

Chapter 9

A “New” Fatima for the “New Orientation”

On May 13, 2000, John Paul II went to Fatima to beatify Jacinta and Francisco. The papal appearance was a kind of living demonstration of the conflict between the two visions of the Church we have been discussing. Evoking the Church of all time, the Pope delivered a sermon after the beatifications. In this sermon many things the Church seemed to have forgotten over the past forty years were suddenly recalled again:

According to the divine plan, “a Woman clothed with the sun” (Apoc. 12:1) came down from Heaven to this earth to visit the privileged children of the Father. She speaks to them with a mother’s voice and heart: She asks them to offer themselves as victims of reparation, saying that She was ready to lead them safely to God. ...

Later Francisco, one of the three privileged children, exclaimed: “We were burning in that light which is God and we were not consumed. What is God like? It is impossible to say. In fact we will never be able to tell people”. God: a light that burns without consuming. *Moses had the same experience when he saw God in the burning bush.* ...

“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 cast 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*".

The Pope's direct linkage of the Message of Fatima with the Book of the Apocalypse, and his likening of the Fatima seers' encounter with God to that of Moses before the burning bush, comprised a stunning papal authentication of the Fatima apparitions as divinely given prophecies for our time. All of a sudden, Fatima was squarely before the eyes of the whole Church again.

There was, first of all, the Pope's astonishing reference to the Message of Fatima as a biblical moment, the very fulfillment of Chapter 12, verse 1 of the Apocalypse, which speaks of the "Woman clothed with the sun." Here Pope John Paul II echoed Pope Paul VI, who, in his apostolic letter *Signum magnum*, delivered at Fatima on May 13, 1967, declared:

The great sign which the Apostle John saw in Heaven, "a woman clothed with the sun," is interpreted by the sacred Liturgy, not without foundation, as referring to the Most Blessed Mary, the mother of all men by the grace of Christ the Redeemer. ... On the occasion of the religious ceremonies which are taking place at this time in honor of the Virgin Mother of God in Fatima, Portugal, where She is venerated by countless numbers of the faithful for Her motherly and compassionate heart, we wish to call the attention of all sons of the Church once more to the indissoluble link between the spiritual motherhood of Mary ... and the duties of redeemed men toward Her, the Mother of the Church.

Even more astonishing, in his sermon Pope John Paul II had explicitly linked the Message of Fatima to Apocalypse, Chapter 12, verse 4, which prophesies that the "tail of the dragon" will sweep one-third of the stars from Heaven and cast them down to the earth. As Father Gruner would later note: "In the language of the Bible, the 'stars of Heaven' are those who are set in the heavens to illumine the way for others to go to Heaven. This passage has been classically interpreted in Catholic commentaries to mean that one-third of the clergy—i.e. Cardinals, bishops, priests—fall from their consecrated state and are actually working for the devil." For example, the *Haydock Commentary* to the *Douay-Rheims Bible* notes that the image of one-third of the stars of Heaven has been interpreted to refer to "bishops and eminent persons who fell under the weight of persecution and apostatized ... The devil is always ready, as far as God permits him, to make war against the Church and the faithful servants of God."

In this connection Father Gruner and others have cited the commentary on Apoc. 12:3-4 by Father Herman B. Kramer, in *The Book of Destiny*. This work was published with an *imprimatur*, providentially enough, in 1956, only six years before the opening of Vatican II. In reference to the symbol of one-third of the stars of Heaven, Father Kramer notes: "This is one-third of the clergy" and that "one-third' of the stars shall follow the dragon"—meaning one-third of the clergy, who are the "stars", the

consecrated souls in the Church.²⁴² That is, one-third of the Catholic clergy will be in the service of the devil, working to destroy the Church from within. Father Herman Kramer’s commentary points out that the red dragon—a sign of the devil which could also symbolize Communism because red is Communism’s emblematic color—brings the Church into great distress by undermining it from within.

The commentary goes on to say that, by means of these apostate clergy, the devil will probably enforce upon the Church “the acceptance of unchristian morals, false doctrines, *compromise with error*, or obedience to the civil rulers in violation of conscience.” In addition, he suggests that “The symbolic meaning of the dragon’s tail may reveal that the clergy who are ripe for apostasy will hold the influential positions in the Church, having won preferment by hypocrisy, deceit and flattery.” The clergy who will follow the dragon—i.e. the devil—would include those “who neglected to preach the truth or to admonish the sinner by a good example, but rather sought popularity by being lax and the slaves of human respect,” as well as those “who fear for their own interests and will not remonstrate against evil practices in the Church” and bishops “who abhor upright priests who dare to tell the truth”.²⁴³ Father Kramer also observes as follows concerning the state of the Catholic Church in the times prophesied by Apoc. 12:3-4:

“The apostolic democracy founded by Our Lord may have given way to an absolute monarchy, in which the episcopate rules with oriental despotism. The priests may be reduced to a state of servility and fawning sycophancy. The rule by reason, justice and love may have been supplanted by the absolute will of the bishop, whose every act and word are to be accepted without question, without recourse to fact, truth or justice. Conscience may have lost its right to guide the actions of the priests and may stand ignored or condemned. Diplomacy, expediency and other trickery may be upheld as the greatest virtues.”²⁴⁴

But none of this is mentioned in those parts of the Message of Fatima which have thus far been revealed. Had the Pope, then, with his startling reference to Apocalypse 12:3-4, just given the world a glimpse into the contents of the Third Secret? Would he now reveal the Secret in its entirety?

