

# Chapter 12

## The Third Secret Predicts: The Great Apostasy in the Church after Vatican II

If, as seems to be the case—and as millions of responsible Catholics believe—there is more to the Third Secret than an obscure vision of the “Bishop dressed in White” with no explanation by Our Lady of Fatima of how it is to be interpreted, then in what would the missing part of the Secret consist? We have already suggested an answer. In this chapter, we develop the answer in some detail.

### Every Witness Agrees

The testimony of every single witness who has spoken on the question points to only one conclusion: the missing part of the Third Secret of Fatima foretells a catastrophic loss of faith and discipline in the human element of the Church—that is, in short, a great apostasy. Let us recall the testimonies on this point, which we first presented in Chapter 4:

### The Future Pope Pius XII - 1931

I am worried by *the Blessed Virgin's messages to Lucy of Fatima*. This persistence of Mary about the dangers which menace the Church is *a divine warning against the suicide of altering the Faith, in Her liturgy, Her theology and Her soul. ...*

### Fr. Joseph Schweigl - 1952

I cannot reveal anything of what I learned at Fatima concerning the Third Secret, but I can say that it has two parts: one concerns the Pope; the other logically (although I must say nothing) would have to be the continuation of the words: “In Portugal, the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved.”

### Father Fuentes (reporting the testimony of Sister Lucy) - 1957

On December 26, 1957, with an imprimatur and the approbation of the Bishop of Fatima, Father Agustín Fuentes published the following revelations by Sister Lucy concerning the Third Secret:

Father, the Most Holy Virgin is very sad because no one has paid any attention to Her message, neither the good nor the bad. The good continue on their way but without giving any importance to Her message. The bad, not seeing the punishment of God falling upon them, continue their life of sin without even caring about the

message. But believe me, Father, God will chastise the world and this will be in a terrible manner. *The punishment from Heaven is imminent.*

*Father, how much time is there before 1960 arrives? It will be very sad for everyone, not one person will rejoice at all if beforehand the world does not pray and do penance. I am not able to give any other details because it is still a secret. ...*

*This is the Third part of the Message of Our Lady which will remain Secret until 1960.*

Tell them, Father, that many times the most Holy Virgin told my cousins Francisco and Jacinta, as well as myself, that many nations will disappear from the face of the earth. She said that Russia will be the instrument of chastisement chosen by Heaven to punish the world if we do not obtain beforehand the conversion of that poor nation.

Father, the devil is in the mood for engaging in a decisive battle against the Blessed Virgin. And the devil knows what it is that most offends God and which in a short space of time will gain for him the greatest number of souls. *Thus, the devil does everything to overcome souls consecrated to God, because in this way, the devil will succeed in leaving souls of the faithful abandoned by their leaders, thereby the more easily will he seize them.*

That which afflicts the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the Heart of Jesus is *the fall of religious and priestly souls.* The devil knows that *religious and priests who fall away from their beautiful vocation drag numerous souls to hell. ... The devil wishes to take possession of consecrated souls.* He tries to corrupt them in order to lull to sleep the souls of laypeople and thereby lead them to final impenitence.

### **Father Alonso - 1976**

Before his death in 1981, Father Joaquin Alonso, who for sixteen years was the official archivist of Fatima and had many opportunities for speaking with Sister Lucy during those years, testified as follows:

It is therefore completely probable that the text makes concrete references to the crisis of faith within the Church and to the negligence of the pastors themselves [and the] internal struggles in the very bosom of the Church and of grave pastoral negligence of the upper hierarchy.<sup>318</sup>

In the period preceding the great triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, terrible things are to happen. These form the content of the third part of the Secret. What are they? If "in Portugal the

<sup>318</sup> Frère Michel de la Sainte Trinité, *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. III, p. 704.

dogma of the Faith will always be preserved,” ... *it can be clearly deduced from this that in other parts of the Church these dogmas are going to become obscure or even lost altogether.*<sup>319</sup>

Does the unpublished text speak of concrete circumstances? It is very possible that it speaks not only of a real crisis of the faith in the Church during this in-between period, but like the secret of La Salette, for example, there are more concrete references to the internal struggles of Catholics or to the fall of priests and religious. *Perhaps it even refers to the failures of the upper hierarchy of the Church.* For that matter, none of this is foreign to other communications Sister Lucy has had on this subject.<sup>320</sup>

### **Cardinal Ratzinger - 1984**

[A]ccording to the judgment of the Popes, it [the Third Secret] adds nothing different to what a Christian must know concerning what derives from Revelation: i.e., a radical call for conversion; the absolute importance of history; *the dangers threatening the faith and the life of the Christian, and therefore of the world.* And then the importance of the “*novissimi*” [the last events at the end of time]. If it is not made public—at least for the time being—it is in order to prevent religious prophecy from being mistaken for a quest for the sensational [literally: “for sensationalism”]. But the things contained in this “Third Secret” correspond to what has been announced in Scripture and has been said again and again in many other Marian apparitions, first of all that of Fatima in what is already known of what its message contains. Conversion and penitence are the essential conditions for “salvation”.<sup>321</sup> (11 November 1984)

### **Bishop Amaral - 1984**

Its content concerns only our faith. To identify the Secret with catastrophic announcements or with a nuclear holocaust is to deform the meaning of the message. *The loss of faith of a continent is worse than the annihilation of a nation;* and it is true that faith is continually diminishing in Europe.<sup>322</sup>

It is important to note that, as part of the general attempt to conceal and suppress the truth about Fatima, Bishop Amaral was pressured to withdraw his remarks shortly after they were made. But then, ten years later, and then safely retired, the bishop casually *reaffirmed his*

<sup>319</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 687.

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 705.

<sup>321</sup> *Jesus* magazine, November 11, 1984, p. 79; see the actual Italian text of the key part of Cardinal Ratzinger’s interview in *Jesus* magazine photographically reproduced on page 352 of this book (in Appendix II), with our English translation provided in the text box on page 353. See also Frère Michel de la Sainte Trinité, *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. III, pp. 822-823; and *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 37, Summer 1991, p. 7.

<sup>322</sup> *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. III, p. 676.

*testimony* in a public interview in 1995, adding a crucial bit of evidence: “Before I asserted in Vienna (in 1984) that the Third Secret concerned only our Faith and the loss of Faith I had consulted Sister Lucy and first obtained her approval.”<sup>323</sup> Thus, Sister Lucy herself indirectly confirmed, yet again, that the true and complete Third Secret of Fatima predicts apostasy in the Church.

### **Cardinal Oddi - 1990**

It [the Third Secret] has nothing to do with Gorbachev. The Blessed Virgin was alerting us against the apostasy in the Church.

### **Cardinal Ciappi - 1995**

Cardinal Mario Luigi Ciappi, who was nothing less than Pope John Paul II's own personal papal theologian as well as the personal papal theologian of his four predecessors, in a personal communication to a Professor Baumgartner in Salzburg (Austria), revealed that:

In the Third Secret it is foretold, among other things, that the great apostasy in the Church will begin *at the top*.<sup>324</sup>

To this train of witnesses we must add two others who have spoken more recently: First, Father José dos Santos Valinho, who is Sister Lucy's own nephew. Second, no less than the late Pope John Paul II himself.

### **Father Valinho - 2000**

In a book by Renzo and Roberto Allegri entitled *Reportage su Fatima* [Milan 2000], published—providentially enough—very shortly before the disclosure of the Third Secret vision and the publication of *TMF*, Father Valinho expressed the view that the Third Secret predicts apostasy in the Church.<sup>325</sup> Coming from the very nephew of the last surviving Fatima seer, who had spoken to his aunt innumerable times over the years, this opinion has substantial weight.

### **Pope John Paul II Has Twice Revealed the Essence of the Secret - 2000 and 1982**

As if all this were not enough, it is apparent that John Paul II revealed the essential elements of the Secret in his sermon at Fatima on May 13, 1982, and in his sermon during the beatification ceremony for Blessed Jacinta Marto and Blessed Francisco Marto at Fatima on May 13, 2000. Indeed, in *The Fourth Secret of Fatima* Antonio Socci argues that these papal revelations represent “a compromise solution” engineered by the Vatican, according to which it was decided to reveal the missing portion of the Third Secret *indirectly* through pointed references to verses 1, 3

<sup>323</sup> CRC, December 1997.

