

Chapter 14

Breakthrough for Fatima: The Revelations of 2006-2007

On February 13, 2005 Sister Lucy of Fatima died at the age of 97 (six weeks short of her 98th birthday). On April 2, 2005 Pope John Paul II followed the last surviving Fatima seer into eternity. Seventeen days later the former Cardinal Ratzinger was elected to the papacy, taking the name of Benedict XVI. On June 22, 2006, Benedict XVI appointed Cardinal (formerly Archbishop) Tarcisio Bertone to replace Cardinal Sodano as Vatican Secretary of State, and Bertone assumed the office on September 15, 2006. Following these events the “landscape” of the Fatima affair would change dramatically, as the truth about the Third Secret broke through the surface in a veritable earthquake of new revelations.

The earthquake began with the publication of Antonio Socci’s *The Fourth Secret of Fatima* on November 22, 2006, an event we have mentioned in Chapter 4 and elsewhere in the preceding chapters. As a renowned Catholic author, journalist and television personality in Italy, a prominent figure of the “mainstream” Church, and a personal acquaintance and collaborator of both the new Pope and Cardinal Bertone, Socci was certainly no friend of the “Fatimists” when he set out to write about their claims. In fact, as we have already mentioned, his intention was to refute those claims as empty “conspiracy theories.”

His suspicions aroused by Cardinal Bertone’s refusal to grant him a friendly interview concerning the Third Secret controversy, despite their prior acquaintance and collaboration, Socci began to suspect that something was being hidden. Examining the “Fatimist” claims with an open mind, he encountered the overwhelming evidence we have presented here. In fact, Socci’s book cites the first edition of this book no fewer than 32 times, along with at least 110 other citations to the works of Frère Michel and other sources on which *The Devil’s Final Battle* is based. “In the end,” writes Socci, “I had to surrender.... Here I recount my voyage into the greatest mystery of the 20th century and set forth the result I honestly reached. A result that sincerely contradicts my initial convictions...”⁴⁰²

That result is Socci’s conclusion that something is missing from the Vatican’s disclosure: a separate text of the Third Secret containing “the words of the Madonna [which] preannounce *an apocalyptic crisis of the faith in the Church* starting at the summit.” This second text is probably “also an explanation of the vision... (revealed on June 26,

⁴⁰² Antonio Socci, *Il Quarto Segreto di Fatima* [*The Fourth Secret of Fatima*], English ed., p. 4; popular ed., p. 11; Italian ed., p. 14.

2000).”⁴⁰³ It is this text that Socci describes as “unspeakable” and whose concealment by the Vatican apparatus exposes the Vatican, as he writes, to “heavy pressure and blackmail.”⁴⁰⁴

Amazingly enough, Socci recounts that he received a personal letter from Pope Benedict XVI “concerning my book, thanking me for ‘the sentiments which have inspired it.’”⁴⁰⁵ Furthermore, the Pope had not written a single word publicly (or evidently even privately) criticizing Socci’s conclusion that the Vatican apparatus, now led by Cardinal Bertone, was engaged in a veritable conspiracy to conceal precious words of the Mother of God from the Church and the world! Indeed, the Holy See has to this day observed a conspicuous official silence concerning Socci’s book, leaving Cardinal Bertone to fend for himself.

Socci’s open-minded validation of the case presented by the unjustly derided “Fatimists” was in itself an enormous breakthrough for the cause of Fatima. The promoters of the Vatican Party Line could not dismiss a man of Socci’s stature as a kook, which is why his book served as the provocation for a series of moves by Cardinal Bertone that would, as we shall see shortly, reduce the “official account” to rubble.

But perhaps Socci’s most important contribution to the search for truth in this matter was to give wide publicity to the testimony of a living eyewitness who finally and decisively confirmed the existence of “two texts” comprising the Third Secret in its totality: Archbishop Loris F. Capovilla, who was personal secretary to Pope John XXIII. Socci’s book relates how Archbishop Capovilla, now age 92 and residing in Bergamo, Italy, granted an interview to “a young Catholic intellectual,” Solideo Paolini, on July 5, 2006 in connection with Paolini’s research for a book on the Fatima controversy. During the interview Paolini asked the Archbishop whether there was an unpublished text of the Third Secret, and the Archbishop replied: “I know nothing.” That answer puzzled Paolini, who expected that “if the mysterious and never-revealed text were a fantasy, the prelate, one of the few who know the Secret, would have been able to and was obliged to reply to me that this is a completely unfounded idea and that everything had been revealed in 2000. Instead he answered: “I know nothing. (*Nulla so!*)” An expression that I imagine he wanted to invoke, ironically, a certain *omertá* [code of silence].”⁴⁰⁶ By this sly and indirect reference to a code of silence, the Archbishop himself was trying to tell us that he was bound by a certain illicit conspiracy that required him to conceal the truth. That impression was confirmed by subsequent events.

On July 18, 2006, Paolini received from Capovilla in the mail a

⁴⁰³ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 74; popular ed., p. 55; Italian ed., p. 82.

⁴⁰⁴ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 162; popular ed., p. 111; Italian ed., p. 173.

⁴⁰⁵ Antonio Socci, “Dear Cardinal Bertone: Who—Between You and Me—is Deliberately Lying?”, May 12, 2007, at <http://www.antoniosocci.com/2007/05/caro-cardinal-bertone-chi-e'-fra-me-e-lei-che-mente-sapendo-di-mentire-e-lasciamo-stare-la-massoneria.../>; English translation at <http://www.fatima.org/news/newsviews/052907socci.asp>. See also *The Fatima Crusader*, No. 86 (Summer 2007), pp. 35-42; see also Appendix III in this book.

