcia was given an extensive set of photographs showing Sr. Lucy as a child, as an adult, and in her 1967 and post-1967 appearances.

He states that he is “**very confident they are not the same individual.**” He further states that the young Sr. Lucy and pre-1960 Sr. Lucy are the same individual. He also believes that the 1967 and elderly Sr. Lucy are the same individual.

Inconsistent Chin

Dr. Garcia notes that the chins of Sr. Lucy I and II are totally inconsistent. As one ages, the chin becomes less prominent over time, yet clearly the chin has become far more prominent in the post-1967 Sr. Lucy. Dr. Garcia tellingly argues that the different chin cannot be explained either through **aging or dental work**, which is exactly the same thing that Dr. Karsten reported independently of Dr. Garcia.

Garcia notes that one way the chin could change in this manner would be through a chin implant. But then the question is: why would Sr. Lucy ever need or, even more, want a chin implant? The only other explanation that Dr. Garcia suggests is a genetic difference, exactly as Dr. Karsten concluded, which means we’re dealing with two different people.

Different Eyelids

Dr. Garcia notes that the pre-1967 and post-1967 Lucys have different eyelids that cannot be explained by the aging process. He notes that when comparing the real Sr. Lucy to the elderly one, the appearance of the difference is “stronger evidence.”

However, the difference in the eyelids between the 1967 and elderly “Sr. Lucy” is explainable by aging since they are relatively consistent in appearance, indicating that they are the same person.

Different Eyebrows

The eyebrows are too different to be explained by age. Dr. Garcia notes, “The distance should shorten, not lengthen, as a person ages.” But the distance between the eyebrow and eyelash is longer in the fake Sr. Lucy, not shorter, which is the opposite of what should happen with aging.

Features Explainable by Aging

Nevertheless, Dr. Garcia notes that the changing angle and thickness of the eyebrows between the real and fake Sr. Lucys can be explained by aging. Additionally, the thinner lips in the post-1967 Lucys is explainable by age and therefore inconclusive in Dr. Garcia’s expert opinion.

Noses

Dr. Garcia notes that the noses appear to be different but said more photos would need to be analyzed before a certain conclusion could be reached.

Conclusions

Dr. Garcia backs up his analysis by stating,

*All of the following opinions set forth above are stated to **a reasonable degree of medical probability.***

This isn’t armchair, conspiratorial gut feelings but stated by a medical professional and with a “reasonable degree of medical probability.” What is the best explanation for these differences? Dr. Garcia himself believes there are two individuals and places his professional reputation on the line.

Forensic Art

Lois Gibson

Lois Gibson is one of the world's foremost forensic artists. She holds the 2017 Guinness World Record for most identifications by a forensic artist. She has helped Houston police solve 1,266 cases alone. She has authored a standard textbook in forensic art. Gibson also received dental training at the University of Texas Health Science Center in San Antonio.

In a private email, Mrs. Gibson stated, "Even one of these [forensic reports] is a complete confirmation. I could have done many more. Any one of the three is conclusive so I sense this is totally convincing."

Report Findings

After analyzing photos of the two Sr. Lucys, Gibson states that the two Sr. Lucys have "completely different facial structures" and therefore that **"it is impossible these are the same woman."**

Note that in the following forensic reports A refers to pictures of the pre-1967 Lucy and B refers to the post-1967 Sr. Lucy. Below we quote her analysis in full.

Profile Comparison ("Our Lady of Fatima Nun Comparison One")

1. The foreheads show much different underlying frontal bones. The superciliary arch of B protrudes forward much more than A.
2. The noses are a different shape with B having a larger, rounder, and more downward angled tip which cannot be explained by cartilage growth.
3. The philtrum (distance from the top of the nose to the top edge of the top lip) is longer on A than B. The lips on A are thicker and narrower on the horizontal plane than B, with A's bottom lip protruding forward much more than B. Dentures, should they be involved, would replicate the pre-existing dentition and thus not cause such a drastic difference.
4. The horizontal mental indentation below the bottom lip, is wider on the vertical plane on A and indents deeper below the bottom lip on A than on B.
5. The mental protuberance (i.e., the chin) of B projects forward to a drastic extent far different from the mental protuberance of A which recedes below the bottom lip. **There is no plastic surgery that could accomplish this, nor would it be offered or desired.**

Facial Comparison (“Our Lady of Fatima Nun Comparison Two”)

1. The nasal bone of A is narrower than B. This causes the eyebrow hair growth to occur closer together in the horizontal center of the superciliary arch of A compared to the wider-apart eyebrows of B.
2. The eyes are closer together due to 1. above.
3. The bottom third of the nose is narrower in A compared to B. The nostril holes of A are rounder, more visible when viewed frontally and those holes are closer together on A than on B. The nasal holes of A are a different shape than the nasal holes of B.
4. A’s philtrum (the distance from the bottom of the nose to the top edge of the top lip) is longer than B’s philtrum.
5. The lips of A are narrower on the horizontal plane than B. The top lip of A is wider on the vertical plane than B’s top lip. The bottom lip of A is thicker on the vertical plane and protrudes further forward beyond the horizontal indentation below the lips compared to B.

