

Chapter 8

The Message of Fatima versus the Party Line

What has been the overall effect of the sudden and quite dramatic changes in the Church which began in the Twentieth Century? As Catholic writers have observed, what Catholics have witnessed especially over the past 40 years represents a kind of “Stalinization of the Roman Catholic Church” that bears an eerie resemblance to what was called at the time “the Adaptation” of Russian Orthodoxy to the demands of the Stalinist regime.

The subversion of the Orthodox Church by Stalin is certainly among the developments in Russia foreseen by the Virgin of Fatima. This is precisely why She came to call for the consecration of Russia to Her Immaculate Heart: so that Russia would embrace the one true religion and the one true Church, not the schismatic Orthodox Church which was founded in human rebellion against Rome when it left the Mystical Body of Christ over 500 years ago, and thus was constitutionally incapable of avoiding its total Adaptation to Stalinism.

The Orthodox Adaptation began officially when the Metropolitan Sergius of the Russian Orthodox Church published an “Appeal” in *Isvestia* on August 19, 1927.

(We must recall that Sergius was one of a small number of Russian Orthodox priests who survived the Stalinist persecution. In 1917 there were about 50,000 Russian Orthodox priests, but by 1935 there were only 500 left.)

The Appeal of Sergius, as it came to be known, set forth a new basis for the activity of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Russian layman Boris Talantov described this as “an Adaptation to the atheistic reality of the U.S.S.R.” In other words, the church had to find a way of living, so the argument goes, with the “atheistic reality” of Stalinist Russia. So Sergius proposed what came to be known in shorthand as the Adaptation.

The Adaptation consisted first and foremost of a false separation between the so-called spiritual needs of man, the purely religious needs of man, and his socio-political needs. In other words, a separation of Church and State. The church was to satisfy the purely religious needs of the citizens of the Soviet Union but without touching on the socio-political structure which had been erected by the Communist Party.

The Adaptation required a new administration of the church in Russia according to guidelines which were set forth after the appeal of Sergius was published. Basically this came down to an agreement not

to criticize the official ideology or even the Party Line²²⁴ of the Soviet Union under Stalin. And this would be reflected in all of the activities of the church. Any opposition by the Russian Orthodox Church to the Soviet regime would henceforth be considered a deviation from pure religious activity and a form of counter-revolution which was no longer to be permitted or countenanced.

In effect the Orthodox Church, through its silence, became an arm of the Soviet state. In fact, Sergius would go on to defend this betrayal and even call for the condemnation and the sentencing to concentration camps of his own fellow Orthodox for so-called counter-revolutionary activities. Talantov, who condemned the whole Adaptation, described it this way: "In actual fact all religious activity was reduced to external rites. The church preaching of those clergymen who held strictly to the Adaptation was totally remote from life and therefore had no influence whatever on hearers. As a result of this, the intellectual, social and family life of believers, and the raising of the younger generation, remained outside church influence. One cannot worship Christ and at the same time in social and family life tell lies, do what is unjust, use violence, and dream of an earthly paradise."²²⁵

This, then, is what the Adaptation involved: The church would be silent about the evils of the Stalinist regime. It would be silent in the presence of the Party Line being broadcast and rebroadcast again and again. It would become a purely "spiritual" community "in the abstract", would no longer voice opposition to the regime, would no longer condemn the errors and lies of Communism, and would thus become the Church of Silence, as Christianity behind the Iron Curtain was often called.

The Appeal of Sergius caused a split in the Russian Orthodox Church. The real believers who rejected the Adaptation, who denounced the Appeal and who remained attached to the Metropolitan Joseph rather than Sergius, were arrested and sent to concentration camps. Boris Talantov himself would eventually die in prison, as a political prisoner of the Stalinist regime. Meanwhile, the Church of Silence, in effect, was transformed into an organ of the KGB. Stalin decimated the Russian Orthodox Church; all of the real Orthodox believers were sent off to concentration camps or executed and replaced by KGB operatives.