⁴⁰⁶ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 131; popular ed., p. 91; Italian ed., p. 140.

package of papers from the Archbishop's files, along with a perplexing cover letter advising him to obtain a copy of CDF's document *The Message of Fatima (TMF)*, which Capovilla must have known Paolini, a student of Fatima, would already have. Was this not, thought Paolini, "an invitation to read something in particular in that publication in relation to the documents sent by the same Archbishop"? That intuition was correct. Among the documents Capovilla had sent was a stamped "confidential note" by Capovilla, dated May 17, 1967, in which the Archbishop had recorded the circumstances of the reading of the Third Secret by Pope Paul VI. According to the note, Paul VI read the Secret on June 27, 1963, only six days after his election to the papacy and before he had even been officially enthroned in the Chair of St. Peter at the papal coronation Mass (which took place on June 29). But according to *TMF* and the "official account" in general, Paul VI read the Secret for the first time nearly two years later: "Paul VI read the contents with the Substitute, Archbishop Angelo Dell'Acqua, on 27 March 1965, and returned the envelope to the Archives of the Holy Office, deciding not to publish the text."⁴⁰⁷

The huge discrepancy between the date recorded by Capovilla and that set forth in *TMF* prompted Paolini to telephone Capovilla, at precisely 6:45 p.m. on the same day he received the documents, to ask the Archbishop to explain the discrepancy. Capovilla protested: "Ah, but I spoke the truth. Look I am still lucid!" When Paolini politely insisted that, still, there was an unexplained discrepancy, Capovilla offered explanations that suggested "eventual lapses of memory, interpretations of what a person might have intended to say," whereupon Paolini reminded Capovilla that he [Paolini] was referring to the date of the reading by Paul VI in an official Vatican document, namely *The Message of Fatima (TMF)*, which in turn was based upon the official notes from the Vatican archive. Capovilla then gave this reply: "But I am right. Perhaps the Bertone envelope is not the same as the Capovilla envelope." Immediately, Paolini interrupted him and asked the question: "Therefore, both dates are true, because there are two texts of the Third Secret?" After a brief pause of silence, the Archbishop gave the explosive answer that confirmed the existence of a missing envelope and missing text of the Third Secret of Fatima: "Exactly so! (*Per l'appunto!*)."⁴⁰⁸

The "confidential note" completely corroborated Capovilla's testimony. According to the note recounting events on the date Pope Paul read the Secret (June 27, 1963), Monsignor Angelo Dell'Acqua—the same "Substitute" referred to in *TMF*—telephoned Capovilla to ask: "I am looking for the Fatima envelope. Do you know where it is kept?"⁴⁰⁹ The note records that Capovilla replied: "It is in the right hand

⁴⁰⁷ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 131; popular ed., p. 91; Italian ed., p. 141; and citing *TMF*, p. 15 (English ed.).

⁴⁰⁸ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 132; popular ed., p. 92; Italian ed., p. 142.

⁴⁰⁹ Notice Dell'Acqua evidently had reason to presume that the envelope was somewhere

drawer of the writing desk called Barbarigo, *in the bedroom.*” That is, the envelope was in the former bedroom of John XXIII, which was now the bedroom of Paul VI; it was *not* in the Holy Office archives. The note further records that the “Fatima envelope” *was found in that desk:* “An hour later, Dell’Acqua telephoned me again. Everything is fine. The envelope has been retrieved.” Finally, the note records that in an audience the next day Paul VI asked Capovilla directly: “Why is your name on the envelope?” Capovilla replied: “John XXIII asked me to inscribe a note concerning the manner of arrival of the envelope in his [Pope John’s] hands and the names of all those to whom he considered it necessary to make it known.”⁴¹⁰ Further, Pope John directed him to write on the outside of “the envelope” (*plico*) or “wrapping” (*involucro*): “I leave it to others to comment or decide.”⁴¹¹

Thus, we now know for certain that a text of the Third Secret was kept in the papal bedchamber, was read by Paul VI on June 27, 1963, and was contained in an envelope on which Archbishop Capovilla had noted his name and the names of others at the instruction of Pope John XXIII and the papal dictation “I leave it to others to comment or decide.” Hence not only John Paul II, but also Paul VI read two texts of the Third Secret on two different dates.

It is opportune to mention here another circumstance whose significance had been little noted before the publication of Socci’s book: In 1960 Pope John read a text of the Secret he had no trouble understanding without assistance, but then, according to Archbishop Capovilla, in August 1959 the Pope read a text that contained difficult Portuguese dialect expressions requiring a translation by Monsignor Paulo José Tavares.⁴¹² As Socci concludes: “These two opposed pieces of information can be explained by considering that the matter involves two readings of two different texts.”⁴¹³ Pursuing this lead, Socci obtained the services of a Portuguese linguist, Professor Mariagrazia Russo, who analyzed the text of the vision published by the Vatican in 2000. In an appendix to Socci’s book, the professor states her conclusion that the text of the vision contains *no* difficult expressions of Portuguese dialect. Ergo, the text John XXIII had difficulty reading would be the one he kept in his desk drawer.

So, it is now known that *three* Popes (John XXIII, Paul VI and John Paul II) read texts of the Third Secret on *two* different occasions—many

in the papal apartment, not in the Holy Office archive, of which Capovilla was not the custodian. Otherwise, Dell’Acqua would have asked the custodian of the archive, Cardinal Ottaviani, where the “Fatima envelope” was, rather than Capovilla, Pope John’s former personal secretary.

⁴¹⁰ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 133; popular ed., p. 93; Italian ed., p. 143.

⁴¹¹ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 133; popular ed., p. 93; Italian ed., pp. 143, 165.

⁴¹² See the August 17, 1959 and second 1960 entries in the Appendix to this book, “A Chronology of the Fatima Cover-up”. See also *WTAF* - Vol. III, pp. 555 and 568ff and *Prospettive nel mondo*, VI, 1991, cited in *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 139; popular ed., p. 96; Italian ed., p. 149.