Inconsistent Chin (“Our Lady of Fatima Nun Comparison Three”)

A and B are shown at a much different age in this photo comparison. Even taking that age difference into consideration, the drastic lighting shows that B’s mental protuberance of her mandible is larger and thrusts much farther forward from her facial plane than A. The aging process would cause the mandible to shrink, **not grow larger**. Said more simply, the chins of A and B have a drastically different shape. This drastic difference in the mandible area shows these cannot be the same individual. **There is no plastic surgery that would make A’s chin look like B’s chin.** Differences described in 1 through 5 in “Our Lady of Fatima Nun Comparison Two” also hold true in the above individuals even considering the large age difference and the presence of glasses on B. It must be noted this writer has successfully reconstructed faces with only the skulls of unidentified murder victims, and has written a textbook about this subject (*Forensic Art Essentials*, 2007).

Conclusions

Regarding the shape of the chin, two experts in their respective fields are at odds whether plastic surgery could produce the kind of difference that exists between Sr. Lucy I and II. However, Gibson adds that even if it were possible, why would it be desirable if it produces such a drastic difference in appearance compared to the real Sr. Lucy?

The most reasonable explanation, according to both experts, regardless of the possibility of a chin implant, is that we are dealing with **two different individuals**. This conclusion is based not just on the issue of the chin, but the accumulation of all the other physiological factors analyzed by both professionals.

It should be repeated that up to this point, three different experts have **all independently affirmed** the same basic points regarding the drastic differences in appearance between the Sr. Lucys. Not only that, they have also **all independently denied that aging and dental work** could cause the sorts of differences seen. This is one of the most

frequent objections you will find online or in discussion: “Aging accounts for these differences. Dental work accounts for the differences.” **No**, three different medical experts, two of whom have formally studied dentistry, deny these as reasonable explanations. **These are no longer tenable explanations** of the drastically different appearances of the Sr. Lucys.

Brayovic Super-Recognizer Analysis

Dragica Brayovic

Ms. Dragica Brayovic is a facial “super-recognizer.” She is currently involved in the cutting-edge research on super-recognizers, conducted by Dr. David White at UNSW (University of New South Wales) Sydney.

What Is a Super Recognizer?

According to the *British Journal of Psychology*, super-recognizers are “individuals who are extremely proficient at processing facial identity.” The *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* states, “The discovery of super-recognizers demonstrates that people can not only be much worse than average at face recognition, but also much better than average.”

Report Findings

Ms. Brayovic was also given a set of photographs depicting the two Sr. Lucys but was not told which corresponded to which. She was asked to identify how many people were in the photographs, using her super-recognizer abilities.

Based on her analysis, she sorted the photos into pictures of the young Sr. Lucy, the pre-1967 Sr. Lucy, the 1967 Sr. Lucy, and the elderly Sr. Lucy. She further concluded that the young and pre-1967 Sr. Lucy were the same person while the 1967 and elderly Sr. Lucy were a different person. Lastly, she was given two videos of the elderly Sr. Lucy and stated that this woman was different than the pre-1967 Sr. Lucy depicted in the photos provided. Rather, it was the same person as the 1967 Sr. Lucy.

Conclusions

Here we have facial analysis by someone who has been scientifically demonstrated to possess higher-than-average facial recognition abilities, which are not acquired through training. She, like all the other experts consulted, also confirms that there are two separate individuals depicted in the photographic records.

iPRoBe Facial Recognition Report

iPRoBe Lab and Dr. Arun Ross

The iPRoBe Lab is based at Michigan State University and is headed by Dr. Arun Ross. Dr. Ross is an established leader in biometrics and biometric recognition, which is the science of identification based on body measurements and characteristics. Using a thumbprint as an identifier is an example of biometrics. Dr. Ross has co-authored the standard textbook introduction to biometrics as well as two other handbooks on biometrics. The iPRoBe Lab has state-of-the-art facial recognition and biometric software. SLT submitted photos of the two Sr. Lucys for analysis.