Shortly before Talantov died in August of 1967, he wrote as follows about the Adaptation:

The Adaptation to atheism implanted by Metropolitan Sergius has concluded (been completed by) the betrayal of the Orthodox Russian Church on the part of Metropolitan Nikodim and other official representatives of the Moscow Patriarch based abroad. This betrayal irrefutably proved by the documents cited must be made

²²⁴ See the description of the Party Line in the photo caption (of Lenin) at the end of the previous chapter.

²²⁵ "The Moscow Patriarchate and Sergianism" by Boris Talantov, from *Russia's Catacomb Saints*, (St. Herman of Alaska Press, Platina, California, 1982) pp. 463-486.

known to all believers in Russia and abroad because such an activity of the Patriarchate, relying on cooperation with the KGB, represents a great danger for all believers. In truth, the atheistic leaders of the Russian people and the princes of the Church have gathered together against the Lord and His Church.²²⁶

Here Talantov refers to the same Metropolitan Nikodim who induced the Vatican to enter into the Vatican-Moscow Agreement, under which (as we showed in Chapter 6) the Catholic Church was forced to remain silent about Communism at Vatican II. Thus, *the same Orthodox prelate who betrayed the Orthodox Church was instrumental in an agreement by which the Catholic Church was also betrayed*. At Vatican II certain Catholic churchmen, cooperating with Nikodim, agreed that *the Roman Catholic Church, too, would become a Church of Silence*.

And since the Council, the Catholic Church has almost everywhere unquestionably fallen silent not only as to the errors of Communism—which the Church has almost completely ceased condemning, even in Red China, which viciously persecutes the Church—but also as to the errors of the world at large. We recall that in his opening address to the Council, Pope John freely admitted that the Council (and most of the Church after him) would no longer condemn errors but would open Herself to the world in a “positive” presentation of Her teaching to “men of good will.” What followed, as Pope Paul VI himself admitted, was not the hoped-for conversion of “men of good will” but what Paul VI himself called “a veritable invasion of the Church by worldly thinking.” In other words, to the extent that this is possible in the Catholic Church (which can never completely fail in Her mission), there has been a kind of *Sergian Adaptation of Roman Catholicism*.

Now, in keeping with this Adaptation of the Catholic Church, by the year 2000 the Message of Fatima had been firmly subjugated to the demands of the new orientation. It had already been determined by certain members of the Vatican apparatus that Russia was not to be mentioned in any consecration ceremony the Pope might undertake in response to the Virgin’s requests. In the November 2000 issue of *Inside the Vatican*, a leading Cardinal identified as “one of the Pope’s closest advisors” (the editor confirms it was Cardinal Jozef Tomko) is quoted to the effect that “Rome fears the Russian Orthodox might regard it as an ‘offense’ if Rome were to make specific mention of Russia in such a prayer, as if Russia especially is in need of help when the whole world, including the post-Christian West, faces profound problems ...”²²⁷ The

²²⁶ “The Moscow Patriarchate and Sergianism: An Essay by Boris Talantov,” found at www.orthodoxinfo.com/ecumenism/cat_tal.aspx.

²²⁷ The vain fears that the Consecration of Russia by the Pope and Catholic bishops would offend the devout Orthodox is completely laid to rest by the article by Cathy Pearson, entitled “Now Is the Time: Consecrating Russia Will Help, Not Harm, Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue”. First published in the magazine *Inside the Vatican*, August/September 2008; reprinted with permission in *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 91, February 2009, pp. 3ff; also on the web at www.fatimacrusader.com/cr91/cr91pg3.pdf. A free copy of this article is

same Cardinal-advisor added: "Let us beware of becoming too literal-minded."