<sup>324</sup> See Father Gerard Mura, “The Third Secret of Fatima: Has It Been Completely Revealed?”, in the periodical *Catholic*, (published by the Transalpine Redemptorists, Orkney Isles, Scotland, Great Britain) March 2002.

<sup>325</sup> *Ibid.*

and 4 of Chapter 12 of the Book of the Apocalypse. The idea, writes Socci in an allusion to Scripture, was: “He who can understand, let him understand.”<sup>326</sup> In this way, the Vatican could assert (with a mental reservation) that the Secret has been revealed in its entirety.

In 1982 John Paul II posed this question in his sermon at Fatima: “Can the Mother, Who with all the force of the love that She fosters in the Holy Spirit and Who desires everyone’s salvation, can She remain silent when She sees the very bases of Her children’s salvation *undermined*?” The Pope then answered his own question: “No, She cannot remain silent.” Here the Pope himself tells us that the Fatima Message concerns Our Lady’s warning that *the very bases of our salvation* are being undermined. Notice the striking parallel between this testimony and that of Pope Pius XII, who spoke of the suicide of altering the Faith in the Church’s liturgy, theology and Her very soul.

Then, on May 13, 2000, during the beatification ceremony, the Pope issued this startling warning to the entire Catholic world:

“Another portent appeared in Heaven; behold, a great red dragon” (Apoc. 12:3). These words from the first reading of the Mass make us think of the great struggle between good and evil, showing how, when man puts God aside, he cannot achieve happiness, but ends up destroying himself. ...

The Message of Fatima is a call to conversion, alerting humanity **to have nothing to do with the “dragon” whose “tail swept down a third of the stars of Heaven**, and dragged them to the earth” (Apoc. 12:4). ...

Man’s final goal is Heaven, his true home, where the heavenly Father awaits everyone with His merciful love. God does not want anyone to be lost; that is why 2,000 years ago He sent His Son to earth, “to seek and to save the lost” (Lk. 19:10). ...

In Her motherly concern, the Blessed Virgin came here to Fatima to ask men and women “to stop offending God, Our Lord, who is already too much offended”. It is a mother’s sorrow that compels Her to speak; *the destiny of Her children is at stake*. For this reason She asks the little shepherds: “Pray, pray much and make sacrifices for sinners; *many souls go to hell because they have no one to pray and make sacrifices for them*”.

We have already noted that His Holiness cited Chapter 12 verses 3 and 4 of the Book of the Apocalypse, and that the reference in those verses is commonly interpreted to mean one-third of the Catholic clergy being swept down from their exalted state through loss of faith or moral corruption—and we are seeing both among possibly even one-third of the Catholic clergy today. Notice the exact coincidence of the Pope’s sermon with Sister Lucy’s warning to Father Fuentes about how “The

<sup>326</sup> E.g., “He who has ears to hear, let him hear!” (Matt. 11:15)

devil knows that religious and priests who *fall away* from their beautiful vocation *drag* numerous souls to hell.”

Therefore, it seems perfectly clear that Pope John Paul II was trying to tell us that the Third Secret relates to the great apostasy foretold in Sacred Scripture. Why did the Pope not say these things directly and explicitly, but rather in a somewhat hidden manner, in language only the more learned would grasp? *Was the Pope trying to send a signal to the more astute about what he thought was going to be revealed very soon—namely, the whole of the Third Secret?* As it turned out, of course, we received only the vision of the “Bishop dressed in White” and the so-called “commentary” in *TMF*. Perhaps the Pope recognized the strength of the resistance posed by Cardinal Sodano and his collaborators, and hoped that he would at least be able to disclose in his sermon the essence of the Secret in the hope that sooner or later the whole truth would come out. Perhaps John Paul II did not feel that he could speak freely, precisely because he had allowed himself to be surrounded by clerics, religious, bishops and Cardinals whom he had later discovered now to be untrustworthy but whom he felt unable to replace (like King David felt regarding his general, Joab [2 Kings 3:26-39; 3 Kings 2:5]), *who were* still in office and *who were* undermining the Faith, *who were (and maybe still are)* part of that one-third of the consecrated souls swept down from their high stations by the devil. Perhaps the Pope either did not know who they were, or he did know but did not think he could speak out publicly and survive for long. (We recall here the sudden death of Pope John Paul I.) Whatever the reason, John Paul II did not speak very clearly—yet clearly enough that one can discern his meaning. As Jesus told His disciples on one occasion: “He who has ears to hear, let him hear.”

In sum, a train of witnesses, from the future Pope Pius XII in the 1930s through John Paul II in 2000—and indeed the currently reigning Pope when he was Cardinal Ratzinger—is unanimous on this point: the contents of the Third Secret of Fatima pertain to a crisis of faith in the Catholic Church, an apostasy, with grave consequences for the whole world. Not a single witness has ever denied that this is what the Third Secret portends. Nor did Sister Lucy ever correct any of these testimonies before her death in 2005, even though throughout her life she had not hesitated to correct those who misrepresented the contents of the Message of Fatima.

### **A “Compromise Solution”?**

Here we stress in particular the testimony of Pope John Paul II that the Message of Fatima foretells a widespread loss of faith, and a fall from grace among the Catholic clergy of various ranks, under the malign influence of the “tail of the dragon” to which the Pope referred at Fatima on May 13, 2000—the very date on which Cardinal Sodano announced the coming publication of the text of the vision of the “Bishop dressed in white” on June 26, 2000.

Socci tells us that while Cardinal Ratzinger and Pope John Paul II

had wanted to release the full text of the Third Secret—including the 25 lines with Our Lady’s own words—they were opposed by Archbishop Bertone and Cardinal Sodano.

The Pope’s truly astounding reference to the dragon seen in Chapter 12 of the Book of the Apocalypse led Antonio Socci to conclude that John Paul II wished to reveal the entirety of the Third Secret, but that “a compromise solution was reached” with Cardinal Sodano and Archbishop Bertone whereby the still-unpublished portion of the Secret would be revealed *indirectly* through John Paul II’s sermon at Fatima, which clearly links the Fatima prophecies to apostasy in the Church by pointed references to verses 1, 3 and 4 of Chapter 12 of the Book of the Apocalypse. The idea, writes Socci in an allusion to Scripture, was: “He who can understand, let him understand.”<sup>327</sup>

This indirect revelation of the missing text to those “in the know,” combined with publication of the wordless vision, “would permit them [the Vatican bureaucracy] to say in [good] conscience that all of the Third Secret had been revealed, but without an integral explicit publication so as to avoid (in their opinion) a great shock to the Christian people, sensationalistic broadcasts and a reaction of panic.”<sup>328</sup>

### **Gateway to the Missing Text**

Now, the first two parts of the Secret of Fatima say absolutely nothing about apostasy in the Church. Likewise, the visional portion of the Third Secret, concerning the “Bishop dressed in White”, says absolutely nothing about an apostasy. If every witness says that the Third Secret speaks of apostasy in the Church, yet those portions of the Message of Fatima revealed to date, including the vision of “a Bishop dressed in White”, say nothing about it, the inescapable conclusion is that some portion of the Third Secret has been withheld. But what precisely does this part of the Secret actually say about the coming crisis of apostasy?

The logical place to begin is with the telltale phrase from Sister Lucy’s Fourth Memoir; the phrase that the Vatican apparatus has been at great pains to demote and obscure as if it were a mere footnote to the Message of Fatima: “In Portugal the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved etc.” This phrase is the only evident reference to a coming apostasy in the published portions of the Message (although we hasten to add, that even without this phrase it would still be clear from all the evidence that the Third Secret relates to an apostasy in the Church). Here, *and only here*, the revealed portion of the integral Message of Fatima touches upon the question of the *dogmas* of the Faith, and how they will be *preserved* in Portugal.

And what would be the point of Our Lady mentioning the *preservation of dogma* in Portugal if not to warn us that dogma was *not* going to be

<sup>327</sup> Ibid.

<sup>328</sup> *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 82; popular ed., p. 60; Italian ed., p. 91.

preserved elsewhere in the Church? As we have earlier suggested, the “elsewhere” is undoubtedly described in the words comprised within Sister Lucy’s “etc.”