But, alas, the sermon ends. It is not the Pope who will discuss the Third Secret. As quickly as it began, the Pope’s momentary return to the vision of the Church of all time is over, and a chief exponent of the new vision rises to his feet. It is Cardinal Angelo Sodano, then Vatican Secretary of State—the same Cardinal Sodano who had tried, but failed, to prevent the Pope from going to Fatima to beatify Jacinta and Francisco.

²⁴² Father Herman Bernard Kramer, *The Book of Destiny*, (first published 1955, republished by TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., Rockford, Illinois, 1975) pp. 279-284.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

For some strange reason it is Sodano, not the Pope, who will announce that the Pope has decided to reveal the Third Secret of Fatima:

On the solemn occasion of his visit to Fatima, His Holiness has directed me to make an announcement to you. As you know, the purpose of his visit to Fatima has been to beatify the two “little shepherds”. Nevertheless he also wishes his pilgrimage to be a renewed gesture of gratitude to Our Lady for Her protection during these years of his papacy. This protection seems also to be linked to the so-called “third part” of the secret of Fatima.

And then what had seemed so strange suddenly became quite explicable. Cardinal Sodano’s task would be to prepare the faithful to accept the notion that the Message of Fatima, including the Third Secret, was now to be considered a thing of the past. The process would begin with the Cardinal’s “interpretation” of the Third Secret:

That text contains a prophetic vision similar to those found in Sacred Scripture, which do not describe with photographic clarity the details of future events, but rather synthesize and condense against a unified background of events spread out over time in a succession and a duration which are not specified. As a result, the text *must be interpreted in a symbolic key*. ...

According to the interpretation of the “little shepherds”, which was also recently confirmed by Sister Lucia, the “Bishop dressed in white” who prays for all the faithful is the Pope. As he makes his way with great effort towards the Cross amid the corpses of those who were martyred (bishops, priests, men and women religious and many lay persons), he too falls to the ground, *apparently* dead, under a burst of gunfire. (Emphasis added.)

As the faithful will soon learn, this is simply a lie. The “Bishop dressed in White” in the vision is not “apparently dead” but is *killed*—as the text of the vision clearly states—in the manner of a military execution, along with many bishops, priests and religious, outside a half-ruined city.

Why, then, insert the word “apparently” into the “interpretation”? Cardinal Sodano immediately tips his hand:

After the assassination attempt of 13 May 1981, it appeared evident to His Holiness that it was “a motherly hand which guided the bullet’s path”, enabling the “dying Pope” to halt “at the threshold of death”. ...

The successive events of 1989 led, both in the Soviet Union and in a number of countries of Eastern Europe, to the fall of the Communist regime which promoted atheism. ...

Even if the events to which the third part of the Secret of Fatima refers *now seem part of the past*, Our Lady’s call to conversion and penance, issued at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, remains

timely and urgent today.

Quite simply, Sodano was preparing the way for an “interpretation” of the Message of Fatima that would bury it once and for all: the Message culminated with the 1981 assassination attempt and the “fall of Communism” in 1989—events which “now seem part of the past.” To insure this result, a “commentary” would be prepared before the actual text of the Third Secret would be released:

In order that the faithful may better receive the message of Our Lady of Fatima, the Pope has charged the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith with making public the third part of the secret, after the preparation of an appropriate commentary.

But why had this commentary not been ready in time for the May 13 ceremony? After all, news of the Third Secret’s impending disclosure had been circulating since at least March of 2000. In that month, Bishop Serafim had announced that the Pope had told him during a visit to Rome that the Pope would “do something special for Fatima”²⁴⁵ when he went there for the beatification ceremony in May 2000.

Curiously enough, the Pope had urged Bishop Serafim to say nothing about this while he was in Rome, but to wait until he returned to Fatima. But the subject was on the Pope’s mind since the previous November, so why had no “commentary” been prepared during the period November 1999 to May 2000? Surely, such a commentary could easily have been completed in that time.

Two conclusions suggest themselves. Either the Pope had not told Cardinal Sodano of his intention concerning disclosure of the Third Secret—in which case the Pope does not trust Sodano—or the Pope did tell Sodano, whereupon Sodano assumed that he would somehow be able to prevent disclosure at the May 13, 2000 ceremony. This would explain why Sodano had not arranged for a commentary beforehand: he thought it would not be needed because he would be able to prevent any disclosure of the Third Secret. But the Pope had pressed ahead, and now the Secret had to be “managed” in such a way that the question of Fatima could be laid to rest.