Report Findings

A preliminary clarification:

1. The young Sr. Lucy is Subject A.
2. The adult, pre-1967 Sr. Lucy is Subject B.
3. The 1967 Sr. Lucy is Subject C.
4. The elderly Sr. Lucy is Subject D.

If our hypothesis is correct, then Subjects A and B are the real Sr. Lucy while Subjects C and D are the impostor.

The computer found that Subject A and B are **moderately likely** to be the same individual.

Subject C and D are **very likely** to be the same individual. This is notable because the results of the box plot and histogram are almost as high as one could get in identifying a match.

Subject B and D are **likely** different individuals. Here we should point out what the report states: the large majority of the scores appear below .5, which indicates that the individuals analyzed are **different** rather than the same. Also, it is important to note that this report has already confirmed that there were two separate individuals.

Interestingly, the computer was not able to establish a difference between Subject B (adult pre-1967 Sr. Lucy) and C (1967 Sr. Lucy). This perhaps raises a question about the identity of the 1967 Sr. Lucy.

Logically, however, there should be no problem:

- The computer recognizes that the pre-1967 Sr. Lucys are one individual.
- The post-1967 Sr. Lucys are also one individual.
- It also recognizes that the real Sr. Lucy is different than the elderly Sr. Lucy.
- Logically, it follows that the real Sr. Lucy must be different than the 1967 Sr. Lucy.

Thus the ability to work logically through the evidence still vindicates our hypothesis. The problems in the computer's analysis may consist in the quality and number of photographs used.

Conclusions

The report still supports the thesis that we are dealing with two individuals, one before 1967 and one after. When combined with the other reports and pieces of evidence, the iPRoBe report adds more support to the overall reasonableness of our hypothesis: there are two Sr. Lucys.

Animetrics Facial Analysis Report

Animetrics

Animetrics is a leading developer in advanced facial recognition technology for the military, intelligence, and law enforcement. For the SLT analysis, Animetrics used their program Forensica GPS to process the images. After the Boston Marathon bombing, Forensica GPS was successfully able to analyze low-resolution camera stills of the bombers and identify them when the software used by the investigators failed to do so.

Report Findings

For this report, only photos of the adult pre-1960 Sr. Lucy and the 1967 Sr. Lucy were submitted for analysis.

Facial analysis **“strongly suggests that Subject A and Subject B are photographs from two different individuals.”** Hence whereas the iPRoBe analysis was not able to distinguish between the two, the Animetrics analysis “strongly suggests” they are different.

Specifically, nose length and philtrum length differ, which agree with the findings of Lois Gibson, the forensic artist. The eyebrow shapes are significantly different enough for the software to consider the Sr. Lucys as two different individuals. Lastly, the report also notes the different shapes of the two Sr. Lucys’ mouths.

Conclusions

The Animetrics report notes that its software does not use algorithms to account for age. However, as we have seen from other reports, the specific differences in appearance between the two Sr. Lucys are overwhelmingly elements that cannot be accounted for by the aging process or dental work.

Both the Animetrics and iPRoBe labs are well-established leaders in their field. Like the iPRoBe analysis, the Animetrics report is one more independent study that supports the hypothesis of two Sr. Lucys.

Handwriting Analysis

Bart Baggett

Bart Baggett is a forensic document examiner and skilled authority in handwriting identification. He has examined over 14,000 documents for over 880 cases and is a court qualified expert witness in the field of questioned documents.

Report Findings

Mr. Baggett was given handwriting samples known to be written by the pre-1950 Sr. Lucy, specifically, photographs and scans of letters and excerpts from her *Memoirs*, dated between May 1941 and December 1955. He was also given signature samples from documents dating between 1927 to 1955.

Baggett extensively compared these known writing samples with questioned documents, specifically:

1. The 2000 text of the Third Secret released by the Vatican
2. A letter written to Dr. Alcino Magelhaes, Sr. Lucy's former dentist, dated December 27, 1969
3. Excerpts from an unpublished, post-1967 manuscript by "Sr. Lucy" called *O meu caminho* or in English, *My Way* or *My Pathway*
4. A copy of a letter to Fr. Umberto Pasquale, dated April 13, 1980
5. A copy of signatures from "Sr. Lucy's" *Memoirs*, dated 1967 and 1969

Baggett found that all post-1960 writing samples submitted **were by another hand** than the pre-1960 writings. He gives an extensive analysis, comparing letter formation, the angle of slants, etc. His analysis includes a consideration of the pens used as well as common characteristics of native Portuguese writing from the time period.