⁴¹³ *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, English ed., p. 139; popular ed., p. 97; Italian ed., p. 150.

months, even years apart—during their respective pontificates, whereas the “official account” in *TMF* of the history of the Secret claims only *one* reading by each Pope.⁴¹⁴ This can hardly be a coincidence or an error of historical record somehow repeated three times in a row. The mention of a second reading by each Pope can only have been omitted from the “official account” because *we were not meant to know of that second reading*, which points unmistakably to the existence of two different texts pertaining to one and the same Third Secret of Fatima, one of which has not been revealed.

So, on the basis of Capovilla’s testimony alone, it has been established beyond doubt that there are two envelopes which hold between them the entire contents of the Third Secret of Fatima: the “Bertone envelope,” kept in the Holy Office archives, whose contents were published on June 26, 2000, and the “Capovilla envelope,” whose contents remain unpublished, kept in the papal bedchamber, as long ago confirmed by the photographs in *Paris-Match* magazine, the statement of Sister Pasqualina, and now, beyond any doubt, the testimony and documentation of Archbishop Capovilla.

Now, *the Vatican has never produced the “Capovilla envelope”* and the text of the Secret that it contains. Yet, as we are about to see, Cardinal Bertone has been forced to admit the Capovilla envelope’s existence, *even as he fails to produce it*. This fact alone deprives the “official account” of all credibility.

Socci rightly observes that Archbishop Capovilla’s testimony provides “the only possible explanation” for the many discrepancies (most of which have already been noted in the previous chapter) concerning the date of reception, format and location of the document at issue, as revealed in the accounts presented up to this point. To recapitulate:

- a document written on January 3, 1944—the date of the document published by the Vatican in 2000—and another document that was not ready until January 9, 1944, which has yet to be published;
- a document which arrived at the Holy Office on April 4, 1957, published by the Vatican in 2000, and a second document, not yet published, which arrived at the Vatican on April 16, 1957;
- a document lodged in the Holy Office archives—the published vision—and a different document lodged in the papal apartment of Pius XII;
- a document Pope John XXIII “understood completely” without need of a translation and which contains no difficult dialect expressions—the one published in 2000—and another document whose dialect expressions had to be translated for Pope John XXIII by Monsignor

⁴¹⁴ The evidentiary chart in Chapter 13 can be supplemented to reflect the reading of two different texts at two different times by both John XXIII and Paul VI as well as John Paul II, so that the chart would depict, not ten, but an even dozen facts in support of the “two texts” deduction.

Tavares;

- a document read by John XXIII and returned to the Holy Office archives, that being the vision published in 2000, and another document which never left Pope John's apartment and was still in his bedroom writing desk when Paul VI took office, as Archbishop Capovilla attests;
- a document Paul VI read on March 27, 1965 and then returned to the Holy Office archives—that is, the published vision—and a different document Pope Paul read on June 27, 1963, having retrieved it from the writing desk called “Barbarigo” in the papal bedchamber, as Archbishop Capovilla has revealed;
- a four-page⁴¹⁵ document containing 62 lines of text, produced by the Vatican in 2000, but also a one-page document in the form of “a letter to the Bishop of Leiria,” containing 25 lines of text, as attested to by Bishop Venancio, Cardinal Ottaviani and others, which we have not yet seen;
- the description of a vision published on June 26, 2000 which records no words spoken by Our Lady, and another document containing “*the words* which Our Lady confided as a secret to the three little shepherds in the Cova da Iria,” suppressed in 1960 and unpublished to this day;
- a document (per Pius XII's emissary, Father Schweigl) that “concerns the Pope,” published in 2000, and another document, not yet published, that contains “the logical continuation of the *words*: ‘In Portugal, the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved etc.’”;
- a document in which Our Lady says nothing to Lucy, that being the published vision, and a different document which (per Cardinal Ottaviani, who read the Secret) contains “what Our Lady *told her* [Sister Lucy] to tell the Holy Father”;⁴¹⁶
- a document from the Holy Office archives read in July 1981 by Pope John Paul II in the hospital after the assassination attempt and then published in 2000, and another document the Pope read in 1978 within days of his election, not found in the archives.

Bertone's Campaign to Save the “Official Account”

Unlike the unjustly marginalized “Fatimists,”⁴¹⁷ Socci simply could

⁴¹⁵ See footnote 368.

⁴¹⁶ Once again, the operative words are “what Our Lady *told her*,” not the Cardinal's interpolation “to tell the Holy Father.”

⁴¹⁷ Marginalized by the illegal and immoral campaign (orchestrated by the Secretary of State) of lies, innuendoes, and half-truths which continue to this day. See, for example, Francis Alban and Christopher A. Ferrara, *Fatima Priest* (Pound Ridge, New York: Good Counsel Publications, 2001, Fourth Edition), which chronicles this vile campaign from 1981 to 2001.

not be ignored. Then again, how could he be answered without great risk to the “official account” in the form of further discrepancies, telling silences and inadvertent disclosures? In the course of Cardinal Bertone’s efforts to limit the damage Socci had caused to the Party Line, there would in fact be innumerable such missteps, resulting (for those who trouble themselves to investigate the matter) in a complete demolition of the “official” version of the Third Secret.