In other words, "Rome"—meaning a few members of the Vatican apparatus who advise the Pope—has decided not to honor the specific request of Our Lady of Fatima for fear of giving offense to the Russian Orthodox. "Rome" does not wish to give the impression that Russia should be converted to the Catholic Faith through its consecration to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, for this would be quite contrary to the new "ecumenical dialogue" launched by Vatican II. The consecration and conversion of Russia called for by the Mother of God would also be contrary to the Vatican's diplomatic agreement (in the 1993 Balamand Declaration) that the return of the Orthodox to Rome is "outdated ecclesiology"—a claim that, as we have shown, flatly contradicts the infallibly defined Catholic dogma that heretics and schismatics cannot be saved outside the Catholic Church. In keeping with this blatant departure from Catholic teaching, the Vatican's own apostolic administrator for Russia, Archbishop Tadeusz Kondrusiewicz, stated publicly in January of 1998 that "The Second Vatican Council has declared that the Orthodox Church is our Sister Church and has the same means for salvation. So there is no reason to have a policy of proselytism."²²⁸

Given the *de facto* abandonment of the Church's constant teaching that heretics, schismatics, Jews and pagans must be added to the Catholic flock if they are to be saved—a development we examined in the previous chapter—a consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary to bring about the conversion of Russia would, of course, be out of the question, so far as those who promote the new orientation of the Church are concerned.

Thus, on May 13, 1982 and again on March 25, 1984, Pope John Paul II had consecrated the *world* to the Immaculate Heart, but with no mention of Russia. In neither case had all the bishops of the world participated.²²⁹ Thus, neither of the two requirements attested to by Sister Lucy throughout her life had been met. Clearly recognizing this, the Pope himself had made telltale remarks during and after the 1984 ceremony. During the ceremony, before 250,000 people in Saint Peter's Square, he spontaneously added to the prepared text the following: "Enlighten especially the peoples of which You Yourself *are awaiting* our consecration and confiding."²³⁰ Hours after the ceremony, as reported in the Italian Catholic bishops' newspaper *Avvenire*, the Holy Father prayed inside St. Peter's, before 10,000 witnesses, asking Our Lady to bless "those peoples for whom You Yourself *are awaiting* our act of

available from the publisher of this book (see page xxvi).

²²⁸ Remarks of January 17, 1998 at The Aid to the Church in Russia Conference, http://www.victorclaveau.com/htm_html/Around%20the%20World/Russia/catholic_church_in_russia_it.htm. Reprinted in *The Catholic Dossier*, March/April 1998, p. 4.

²²⁹ Maybe a few bishops had done so, but not many did—thus, not fulfilling the Consecration as requested by Our Lady of Fatima that all the bishops join in.

²³⁰ *L'Osservatore Romano*, March 26-27, 1984, Italian ed., pp. 1, 6; English ed., pp. 9-10.

consecration and entrusting.”²³¹ Russia had not been consecrated to the Immaculate Heart, and John Paul II knew it. Evidently persuaded by his advisers, the Pope had told Bishop Cordes, head of the Pontifical Council of the Laity, that he had omitted any mention of Russia because “it would be interpreted as a provocation by the Soviet leaders.”²³²

The Emergence of the “Party Line” on Fatima

But the issue of the Consecration of Russia would not go away, for it was obvious that following the 1984 ceremony Russia failed to experience the religious conversion the Virgin had promised as the fruit of a proper consecration to Her Immaculate Heart. Quite the contrary, despite certain political changes, Russia’s spiritual, moral and material condition has continued to deteriorate up to the present day (2009).

As we demonstrate beyond doubt in Chapter 16, Russia has not converted in *any* sense of the word—religiously, morally, politically or even economically—much less in the sense intended by the Blessed Virgin, which would necessarily involve the reunification of the Russian people with Rome upon their embrace of the integral Catholic Faith. Russia today continues to suffer from the highest per capita abortion rate in the world (with only China exceeding Russia in the gross number of abortions), alcoholism and child pornography are rampant, and homosexual conduct has been “legalized.” The nominal Russian Orthodoxy of many Russians is meaningless, as few Russians attend Mass; occultism and satanism are on the rise; and there has been no elevation of moral life among the nominally Orthodox population, but rather a steady decline fueled by a degenerate popular culture, including sexually explicit “reality TV.” The Catholic Church remains a tiny minority, suffering persecution under tight legal restrictions orchestrated by Vladimir Putin, who has assembled and continues to control a neo-Stalinist dictatorship from the Kremlin through his puppet, President Medvedev. Russia’s recently forged military alliance with China and her newly developed nuclear weapons evince a nation preparing for war and regional or even global domination, not peace. And the worldwide economic collapse has exposed the true nature of the so-called “capitalist explosion” in Russia: a few wealthy oligarchs bestride an economy that remains Third World in its standard of living for the overwhelming majority of the Russian people.