Given that the vision published on June 26, 2000 contains no further words of Our Lady, it can only be concluded that the missing words of Our Lady are found in the “sound track”, as it were, of the Third Secret, in which Our Lady would explain the vision. The vision, it would seem, is the end result of this catastrophic loss of faith: The Pope and remaining hierarchy are being hunted down and killed outside the half-ruined city of Rome, perhaps (we can only speculate since the words of Our Lady are missing) after a nuclear holocaust. This, indeed, fits perfectly with Cardinal Ratzinger’s admission in 1984 that the Third Secret relates to “dangers threatening the faith and the life of the Christian, and therefore (the life) *of the world.*” On the figurative level, the corpses surrounding the Pope as he walks haltingly toward the hill where he is executed by soldiers would represent the victims of apostasy, and the half-ruined city the condition of the Church during this time of apostasy.

That telltale “etc” in Lucy’s Fourth Memoir is, therefore, the gateway to the missing text of the Secret in which precisely the *dogmatic* crisis in the Church is foretold in connection with subsequent apostasy and calamity for the whole world.

### **The Greatest Threat of All: The Loss of Catholic Dogma**

When Mother Angelica stated on national television on May 16, 2001 that she believes “we didn’t get the whole thing” (i.e., the whole Third Secret) because “I think it’s scary,” she was surely correct. There is nothing more frightening than the danger of a widespread loss of Faith in the Church, especially when the danger emanates “from the top” as Cardinal Ciappi, Pope John Paul II’s own personal theologian, said concerning the Third Secret. The result of this danger, if it is not averted, will be the eternal damnation of millions of souls (maybe even billions).<sup>329</sup> And who knows how many have been lost already for lack of the Third Secret’s salutary warnings and advice?

The vision published on June 26, however, simply does not express anything that frightening. The vision, in fact, expresses *nothing* so terrible that the Vatican would have kept it under lock and key for forty years. Indeed, Cardinal Ratzinger tells us that the Third Secret, as represented by the vision alone, contains “no great surprises”. That is because the surprises follow the still-hidden conclusion of the phrase “In Portugal the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved etc”—again, the very phrase the *TMF* “commentary” has removed from the

---

<sup>329</sup> See the sermon of St. Leonard of Port Maurice and the introduction published in “The Little Number of Those Who Are Saved”, *The Fatima Crusader*, No. 92 (May 2009), pp. 12ff; also on the web at <http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr92/cr92pg12.pdf>

integral text of Our Lady's words in Sister Lucy's Fourth Memoir.

Now, when Pope John Paul II spoke of "the very bases of our salvation undermined" in his Fatima sermon in 1982, he certainly meant the undermining of the Catholic Faith. We know this from the constant teaching of the Catholic Church. For example, the Athanasian Creed says: "Whoever wishes to be saved must before all else adhere to the Catholic Faith. He must preserve this faith whole and inviolate; otherwise he shall most certainly perish in eternity." The foundation of our salvation is belonging to the Catholic Church and holding on to our Catholic Faith whole and inviolate. The loss of this foundation must be what the Third Secret concerns. Every witness said so, Pope John Paul II said so, and the telltale phrase "In Portugal the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved etc." also said so.

As Our Lord warned us: "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world if he loses his own eternal soul?" If a person loses his soul for the new orientation of the Church; the New World Order; or the Masonic, man-made One World Religion; it profits him nothing, for he will burn in hell for all eternity. For this reason alone, the Third Secret is vitally important to us. It could not be any more important, because it concerns the salvation of our own individual souls. It also concerns the salvation of the souls of the Pope, Cardinals, bishops, priests, and indeed of every living person. Thus, the Third Secret concerns every man, woman and child on the face of the earth, and particularly Catholics.

We recall again that in 1984 Cardinal Ratzinger admitted that if the Secret was not published "at least for the time being" it was to "prevent religious *prophecy* from being mistaken for a quest for the sensational"—a far cry from his claim in 2000 that, according to Sodano's Party Line, the Third Secret culminated in 1981 with the failed assassination attempt. Further, the Third Secret is a prophecy that began to be realized in 1960, which Sister Lucy said was the year by which the prophecy will be "much clearer" (*mais claro*). As Frère Michel points out, a prophecy that starts to be realized obviously becomes much clearer. The prophecy, therefore, started to be realized at least by 1960. It is, therefore, a prophecy that tells us *about our time*. It is a loving warning from Our Lady, and also advice on how to respond to the clear and present danger in the Church.

Now let us look more closely at the essence of the Third Secret. As the former Cardinal Ratzinger admitted 25 years ago (in 1984)—again, before Cardinal Sodano issued the Party Line on Fatima—the Third Secret concerns, first of all, the dangers to the Faith. St. John tells us what it is that overcomes the world: he says it is our faith. *Therefore, in order for the world to overcome the Church, it first has to overcome our faith as Catholics.*

The Third Secret's essence then concerns the world's attempt to overcome our Catholic Faith. As we have demonstrated abundantly in the previous chapters, the forces of the world have conducted a major

assault on the Catholic Faith since 1960. There is simply no question about this, based on the overwhelming evidence which we have only outlined here.

Still more particularly, the Secret concerns the *dogma* of the Faith. Our Lady of Fatima spoke about the *dogma* of the Faith always being preserved in Portugal, not simply “the Faith.” Why did Our Lady focus on Catholic *dogma*? Clearly, She did so because the Secret is a prophecy that Catholic *dogma*, *specifically*, would be the target of those who would attack the Church from within and without. As Our Lord Himself warned us in Sacred Scripture: “For false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect” (Mk. 13:22). As the Arian crisis demonstrates, these false prophets can include even priests and bishops. We can cite here Cardinal Newman’s famous description of that time in Church history: “The comparatively few who remained faithful were discredited and driven into exile; the rest were either *deceivers* or *deceived*.” In such times of crisis, Catholics must adhere to the dogmas of the Faith.

What is dogma? Dogma is what has been *infallibly defined by the Church*. Dogma is what Catholics must believe in order to be Catholic. The dogmas of the Faith are what is contained in the solemn, infallible definitions of the Magisterium—namely, the Pope alone, speaking in a way that clearly binds the Universal Church to believe in what he is pronouncing, or an ecumenical council of all the Catholic bishops presided over by the Pope which issues such binding pronouncements, or those things taught by the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium of the Church.

What is meant by the *infallible* definition of dogma? The word infallible means “*cannot fail*”. Therefore, the definitions of the Faith, solemnly defined by the Church, cannot fail. We know what the Faith is, what the dogmas of the Faith are, by means of the *infallible* definitions. *If we believe and hold fast to these infallible definitions, then we cannot be deceived in those matters so defined.*

How do we know that a matter has been defined infallibly as an article of the Catholic Faith? We know it from the manner in which the teaching is presented.

### **Four Sources of Infallible Teaching**

There are four principal ways Church teaching is presented to us infallibly:

First, through the promulgation of *creeds* by the Popes and ecumenical councils, which provide a summary of what Catholics must believe in order to be Catholic.

Second, by means of solemn *definitions* containing such phrases as “We declare, pronounce and define,” or some similar formula indicating that the Pope or the Pope together with an ecumenical council clearly intend to bind the Church to believe in the teaching. Such definitions

are usually accompanied by *anathemas* (condemnations) of those who would in any way deny the defined teaching.

Third, the definitions of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, meaning the *constant* teaching of the Church in an “ordinary” manner, *always and everywhere*, even if the teaching is never solemnly defined by such words as “We declare, pronounce and define...” (One example of this is the Church’s constant teaching, throughout Her history, that contraception and abortion are gravely immoral.)

Fourth, there are definitive judgments of the Pope, usually *condemned propositions*, which are those propositions a Catholic is *forbidden* to believe. When a Pope, or a Pope and Council together, solemnly condemn a proposition, we can know infallibly that it is contrary to the Catholic Faith.