A Press Conference to Announce the Sodano Party Line

We thus arrive at the fateful date of June 26, 2000. On this date the Third Secret is “disclosed” at a Vatican press conference, along with a

²⁴⁵ On this point we refer the reader again to the following articles: 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”.

commentary prepared by Cardinal Ratzinger and Monsignor Tarcisio Bertone, then Secretary of the CDF, entitled *The Message of Fatima* (hereafter referred to as *TMF*). In *TMF* the Party Line on Fatima would be officially promulgated—by the direct command of Cardinal Angelo Sodano.

First of all, the faithful were told that the following text of a vision seen by Sister Lucy is all there is to the Third Secret of Fatima:

After the two parts which I have already explained, at the left of Our Lady and a little above, we saw an Angel with a flaming sword in his left hand; flashing, it gave out flames that looked as though they would set the world on fire; but they died out in contact with the splendour that Our Lady radiated towards him from her right hand: pointing to the earth with his right hand, the Angel cried out in a loud voice: 'Penance, Penance, Penance!'. And we saw in an immense light that is God: 'something similar to how people appear in a mirror when they pass in front of it' a Bishop dressed in White 'we had the impression that it was the Holy Father'. Other Bishops, Priests, men and women Religious going up a steep mountain, at the top of which there was a big Cross of rough-hewn trunks as of a cork-tree with the bark; before reaching there the Holy Father passed through a big city half in ruins and half trembling with halting step, afflicted with pain and sorrow, he prayed for the souls of the corpses he met on his way; having reached the top of the mountain, on his knees at the foot of the big Cross he was killed by a group of soldiers who fired bullets and arrows at him, and in the same way there died one after another the other Bishops, Priests, men and women Religious, and various lay people of different ranks and positions. Beneath the two arms of the Cross there were two Angels, each with a crystal aspersorium in his hand, in which they gathered up the blood of the Martyrs and with it sprinkled the souls that were making their way to God.

The immediate reaction of millions of Catholics could be summarized in two words: *That's it?* Clearly, something was amiss, since nothing in this text corresponded to what Cardinal Ratzinger himself had said about the Third Secret in 1984—a point to which we shall return shortly. Nor did it contain anything that would have explained its mysterious suppression since 1960.

Most important, this obscure vision, written down on 62 lines of notebook paper, contained no words of Our Lady. In particular, it contained nothing that would complete the famous phrase spoken by Our Lady at the conclusion of the recorded portion of the Message of Fatima as faithfully transcribed by Sister Lucy in her memoirs: "In Portugal the dogma of the faith will always be preserved etc." Sister Lucy had added this phrase, including the "etc.", to her fourth memoir as part of the integral text of the Message. This addition had led every reputable Fatima scholar to conclude that it signaled the beginning of

the unrecorded Third Secret, and that the Third Secret pertained to a widespread dogmatic crisis in the Church outside of Portugal. Clearly, the Virgin had more to say that was not written down because Sister Lucy had been instructed to keep it secret—until, as we have seen, 1960.

In a curious maneuver, however, *TMF* had avoided any discussion of the telltale phrase by taking the text of the Message of Fatima from Sister Lucy’s *third* memoir, where the phrase does not appear. *TMF* justifies this as follows: “For the account of the first two parts of the ‘secret’, which have already been published and are therefore known, we have chosen the text written by Sister Lucia in the *Third Memoir* of 31 August 1941; some *annotations* were added in the *Fourth Memoir* of 8 December 1941.” Annotations? The key phrase concerning the preservation of dogma in Portugal was no “annotation” but *an integral part of the spoken words of Our Lady*, after which She had said: “Tell this to no one. Yes, you may tell Francisco.”

Having deceptively mischaracterized an integral part of the Message of Fatima as an “annotation”, *TMF* then buries it in a footnote that is never mentioned again: “In the ‘Fourth Memoir’ Sister Lucia adds: ‘In Portugal, the dogma of the faith will always be preserved, etc. ...’.”

Why are Sodano/Ratzinger/Bertone so leery of this key phrase that they would so obviously go out of their way to avoid it by using an earlier and *less complete* memoir of the text of the Message? If there is nothing to hide in this phrase, why not simply use the Fourth Memoir and attempt an explanation of what the phrase means? Why did the authors of *TMF* so obviously *pretend* that the phrase is a mere “annotation”, when they know full well that it appears in the integral text as part of the spoken words of the Mother of God? We shall return to this suspicious behavior in a later chapter.