Clearly, 25 years after it took place the 1984 ceremony has failed to produce what Our Lady of Fatima promised, because that ceremony was not what She requested. But what She requested—the specific

²³¹ *Avenir*, March 27, 1984, p. 11. See also *L’Osservatore Romano*, March 26-27, 1984, Italian ed., p. 4; see photo on page XVI in the photo section of this book.

²³² Father Fabrice Delestre, “Fatima: Why Isn’t the Mother of God Being Obeyed as She Should Be?,” *Angelus*, June 2000, Vol. 23, No. 6; on the web at <http://www.fatima.org/consecrussia/notobeyed.asp>. See also Frère François de Marie des Anges, *Fatima: Joie Intime Événement Mondial*, (French edition, Contre-Réforme Catholique, France, 1991) pp. 363-364; Frère François de Marie des Anges, *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, pp. 168-172.

Consecration of Russia by name, so that the world would know that Russia's miraculous conversion was obtained through the intercession of Her Immaculate Heart—is absolutely unacceptable to the custodians of the Sergian Adaptation of the Church to “the modern world.” Hence, from their perspective, something had to be done about Fatima.

And, in particular, something had to be done about a Canadian priest by the name of Father Nicholas Gruner, whose Fatima apostolate has become a sounding board for millions of Catholics who were convinced that the Consecration of Russia had been derailed by the plans of certain men in the Vatican. Quite simply, Fatima and “the Fatima priest” had to be buried once and for all.

The process began as early as 1988, when, Frère François recounts: “[A]n order came from the Vatican addressed to the authorities of Fatima, to Sister Lucy, to diverse ecclesiastics, including Father Messias Coelho, and a French priest [evidently Father Pierre Caillon] very much devoted to Our Lady, ordering everyone to cease pestering the Holy Father with the Consecration of Russia.” Fatima devotee Father Caillon confirmed the issuance of this order: “An order came from Rome, obliging everyone to say and think: ‘The Consecration is done. The Pope having done all that he can, Heaven has deigned to agree to this gesture.’”²³³ It was around this time, 1988-1989, that many Fatima Apostolates who had maintained that the Consecration of Russia had not been done suddenly reversed themselves and declared that the 1984 consecration fulfilled the desires of Heaven. Sadly, even Father Caillon soon afterwards changed his testimony and began to say that the 1984 Consecration had fulfilled the Virgin's requests.

It was also at this time that typewritten and computer-generated letters, purportedly from Sister Lucy, began to circulate. Typical of the manifestly incredible letters was the one dated November 8, 1989, to a Mr. Noelker, which contains the statement by “Sister Lucy” that Pope Paul VI consecrated the world to the Immaculate Heart during his brief visit to Fatima in 1967—a consecration that never happened, as Sister Lucy certainly knew because she witnessed the entire visit.²³⁴

Thus emerged “the Party Line” on the Message of Fatima. What, precisely, do we mean by “the Party Line”? Vladimir Ilyich Lenin once said: “The lie is sacred and deception will be our principal weapon.” Thus it was no surprise that *Pravda*, when it was the official organ of the Soviet Communist Party, was filled with lies, even though the Russian word *Pravda* means “truth.” A newspaper whose name is “truth” was always filled with lies, because, as Lenin said, “the lie is sacred and deception will be our principal weapon”.

Now, a liar will not convince anyone of his lies if he wears a big

²³³ *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, pp. 189-190.