An example of a *creed* is the Profession of Faith promulgated by the Council of Trent. We present it here, conveniently arranged in the form of points, with the language unaltered:

- I, N., with firm faith believe and profess each and every article contained in the Symbol of faith which the holy Roman Church uses; namely:
- I believe in one God, the Father almighty, Creator of Heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in
- one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages; God from God, light from light, true God from true God; begotten not made, of one substance (consubstantial) with the Father; through whom all things were made;
- who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven, and was made incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary, and was made man.
- He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, died, and was buried; and
- He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven;
- He sits at the right hand of the Father, and He shall come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and of His kingdom there will be no end.
- And I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, and giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who equally with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified; who spoke through the prophets.
- And I believe that there is one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church.
- I confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I hope for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

- I resolutely accept and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions and the other practices and regulations of that same Church.
- In like manner I accept Sacred Scripture according to the meaning which has been held by holy Mother Church and which She now holds. It is Her prerogative to pass judgment on the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Scripture. And I will never accept or interpret it in a manner different from the unanimous agreement of the Fathers.
- I also acknowledge that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the New Law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and that they are necessary for the salvation of the human race, although it is not necessary for each individual to receive them all.
- I acknowledge that the seven sacraments are: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of the seven, Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders cannot be repeated without committing a sacrilege.
- I also accept and acknowledge the customary and approved rites of the Catholic Church in the solemn administration of these sacraments.
- I embrace and accept each and every article on Original Sin and justification declared and defined in the most holy Council of Trent.
- I likewise profess that in the Mass a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice is offered to God on behalf of the living and the dead, and that the Body and Blood together with the Soul and Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and that there is a change of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood; and this change the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.
- I also profess that the whole and entire Christ and a true Sacrament is received under each separate species.
- I firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful.
- I likewise hold that the saints reigning together with Christ should be honored and invoked, that they offer prayers to God on our behalf, and that their relics should be venerated.
- I firmly assert that images of Christ, of the Mother of God ever Virgin, and of the other saints should be owned and kept, and that due honor and veneration should be given to them.
- I affirm that the power of indulgences was left in the keeping of the

Church by Christ, and that the use of indulgences is very beneficial to Christians.

- I acknowledge the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Roman Church as the mother and teacher of all churches; and
- I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, vicar of Christ and successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles.
- I unhesitatingly accept and profess all the doctrines (especially those concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and his infallible teaching authority<sup>330</sup>) handed down, defined, and explained by the sacred canons and ecumenical councils and especially those of this most holy Council of Trent (and by the ecumenical Vatican Council I). And at the same time:
- I condemn, reject, and anathematize everything that is contrary to those propositions, and all heresies without exception that have been condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church.
- I, N., promise, vow, and swear that, with God's help, I shall most constantly hold and profess this true Catholic faith, outside which no one can be saved and which I now freely profess and truly hold. With the help of God, I shall profess it whole and unblemished to my dying breath; and, to the best of my ability, I shall see to it that my subjects or those entrusted to me by virtue of my office hold it, teach it, and preach it. So help me God and His holy Gospel.

As for solemn and infallible *definitions* of Catholic dogma, one recent example is the Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX, *Ineffabilis Deus* (1854), infallibly defining the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary:

*We declare, pronounce, and define* that the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instance of Her conception, by a singular grace and privilege granted by Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of Original Sin, is a doctrine revealed by God and therefore to be believed firmly and constantly by all the faithful.

Hence, if anyone shall dare—which God forbid!—to think otherwise than as has been defined by us, let him know and understand that *he is condemned by his own judgment; that he has suffered shipwreck in the faith; that he has separated from the unity of the Church; and that, furthermore, by his own action he incurs the penalties established by law if he should dare to express in words or writing or by any other outward means the errors he*

---

<sup>330</sup> The words in parenthesis in this paragraph are now inserted into the Tridentine profession of faith by order of Blessed Pope Pius IX in a decree issued by the Holy Office, January 20, 1877. (*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, X [1877], pp. 71ff.)

thinks in his heart.

Here we recall that in *TMF* Cardinal Ratzinger claimed that “According to Matthew 5:8, the ‘immaculate heart’ is a heart which, with God’s grace, has come to perfect interior unity and therefore ‘sees God.’” No, no, no! The Immaculate Heart is not “a” heart, but *the* heart—the one and only heart—of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Who is the only merely human being Who was conceived without Original Sin and Who never committed even the slightest personal sin during Her glorious life on this earth.

Finally, there is the *condemned proposition*. A prime example of this is the *Syllabus of Errors* of Blessed Pius IX, wherein this great Pope enumerated the many errors of liberalism in the form of propositions which he solemnly, definitively and infallibly condemned as errors against the Faith,<sup>331</sup> including proposition #80 (which we mentioned earlier): “The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself and come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.”

As we have shown, here too Cardinal Ratzinger appeared to contradict prior Church teaching, telling us that the teaching of Vatican II was a “countersyllabus”, which was “an attempt at an official reconciliation with the new era inaugurated in 1789” and an effort to correct what he called “the *one-sidedness* of the position adopted by the Church under Blessed Pius IX and Saint Pius X in response to the situation created by the new phase of history inaugurated by the French Revolution ...”<sup>332</sup> Making his apparent rejection of the solemn, infallible teaching of Blessed Pius IX even more explicit, the Cardinal declared that at Vatican II, “the attitude of critical reserve toward the forces that have left their imprint on the modern world is to be replaced by a *coming to terms* with their movement.”<sup>333</sup> This opinion flatly contradicts the teaching of Blessed Pius IX that the Church *must not* “come to terms” with “progress, liberalism and modern civilization.”

This abuse of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and dismissal of the *Syllabus* as “one-sided” exposes the very core of the post-conciliar crisis in the Church: an assault on *the infallible definitions* of the Magisterium.

---

<sup>331</sup> In Paragraph 6 of the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* which was issued with the *Syllabus* on December 8, 1864, Blessed Pope Pius IX stated solemnly: “Amid, therefore, so great perversity of depraved opinions, We, well remembering Our Apostolic Office, and very greatly solicitous for Our most holy Religion, for sound doctrine and the salvation of souls which is entrusted to Us by God, and (solicitous also) for the welfare of human society itself, have thought it right to raise up Our Apostolic voice. *Therefore, by Our Apostolic Authority, We reprobate, proscribe and condemn all the singular and evil opinions and doctrines severally mentioned in this Letter, and will and command that they be thoroughly held by all children of the Catholic Church as reprobated, proscribed and condemned.*” (Our emphasis) Taken from *The Popes Against Modern Errors*, (TAN Books and Publishers, Rockford, Illinois, 1999) p. 21.

<sup>332</sup> Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, (Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1987) pp. 381-382.

<sup>333</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 380.

Now, for the most part, this assault has been rather indirect. The infallible definition is usually not directly denied, but rather *undermined* through criticism or “revision.” The innovators in the Church are not so direct and forthright to declare that an infallible Church teaching is wrong. And, in their supposed “enlightenment” these innovators may actually think they are “deepening” or “developing” Catholic teaching for the good of the Church—again, we are not judging their subjective motivations. But the *effect* of what they do is obvious: the undermining of the infallibly defined teachings of the Magisterium.

Another example of this undermining is the attack on the dogma that outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation. The Tridentine creed, quoted in full above, states: “I shall most constantly hold and profess this true Catholic faith, outside which no one can be saved ...” In Chapter 6 we show how, over and over again, the Magisterium has solemnly defined the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. Yet today, the dogma is denied and *undermined* by an “ecumenism” which declares that neither the Protestant heretics nor the Orthodox schismatics need return to the Catholic Church, because this is “outdated ecclesiology.”<sup>334</sup> And in many places today, the dogma is directly denied, and in other places it is not directly denied but in practice it collapses from insidious, repeated, indirect attacks and, as a result, it is no longer believed and followed in those places.

It is undeniable that since Vatican II a host of novel notions has been passed off in the Church as “development” of Catholic doctrine, even though these novelties at least implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) contradict (or at least undermine) the infallible definitions. The idea, for example, that the Council document *Gaudium et Spes* is a “countersyllabus” that counters the solemn condemnations of Blessed Pope Pius IX<sup>335</sup> undermines the whole integrity of the infallible Magisterium. Such talk is an assault on the very credibility of the teaching office of the Church, and is thus, in the end, an assault on Catholic dogma itself.

### **There Cannot be a “New Understanding” of Catholic Dogma**

This post-conciliar attack on dogma through undermining as well as implicit and explicit contradiction cannot be justified as a “development” or “new insight” into dogma. As the First Vatican Council solemnly taught: “For, the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that they might disclose *new doctrine*, but that by His help they might guard sacredly the revelation transmitted through the Apostles and the deposit of faith, and might faithfully set it forth.”<sup>336</sup>

Further, as Vatican I taught, there cannot be any “new understanding”

<sup>334</sup> *The Balamand Statement*, No. 30, June 23, 1993.

<sup>335</sup> See footnote 331 of this chapter.