Another ground for suspicion was that the vision of the “Bishop dressed in White” was not at all the 25-lined, one-page “*letter ... in which Sister Lucy wrote down the words which Our Lady confided as a secret to the three shepherds in the Cova da Iria*”—as the Vatican itself had described it in the aforementioned 1960 press release. The text of the vision spans 62 lines and apparently *four distinct pages* of what appear to be ruled notebook paper.²⁴⁶

Yet another suspicious circumstance is that on June 26 Cardinal Sodano’s falsehood of May 13 was clearly exposed: the Pope *is killed* by soldiers who fire upon him as he kneels at the foot of a large wooden Cross outside a half-ruined city. The Pope is not “apparently dead”, as Sodano had falsely asserted in May; the Pope *is* dead. The vision, whatever it means, clearly has absolutely nothing to do with the 1981 assassination attempt. The faithful had already been duped in May, and now the process of duping them was clearly continuing.

The dozens of discrepancies raised by this text—prompting

²⁴⁶See footnote 368 for a fuller explanation of this point.

Catholics around the world to doubt that we have received the Secret in its entirety—will be addressed in a later chapter. For now, we consider the Ratzinger/Bertone “commentary” in *TMF* on the Fatima Message as a whole.

Cardinal Sodano Dictates the “Interpretation” of the Third Secret

First of all, *TMF* is a virtual admission that the “interpretation” of the Message of Fatima which Cardinal Ratzinger and Msgr. Bertone will “attempt” (to use Cardinal Ratzinger’s word) has been dictated by none other than Cardinal Sodano. No fewer than four times, *TMF* states that it is following *Sodano’s* “interpretation” of the Third Secret—namely, that Fatima belongs to the past:

Before attempting an interpretation, the main lines of which can be found in the statement read by *Cardinal Sodano* on May 13 of this year ...

For this reason the figurative language of the vision is symbolic. In this regard *Cardinal Sodano* stated ...

As is clear from the documentation presented here, the interpretation offered by *Cardinal Sodano*, in his statement on 13 May, was first put personally to Sister Lucia. ...

First of all *we must affirm with Cardinal Sodano*: “the events to which the third part of the ‘secret’ of Fatima refers now seem *part of the past*”.

And just in case the reader still has not gotten the point, the basic aim of *TMF* is driven home once again:

Insofar as individual events are described, *they belong to the past*.

Is it not curious that the interpretation of the Virgin of Fatima’s vital message to the world had been given over, not to the Pope, nor even to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (which was merely aping Cardinal Sodano’s opinion), but to the *Vatican Secretary of State*? What authority did Cardinal Sodano have to impose his view upon the Church? None, of course. But Cardinal Sodano had arrogated that authority to himself in keeping the overall post-conciliar ascendancy of the Vatican Secretary of State to the status of *de facto* Pope when it comes to the daily governance of Church affairs.

Here it would be opportune to provide another very telling example of this usurpation of authority by the Secretary of State. In an article entitled “The Pope, the Mass and the Politics of the Vatican Bureaucrats” (*The Latin Mass* magazine, Winter Supplement, January 2002), Italian journalist Alessandro Zangrando recounts an incident in which the Vatican Secretary of State blocked publication in *L’Osservatore*

Romano of Pope John Paul II’s praise of the traditional Latin Mass. The praise had been expressed in a papal message to an assembly of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments: “In the Roman Missal of St. Pius V, as in many Eastern liturgies, are very many beautiful prayers with which the priests express the most profound sense of humility and reverence before the Holy Mysteries, the prayers revealing the Substance Itself of each Liturgy.”

Zangrando noted that while papal messages to Vatican congregations are routinely published soon after their release, this one was not. It was only after the Pope’s praise of the traditional Mass was published in the secular Italian newspaper *Il Giornale* that the Vatican Secretary of State suddenly (within 24 hours) released the text of the Holy Father’s message through the Vatican Press Office—more than a month after its issuance by the Pope. But to this day, and contrary to normal practice, the Pope’s message to the Congregation has not been published in *L’Osservatore Romano*, the Pope’s own newspaper. Zangrando quoted the conclusion of the renowned “Vaticanista” (specialist in Vatican affairs) Andrea Tornielli: “The very fact that 24 hours after the publication of the article [in *Il Giornale*] the Vatican Secretariat of State made public the text of the Holy Father’s letter, proves that a real attempt had been made at ‘censoring’ the Pope’s words... The operation backfired with unintended results”—that is, the Pope’s praise of the traditional Mass ended up gaining even wider publicity in the secular press.

Here we see how another key element of the Church’s new orientation—the abandonment of Her traditional Latin liturgy—was enforced by the Secretary of State, who tried to censor the Pope’s praise for the traditional Mass. Who knows how many other papal utterances have been censored—successfully—by the Vatican Secretariat of State? This incident is only typical of the way Church governance operated, especially given Pope John Paul II’s declining physical health.