More than this, he found that **all the post-1960 writings are internally consistent**, meaning they were written by the same hand. The findings of the handwriting analysis conclusively demonstrate that the same "Sr. Lucy" was writing between 1967 and 1980 at least.

The Analysis of the Third Secret Text

The analysis that Baggett conducts on the Third Secret, however, is astounding. He finds that the handwriting is consistent with the samples of Sr. Lucy's handwriting from the 1940s, specifically from the *Third Memoir*, wherein the First and Second Secrets are written. This suggests that the released Third Secret is an authentic text written in the real Sr. Lucy's hand.

Many problems still remain, specifically the matter of interpretation. The first two Secrets have an explanation from Sr. Lucy herself, but the Third Secret does not. It is only

explained by Cardinals Sodano, Bertone, and Ratzinger, with whom “Sr. Lucy” reportedly agreed. This opens up the possibility of Antonio Socci’s “4th Secret of Fatima” hypothesis. However, it’s not the purpose of this presentation to draw out possible theological conclusions. We’re simply reporting the evidence.

Conclusions

Putting aside the matter of the Third Secret text, we know from handwriting analysis that the post-1960 writings are definitely by a different hand than the pre-1960 Sr. Lucy. What is the most reasonable explanation for this difference except that there was **another person posing as Sr. Lucy?**

Conclusion

The Undeniable Conclusion of These Findings

All of these reports and analyses agree: there are at least two individuals, one certainly before and after 1967. All of these reports were conducted by experts and leaders in their respective fields, whose professional reputations are on the line. If the theory of two individuals were so forced or absurd, one would expect there to be a greater divergence in the reports. But instead we find nearly complete agreement. Not only that, but as we pointed out, several experts independently pointed out the same differences between the two Sr. Lucys: aging and dental work cannot account for all differences of appearance.

We have further proof of the objectivity of these reports since we also received results that were unexpected:

1. The iPRoBe report was not entirely consistent even though the logic and overall findings support the existence of two Sr. Lucys.
2. The handwriting analysis found the Vatican text of the Third Secret to be consistent with Sr. Lucy's handwriting from the 1940s.

Despite all the logistical concerns regarding the replacement of the real Sr. Lucy with an impostor, how, when, and by whom precisely this switch was conducted, how the coverup was maintained, and why those closest to Sr. Lucy remained silent after the replacement, **what remains undeniable at this point is the scientific evidence and the testimony of multiple medical experts that there were two Sr. Lucys.** Every other difficulty may remain shrouded in mystery, but the evidence speaks for itself and cannot be reasonably explained away by the idea that there was always only one Sr. Lucy.

In short, from this point forward, we must accept that there were at least two individuals, and the results of our findings are exactly what one would expect if **the most reasonable explanation for the changes in Sr. Lucy before and after 1960 was the existence of an impostor.**

Objections and Responses

How is this not simply another crazy conspiracy theory?

Given all of the misinformation in the world, the confusion, and the opportunity for any obscure person to broadcast his ideas across the internet, no matter how bizarre, this is an understandable reaction. Initially we did not accept the theory of two Sr. Lucys, and we would not believe it ourselves—if it wasn't for the undeniable force of the evidence.

We simply ask the reader to evaluate the evidence presented here, which speaks for itself. Unlike with some conspiracy theories that one may encounter elsewhere, the experts and labs that we have commissioned are not obscure individuals or groups that have been dismissed from the wider scientific community. They are well-established leaders and notable experts in good repute within each of their respective fields. They have generously agreed to have their names attached to their work, putting their professional reputations on the line. Lastly, they are not personally invested in the results of this work.

SLT makes no attempt to draw theological conclusions from our findings. We simply wish to present the truth.

Why focus on this issue? Isn't it so small compared to everything going on in the world and the Church today?

There are several points of response to this important question. First, we have to look at the political and ecclesiastical consequences of this issue; then the theological implications; and finally, the historical importance of the issue of Fatima.

If the hypothesis of two Sr. Lucys were true, consider the massive implications for what has been happening in the Church over the course of the 20th century. If the highest members of the Church hierarchy have been complicit in such a coverup, the ramifications cannot be overstated. Yet we have already seen comparable corruption revealed in the past few decades with all the various scandals emerging from the Vatican. The replacement of Sr. Lucy would be one more unravelled thread to the huge tapestry of corruption and radical changes that have occurred within the Church, especially since the 1960s.