<sup>336</sup> Vatican Council I - 1870 A.D., see Denzinger (Dz.) 1836.

of what the Church has already infallibly defined:

[T]hat understanding of its sacred dogmas must be *perpetually retained*, which Holy Mother Church has once declared; and there must never be a recession [moving away] from that meaning under the specious name of a deeper understanding.<sup>337</sup>

Thus, it is a matter of Catholic Faith that we believe that *no new doctrine has been revealed by God since the death of the last Apostle, Saint John*, and that *no new understanding of doctrine* has arisen because of Vatican II or otherwise.

Therefore, this “new” doctrine or “counter”-doctrine we have heard so much about since Vatican II can only be pseudo-doctrine. This pseudo-doctrine is being taught very subtly. When pseudo-doctrine contradicts doctrines that have been infallibly defined, then Catholics must cling to the infallible doctrines and reject the new “doctrines”.

The dogma of the Faith *cannot* fail, but novelties can fail us. Men can fail; lay people can fail; priests can fail; bishops can fail; Cardinals can fail; and even the Pope can fail in matters which do not involve his charism of infallibility, as history has shown us with more than one Pope who taught or appeared to teach some novelty.

For example, Pope Honorius was posthumously condemned by the Third Council of Constantinople in 680 A.D. for aiding and abetting heresy,<sup>338</sup> and that condemnation was approved by Pope Leo II and repeated by later Popes. As another example, Pope John XXII, in the 14<sup>th</sup> Century (1333 A.D.), gave sermons (but not solemn definitions) in which he insisted that the blessed departed do not enjoy the Beatific Vision until the day of General Judgment. For this he was denounced and corrected by theologians, and he finally retracted his heretical opinion on his deathbed.

In the case of Pope John XXII,<sup>339</sup> knowledgeable Catholics (in this case theologians) knew that John XXII was wrong in his teaching about the Particular Judgment. They knew that something was wrong with John XXII's teaching because it contradicted what the Church had always believed, even if there had not yet been an infallible definition.

---

<sup>337</sup> Vatican Council I, see Dz. 1800.

<sup>338</sup> Through his negligence, Pope Honorius had been largely responsible for the spread of the Monothelite heresy by asserting that there is only one will in Christ, the divine will—an error that implicitly denies that Christ is both true God and true man—, although he understood this in a Catholic sense, namely that there could not be a conflict between the divine will and the human will of Christ. However, his formulation allowed the Monothelite heretics to assert that there was only one will in Christ and that the Pope agreed with them.

<sup>339</sup> John XXII (1316 – 1334) was a very erudite Pope who condemned the Waldensians, Jean Pouilly, Marsilius of Padova, and Eckhard, in 1331 and 1332. However, he preached that the blessed departed do not enjoy the Beatific Vision until the day of General Judgment. In 1333 he even wrote a booklet about it and sent it to the University of Paris. The King of France called in the Inquisition and on January 3, 1334, the Pope submitted and on his deathbed solemnly recanted, leaving the final decision to his successor, Benedict XII (D.S. 1000).

Catholics who knew their faith in the 14<sup>th</sup> Century did not simply say: “Oh, the Pope has given a sermon, therefore we must change our belief.” Looking at the Church’s constant teaching that the blessed departed enjoy the Beatific Vision immediately after Purgatory, the theologians knew Pope John XXII was wrong, and they told him so.

As it turned out, the immediacy of the Beatific Vision was solemnly and infallibly defined by John XXII’s successor in 1336. This placed the matter beyond all further dispute—which is precisely why an infallible definition was needed. The same is true with every other matter infallibly defined by the Church. We can, and must, rely on these infallible definitions with absolute certainty, rejecting all opinions to the contrary—even if contrary opinions were to come from a Cardinal or even a Pope.

There are other examples of Popes failing. Even the first Pope, St. Peter, failed, as shown in Sacred Scripture—not by what he said but by the example he gave. Saint Peter refused to sit at table with Gentile converts, in Antioch about 50 A.D. By shunning these converts he gave the false impression that the First Council of Jerusalem was wrong in its infallible teaching that the Mosaic ceremonial law, including the prohibition against Jews eating with “unclean” Gentiles, was not binding on the Catholic Church. This was the incident for which St. Paul rebuked St. Peter to his face in public. (Gal. 2:11)

Another example is Pope Liberius in 357 A.D., who failed by signing a Creed which the Arians proposed to him, leaving out any reference to the Son being consubstantial with the Father. He did this after two years in exile and under the threat of death. And he also failed (under duress while in exile) by wrongly condemning and excommunicating—in reality, only giving the appearance of excommunicating—St. Athanasius, who was defending the Faith in this matter. Liberius, the first Pope not to be proclaimed a saint by the Church, was wrong because Athanasius was teaching the Catholic doctrine—the true doctrine, the infallible doctrine—taught infallibly by the Council of Nicea in 325 AD. It was that infallible definition, not the defective teaching of Pope Liberius, that had to be followed in that case and must be followed now and forever. Amen!

From these examples in Church history we learn that *everything* proposed to us for our belief must be judged by those definitions. And so if a Cardinal, a bishop, a priest, a layman *or even the Pope* teaches us some novelty that is contrary to any definition of the Faith, we can know that the teaching is wrong and that it must be rejected for the salvation of our immortal souls. Yes, even the Pope can fail, *and he does fail* if he expresses an opinion that is contrary to a solemn, infallible definition of the Catholic Church. This does not mean the *Church* fails when this happens, but only that the Pope has made a mistake without imposing it on the whole Church. And, of course, if even the Pope can make a mistake in teaching some novelty, then certainly Cardinals, bishops and priests can make mistakes in their teaching and opinions.

And so, when Our Lady speaks about the “dogma of the Faith”, She indicates to us that “the dangers threatening the faith and the life of the Christian and therefore (the life) of the world”—to recall Cardinal Ratzinger’s admission—will arise when solemn dogmatic definitions of the Catholic Faith are contradicted or undermined; for it is these definitions which are the very foundation of the Catholic Faith, and therefore the foundation of our salvation, to recall Pope John Paul II’s 1982 sermon at Fatima.

To the objection that mere priests, or mere lay people, cannot disagree with high-ranking prelates, or even (in the kind of extraordinary case for which we have just given examples) the Pope, one must reply: That is why the Church has infallible definitions. It is by measuring any given teaching against solemn, infallible definitions that one can know that a teaching is true or false—not by what rank in the clergy a person has. As St. Paul taught: “But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.” (Gal. 1:8) The faithful are to regard *even an Apostle* as anathema—accursed, cut off from the Church, worthy of hellfire—if he contradicts the infallible teaching of the Church. That is why theologians were able to correct Pope John XXII (in 1333 A.D.) in his erroneous teaching from the pulpit; and it is why Catholics today can tell right from wrong teaching, even if they have a rank lower than the prelate who is committing the error.

A prime historical example of this is found in the case of a lawyer named Eusebius, who pointed out that Nestorius, a high-ranking Archbishop in Constantinople, the highest ranking prelate after the Pope, was wrong when he denied that Mary is the Mother of God. Eusebius stood up in his pew on Christmas Day, during Mass, and denounced Nestorius for preaching heresy. Yet all the “high-ranking” priests and bishops had remained silent in the face of Nestorius’ heresy. Thus, a mere layman was right and all the rest of them were in error. The Council of Ephesus was called to hear the matter, and it was solemnly and infallibly defined that Mary is the Mother of God. And since Nestorius refused to recant, he was deposed and declared a heretic. Nestorius was excommunicated!

To summarize, truth is not a matter of numbers or rank; truth is a matter of what Christ and God have revealed in Sacred Scripture, dogma and Tradition, what has been solemnly defined by the Catholic Church, and what the Catholic Church has always taught—taught *always*, not just since 1965!

### **The Disastrous Effects of Tampering With Infallible Definitions**

History likewise provides us with a prime example of what can happen to the Church when even one dogma is contradicted on a wide scale. The heresy of Arianism caused catastrophic confusion in the Church

from 336 A.D. to 381 A.D. After Arianism had been formally condemned at the First Council of Nicea in 325 A.D., the Arian heretics reintroduced it to the general public of the Catholic Church around 336 A.D. The heresy eventually claimed about 90% of the bishops before it was finally defeated about forty years later. In the resulting confusion and loss of faith, even the great St. Athanasius was “excommunicated” by the Pope in 357. Arianism was still in full bloom for some time between 360 and 380. The results were utterly devastating to the Church. However, by 381 Arianism had been defeated by the First Council of Constantinople.