²³⁴ For a good treatment of the falsehood of the Noelker letter, see Mark Fellows, “This Present Darkness” Part II, *Catholic Family News*, September 2000. See also Mark Fellows, *Fatima in Twilight*, (Marmion Publications, Niagara Falls, 2003) Chapter 25, pp. 303-314.

placard on his chest that says “Liar!” Not even a fool would believe such a man. For the liar to convince people that his lies are truth, *the truth must be redefined*. This is what is meant by Lenin’s phrase “the lie is sacred ...” The lie becomes the “truth” and is slavishly adhered to in place of the truth. As Scripture says, pronouncing the curse in the book of Isaias, “Woe to you that call evil good, and good evil: that put darkness *for* light, and light *for* darkness”. (Is. 5:20) The darkness of falsehood is given the appearance of the light of truth, and this is one of the principal errors of Russia.

Since according to Lenin “the lie is sacred”, he had to develop a policy for all his followers about official lies. By the phrase “the lie is sacred”, Lenin taught that whenever lying advances the Communist cause then his followers must lie—to remain “true” to their “principles”. But this policy could not work if Communist agent #1 told a lie that was contradicted by another lie told by Communist agent #2. So the Communist Party had to come up with a common lie for both agent #1 and agent #2 to repeat. This common lie came to be known as the Party Line.

But this trick of turning a lie into the “truth” did not originate with Russia, or with the Communists; it originated with the devil, who is the Father of Lies. St. Paul speaks of the devil under the guise of the angel of light. To be more specific, he refers to the Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ: “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) It is the devil, appearing under the guise of an angel of light, who gives the appearance of truth in order to deceive by means of the lie. This is where the error “the lie is sacred” and “falsehood is truth” originated.

Father Paul Kramer relates a conversation he had with General Daniel Graham, a general in the US Army. “General Graham said that he had once been in Russia with a Soviet official and the Soviet official asked him, ‘Don’t you want peace?’ And the General answered: ‘No! Because I know how you define peace. I do not want that kind of peace.’ As they were conversing, they drove by a huge billboard that showed soldiers with their rifles. On the billboard was the caption: ‘Pobieda kommunista eta mir’. Which is, in English, ‘Communist Victory is Peace.’”

According to Marxist teaching, the Communist State wages war to make revolution and uses every possible means of deception—total war—in order to subjugate the entire world to Communism. And once total war has been waged and Communism is victorious over the entire planet, then there is the Communist version of “peace”. But what is peace *in reality*? It is best defined by St. Augustine: “Peace is the tranquillity of order.” Which definition is correct? It is not a matter of subjective evaluation. St. Thomas Aquinas explains: “*ens et verum convertunter*”, which is a scholastic way of saying that truth is convertible with reality. That which is objectively *real* is, for that very reason, objectively *true*. In other words, truth is that which *is*, whereas a lie is that which *is not*. That which *is not* cannot be true. Therefore, if someone declares, for example,

that white is black, the claim that white is black is a lie—no matter how high the authority of the one making the claim.

According to Marxist doctrine, however, *truth is that which promotes the Communist revolution*. And what is it that promotes the Communist revolution? It is whatever has been decided to be the Party Line. *What the Party dictates to be true becomes the “truth” even if, in reality, it is a lie*. Thus, if the Party Line is that black is white, then that is what all Party members must believe and say, simply because it has been decided by the Party that black is white.

Just as there has been a kind of “Stalinization” of the Church, in the sense of an Adaptation of the Church to the world, so also must there be a kind of Stalinist Party Line on Fatima—a version of Fatima dictated from on high to which all the members of the Church of the post-conciliar Adaptation must adhere. In essence, the Party Line on Fatima comes down to this: The “Consecration of Russia” is over and done with, and everyone must cease asking for it. We have “peace” as predicted by Our Lady of Fatima. Russia is undergoing the “conversion” Our Lady promised. Therefore—so the Party Line goes—nothing in the Message of Fatima remains to be accomplished, and Fatima now belongs to the past.