Theologically, devotion to the Immaculate Heart, devotion to Our Lady is vital in the life of every Catholic. Our Lady came to Fatima to establish devotion to the Immaculate Heart as a remedy for the calamities revealed to the seers: firstly, the vision of Hell, and secondly, the wars, persecutions, famines that would occur in the 20th century.

But from another theological perspective, the problem of Sr. Lucy's identity and the twisting of Fatima cannot but raise the question of Sedevacantism. Even conservative, mainstream Church theologians and writers take the issue seriously and respond to it.

If one studies the history of the 20th century, Fatima is at the heart of it. It touches directly upon the two World Wars, the Cold War, and the spread of Communism. It predicted the start of World War II if Our Lady was ignored. It coincided with the Bolshevik Revolution,

with the final overturning of European Christendom in World War I, and finally, with the revolution within the Church herself beginning with the first working session of Vatican II on October 13, 1962, the anniversary of the miracle of the sun. It is a matter of historical fact that Our Lady came to Sr. Lucy in 1929 specifically to ask for the Consecration of Russia as if this were the most urgent matter. “The moment has come...” she said to the seer of Fatima. We know from history what happened in those following years under Stalin’s satanic regime and his policy of *dekulakization*, which killed millions of lives. Sr. Lucy, trembling and sad, confirmed to Fr. Fuentes that 1960 would be a pivotal turning point in the history of the world and the Church since Our Lady’s requests for the Consecration of Russia had not been heeded. She was silenced, and Fr. Fuentes was disavowed.

The problems we spoke of earlier: the bizarre change in Sr. Lucy, the catastrophic changes in the Church, and all of this tied up with the dilution of Fatima over decades of propaganda and silence by the highest Church authorities. These are problems at the heart of the Church that no observant or zealous Catholic can ignore! We must answer the question: what is the most reasonable explanation for them? The identity of Sr. Lucy is emerging as a key to the answer.

We are making the small contribution that God has providentially granted us the opportunity to make. Given the severity of the crisis within society and the Church, this issue may seem relatively small, yet it is worth the effort. Few have the opportunity to study theology systematically and defend Church doctrine; few can become professional historians and publish how such dramatic changes could occur within generations; fewer still can combine these fields with the opportunity to publicize this knowledge. SLT is the simple and sincere effort of Dr. Peter Chojnowski to promote the true and the good in one small corner of the Church.

Isn’t Fatima simply a private revelation? Why can’t we just ignore all of it?

Yes, the Fatima apparitions are private revelations. After a thorough canonical inquiry lasting 8 years, José Alves Correia da Silva, the bishop of Fatima, solemnly approved the apparitions on October 13, 1930 in his pastoral letter *A divina Providencia* with the approbation of Pius XI. As Fr. Antonio Royo Marín, OP, one of the 20th century’s foremost Thomistic theologians, clarifies:

Apparitions and private revelations are not an object of Catholic faith. It is not obligatory to believe in them, and because of that, it is also not heretical to deny them.

However, the Spanish Dominican immediately adds:

*But when the Church, after long and mature deliberation, has declared as “worthy of belief” a specific apparition or private revelation, **frankly it would be ridiculous, rash, and reckless to insist on continuing to deny it without any foundation.***

As we state above, Fatima is at the heart of every significant political and ecclesiastical event of the 20th century: the overturning of Christendom in World War I, the prediction of World War II, the Bolshevik Revolution, Stalin's genocidal program of *dekulakization* and the Cold War, and the Second Vatican Council, which marked the overthrowing of the traditional Faith. The miracle of the sun is perhaps the most witnessed miracle in history. Our Lady provided this miracle to confirm the authenticity and importance of the Fatima message. As Antonio Socci summed it up in *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*:

The Fatima event has received on the part of the Church—which in general is very cautious concerning supernatural phenomena—a recognition that has no equal in Christian history.

One may certainly go on living his faith without any consideration of these facts, but anyone fired with an apostolic zeal for the state of the Church and the world would be hard pressed to ignore them!

It seems suspicious that the theory of the two Sr. Lucys never showed up until 60 years after the fact and, quite conveniently, has been promoted especially among Sedevacantists to fit their own narrative.

This objection is a textbook example of a logical fallacy called the *genetic fallacy*. The genetic fallacy is committed when a person attempts to disprove a position by pointing to how or why a person comes to hold that view and so fails to assess the position on its own merits. For example, an atheist may dismiss Christianity by saying, "You believe in God because you just want to avoid going to Hell." But a person's motivation for believing in God is logically irrelevant to whether or not God actually exists. It may just be the case that the atheist disbelieves in God because he doesn't want a place like Hell to exist! Likewise, whether a Sedevacantist wants there to be an impostor Sr. Lucy in order to bolster his Sedevacantist belief is logically irrelevant to whether there actually was an impostor.