The Arian crisis has much to teach us about the probable contents of the missing text of the Third Secret. One reason the Arians were able to succeed for a time, was that they “successfully” attacked a *dogma* that had been solemnly and infallibly defined at the Council of Nicea in 325—that Christ is “God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God; *begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father*”. This solemn and infallible definition is in the Credo of the Council of Nicea, which we say every Sunday at Mass.

The Arians overturned the definition by getting many of the “faithful” to argue for replacing it with a false definition that was not infallible. In 336 they replaced the Greek word *Homoousion* with another word *Homoiousion*. The word *Homoousion* basically means “consubstantial” with the Father. For God the Son to be consubstantial with the Father, the Son must not only be God but the *same* one God as the Father, so that the substance of the Father *is* the substance of the Son, even though the Person of the Father is not the Person of the Son. Thus, there are three Persons in one God—Father, Son and Holy Ghost—but there is only one God, with one *substance*, in three Persons. That is the mystery of the Trinity. The new word *Homoiousion*, however, means “of *similar* substance” to the Father. Thus, the critical phrase in the dogma— “consubstantial with the Father”—was changed to “of similar substance with the Father” or “like the Father.”

Thus the Arians brought about mass confusion in the Church by adding *one letter* to the word *Homoousion* to create a new word with a new meaning: *Homoiousion*. They attacked a solemn definition, claiming that their new definition would be better than the solemn definition. But, of course, the new definition could not be better than the solemn definition, because the solemn definition of the Council of Nicea was infallible.

By adding *one letter to one word*, the Arians got rid of an infallible definition. This opened the way for the Arians and the semi-Arians, leading to actual warfare. People were martyred, persecuted, driven out into the desert, driven into exile over this *one* change to *one* infallible dogma. St. Athanasius was driven into exile five different times by the national conference of Egyptian bishops (and spent at least 17 years in exile as a result). But he was right and the heretical bishops of that Synod were all wrong.

## **Infallible Definitions Are Higher than Any Learning or Rank in the Church**

Why did Athanasius know he was right? Because he clung to the infallible definition, no matter what everyone else said. Not all the learning in the world, nor all the rank of office, can substitute for the truth of one infallibly defined Catholic teaching. Even the simplest member of the faithful, clinging to an infallible definition, will know more than the most “learned” theologian who denies or undermines the definition. *That is the whole purpose of the Church’s infallibly defined teaching*—to make us independent of the mere opinions of men, however learned, however high their rank.

Now, in 325 A.D. the solemn definition of the Council of Nicea was infallible, but many people then did not fully realize that solemn definitions of the Faith were infallible. That is, at this time in Church history the Church had not yet issued the solemn definition teaching that the definitions of Faith are infallible. But in 1870 A.D., the First Vatican Council solemnly and infallibly defined the infallibility of the Church’s solemn definitions. Now we know, infallibly, that solemn definitions are infallible. Once again: they cannot fail—*ever*.

### **The Infallible Definitions Are Under Attack in Our Time**

In our day, therefore, there is no excuse for being taken in by heresy and giving up the defense of solemn definitions. But that is precisely what is happening today, just as in the time of Arius. *Churchmen are judging things in light of the Second Vatican Council instead of judging the Second Vatican Council in light of the infallible definitions*. They have forgotten that the infallible definitions, not Vatican II, are the unchanging standard by which one measures every doctrine, just as a 36-inch yardstick is the unchanging standard for measuring a yard. One does not suddenly decide that the new standard for measuring a yard is a 35-inch stick. Likewise, the Church cannot suddenly decide that Vatican II is the new yardstick of the Faith.

And so we arrive again, after a more detailed examination, at the crux of the Third Secret. *This* is why it begins with Our Lady’s reference to the *dogma* of the Faith. This is why Sister Lucy said the Third Secret would be “much clearer” after 1960. And here it must be noted that we are clearly living in the midst of the period of calamity the Third Secret predicts. How do we know this? We know this from four facts:

**The first fact** is that the Third Secret is really the third part of one secret. So we need to understand and read the Third Secret in context. The Third Secret starts with the words: “In Portugal the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved etc.” We also know the end of the Third Secret which is Our Lady’s words: “In the end, My Immaculate Heart will triumph. The Holy Father will consecrate Russia to Me, and she will

be converted, and a period of peace will be granted to the world.”

**The second fact** is, we know that the Third Secret is a prophecy; that is, it is a foretelling of future events. We know this from Cardinal Ottaviani who said this in 1955. We know the prophecy foretells that dogma will be preserved in Portugal, and it is implicit that it will not be preserved in other parts of Europe and possibly even the rest of the world.

**The third fact** is, we know that the prophecy begins on or about 1960. We know this by deducing from Lucy’s comment that the Third Secret, which foretells events still in the future, will be clearer in 1960. Now why does a prophecy become clearer in 1960? Because by that year enough events have happened so that when the prophecy is heard in 1960 it would be more understandable than if it were heard before the events of 1960 took place. Thus the Third Secret will be clearer in 1960 because the prophecy begins to be realized or is about to be realized in the year 1960. We now know that the Third Secret mentions explicitly a council (see *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 92, May 2009, pp. 7-11), as testified to by Father Döllinger, and Vatican II was announced on January 25, 1959.

**The fourth fact** is, we know that we are living in the period of the Third Secret because we know it started on or around 1960 (as explained above) and we also know we have not yet arrived at the consecration and conversion of Russia and the resulting period of peace predicted and promised at the end of the Third Secret. Since we are living after 1960 and we have not yet arrived at the period of peace, therefore we are still living within the period of the prophecy of the Third Secret.

### **The Second Vatican Council Announced in 1959 and the Council’s Subtle Attack on Dogma**

Now what we have seen since the Second Vatican Council is a very subtle, indirect attack on the solemn definitions of the Church. We have had a so-called *pastoral* council that refused to speak with solemn definitions and—in the view of some—actually went against certain solemn definitions. But the Council, as we have seen, wished to be “pastoral”, to avoid solemn definitions, to avoid condemnations of error, as Pope John XXIII declared in his opening speech. Well, what is wrong with that? What is wrong is that by the subtle mistake of refusing to make solemn definitions, the door is opened for a Council to use language that could undermine *existing* solemn definitions—exactly this trick was used by the Arians in the Fourth Century in order to bring about confusion in the Church. And they almost succeeded in overcoming the whole Church.

This same process has been occurring again since the opening of the Second Vatican Council. But the faithful have a remedy for the problem: Vatican II is not authoritative to the extent it did not exercise

its supreme Magisterium, its power to define doctrine and its power to anathematize error. Since it did not exercise this authority, everything taught by Vatican II that had not been taught infallibly *before* Vatican II has to be examined in light of the infallible dogmatic definitions and teachings of the Catholic Church.

However, that is not what is happening today. What is happening today is people are redefining “the faith” in light of Vatican II. It is surely this process that Our Lady of Fatima speaks about when, going right to the heart of the matter, She says that the *dogma* of the Faith will always be preserved in Portugal—but clearly lost in many other places—telling Sister Lucy that this warning must be made known by 1960, by which time the Council had been announced.

This conclusion is confirmed by Pope John Paul II's sermons at Fatima in 1982 and 2000. In 1982 the Pope said that the bases of our salvation were being *undermined*. And in 2000, in his sermon during the beatification of Blessed Jacinta and Blessed Francisco, Pope John Paul II warned us about the dangers to our salvation *today* by telling us that “The Message of Fatima is a call to conversion, alerting humanity *to have nothing to do with the ‘dragon’ whose ‘tail swept down a third of the stars of Heaven, and dragged them to the earth’* (Apoc. 12:4).” Again, where do we find this in the revealed parts of the Fatima Message? Nowhere. It must, therefore, be in the Third Secret. The Pope is telling us that the Third Secret concerns dangers to the Faith and that one-third of the Catholic clergy in fact are working for the devil and therefore dragging many of the faithful to hell.<sup>340</sup>

### **The Attack is From Within the Church**

Now we will focus on yet another particular of the Third Secret's essence. Pope John Paul II also pointed out that the attack on the Catholic Faith is coming from *within*. He said in 1982: “Can the Mother, Who with all the force of the love that She fosters in the Holy Spirit and Who desires everyone's salvation, can She remain silent when She sees the very bases of Her children's salvation *undermined*?” The word *undermine* implies a weakening of the foundation of our salvation from within. An external enemy of the Church attacks from without, an infiltrator undermines from within. In the latter case, the attack is not expected and everyone's guard is down; the attacker is viewed as a “friend.”