It is impossible here to detail all of the “ins and outs” of Bertone’s failed campaign to keep the lid on the Third Secret controversy, which was lifted sensationally by *Fourth Secret* and Capovilla’s frank testimony. For a complete account one would need an entire book in itself, such as the one Socci himself has written or the investigation published by the Catholic attorney and commentator Christopher A. Ferrara, cited previously, which (like *Fourth Secret*) has been published in both Italy and America.⁴¹⁸ Or one could take an hour to watch a documentary film, *The Secret Still Silenced*, in either English or Italian to obtain a good overview of the facts spelled out in detail by Socci and Ferrara. For our purposes it suffices to touch upon the major developments in 2006-2007, the time period of Bertone’s ill-fated campaign to save the “official account.” Those developments support no reasonable conclusion but that a text pertaining to the Secret has been suppressed.

A Book that Answers Nothing

Cardinal Bertone’s first move was to rush into print on May 10, 2007 a book of his own, *L’Ultima Veggente di Fatima (The Last Visionary of Fatima)*, to “answer” Socci’s accusation that he and the Vatican are concealing a text of the Secret. The book was in the form of an interview by Giuseppe De Carli, a “Vaticanista” (reporter on the Vatican beat) and ardent admirer of the Cardinal, whose fawning questions not only posed no real challenge to the Cardinal, but actually assisted him in promoting what Socci had called “the official reconstruction” of the Third Secret.

As Socci shows in his response to Bertone’s book on May 12, 2007 in the Italian newspaper *Libero*,⁴¹⁹ Bertone’s effort is a major embarrassment to him and to the Vatican—a disaster, in fact, because it leaves untouched the entire case in support of the thesis that the Vatican is hiding part of the Secret, while raising still more doubts about Bertone’s credibility. At the same time, Bertone demeans his high office by recklessly hurling invective at Socci, pronouncing his contentions

⁴¹⁸ Cf. Christopher A. Ferrara, *The Secret Still Hidden*, which systematically presents every pertinent detail of the events following the publication of *Fourth Secret* and the Cardinal’s efforts to rebut Socci’s book and the “Fatimist” evidence it presents. This chapter incorporates a portion of Mr. Ferrara’s text with his kind permission.

⁴¹⁹ Socci, “Dear Cardinal Bertone: Who—Between You and Me—is Deliberately Lying?”, May 12, 2007 edition of the Italian newspaper *Libero*; at <http://www.antoniosocci.com>; also available photographically reproduced from the publisher of this book. English translation at <http://www.fatima.org/news/newsviews/052907socci.asp>; see also *The Fatima Crusader*, No. 86 (Summer 2007), pp. 35-42.

“ravings,” calling him a deliberate liar (“*mendace*”), and even accusing him of the tactics of Freemasonry, which has to be one of the most ironic remarks of the post-conciliar epoch. Bertone acts like a desperate, wounded man instead of the Vatican Secretary of State.

Bertone’s *Last Visionary* is essentially 140 pages of meandering “answers” in which Bertone fails to address the merits of a single one of Socci’s well-supported arguments. For example, as to the key contention that the missing words of the Virgin are found within Sister Lucy’s “etc.,” Bertone does nothing more than restate the contention without answering it. Small wonder, for it was Bertone and his collaborators who (as Socci discusses in his own book) deliberately evaded the telltale “etc.” by detaching it from the integral text of the Fatima Message and relegating it to a footnote without explanation in Bertone’s *TMF*, the so-called “official commentary” on the Third Secret.

To take another example, regarding the substantial evidence (including three eyewitnesses and a photograph) that the missing 25-line, one-page text containing the Virgin’s words was kept separately in the papal bedchamber rather than in the Holy Office archives, where the 62-line, four-page text of the vision was maintained, Bertone ducks the issue by stating that a one-page text was never in the archives, while saying nothing about what, if anything, was in the papal bedchamber. Having conspicuously failed to deny that a missing text was in the bedchamber, Bertone suddenly announces, for the first time ever, that some seven years ago Sister Lucy told him during an unrecorded interview that the four-page text of the vision “is the Third Secret and I have never written other.”

We are asked to believe that Sister Lucy uttered this never-before-mentioned phrase during one of three interviews conducted by Bertone, totaling ten hours, which, as Socci’s response notes, were “incredibly ... not taped, nor filmed, nor transcribed.” Bertone claims, however, that he “took notes”—a total of four minutes’ worth of phrases out of ten hours of alleged conversation. Socci rightly asks: “Why was such an important phrase not reported by Bertone in the official publication [in 2000]?” Moreover, why was it not reported until Sister Lucy was dead, and could no longer deny anything? As Socci shows with this and other examples of alleged statements by Sister Lucy during the purported interviews, Bertone’s mysterious “notes” rather conveniently yield just what Bertone needs, just when he needs it—and not a moment sooner. Yet somehow not one of the same alleged statements of Sister Lucy found its way into the Vatican commentary of 2000, where they would have handily supported the Vatican’s position. Indeed, Sister Lucy was kept incommunicado throughout the “revelation” of the Third Secret in that year, even though she was the only living witness to its true contents.

Socci’s response poses the \$64,000 question that Bertone continues to duck: “[W]hy did the prelate not ask the visionary if she had ever written the sequel to the mysterious words of the Virgin suspended by

et cetera ("In Portugal the dogma of the faith will always be preserved") which have always been considered by the experts the beginning of the Third Secret? Very strange." Or perhaps Bertone did ask her, and got an answer he does not wish us to know. Perhaps the answer is in his "notes." But don't expect these "notes" ever to see the light of day.

As Socci further observes in his reply, Bertone's book not only fails to answer any of the points he raised in *Fourth Secret*, but also "poses further problems. I was even embarrassed to read a thing so bungled and self-wounding." For example, in order to bolster the Vatican Party Line that the Message of Fatima (and thus the Third Secret) belongs to the past because Russia has already "converted," Bertone "credits the rumor that Gorbachev, in the historic visit to Pope Wojtyla of December 1, 1989, 'made a *mea culpa*' before the Pope"—a myth that was "officially denied by the Vatican Press Office on March 2, 1998."