The truth or falsity of Sedevacantism has nothing logically to do with the irrefutable force of the scientific and medical evidence that SLT has gathered. Each position must be considered on its own merits.

SLT takes no official stance on the theory of Sedevacantism. Clearly the existence of an impostor Sr. Lucy does not in and of itself mean Sedevacantism is true, but it certainly raises the question. The fact of the matter is that the theory of two Sr. Lucys has been promoted for over a decade and by people who are not Sedevacantists.

As we state in our response to the objection about how a coverup like this could be maintained for decades, the development of digital communications and the internet have provided an incredible catalyst for scrutinizing the historical facts. The determination to discover the truth of the matter by utilizing state-of-the-art facial recognition technology and expert medical analysis alone drives this project.

Will you not acknowledge the groundbreaking work of others in arguing for two Sr. Lucys?

While the analyses of these individuals may contribute in important ways to the debate about Fatima, they nevertheless hinge on the authors' personal analysis and gut feelings. When it comes to two Sr. Lucys, the analysis consists solely of side-by-side comparisons by laymen. The problem is that any other layman can come along and deny the "gut feelings" of these people with their own armchair analysis. Hence there is endless arguing about what "seems" right to each.

SLT's approach is completely novel to what has been done until now. SLT is about obtaining scientific, irrefutable evidence of the highest, most objective kind, which would even pass in a court of law. Our reports and efforts have produced precisely that. These findings cannot be dismissed as the supposed looney reflections of a lone individual but are the findings of multiple experts and state-of-the-art facial recognition technology, which all have independently come to the same conclusion.

People's personal opinions override any deference to scientific or expert authority. They say, "It seems to me...looks to me like... based on what I've read or heard..."

SLT moves past all personal opinions, which leads to endless bickering. This is why we have commissioned multiple scientific and medical experts, people who are specifically trained and competent in their fields to conduct the analysis that we have asked for. They have all independently concluded the same thing: there are two individuals.

It is simply impossible to explain these scientific findings on the theory that there was always one Sr. Lucy. No matter what a person may have read or heard, these historical changes and scientific facts must still be explained. One simply cannot account for the differences in every aspect of her life as demonstrated above with the idea that there was only one Sr. Lucy. We can take the line of Sherlock Holmes as our own:

When you have eliminated all which is impossible, then whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth.

Some dismiss the weight of the scientific evidence. Typically it comes in the form of a cynical tagline: "You get the results you pay for."

First, this is an uncharitable assumption that we have dishonest motives, and this alone should be sufficient to dismiss the accusation. But further, it ignores the fact that we have a public and professional reputation to maintain. Publicly conducting this sort of project has consequences.

The scientists and experts commissioned also have public, professional reputations on the line. Further, they are not personally invested in the results. All of them were given this material for analysis without any explanation of the desired results. They were simply asked to

analyze and deliver the conclusions based on their own expertise or technological equipment. They all independently came to the same conclusion: there are two individuals.

The most critical response, however, is that we received results that we did not expect or want, such as in the iPRoBe Lab or the handwriting analysis of the Third Secret. If we had simply paid off these experts, then all the results should be in our favor. The fact that not everything lines up as we had hoped or expected is a further proof of their objectivity.

Why don't dental work or aging explain the differences in appearance between the two Sr. Lucys?

Dr. Ruud Karsten, Dr. Julio Garcia, and Lois Gibson all independently affirm that the preponderance of physical differences between the two Sr. Lucys **cannot be explained away by dental work or the aging process**. They further state that the differences are so significant that the most reasonable explanation for them is the existence of two separate individuals. When one considers that the success of their professional careers has been based on the rigorous competence of their medical and scientific training, it would be rash to flippantly claim that they were all wrong on the same points.

Why has it taken so long to prepare and publish this material?

Money, time, and manpower are the simple limiting factors, and any additional delays come down to logistical difficulties. The handful of individuals working on this project all have full time responsibilities beyond SLT. Further, they are scattered across the United States. And as everyone also experiences, unexpected personal issues may arise that cause further delays. We don't have a dedicated team working round the clock.

Regarding the actual commissioning of reports, it has taken extensive time to gather all the relevant evidence, to confirm its quality and authenticity (e.g. we decided not to pursue an analysis of one supposed text of the Third Secret since there were too many problems with the questioned document to warrant spending the money), to plan and estimate costs, to judge the "return on investment" that any particular analysis may bring, and finally, to overcome false starts and dead ends.