Cardinal Ratzinger Executes the Sodano Party Line

Returning to the “commentary” with these facts in mind, one can see that the press conference of June 26, 2000 had one overriding purpose: to carry out Cardinal Sodano’s order concerning the “correct” interpretation of the Message of Fatima. By the time the reporters left that room, the Message of Fatima—all of it—was to be buried. And once buried, the Message would no longer impede Cardinal Sodano and his collaborators in their relentless pursuit of the Church’s new, post-Fatima orientation, which includes (as we shall see) the important Church business of lauding, dining and hobnobbing at the Vatican with the likes of Mikhail Gorbachev, having the Pope apologize to the Red Chinese regime, pressuring Romanian Catholics to surrender to the Orthodox church the local Catholic Church’s rights to the properties stolen by Josef Stalin, supporting and even contributing money to a godless,

unaccountable International Criminal Court under United Nations auspices that could try Catholics of any nation for unspecified “crimes against humanity”, and other such “triumphs” of Vatican diplomacy.

In other words, every last holdout in the Church must be brought along to the Vatican’s new way of thinking and speaking to the world, which does not square well with Our Lady of Fatima’s prophecy of the *triumph* of Her Immaculate Heart, the spread of *devotion* to Her Immaculate Heart and the consequent *conversion* of Russia through the intervention of the Immaculate Heart. This sort of talk just won’t do anymore, even if it does come from the Mother of God. So, the precise task entrusted to Cardinal Ratzinger and Msgr. Bertone on June 26 was to find a way to detach the faithful once and for all from the explicitly Catholic aspects of the Message of Fatima, which all too clearly remind us of the “triumphal” Church of the “pre-conciliar dark age”. As the *Los Angeles Times* would observe in its headline of June 27, 2000: “Catholic Church Unveils Third Secret: The Vatican’s Top Theologian Gently Debunks a Nun’s Account of Her 1917 Vision That Fueled Decades of Speculation.” The effort was so blatant that even a secular newspaper could not help but notice it. Let us provide the proof of this crime against the Virgin of Fatima and the saintly seers God chose to receive Her message.

First, there was the attempt in *TMF* to dispose of the *triumph* of the Immaculate Heart:

I would like finally to mention another key expression of the “secret” which has become justly famous: “my Immaculate Heart will triumph”. What does this mean? The Heart open to God, purified by contemplation of God, is stronger than guns and weapons of every kind. The *fiat* of Mary, the word of her heart, has changed the history of the world, because it brought the Saviour into the world—because, thanks to her *Yes*, God could become man in our world and remains so for all time.

The attentive reader will notice immediately that the first three words from the Virgin’s prophecy: *In the end* have been removed. This was necessary for the revisionist “interpretation” along the lines dictated by Sodano: namely, that Fatima belongs to the past.

Thus, “*In the end*, My Immaculate Heart will triumph” is—after the expedient removal of the first three words—now to be understood as follows: “2,000 years ago My Immaculate Heart triumphed.” Our Lady’s prophecy of what *will* happen *in the end* is blatantly falsified into a mere acknowledgment of what had already happened 20 centuries ago at the *beginning* of Christian history. Four future events—the triumph of the Immaculate Heart, the consecration of Russia, Russia’s conversion, and the resulting period of peace in the world—are cunningly converted into one event 2,000 years ago! This tampering with a message God Himself sent to earth through His Blessed Mother should cause any member of the faithful to rise up and demand justice in the name of Heaven.

But on this point it seems that Pope Benedict XVI—as if his elevation to the papacy had freed him from the dictates of the Vatican Secretary of State—has reconsidered this exercise in Fatima revisionism. In a prayer that Pope Benedict addressed to the Mother of God in the Holy Land at Bethlehem on May 13, 2009, the anniversary of the first apparition at Fatima, the Pope said: “You promised the three children of Fatima that ‘in the end, My Immaculate Heart will triumph.’ May it be so!”

That remark represents a stunning reversal of the Party Line that the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart is already behind us, and that it consists of the “fall of communism” following the “consecration of Russia” in 1984—during a ceremony which avoided any mention of Russia, lest the Russians be offended. We will examine the evidence that demolishes that claim more in Chapter 16. But, more to the point at issue here, the Pope’s declaration is a reversal of the former Cardinal Ratzinger’s truly embarrassing claim in *TMF* that the triumph of the Immaculate Heart prophesied at Fatima was Mary’s “fiat” 2,000 years ago at the Annunciation of the Archangel Gabriel.

These and other words and deeds of the currently reigning Pope, Benedict XVI, some of which we have already mentioned, give reason for hope that the course of events can be altered to avert disaster for the Church and the world. But, seven years after we published the first edition of this book, the course remains essentially unaltered, with a new helmsman in the Vatican Secretariat of State—Cardinal Bertone, the successor to Cardinal Sodano—following precisely the same coordinates, even if we now have a Pope who might wish to turn the ship around. We shall explore this situation in the final chapters, especially Chapters 15 and 16.

Second, concerning Our Lady’s call to establish *devotion* to Her Immaculate Heart throughout the world as “God wishes,” Cardinal Ratzinger suggests:

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.” To be “devoted” to the Immaculate Heart of Mary means therefore to embrace this attitude of heart, which makes the *fiat*—“your will be done”—the defining centre of one’s whole life.