So we have John Paul II telling us that the Catholic Faith is being undermined from within (May 13, 1982: “the very bases of Her children's salvation undermined”) by the one-third of Catholic clergy (May 13, 2000: “one-third of the stars of Heaven”).

We conclude this point by noting that there is another source from

---

<sup>340</sup> See a traditional Catholic commentary on this Scriptural passage in *The Book of Destiny* by Father Herman Bernard Kramer, (First edition 1955, republished by TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., Rockford, Illinois, 1975) pp. 280-284. See also pages 120-121 in Chapter 9 of this book, *The Devil's Final Battle*.

which we can glean this aspect of the Third Secret. In 1963 the German publication *Neues Europa* revealed what was purported to be part of the Third Secret: that Cardinal would oppose Cardinal, bishop oppose bishop. We know that when asked whether the *Neues Europa* account should be published, Cardinal Ottaviani, who also had read the Third Secret—who had a very dry personality and was pretty much opposed to most reported apparitions—exclaimed very emphatically: “Publish 10,000 copies! Publish 20,000 copies! Publish 30,000 copies!”<sup>341</sup>

Then we have the testimony of the late Father Malachi Martin that the message of Garabandal contains the Third Secret or parts of the Third Secret. Father Martin, who knew the Third Secret because he had read it himself, and who also read the message of Garabandal, said that because the Vatican chose not to release the Third Secret in 1960, Our Lady had appeared at Garabandal in 1961 in order to disclose the Third Secret. What is in the Garabandal message? The Garabandal message says, among other things: “many Cardinals, bishops, and priests are on the road to hell and ‘dragging’ many more souls with them”. Notice yet again the concept of *dragging* souls down into hell. The same terminology appears in Sister Lucy’s remark to Father Fuentes that “The devil knows that religious and priests who fall away from their beautiful vocation *drag* numerous souls to hell,”<sup>342</sup> and in John Paul II’s sermon on May 13, 2000, which refers to the scene in the Book of the Apocalypse in which the tail of the dragon drags down one-third of the stars of Heaven (Cardinals, bishops and priests).

While the Garabandal apparitions are not formally approved, the Bishop with jurisdiction over Garabandal—that is, the Bishop

---

<sup>341</sup> Personal testimony of retired Vatican Msgr. Corrado Balducci to Father Nicholas Gruner, Christopher Ferrara and various other witnesses. This fact is also attested to by Marco Tosatti in his book *Il Segreto Non Svelato* [*The Secret Not Revealed*], (Edizioni Piemme Spa, Casale Monferrato, Italy, May 2002), p. 86.

Marco Tosatti writes: “Father Mastrocola, director of a religious newsletter ‘Santa Rita’, asked Cardinal Ottaviani the permission to reprint the prophecies made in ‘Neues Europa’. The reply was encouraging, but in the light of the ‘revealing’ of the secret of June 26, 2000, embarrassing. ‘Do it, do it’—replied the Cardinal custodian of the Third Secret—‘publish as many copies as you want, because the Madonna wanted it to be published already in 1960.’ And of that text Vatican Radio also spoke in 1977 on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the trip of Pope Paul VI to Fatima. The text of ‘Neues Europa’ received great circulation and was republished even in the *L’Osservatore Romano* Sunday edition of October 15, 1978”.

The Italian original is as follows: “Padre Mastrocola, direttore di un foglio religioso, ‘Santa Rita’, chiese al cardinale Ottaviani il permesso di riprendere l’anticipazione fatta da ‘Neues Europa’. La risposta fu incoraggiante, ma alla luce dello ‘svelamento’ del segreto del 26 giugno 2000, imbarazzante. ‘Fatelo, fatelo pure’—rispose il porporato custode del terzo segreto—‘pubblicatele quante copie vi pare, perché la Madonna voleva che fosse reso noto già nel 1960’. E di quel testo parlò anche la Radio Vaticana nel 1977, nel decennale del viaggio di Paolo VI a Fatima. Il testo di ‘Neues Europa’ conobbe grande fortuna, e venne ripreso persino il 15 ottobre 1978 dall’ ‘Osservatore della Domenica’”.

<sup>342</sup> See Francis Alban, *Fatima Priest*, First Edition, (Good Counsel Publications, Pound Ridge, New York, 1997) Appendix III, “A Prophetic Interview with Sister Lucy of Fatima”, p. 312. See also *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. III, pp. 503-510 for the text of this interview together with further explanations by Frère Michel.

of Santander—said that nothing in the message was contrary to the Catholic Faith.

### **The Attack Includes Bad Practices As Well As Bad Doctrine**

Here it must be noted that whether a member of the clergy (or the laity) is good or bad is not determined solely by whether he verbally upholds or does not uphold the Faith. Besides comparing the teaching (i.e. the words) of a priest, a bishop, a Cardinal or the Pope to the infallible teaching of the Magisterium, one needs to see if the person is also upholding the orthodox *practices* of the Catholic Church by his words (written and spoken), by his actions and by the Christian conduct of his life. One needs to know if the person (priest, bishop, Cardinal or Pope) is engaging in *heteropraxis*—practices contrary to the Faith—such as disrespect for the Blessed Sacrament.

The Faith can be attacked by *actions* done in either an obvious or a subtle manner. *Our actions must support our words.* We uphold the Faith by upholding the doctrines in our thoughts, words, and writings and also by upholding the pious practices of the Church that support our adherence to the Faith. By introducing novel practices into the local parish (or the local diocese or the local ecclesiastical province, or even into the Universal Church as Catholic Doctors have written is possible to happen) that give the *impression* that the defined Faith is not to be believed, one scandalizes the little ones and even some learned souls by this *heteropraxis*.

For example, we know by the solemn definitions of the Council of Trent that God guarantees to us that the consecrated Host is indeed His Real Presence—that is, really present in the Blessed Sacrament is the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His Soul and Divinity. Now, the Protestant rebels wanted to deny this article of the Faith and they wanted to influence others to do the same. So they reintroduced the practice of Communion in the hand (it had been originally introduced as a widespread practice by the Arian heretics of the Fourth Century to deny that Jesus is God). By this symbolic action, their denial would be clear to all.

*Heteropraxis* has been used in our day by the enemies of the Church to scandalize many Catholics into losing their Faith in the Real Presence. That is why the abuse of Communion in the hand forbidden by the universal law of the Church for many centuries and still forbidden by the law of the Church to this day is widely promoted. The recent indult [i.e. permission] to go against the letter of the law is only allowed if this practice does not lead to the lessening of the Faith in the Real Presence and does not lead to less respect for the Real Presence. But the actual practice of Communion in the hand *always does*, as we can see from our own everyday experience with this form

of heteropraxis.<sup>343</sup>

The practices which *uphold* orthodox doctrine, on the other hand, are referred to as *orthopraxis* (i.e. orthodox Catholic practices). These include: genuflecting in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, distributing/receiving Communion on the tongue, maintaining the tabernacle with the Blessed Sacrament as the primary focus of attention (and worship) in the center of the sanctuary; and the solemn behavior of the clergy within the sanctuary,<sup>344</sup> showing due reverence to the Presence of God in the Blessed Sacrament. These examples of *orthopraxis* (orthodox actions upholding the Faith) testify to the truth of the dogma that the Blessed Sacrament *is* the Real Presence of God—the Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ under the appearance of bread—as well as the proper respect of man to God.

Examples of *heteropraxis* against the dogma of the Real Presence include Communion in the hand. This form of *heteropraxis* conveys the erroneous message to the faithful that the Blessed Sacrament is just not that important, that It is just bread, and promotes the heresy that It is not the Real Presence of God—the Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ under the appearance of bread. Another example of *heteropraxis* in this area is the permanent removal of the tabernacle with the Blessed Sacrament from the sanctuary to a side room or broom closet, so that the primary focus of attention (and worship) in the sanctuary becomes the chair of the “celebrant” or “Presider” over the “assembly”. The message is subtly given, and received, that the person sitting in the chair is more important than the Blessed Sacrament. And since the “Presider” (or president of the “assembly”) represents the people, then subtly the message is given that God is less important than the people.