Another self-inflicted wound is Bertone's statement (in his book, *Last Visionary*, on page 89 of the English edition and page 101 of the Italian edition) that "Sister Lucy never worked with a computer." Here Bertone forgets that, when it was expedient for him to do so, he asserted precisely the opposite: that Sister Lucy "even used a computer" in 1989—a claim that, as Socci notes, "served to accredit certain letters that Sister Lucy had not written in her own hand and which contradicted everything she had said before on the consecration of Russia." Bertone has thus undermined all claims that Sister Lucy was the author of those letters, especially the alleged letter of November 8, 1989 to Mr. Noelker, cited in *TMF* as the sole evidence for claiming that the Consecration of Russia was done in 1984.

The damning omissions, admissions and inconsistencies in Bertone's attempt to answer Socci only reinforced Socci's conviction (and millions of others) that, as he states in his reply to *Last Visionary*, "It is evident that the 'Fourth Secret' of Fatima (or rather the hidden part of the Third) exists and in my book I think that I have demonstrated it."

But Socci is not pleased by his vindication through Bertone's flailing and ineffectual attacks. As he explains:

For any author it would be a coup to see himself personally attacked by the Secretary of State without even a trace of argument. But for me it is a disaster, because I am first of all a Catholic before being a journalist. I would have preferred ... to be confuted. Or else I would have wanted the Holy See to reveal the whole truth about the "Third Secret" of Fatima, publishing—as the Madonna requested—the part still hidden. Otherwise I would have preferred to be ignored, snubbed, boycotted. It is one thing to be mistaken, another to evade, and that is precisely what Bertone has done: publicly exposing himself without responding to anything and on the contrary adding disastrous findings. For him and for the Vatican.⁴²⁰

⁴²⁰ Socci, "Dear Cardinal Bertone: Who—Between You and Me—is Deliberately Lying?", loc. cit.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this development: a prominent and unimpeachable Catholic journalist and intellectual has publicly accused the Vatican of hiding a text containing a prophecy of the Virgin concerning apostasy in the Church and perhaps apocalyptic events for the world at large, and the Vatican offers no defense to the charge except a rambling collection of evasions and insults uttered by its Secretary of State.

Bertone's book boasts an introduction in the form of a letter from Pope Benedict, which tellingly avoids any details of the controversy. But, in a thickening of the plot, Socci reveals that he has received a letter from the Pope "concerning my book, thanking me for 'the sentiments which have suggested it.'" Socci says that the Pope's words are "comforting before the insults and coarse accusations" Bertone has hurled at him.

While Socci is understandably comforted by the Pope's letter, however, it raises troubling questions: Why would the Pope thank Socci for a book that accuses the Vatican Cardinal Secretary of State of censoring the very words of the Mother of God and at the same time send a generic letter of apparent support to the same Secretary of State for his book which includes an attack on Socci, filled with insults and evasions that only confirm the suspicions of the faithful? If what Bertone says is true and what Socci says is false, then why did the Pope's letter to Socci apparently contain not a word of rebuke or correction? There is only one reasonable answer: *the Pope knows that Socci is onto something*, and thus the Pope cannot bring himself to condemn his book. And that is precisely why neither the Pope nor the Holy See has issued any official pronouncement against *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*. That official silence is thunderous, and in itself is confirmatory of the entire "Fatimist" position.

The Cover-Up Collapses

Recognizing that his book had failed to control the damage to the "official account" provoked by Socci's book, Bertone's next move was an utterly extraordinary television appearance to attack Socci's book. On May 31, 2007 Bertone appeared on *Porta a Porta* ["Door to Door"], Italy's most popular talk show, as the guest on a segment entitled "The Fourth Secret of Fatima Does Not Exist." While the title of the show was a direct reference to Socci's *Fourth Secret*, Socci was not invited to participate, evidently because the Cardinal would not allow himself to be subjected to any difficult questions.

Bertone appeared as a guest like any other, on a remote feed from his Vatican office and without any official mission from the Holy See, which had said absolutely nothing about Socci's book (apart from the personal letter of acknowledgment the Pope had sent Socci). His appearance was billed as a sensational on-camera display of the Third Secret documents that would supposedly end the controversy once and for all. In fact, the display of documents on live television and Bertone's own statements were utterly devastating to Bertone's version of events.

A complete account of this fateful telecast is not possible here.⁴²¹ We focus on only four of the most important revelations, which suffice to show beyond question that a text of the Secret remains, as Socci puts it, “well hidden”⁴²² in the Vatican:

The **first revelation**, by Cardinal Bertone on *Porta a Porta*, is that there are *two* sealed envelopes which Sister Lucy prepared for the Third Secret. Each envelope had three large wax seals on the back of the envelope, besides being glued closed in the usual way. Bertone displayed both envelopes, front and back, on camera (see the photos on page XV in the photo section).

The **second revelation** is that each of these two envelopes shown during that telecast contains the identical order in Lucy's own handwriting with the exact same words: “By express order of Our Lady, this envelope can only be opened in 1960 [only] by the Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon or the Bishop of Leiria.” We can distinguish between these two envelopes because on one envelope the words “Nossa Senhora” (Our Lady) are both on the same line, whereas on the other envelope “Nossa” and “Senhora” are on different lines (see page XV in the photo section for the photos of these two envelopes).