Notice, first of all, the quotation marks placed around *devoted* and *immaculate heart*, which is stripped of its upper-case I—a sure sign these words are about to acquire a new meaning.

Thus, “God wishes to establish in the world devotion to My Immaculate Heart” is now to be understood as: “God wishes everyone to do His will.” In fact, everyone whose heart is open to God’s will acquires an “immaculate heart” of his own. So, devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary means opening one’s *own* heart to God, not spreading devotion to *Her* heart in order to make the world (especially Russia) Catholic.

Immaculate with a capital I becomes immaculate with a lower-case i, and Her Heart becomes everyone's heart, at least potentially. As a magician would say: "Presto, change-o!"

There is, of course, only one word to describe the demotion of the one and only Immaculate Heart—conceived without Original Sin and guilty of no personal sin whatsoever—to the level of the heart of any person who turns away from his sins and finds interior unity with God. The word is *blasphemy*.

Here too, however, we have witnessed since the first edition of this book an apparent change in the man who was Cardinal Ratzinger but is now Benedict XVI—almost as if the Pope had somehow heeded the criticism leveled in the first edition of this book against the Cardinal, even if he had never read it. In an Angelus address on June 5, 2005, less than two months after his election to the papacy, the Pope unequivocally affirmed the uniqueness of the Immaculate Heart:

The heart that resembles that of Christ *more than any other* is without a doubt the Heart of Mary, His Immaculate Mother, and for this very reason the liturgy holds Them up together for our veneration.²⁴⁷

And then, in his homily on the Solemnity of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in 2009, the Pope offered these beautiful words of praise and tribute to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, while affirming the dogma of the Immaculate Conception:

May the Virgin Mary, whose Immaculate Heart we shall contemplate with lively faith tomorrow, obtain this grace for us. The Curé of Ars had a filial devotion to Mary, a devotion so profound that in 1836, in anticipation of the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, he dedicated his parish to Mary "conceived without sin". He frequently renewed this offering of the parish to the Blessed Virgin, teaching his parishioners that "to be heard it is enough to speak to Her", for the simple reason that She "desires above all else to see us happy".²⁴⁸

Papal statements like these are an encouraging sign that perhaps this Pope will finally bring the Church to correspond to the requests of Our Lady of Fatima, if the faithful continue to pray and work for that outcome. Meanwhile, however, the Party Line as enunciated in *TMF* continues to exert its negative influence at many levels of the Church.

Third, the *conversion* of Russia had to be disposed of. This was a bit more difficult to make disappear, for there is not much one can say to obscure the Mother of God's very clear statement that "the Holy

²⁴⁷ Benedict XVI's talk at the Angelus on June 5, 2005; on the web at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/angelus/2005/documents/hf_ben-xvi_ang_20050605_en.html.

²⁴⁸ Solemnity of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, Opening of the Year for Priests on the 150th Anniversary of the Death of Saint John Mary Vianney, Homily of His Holiness Benedict XVI, Saint Peter's Basilica, Friday, June 19, 2009.

Father will consecrate Russia to Me, which *will be converted*.” But, as we have demonstrated abundantly, the conversion of Russia is no longer acceptable to the Vatican apparatus. The solution to this problem was simply to avoid any discussion of the subject in *TMF*, although Our Lady’s words are quoted without comment. The conversion of Russia? What conversion?²⁴⁹

Fourth, *TMF*’s crowning insult was the citation of only one “authority” on Fatima in *TMF*: the Flemish “theologian” Edouard Dhanis, S.J., who is identified as an “eminent scholar” on Fatima. Dhanis, a modernist Jesuit, made a veritable career out of casting doubt on the Fatima apparitions. Dhanis proposed that everything in the Secret of Fatima beyond a call for prayer and penance was cobbled together in the minds of the three children from things they had seen or heard in their own lives. Dhanis thus categorized as “Fatima II” all those things which the “eminent scholar” arbitrarily rejected as fabrications—without ever once interviewing Sister Lucy or studying the official Fatima archives.

As Dhanis put it: “All things considered, it is not easy to state precisely what degree of credence is to be given to the accounts of Sister Lucy. Without questioning her sincerity, or the sound judgment she shows in daily life, one may judge it prudent to use her writings only with reservations. ... Let us observe also that a good person can be sincere and prove to have good judgment in everyday life, but have a *propensity for unconscious fabrication* in a certain area, or in any case, a tendency to relate old memories of twenty years ago with embellishments and considerable modifications.”²⁵⁰