It is unfortunate, but perhaps to be expected, that some have uncharitably assumed that this work is for financial gain. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact that we have taken the trouble to register SLT as a tax-exempt nonprofit organization is a demonstration of our goodwill and seriousness. All donations and expenses are set aside only for the stated purposes of the organization and thoroughly documented. Frankly, we lose money by setting aside time for this work, and we are putting our reputations on the line.

Wouldn't Sr. Lucy's family or relatives or the nuns of her convent have known that she was an impostor?

Firstly, we don't know what Sr. Lucy's family, relatives, or nuns "knew" about her, and barring the revelation of some unknown confession, we may never know. However, there are

some truths we do know. The scientific and medical evidence we have is irrefutable. All the logistical difficulties of how an impostor could be introduced are secondary details that remain to be discovered. However, we know that the relatives were never allowed to see Sr. Lucy face-to-face but always behind the grille and in the presence of other sisters of the community. Hence there was no opportunity for intimate or in-depth conversation.

If it is true that the Church replaced Sr. Lucy with an impostor, if it is possible that the Church was overrun by Communists and Freemasons, is it not also reasonable to believe that these thugs acting in the name of the Church exerted pressure on Sr. Lucy's relatives to remain silent and pretend as if nothing were happening? This isn't proof that there was an impostor. It is simply stating that we should not be surprised that a cover up would involve tying up the loose ends with whatever threats or means necessary.

Wouldn't a false Sr. Lucy have to have sacrificed her entire life in order to play a role? What could she possibly gain?

Many dedicate their entire lives to a cause, and many evil people have made incredible sacrifices for terrible purposes. Likewise, many heroic individuals have sacrificed everything knowing they would never see the fruits of their actions. The work of internally subverting the Catholic Church in the 20th century by external enemies and conspirators is a well-documented fact. Have not Communist or Masonic agents acted as priests and even prelates of the Church for the remainder of their lives? The purpose of playing such a role is simple: the destruction of the Catholic Faith itself.

Why replace Sr. Lucy when the Vatican could simply silence her?

For the simple reason that they could not silence the true seer of Fatima. Even more so, given the Vatican's 40 years of silence following 1960 and its relentless propaganda to water Fatima down into a vague and generic call to holiness, prayers, and penance, they not only needed the silence of Sr. Lucy, they needed her undivided support. Her writings from after 1960 bear this point out. She called for complete obedience to the postconciliar popes. Her adulation of these popes culminated in her 1992/1993 interviews and her supposed approval of the interpretation of the Third Secret given in 2000, all of which make the Third Secret about John Paul II, the great hero of Fatima.

They could not silence the seer. Before 1960, she repeatedly insisted in her letters that obedience to Our Lord and Our Lady compelled her to speak. They could not silence the seer who did not hesitate to criticize each preconciliar pope who failed to heed Our Lord and Lady's requests. In 1928 she wrote how "Our Lord is profoundly displeased." In 1929 she let it be known that the Holy Fathers themselves would fail Our Lord as the king of France had failed Him. In a 1935 letter to Fr. Gonçalves, Sr. Lucy's confessor, she wrote,

Regarding the matter of Russia, I think that it would please Our Lord very much if you worked to make the Holy Father comply with His wishes.

When Fr. Gonçalves wrote back in 1936 asking whether it was still necessary to insist on this point, she answered,

Believe me, if it were not for the fear of displeasing Our Good Lord because of my lack of clarity and sincerity, I would never have decided to speak so clearly.

And like a gadfly, she continued to repeat and proclaim the renewed requests of Our Lord and Our Lady in letters all through the years between 1940 to 1952 and for the final time in 1957. At the end of 1957, she said in her interview with Fr. Fuentes,

Believe me, Father, God will chastise the world and this will be in a terrible manner. The chastisement from Heaven is imminent. The year 1960 is on us, and then what will happen? It will be very sad for everyone, and far from a happy thing if the world does not pray and do penance before then.

Not only was Sr. Lucy silenced, but Fr. Fuentes was publicly disavowed. The next bishop of Leiria, Msgr. João Pereira Venâncio, said in 1960 regarding the Third Secret: “I can say nothing.” Despite Msgr. Venâncio’s final attempt in a letter of May 17, 1960 to unite all the bishops of the world in preparation for the Consecration of Russia, John XXIII ignored it.