These first two revelations were enough to destroy the “official account.” We note, first of all, that for the seven years preceding the May 31, 2007 telecast—beginning with publication of *TMF* on June 26, 2000—Bertone had represented to the world that Sister Lucy “confessed” to him that she had never received any directive from the Virgin regarding disclosure of the Secret in 1960. Bertone had made this claim both in *TMF* and in his book *Last Visionary*.⁴²³ The claim that Lucy “confessed” that she had simply invented a connection of the Secret to the year 1960—which would make the seer a liar—was clearly intended to accomplish three purposes: (1) severing any connection between the Secret and that year, in which the Second Vatican Council had recently been announced, (2) lending support to Bertone's “interpretation” of the vision of the “Bishop dressed in white” as a depiction of the 1981 attempt on the life of John Paul II, and (3) distracting attention from the salient fact that the vision has no connection whatsoever to 1960, which would lead one to doubt that the vision standing alone is the whole of the Third Secret.

But now here was Bertone on national television blithely contradicting his own representations that Sister Lucy had never received any order from the Virgin regarding 1960. As if nothing were

⁴²¹ For a complete account see Christopher Ferrara, *The Secret Still Hidden*, Chapter 8.

⁴²² Antonio Socci, “Bertone in the ‘Wasp’s Nest’ of the Polemics,” June 2, 2007, at <http://www.antoniosocci.com/2007/06/bertone-nel-“vespaio”-delle-polemiche>; also available photographically reproduced from the publisher of this book. English translation at <http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr86/cr86pg43.asp>; see also *The Fatima Crusader*, No. 86 (Summer 2007), pp. 43ff.

⁴²³ *TMF*, p. 29; *Last Visionary*, English ed., p. 80; Italian ed., p. 92.

amiss, he had just displayed for the camera *two* envelopes referencing *precisely* such an order to the seer from the Mother of God! Either he was lying about the order from the Virgin or Sister Lucy was. Who was more likely to have told a lie about the “1960 order”—Lucy, who had no reason to lie about the Virgin’s precise connection of the Third Secret to that year, or Bertone who had powerful motives to deny that connection? The question answers itself. And given the self-evident answer, why should anyone believe anything at all Bertone has to say about the Third Secret of Fatima?

Now, as to the revelation that there are *two* sealed envelopes pertaining to the Secret, we know that Sister Lucy, on January 9, 1944, had referred to a *single* sealed envelope in her letter to Bishop da Silva (“I have written what you asked... it is sealed in *an* envelope...”). Yet Bertone suddenly revealed for the first time that there had been *two* sealed envelopes all along, with *each* bearing its own “1960 order.” What could be more obvious than that the two different envelopes were meant for two different parts of the same Secret: the vision, and the words of the Virgin explaining the vision (just as She had explained to the Fatima seers something as obvious as the vision of hell: “You have seen hell, where the souls of poor sinners go.”).

The Cardinal presented the two envelopes on camera as if Lucy had placed one inside the other, even though neither the Cardinal nor Lucy herself had ever mentioned such a curiously redundant double sealed envelope (both with three wax seals) at any time. It would hardly make sense to have created *two* sealed envelopes, each thrice sealed with wax and bearing the *same* command on the outside, in order to use the resulting two “top secret” envelopes for only *one* “top secret” text.

Indeed, it would be something of a joke to write on an outer envelope “not to be opened before 1960” only to write on the inner envelope “not to be opened before 1960.” Had Lucy done such an odd thing, Bertone certainly would have said so and would have had her authenticate *both* sealed envelopes during the meeting of April 2000 mentioned in the Introduction to *TMF*, rather than creating needless suspicion about a second envelope suddenly revealed for the first time on *Porta a Porta*.

Here it is crucial to note that if Sister Lucy *had* used two envelopes, both sealed, for the *same* text, then she and others would not have referred so consistently to *one* sealed envelope. For example:

“it is sealed in *an* envelope” (Lucy, 1944);

“It has been written and placed in *a* sealed envelope” (Cardinal Cerejeira, 1946);

“in the bishop’s larger envelope he [Bishop Venancio] discerned a smaller envelope, that of Lucy, and inside *this* envelope, an ordinary sheet of paper...” (Bishop Venancio to Frère Michel).⁴²⁴

⁴²⁴ *The Whole Truth About Fatima* – Vol. III, pp. 47, 471, 481.

Most tellingly, in his own book *Last Visionary*, ostensibly published for the very purpose of rebutting Antonio Socci's claim that the Vatican is hiding a text of the Secret, Bertone quotes Sister Lucy as referring to only *one sealed envelope* prepared by her for the text she was asked to authenticate in an April 2000 meeting with the Cardinal. Sister Lucy, reported by Cardinal Bertone, allegedly said: "This is my *envelope*, this is my writing, this is my text."⁴²⁵ As Bertone states on the same page of his own book, the "authenticated" text was contained in only *one sealed envelope* of Lucy's: "An external with the note 'Third Part of the Secret,' and *an internal of Sister Lucy's* with the date '1960.'"⁴²⁶

These admissions leave no room for argument: Cardinal Bertone and Bishop Venancio both testified to a document ensemble consisting of an outer envelope that was *not* Sister Lucy's inside of which was only *one envelope*, sealed, that *was* Sister Lucy's. On this basis alone we can lay to rest any speculation that Lucy, for some strange reason, decided to use a redundant second envelope, with a redundant second order about 1960, to contain the text published by the Vatican on June 26, 2000.

In answer to the objection that Cardinal Bertone would not have revealed the second envelope if he had had something to hide, we can only say that its revelation may have been a mishap or else a calculated effort to smuggle into the picture, as if it had always been there, the long-suspected second envelope, whose existence could no longer be denied following Socci's publication of Archbishop Capovilla's testimony about the "Capovilla envelope" in the papal apartment. In any case, the problem is not ours to confront, but rather the problem of those whose long course of conduct has been to obviously lie to us over and over again.

Since we have learned from Bertone himself (at long last) that there *are* two sealed envelopes from Sister Lucy, each bearing its own order concerning the year 1960, and since, moreover, both Bertone and Venancio attest to having seen only *one* such sealed envelope, then we are obviously dealing with two different envelopes pertaining to *two different documents*, only one of which (the text of the vision) has been revealed.