These examples remind us yet again of the words of Pope Pius XII, quoted earlier:

Suppose, dear friend, that Communism [one of “the errors of Russia” mentioned in the Message of Fatima] was only the most visible of the instruments of subversion to be used against the Church and the traditions of Divine Revelation ... I am worried by the Blessed Virgin’s messages to Lucy of Fatima. This persistence of Mary about the dangers which menace the Church is a divine warning against the suicide of altering the Faith, in *Her liturgy, Her theology and Her soul*. ... I hear all around me innovators who wish to dismantle the Sacred Chapel, destroy the universal flame of the Church, reject Her ornaments and make Her feel remorse for Her historical past.... A day will come when the civilized world will deny its God, when the Church will doubt as Peter doubted. She will be tempted to believe that man has become God ... In our

<sup>343</sup> See *Fatima Priest*, Editions 1 and 2, Appendix V, “Regarding Communion in the Hand”. See also *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 28, June-July 1989, pp. 33ff, 34ff, 36ff; *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 29, September-November 1989, p. 16; and *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 7, Spring 1981, p. 11.

<sup>344</sup> See “Sanctuary”, on page 379.

churches, Christians will search in vain for the red lamp where God awaits them, like Mary Magdalene weeping before the empty tomb, they will ask, “where have they taken Him?”<sup>345</sup>

From Pius XII's words, it seems then that these above-mentioned forms of *heteropraxis* against the Blessed Sacrament were explicitly mentioned in the Third Secret of Fatima, because while Pius XII relates them to the Fatima Message, they are not mentioned in *any* part of the Message that has been published. That is why they must be mentioned in the Third Secret—that is, the part that is not yet published. Pius XII clearly says that it is *Our Lady of Fatima* who warns us against “the suicide of altering the Faith in Her *liturgy*, Her *theology* and Her *soul*.” Therefore, the Third Secret warns us about *both* false doctrine and *heteropraxis* as attacks upon “the dogma of the Faith.”

### **The Attack Includes the Moral Corruption of the Clergy Which We Now Witness**

As we have seen, with the eruption of a massive, worldwide scandal involving the sexual misconduct of members of the priesthood, there is a third line of attack on the Church during this time of great crisis: the moral corruption of many consecrated souls. The tail of the dragon sweeps souls from the heavens—down from their consecrated state—not only through heterodoxy and heteropraxis, but also through immorality. Let us recall the statements of Sister Lucy to Father Fuentes:

The devil wishes to take possession of consecrated souls. He tries to corrupt them in order to lull to sleep the souls of lay people and thereby lead them to final impenitence. That which afflicts the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the Heart of Jesus is the fall of religious and priestly souls. The devil knows that religious and priests who fall away from their beautiful vocation drag numerous souls to hell.

Today we see widespread corruption among the Catholic clergy which is now being manifested in sexual scandals of an unspeakable nature in dioceses throughout North America, Europe and Africa. The tail of the dragon has dragged many members of the clergy down into the rankest forms of immorality.

As a result, the credibility of the many priests who do honor their vows and keep the faith is being destroyed, along with the very credibility of the Church as an institution. Even if there is good doctrine and good practice, the benefits of these often are negated when moral corruption undermines the credibility of the Church.

### **Who Is Responsible?**

Now the question arises: But *who* is identified in the Third Secret as being responsible for the undermining of the Faith through heterodoxy,

---

<sup>345</sup> Pope Pius XII, quoted in the book *Pie XII Devant L'Histoire*, pp. 52-53.

heteropraxis and the moral corruption and fall of consecrated souls? First of all, it is members of the Vatican apparatus itself. We note again the revelation of Cardinal Ciappi, Pope John Paul II's official papal theologian, that "In the Third Secret it is foretold, among other things, that the great apostasy in the Church will begin *at the top*." Thus, the responsibility lies first and foremost with men in the Vatican. In this, we see the fulfillment not only of the Third Secret, but also the warning of St. Pius X in his 1907 encyclical *Pascendi*, wherein he writes: "The partisans of error are to be sought not only among the Church's open enemies; but ... *in Her very bosom, and are the more mischievous the less they keep in the open*." These enemies are lay people, priests and bishops "thoroughly imbued with the poisonous doctrines taught by the enemies of the Church", and who put themselves forward "*as reformers of the Church*".<sup>346</sup>

St. Pius X insists:

"The Church has no greater enemies. For they put into operation their designs for Her undoing, not from without but from within. Hence, the danger is present almost in the very veins and heart of the Church, whose injury is the more certain from the very fact that their knowledge of Her is more intimate."<sup>347</sup>

"They seize upon professorships in the seminaries and universities, and gradually make of them chairs of pestilence."<sup>348</sup>

"It is time to tear away the mask from these people and to show them to the Church such as they are."<sup>349</sup>

But then it will be asked: "How do we know which of the clergy are part of the one-third of the stars alluded to by Pope John Paul II; how do we know who the partisans of error are?" The answer again lies in what has been infallibly defined. Those who uphold the Faith, who hold fast to the doctrine of Jesus, are friends. (Apoc. 12:17) Those who do not are foes. As Our Lord said, "By their fruits you shall know them." (Mt. 7:16) One can tell whom to trust by whether they are upholding the Catholic Faith as defined by the solemn definitions. Another sign is that they are living their Catholic Faith as well.

In conclusion, when Pope Paul VI lamented in 1967 that "the smoke of Satan has entered the Church" and in 1973 that "the opening to the world has become a veritable invasion of the Church by worldly thinking" he was only confirming the contents of the Third Secret; so was Pope John Paul II in his more veiled statements in 1982 and 2000. The second part of the Great Secret of Fatima warns of the spread of Russia's errors throughout the world. The Third Secret, in its full contents, is surely a warning that those errors will infiltrate the Church Herself, and especially taking hold through the "opening to the world" at Vatican II.

<sup>346</sup> Pope St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, para. no. 2.

<sup>347</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 3.

<sup>348</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 61.

<sup>349</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 3.

The infiltration of the Catholic Church by Masonic, Communist, neo-modernist and homosexual elements is seen in the ruinous results of their activities and the loss of faith among Catholics in the pew.

To those who scoff at the claim that such a disaster has befallen the Church in our time, we can only say that they are blind, and that they have ignored the Church's own history, which shows that something very similar has happened before. We alluded earlier to Cardinal Newman's description of the state of the Church during the Arian heresy. A more extended quotation from that description, found in his book *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*, suffices to prove that the state of affairs in the Church today is not without precedent:

The body of bishops failed in their confession of the Faith. . . . They spoke variously, one against another; there was nothing, after Nicea, of firm, unvarying, consistent testimony, for nearly sixty years. There were untrustworthy Councils, unfaithful bishops; there was weakness, fear of consequences, misguidance, delusion, hallucination, *endless, hopeless, extending into nearly every corner of the Catholic Church*. The comparatively few who remained faithful were discredited and driven into exile; the rest were either *deceivers or deceived*.<sup>350</sup>

The point of Cardinal Newman's book was that it was the laity, clinging to the defined dogma of the Faith, along with a few good priests and bishops such as Saint Athanasius, who kept the Faith alive during the Arian crisis. So it is today.

But one of the great differences between the Arian crisis and the current crisis in the Church is that the Virgin Mary not only gave us a warning many years in advance of the current crisis, but also the means to avoid it by following Her requests at Fatima. To have deprived the Church of the warning contained in the Third Secret, to have covered up the prophecy of apostasy that implicates the very men who have imposed a ruinous new orientation upon the Church and allowed Her to be invaded by the enemy, to have thus prevented the faithful from understanding the cause of it all and arming themselves against it, is another key element of the great and terrible injustice against God and all the faithful of the Catholic Church.

Yet the cover-up had not entirely succeeded. Disbelief in the completeness of the purported disclosure of the Third Secret was widespread and growing in the years following publication of the vision alone in 2000. And by the "breakthrough" year of 2006, the evidence for the existence of a second distinct text pertaining to the Secret, the "soundtrack" of the vision, had become overwhelming. Before we undertake a discussion of the "breakthrough for Fatima" that occurred in 2006, a final systematic review of the evidence for the existence of a second text is in order. That is the subject of the next chapter.

---

<sup>350</sup> John Henry Newman, *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*, (Kansas City, Sheed and Ward, 1961) p. 77.