As we shall see, all of the terms in quotation marks—“Consecration of Russia”, “peace” and “conversion”—have been redefined to accommodate the Party Line on Fatima. Where Fatima is concerned, we are now being asked to believe the equivalent of “black is white,” for that is the Party Line.

The Dictatorship of the Vatican Secretary of State

Now every Party Line requires a dictator, a head of the Party, to impose it. From where, exactly, within the Vatican apparatus did the Party Line on Fatima originate? The evidence is overwhelming that it originated with the Vatican Secretary of State. On this point some brief background is in order.

First of all, in the proper state of things—what St. Augustine called “the tranquillity of order” or peace—the Church is not a dictatorship. Dictatorship is a barbaric institution. As Euripides says “among the barbarians all are slaves but one.” Our Lord said “the princes of the Gentiles lord it over” their subjects. (Mt. 20:25) He said to His apostles “with you it is not to be this way.” Yet the tranquillity of order—the peace of the Church—has been disturbed enormously in the post-conciliar period. What we see in the Church today is that the hierarchs of the Roman Curia (*not* the Pope, but a few of his Vatican ministers) lord it over their subjects with an oriental despotism. To be more precise, they lord it over *certain* subjects, who buck the Party Line, while the Church at large suffers from a near-collapse of faith and discipline which these same potentates ignore.

How did this come to pass? Since the restructuring of the Roman Curia,

around 1967, by order of Pope Paul VI—which was actually designed and carried out by Cardinal Jean Villot—the heads of the various Roman dicasteries have been able to behave like dictators. Before the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Curia was structured as a monarchy. The Pope was the Prefect of the Holy Office, while the Cardinal in charge of the day-to-day business of the Holy Office was the second-in-command. The other dicasteries were of lower rank. And while having their own authority and jurisdiction, again in accordance with that principle of subsidiarity,²³⁵ they were subordinate to the Holy Office, and the Holy Office was directly under the Pope. This arrangement was entirely in keeping with the Divine Constitution of the Church. The Pope, the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, was at the head of the chain of command.

But after Vatican II, Cardinal Villot engineered the restructuring of the Roman Curia. Long before Gorbachev announced his program of *perestroika* in the Soviet Union, the Church underwent its own *perestroika* in the Roman Curia. The Holy Office was renamed—but far more significant, the Holy Office lost its supreme position in the Curia. The Curia was restructured in such a manner that the Cardinal Secretary of State was placed over all the other dicasteries, including the former Holy Office. Renamed and restructured, it was now called the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), and the Pope was no longer the Prefect. But it (the CDF) is now under a Cardinal Prefect and he is under the authority of the Secretary of State.

According to the preceding organization when the Roman Curia was directly subject to the Pope and the Holy Office, then the most important factors which determined the policy and politics of the Roman Curia were faith and morals. After the Second Vatican Council and the reorganization of the Curia, under the Cardinal Secretary of State and his dicastery, the Secretariat of State, it is *the Party Line*—that is, the policies and politics of the Secretary of State—that is the one and only determining factor in the formulation of Church policies. Even the former Holy Office, now the CDF, is subordinate to the Secretary of State. As a result of this restructuring, the Holy Father, the Supreme Pontiff, is reduced to a figurehead who gives his approval, as a rubber stamp, to rulings presented to him as a *fait accompli* by the Secretary of State. This bears repeating: *The Pope has been reduced to a figurehead in the service of the dictatorship of the Secretary of State.*²³⁶

In the Masonic registry required by Italian law, one did find the name of Jean Villot—the same Villot who oversaw the curial reorganization.

²³⁵ The principle which requires that authority be exercised at the lowest possible level to avoid tyranny through excessive centralization of government. For example, the budget of a town should be determined by the town Fathers, not by the state or federal government.

²³⁶ Under the old structure, before 1967, the Pope presided over the Roman Curia. Under the new structure, since 1967, it is the Vatican Secretary of State who presides over the Roman Curia. The reader is invited to check the *Annuario Pontificio* both before and after 1967 to see the change in the structure of the Roman Curia.