But when was the second sealed envelope containing the second document created? As suggested in Chapter 4, it could only have been sometime before June 17, 1944 when Sister Lucy delivered the entire Secret to Bishop da Silva and sometime after she wrote to Bishop da Silva on January 9, 1944 to advise of the existence of a sealed envelope and "notebooks" that were evidently to be conveyed along with it. Only one reasonable conclusion is possible: something from Lucy's notebook ended up in one of the two envelopes.

⁴²⁵ "Questa è la mia busta, questa è la mia scrittura, questo è il mio testo." *L'Ultima Veggente*, p. 49.

⁴²⁶ Notice the rather misleading suggestion that the envelope had only the date "1960" written on the outside, when Bertone had to know, as he himself revealed only weeks later, that the outside of the envelope actually said: "By express order of Our Lady, this envelope only can be opened in 1960..."

Which brings us to the **third revelation** during the telecast. As Bertone showed the camera, what the Vatican published in June of 2000 is precisely *a folio of notebook paper* folded to make four sides on which there are 62 lines of writing, not the four separate pages *TMF* had appeared to present in photocopy form. This can only mean that the other sealed envelope must have been intended for the one-page document we have yet to see, the document containing only 25 lines of text famously revealed by both Bishop Venancio and Cardinal Ottaviani as discussed in Chapter 4. That one-page document was probably found in the “Capovilla envelope” in the papal apartment—in the writing desk called “Barbarigo.” As we will see in the next section, during his own television presentation of September 21, 2007, Bertone publicly conceded before the whole world *that the Capovilla envelope exists*, yet he has conspicuously *failed to produce it*.

In the **fourth major revelation** of the telecast of May 31, 2007, Cardinal Bertone, backed into a corner, indirectly confirmed the truth of Cardinal Ottaviani’s decisive testimony. During the broadcast the Vaticanista Marco Politi queried Bertone on the discrepancy between Cardinal Ottaviani’s revelation that the Third Secret involved a text of 25 lines on a single page, and the Vatican’s claim that the Secret only involved the 62 lines on four pages comprising the vision of the “Bishop dressed in white.” Confronted by the discrepancy, Bertone not only did not deny that Ottaviani had so testified, but responded that “I was a little amazed that Cardinal Ottaviani had said categorically ‘a folio of 25 lines’...”

And, in the ensuing moments of the broadcast, Bertone offered a most unconvincing explanation of why the late Cardinal would have said such a thing. Following a four-minute commercial break during which he had ample time to consider the problem posed for the “official” account, Bertone proposed on camera what he called “an attempt at an explanation” of Cardinal Ottaviani’s testimony: that the late Cardinal had counted the first and fourth pages of the four-page vision as if it were one page consisting of 25 lines, while disregarding the second and third pages! Putting aside the utter implausibility of the claim that the very Cardinal entrusted with reading the Secret could have overlooked half its content in describing it to others, the fact is that the first and fourth pages of the text of the vision contain 32 lines in total, not 25 lines, or 30 lines if one discounts “J.M.J” on the first page and the line containing the date on the fourth page. *The “Fatimist” account of Ottaviani’s revealing testimony was thus admitted by Cardinal Bertone himself.*

Certainly, Cardinal Bertone had had ample time to count the lines in question during the commercial break. Thus, he either deliberately misstated the number of lines, or never bothered to count them but only ventured a haphazard guess. In either case, Bertone had demonstrated a willingness to “fudge” the facts in order to serve the “official” account. But if this was the only explanation he could contrive for Cardinal Ottaviani’s “categorical” affirmation contradicting the “official” account,

then in effect Bertone had no explanation at all. Thus, Cardinal Bertone's "attempt at an explanation" only further confirms (albeit indirectly) the existence of a one-page text of the Secret containing only 25 lines.

All in all, Bertone's appearance on *Porta a Porta* was a disaster for Bertone but a triumph for the truth. As Socci wrote of the telecast, Bertone had not only failed to "give even one answer" to Socci's book, but "On the contrary, he did more: He offered the proof that I am right." Not only did Bertone fail to kick a goal into the empty net on Socci's side of the field, he

scored the most sensational goal against himself: he demonstrated (involuntarily) that as a matter of fact the explosive part of the "Third Secret of Fatima" exists yet is well hidden.... For this service to the truth (although indirect) it is necessary to thank the Cardinal. And to encourage him now to tell everything because—as the Gospel explains—"the truth will make you free."⁴²⁷

The "Cardinal Bertone" Show

Facing disaster, Bertone's next move was to stage his own television show, broadcast on the Telepace channel on September 21, 2007. The press were invited to attend. Billed as a "presentation" of Bertone's *Last Visionary*—months after that book had already been presented to the public with great fanfare—this too was an unofficial initiative, with no backing from the Holy See, to discredit Socci and "save" the "official account." Socci, in fact, came as an invited journalist to the auditorium where the telecast was conducted in the hope of questioning Bertone, but was *thrown out of the building* by security guards.⁴²⁸

Part of this "Cardinal Bertone Show" was a heavily-edited videotaped segment of an interview of Archbishop Capovilla conducted, not by the Vatican, but by none other than Giuseppe De Carli, the same fawning "Vaticanista" who had collaborated with Bertone on *Last Visionary*. While the interview segment was clearly offered in an effort to counter Capovilla's testimony to Solideo Paolini as discussed above, Capovilla *failed to mention that testimony* or even mention Paolini's name, even once. On the contrary, he confirmed all of the following facts on camera:

- that on June 27, 1963 Paul VI contacted him, through Monsignor Dell'Acqua, to determine the location of the "Capovilla envelope" in the papal apartment,
- that the envelope was retrieved from the Barbarigo desk in the apartment,

⁴²⁷ Antonio Socci, "Bertone in the 'Wasp's Nest' of the Polemics," June 2, 2007, at www.antoniosocci.com.