Dhanis, who refused to examine the official Fatima archives, cast doubt on every aspect of the Message of Fatima which did not accord with his neo-modernist leanings: the prayer taught by the Angel he called “inexact”; the vision of hell he called an “exaggeratedly medieval representation”; the prophecy of “a night illumined by an unknown light” heralding the advent of World War II he described as “grounds for suspicion.” And as for the consecration of Russia, Dhanis flatly declared that: “Russia could not be consecrated by the Pope, without this act taking on the air of a challenge, both in regard to the separated hierarchy, as well as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. *This would make the consecration practically unrealizable ...*” Thus, Dhanis declared that the consecration of Russia would be “morally impossible by reason

²⁴⁹ Following the first edition of *The Devil’s Final Battle*, the respected journal *Inside the Vatican* published an article demolishing the specious objection that the Consecration of Russia by the Pope and Catholic bishops would offend the Russian Orthodox. Cf. Cathy Pearson, “Now Is the Time: Consecrating Russia Will Help, Not Harm, Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue,” *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 “breakthrough” article is available from the publisher of this book (see page xxvi).

²⁵⁰ Dhanis’ entire thesis against Fatima is explained and critiqued in Frère Michel, *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. I, Part II, pp. 384-528. All quotations concerning his false theory are from this source.

of the reactions it would normally provoke.”²⁵¹

Dhanis' deconstruction of the Message of Fatima is a typical example of how modernists undermine Catholic truths based upon premises they themselves invent. Since (invented premise) the consecration of Russia is morally impossible, how could Our Lady of Fatima have requested it? Having thus stacked the deck against Sister Lucy, Dhanis states the “inevitable” conclusion: “But could the Most Holy Virgin have requested a consecration which, taken according to the rigor of the terms, would be practically unrealizable? ... This question indeed seems to call for a *negative response*. ... Thus, it hardly seems probable that Our Lady asked for the consecration of Russia. ...” Based entirely on the premise Dhanis invented, Sister Lucy's testimony is pronounced a fraud.

That is precisely the line adopted by Cardinal Sodano and his Vatican apparatus: the Mother of God could not possibly have requested anything as diplomatically embarrassing as a public Consecration of Russia: and so we must do away with this embarrassing notion once and for all. It is this Party Line that Cardinal Ratzinger endorsed in his “commentary” by praising Dhanis as an “eminent scholar” on Fatima. Cardinal Ratzinger, following the Party Line, suggests that the Third Secret in particular consists of “images which Lucia may have seen in devotional books and which draw their inspiration from long-standing intuitions of faith.” In other words, who can really say which parts of the Third Secret are authentic and which are merely personal memories or “intuitions”? And if that were true of the Third Secret, it would also be true of the rest of the Message of Fatima.

The apparent attempt to undermine Sister Lucy's credibility, while professing great respect for the Message of Fatima, will be taken up again in the following chapter. Here it suffices to say that the former Cardinal Ratzinger's evident agreement with Dhanis that all the specifically prophetic elements of the Message are unreliable ought to have disqualified him from proposing any “interpretation” of the Third Secret, or indeed any other part of the Fatima Message. If (at least in 2000) he simply did not believe that the Mother of God called for the consecration of Russia, the conversion of Russia to the Catholic Faith, the triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and the establishment throughout the world of the specifically Catholic devotion to *the one and only* Immaculate Heart, then he had a duty to reveal that bias and abstain entirely from the matter, rather than “proposing” an “interpretation” that discredited that which he purported to “interpret.”

What was left of the Message of Fatima after June 26? On this point, the then-Cardinal Ratzinger, Msgr. (now Cardinal) Bertone, and Fr. Dhanis all seemed to agree: “What remains was already evident when we began our reflections on the text of the ‘secret’: the exhortation to prayer as the path of ‘salvation for souls’ [*sic*] and, likewise, the

²⁵¹ Ibid.

summons to penance and conversion.” On June 26, 2000 the Message of Fatima became Fatima Lite: a watered-down prescription for personal piety without any specific relevance to the future of mankind.

For *this* the Mother of God came to earth and called down the Miracle of the Sun? It is interesting to note that even in presenting this minimalist version of the Message, Cardinal Ratzinger could not write about salvation for souls without bracketing those words with the same squeamish quotation marks he used to distance himself from the words *devotion*, *triumph* and *immaculate* in his commentary. It seems even Fatima Lite is not quite light enough in Catholic content for the ecumenical palates of modern churchmen.

As for Our Lady’s prophetic warning that “various nations will be annihilated” if the consecration of Russia were not done, this we are apparently supposed to forget. There will be no annihilation of nations, “Fatima is all in the past.” Cardinal Sodano said as much and the then-Cardinal Ratzinger seemed to agree.

The Party Line on the Consecration of Russia

We have mentioned Archbishop (now Cardinal) Bertone’s role in *TMF*. His principal contributions to the farce were two:

First, Bertone issued the “command” (binding, of course, on no one) that the faithful must cease asking for the Consecration of Russia: “Hence any further discussion or request [of the Consecration] is without basis.”