After Cardinal Villot died, in his private library was found a handwritten message from the Grand Master of Villot's Masonic Lodge, praising Villot for upholding Masonic traditions.²³⁷ As a French priest living in Rome said: "At least in one area he was traditional."

The Use of False "Obedience" to Impose the Party Line

In 1917, the very year Our Lady appeared at Fatima, Saint Maximilian Kolbe was in Rome, where he saw the Masons showing their open hostility to the Catholic Church and carrying placards announcing their intention to infiltrate the Vatican so that Satan would rule from the Vatican and the Pope would be his slave.²³⁸ They also boasted at the same time that they would destroy the Church. The intention of the Masons to destroy the Church fits in perfectly with the well-known Masonic dictum, "We will destroy the Church *by means of holy obedience*." As we showed in an earlier chapter, Bishop Graber of Regensburg, Germany, collected other such testimonies of Masonic luminaries, and the *Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita* itself boldly declared "let the Clergy march under your standard, always believing that they are marching under the banner of the apostolic keys." That is, the demand for "obedience" would be used in dictatorial fashion to undermine true obedience and the faith itself.

And the curial reorganization of 1967 would be instrumental in accomplishing that aim by subjecting the whole Church to the Party Line of the Secretary of State—including the Party Line on Fatima—under the guise of a false "obedience" to an authority who has clearly exceeded the bounds established by God Himself. As we will demonstrate shortly, it was Cardinal Sodano who literally dictated the "interpretation" of the visional aspect of the Third Secret of Fatima, which has been published without the Virgin's own words to explain it.

The Secretary of State Targets the Message of Fatima

This brings us to the precise role of the Secretary of State in imposing the Party Line with respect to Fatima. As we have noted, this process would involve the Message of Fatima in general and, in particular, perhaps its foremost proponent in the Church: the Fatima apostolate of Father Nicholas Gruner.

As early as 1989, the Secretary of State at the time, Cardinal Casaroli (the great propagator of *Ostpolitik*) had communicated to Father Gruner's bishop at the time, His Excellency Gerardo Pierro of the Diocese of Avellino, Italy, what the bishop had called "worried signals" about Father Gruner's Fatima apostolate. Father Gruner had been ordained in Avellino in 1976

²³⁷ A French priest showed the Masonic document to, among others, the American priest Father Paul Kramer, the editor of this book.

²³⁸ Paul Fisher, *Their God is the Devil*, (American Research Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1990) p. 40.

for a Franciscan community that did not form as expected. Since 1978 he had been residing in Canada with the bishop's permission, where he had become the leader of a small Fatima apostolate that had since grown into the largest of its kind in the world. But after the Party Line concerning the "consecration" of 1984 had been imposed by the anonymous order of 1988, it was inevitable that Father Gruner's apostolate and the Secretary of State would collide—just as the traditional orientation (based on the dogmas of the Faith as defined by the popes for the past 20 centuries) and the new orientation of the Church have collided after Vatican II.

The basic technique for trying to get rid of Father Gruner had been to create a bogus canonical scenario in which, having been ordered to find some other bishop to incardinate him outside of Avellino, Father Gruner's incardination anywhere else was then blocked through unprecedented arm-twisting behind the scenes, so that Father Gruner would be forced to "return" to Avellino and abandon his apostolate. Having blocked Father Gruner's incardination by three successive benevolent bishops who were friends of Fatima, the Vatican apparatus (in a complex proceeding beyond the scope of this book²³⁹) had finally lowered the boom: Father Gruner must "return" to Avellino or be "suspended" for "disobedience." In essence, Father Gruner was under a threat of "suspension" for having failed to do what his very accusers had systematically prevented him from doing—namely, find another bishop to incardinate him.²⁴⁰

As Father Gruner's various canonical appeals from these unprecedented actions against him wended their way through Vatican tribunals, his Fatima apostolate continued to flourish. By the year 2000 the apostolate, particularly through its journal *The Fatima Crusader*, had become the strongest and most persistent voice in the Church for both the Consecration of Russia and disclosure of the Third Secret.