From then on, not only silence from Sr. Lucy, but any further word from her was in total agreement with whatever the Church hierarchy wished to say about Fatima and the Third Secret. Not only was the Vatican able to finally silence the seer who refused to remain silent, but they could have her agree with any change to the Fatima message they saw fit to promote. How do we explain this complete change in Sr. Lucy’s behavior, which occurred precisely after her final interview was published in 1959?

How could a cover up this extensive be maintained over decades?

We don’t have enough information to know exactly how the cover up occurred and how it was maintained. **The only thing we have for certain is the irrefutable scientific and medical evidence that there were two Sr. Lucys.** Nevertheless, we can still suggest a few reasons how it would have been possible to get away with the substitution.

Part of what made the coverup easy to maintain for decades was the inability to share extensive photographs, videos, and samples of Sr. Lucy’s appearance and handwriting before and after the 1960s. With the advent of the internet and social media, spreading this information has become easy and instantaneous. For the first time in history, we can see for our own eyes how Sr. Lucy appeared, how she changed, as well as her handwriting.

But imagine a person “seeing” Sr. Lucy in 1967 or in magazine publications afterwards. They wouldn’t remember how she had appeared in the decades before. They would have nothing to compare her appearance with. Before instant communications and technology, Sr. Lucy could easily be hidden away in the convent at Coimbra for decades, as she was after the Fr. Fuentes interview.

Following that interview, Sr. Lucy was ordered to keep strict silence about the matter of Fatima and the Secret. The Diocese of Coimbra's 1959 note said: "Sister Lucy has nothing more to say on Fatima!" This was the last official word of the Church on Sr. Lucy and Fatima. Even when the Third Secret was revealed in 2000, Sr. Lucy didn't offer her interpretation. Cardinals Sodano, Bertone, and Ratzinger merely say she approved of their interpretation. John Haffert claimed that after 1959 the Pope had authorized only persons who had already met Sr. Lucy to speak with her again; everyone else required the express permission of the Holy See. We know that the Mother Prioress of Coimbra, shortly after the Fr. Fuentes interview, wrote to Father Messias Dias Coelho, an expert Fatima historian,

Do not ask [Sr. Lucy] to interpret what she has written or said. Ask this of the theologians, ask the hierarchy and the apostles of Fatima.

This silence on Fatima is reflected in "Sr. Lucy's" letters after the 1960s. She addresses the spiritual life, the Rosary, the life of the Church, everything else, always circling around the issue of Fatima. In a letter from 1970, she even says directly, "I must remain in silence."

As we mentioned earlier, Sr. Lucy's relatives had no opportunity for intimate and in-depth conversation. In the 1992/1993 interviews, there is no deep conversation but formulaic questions and answers that only serve to confirm the Vatican's propaganda about Fatima since the 1960s and bolster John Paul II as the great hero of Fatima.

But now with modern technology, the coverup is beginning to unravel. More people are able to educate themselves and discuss the matter. More and more minds are able to scrutinize the gaps and inconsistencies.

Support for the Sister Lucy Truth Project

SLT Depends Entirely on Your Generosity

This project depends **entirely on the generosity of its donors**. To demonstrate our good will and seriousness, SLT was officially established as a tax-exempt, nonprofit organization. All donations are reserved for its stated goals.

More reports are to be commissioned. Some are in the process of being finalized. Some experts still require payment for their services. The next step in the first phase of accumulating expert and scientific analysis is to obtain DNA samples of the impostor Sr. Lucy and her relatives. This should prove to be **definitive**, but it will require extensive planning and time:

1. Hiring of investigators for research and planning purposes
2. Research into locations
3. Travel expenses
4. Seeking Sr. Lucy's relatives and receiving permission to participate
5. Obtaining the samples
6. Hiring DNA analysts and commissioning reports
7. Formatting the reports for publishing on our website and social media

The estimated cost is \$15,000 at this point. Without your generosity, this task is impossible.

The Three Best Ways to Support SLT

If you believe this work is valuable and important, these are the three best things you can do to support the project:

1. **Pray for its success**
2. **Share** the news of the project through word of mouth, emails, and social media. Online search algorithms tend to hide this sort of material which is quickly deemed “conspiratorial.” But social media cannot prevent people from actively sharing the links to the website. Actually sharing the links, through copying and pasting, emails, social media, is the best way to spread the news online.
3. **Make financial donations**, which are tax-deductible.

Even if you cannot make a donation, please spread the word, share the links through email and social media and word of mouth.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Our Lady of Fatima, pray for us!

Dr. Peter E. Chojnowski