⁴²⁸ "Fourth Secret' of Fatima: Socci challenges Cardinal Bertone, thrown out by gendarmes," Bartolini Bruno, *Corriere della Sera*, September 22, 2007. See "Bertone's Cover-up of Third Secret Continues to Unravel" in *The Fatima Crusader*, No. 87 (Autumn 2007), pp. 16ff; at <http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr87/cr87pg16.asp>

- that Paul VI read its contents on that date,
- that Paul VI *replaced the text and resealed the “Capovilla envelope,”* having left it to “others to decide,” as had John XXIII.

To leave the reader with no doubt about the matter, here is the verbatim transcript of what Capovilla said on this score:

On June 27, 1963 I was, that afternoon, with the Sisters of the Poor in Via Casilina. A worried Monsignor Dell’Acqua telephoned me. The Fatima envelope could not be found. *I replied that probably it could be found in the writing desk called “Barbarigo,”* because it belonged to Saint Gregory Barbarigo and was gifted to Pope John by Count della Torre. *Pope John held it dear, in his bedroom, like a relic.* There were on the right and on the left five or six drawers. Later, Dell’Acqua telephoned me and communicated that *the envelope had been found.*

On June 28 Pope Paul called me and asked *who had dictated the lines on the envelope.* I explained that it was the Pope himself who wanted to indicate the persons who had knowledge of the text. “Pope John did not say anything else to you?,” Pope Paul asked me. “No, Holy Father, he left it to others to decide.” “I will also do as much”, responded Pope Montini. The envelope was resealed and *I don’t know if it was spoken of further.*⁴²⁹

So Bertone had finally admitted through Archbishop Capovilla, whom he had made his own witness, that there was indeed a “Capovilla envelope” located in the papal apartment and containing a text of the Secret read some two years before the date provided in the Bertone “official account.” Yet, through his surrogate De Carli, Bertone proceeded brazenly to claim on live television that the never-produced Capovilla envelope was the same as the documentation he had already produced on *Porta a Porta*. As De Carli declared to the camera:

I conclude, therefore, there is not a **Capovilla envelope** to contrast to a **Bertone envelope**. The two envelopes are the same document.

But this was utter nonsense, since we know that the Capovilla envelope bears the handwriting of Archbishop Capovilla indicating the names of all those who had read its contents, his own name, and the dictation of John XXIII that “I leave it to others to comment or decide.” Bertone had never at any time over the previous seven years produced this envelope, nor did he produce it during the telecast of September 21, 2007. Nor has he done so as of the publication of this second edition of *The Devil’s Final Battle* (December 2009). Yet Bertone *has* shown us the Bertone envelope, and it clearly is *not* the Capovilla envelope testified to by Archbishop Capovilla in such exacting and irrefutable

⁴²⁹ Cf. Christopher A. Ferrara, *The Secret Still Hidden*, p. 187.

detail during *the very telecast Bertone himself had orchestrated*. Thus De Carli—and by extension Bertone himself—had the audacity to declare what he and Bertone had to know was precisely the opposite of the truth. And notice that it is *De Carli*, not Archbishop Capovilla, who “concludes” this, providing the “testimony” he clearly could not extract from the Archbishop since it was manifestly false.

There are other telling slip-ups in this telecast, but the details of these need not delay us, as significant as they are.⁴³⁰ For we have already seen enough in the three moves, each disastrous, Socci's book had provoked Bertone to undertake. Bertone's book and his two telecasts had only served to confirm what was already apparent: that there are two envelopes and two texts comprising the Third Secret of Fatima in its entirety, and that we have seen only one of the texts—the text of the vision—while the text containing the words of the Virgin explaining the vision and predicting a crisis for the Church and the world remains hidden, evidently inside the “Capovilla envelope” that Bertone wishes to pretend he has produced without actually producing it.

As Scripture says, “He that diggeth a pit, shall fall into it...”⁴³¹ Despite all his efforts to the contrary, Cardinal Bertone had only further revealed that which, as Socci courageously recognizes, Cardinal Bertone and his collaborators in the Vatican apparatus wish to conceal. Five years after this book first appeared, Divine Providence had written straight with Bertone's crooked lines, shining the light of Heaven itself on the Secret still hidden.

But that is not all. Before the guards threw Socci out on the street at the location of the telecast of September 21, 2007, he was able to play for the assembled journalists an audiotape of Capovilla's statements to Paolini during a further meeting of the two on June 21, 2007. As the major Italian daily *Il Giornale* reported, on the tape Capovilla is heard to state: “Besides the four pages [of the vision of the bishop dressed in white] there was also something else, an attachment, yes.” As the reporter from *Il Giornale* concluded, Capovilla's statement “would confirm the thesis of the existence of a second sheet with the interpretation of the Secret. The mystery, and above all the polemics, will continue.”⁴³²

Thanks to the revelations of 2006-2007 the mystery and the polemics will indeed continue. Meanwhile, however, not only the Church, but the whole world, is moving inexorably toward the ultimate consequences the missing text of the Third Secret no doubt foretells and gives us the means to avoid. The next chapters of this book will focus on the ever increasing danger posed by deliberate concealment of the Heaven-sent text that completes the Third Secret of Fatima.

⁴³⁰ Cf. *The Secret Still Hidden*, Chapter 10, for a full account.

⁴³¹ Ecclesiastes, 10:8.

⁴³² “Non esiste un quarto segreto di Fatima” [“The Fourth Secret of Fatima does not exist”], *Il Giornale*, September 22, 2007.