Furthermore, Pope John Paul II himself had complicated the Fatima picture with his decision to beatify Jacinta and Francisco in a ceremony at Fatima on May 13, 2000. His intention to beatify the two children was made known as early as June of 1999, and this development had clearly triggered an internal struggle within the Vatican apparatus. This is shown by the curious on-again, off-again nature of the beatification ceremony, which is most unusual for the Vatican. First, the then-Secretary of State, Cardinal Angelo Sodano, announced in October 1999 that the beatification of Jacinta and Francisco would take place on April 9, 2000 in St. Peter's Square, along with four other beatifications. The Patriarch

²³⁹ See Francis Alban and Christopher A. Ferrara, *Fatima Priest*, Fourth Edition (Good Counsel Publications, Pound Ridge, New York, 2000), Chapters 12, 14, 17-22; App. I, App. II.

²⁴⁰ For the details of the long and tortuous "proceedings" to silence Father Gruner, the reader may consult: *Fatima Priest* (Fourth Edition, available from The Fatima Center, 17000 State Route 30, Constable, New York 12926) or *A Law for One Man* (available free of charge from the publisher of this book, see page xxvi). Both are also available on the web at: www.fatimapriest.com/content.html and also www.fatima.org/apostolate/defense/law1man.asp

of Lisbon is quoted in the Portuguese press as having been informed by the Vatican that it was “quite impossible” for the Pope to come to Fatima for the children’s beatification and that the question was “closed.” The Patriarch told Portuguese journalists that he was convinced this “impossibility” of the Pope coming to Fatima was exclusively due to a decision by none other than the Vatican Secretary of State.

But the Pope had other ideas. In November of 1999 His Holiness—obviously bypassing Cardinal Sodano—informed Bishop Serafim, the Bishop of Fatima, directly that he should announce that the Pope would indeed come to Fatima on May 13 to perform the beatifications. Bishop Serafim did not make the new announcement until December 1999. And then, in March of 2000, the bishop also let it slip that “the Pope will do something special for Fatima.” This prompted furious speculation in the press that the Pope was, at last, going to reveal the Third Secret. Bishop Serafim was immediately rebuked in public by the Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon, possibly under orders from somebody in the employ of the Vatican Secretary of State, who did not wish anyone to know that the Pope was contemplating revelation of the Secret. But the proverbial cat was out of the proverbial bag. Now events would unfold rapidly, and with devastating results for the Party Line.²⁴¹

²⁴¹ Regarding the on-again, off-again beatification ceremony and related matters, see: the daily newspaper *Correio da Manhã* of 14 October 1999, the article on p. 12; the weekly newspaper *Jornal de Leiria* of 14 October 1999, p. 24; the weekly newspaper *A Ordem* on 21 October 1999, p. 1; the official weekly of the Patriarchate of Lisbon *Voz da Verdade* on 31 October 1999, on p. 6, the article entitled “The Beatification of the Little Shepherds Definitely Will Be At Rome”; the official weekly of the Patriarchate of Lisbon *Voz da Verdade* on 5 December 1999, entitled “The Pope Will Return to Portugal; Fatima is the Place of the Beatification”; article in *Euronoticias* on 24 March 2000, p. 8, entitled “Bishop of Leiria-Fatima March 21 press conference”; weekly *Euronoticias* of 24 March 2000, on p. 8, “Crisis: The Bishop of Leiria-Fatima Creates A Mystery Around the Visit of the Pope Without Telling the Patriarch What It Concerns, Will the Pope Reveal the Third Secret?”; *Euronoticias* of 24 March, 2000, an article on p. 9 entitled “Analysis: Persons Who Have Studied the Apparitions Say That the Third Secret Could Concern the Destruction of the Faith. A Crisis in the Interior of the Church Would be the Third Secret”.