To support this claim, Bertone cited exactly one piece of evidence: the manifestly fake “letter of November 8, 1989” from “Sister Lucy” to Mr. Noelker, which we have already mentioned—the same letter in which “Sister Lucy” writes about a consecration of the world by Pope Paul VI at Fatima which she never witnessed because it never happened. Tellingly enough, Bertone fails to identify the addressee of the letter. Nor does he provide the world with a copy to examine, lest anyone notice the fatal blunder concerning Pope Paul’s nonexistent “consecration of the world.” Even more telling, *TMF* contains absolutely no direct testimony by Sister Lucy herself concerning the Consecration, even though Bertone himself had interviewed her about the Third Secret only two months earlier, and she was readily available to the then-Cardinal Ratzinger and the entire Vatican apparatus during the beatification ceremony in May.

Small wonder. *TMF*’s version of the “consecration of Russia”—which is to say Cardinal Sodano’s version—flatly contradicts a lifetime of testimony to the contrary by Sister Lucy. We consider a few examples here.

Over 60 years ago, on July 15, 1946, the eminent author and historian, William Thomas Walsh interviewed Sister Lucy, which is recounted in his important work, *Our Lady of Fatima*, which sold over one million copies. During this interview, which appears at the book’s

end, Mr. Walsh asked her pointed questions about the correct procedure for the Collegial Consecration:

Finally we came to the important subject of the second July secret, of which so many different and conflicting versions have been published. Lucia made it plain that Our Lady did not ask for the consecration of *the world* to Her Immaculate Heart. What She demanded specifically was the consecration of *Russia*. She did not comment, of course, on the fact that Pope Pius XII had consecrated the world, not Russia, to the Immaculate Heart in 1942. But she said more than once, and with deliberate emphasis: "What Our Lady wants is that the Pope and all the bishops in the world shall consecrate Russia to Her Immaculate Heart on one special day. If this is done, She will convert Russia and there will be peace. If it is not done, the errors of Russia will spread through every country in the world".²⁵²

Sister Lucy is clear and forthright. The collegial consecration requested by Heaven is the Consecration of *Russia*, not the *world*, which must be done by the Pope in union with the world's bishops on the same day.

Then there is the little-known revelation of Our Lady to Sister Lucy in the early 1950s, which is recounted in *Il Pellegrinaggio delle Meraviglie*, published under the auspices of the Italian episcopate. The Virgin Mary appeared to Sister Lucy in May 1952 and said: "Make it known to the Holy Father that I am always awaiting the Consecration of Russia to My Immaculate Heart. Without the Consecration, Russia will not be able to convert, nor will the world have peace."²⁵³

Thus, 10 years after Pope Pius XII's 1942 consecration of the world, we have the report of Our Lady reminding Sister Lucy that Russia will not be converted, nor will there be peace, unless Russia is consecrated by name.

Thirty years later, in 1982, Sister Lucy's testimony remains steadfast. On May 12, 1982, the day before the attempted 1982 consecration, the Vatican's own *L'Osservatore Romano* published an interview of Sister Lucy by Father Umberto Maria Pasquale, a Salesian priest, during which she told Father Umberto that Our Lady had never requested the consecration of the world, but *only* the Consecration of Russia:

At a certain moment I said to her: "Sister, I should like to ask you a question. If you cannot answer me, let it be. But if you can answer it, I would be most grateful to you ... Has Our Lady ever spoken to you about the Consecration of ***the world*** to Her Immaculate Heart?"

²⁵² William Thomas Walsh, *Our Lady of Fatima*, (Image-Doubleday, New York, *Imprimatur* 1947) p. 221. Emphasis in the original.

²⁵³ *Il Pellegrinaggio delle Meraviglie*, (Rome, 1960) p. 440. This same work, published under the auspices of the Italian episcopate, affirms that this message was communicated to Pope Pius XII in June. Also, Canon Casimir Barthas mentioned that apparition in his communication to the Mariological Congress of Lisbon-Fatima, in 1967; see *De Primordiis cultus marianae, Acta congressus mariologici-mariana in Lusitania anno 1967 celebrati*, (Rome, 1970) p. 517. See *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, pp. 21 and 37.

“**No**, Father Umberto! **Never!** At the Cova da Iria in 1917 Our Lady had promised: **I shall come to ask for the Consecration of Russia ...** In 1929, at Tuy, as She had promised, Our Lady came back to tell me that the moment had come to ask the Holy Father for the Consecration of **that country** [Russia].”

This testimony was confirmed by Sister Lucy in a handwritten letter to Father Umberto, which the priest also published. (See photographic reproduction below.) A translation of the letter reads:

Reverend Father Umberto, in replying to your question, I will clarify: Our Lady of Fatima, in Her request, referred only to the Consecration of Russia ... — *Coimbra 13 IV - 1980 (signed) Sister Lucia*

J + M.
 Sr. do Senhor F. Umberto
 Respondendo à sua pergunta
 te esclareço:
 Nossa Senhora, em Fátima, em
 seu pedido, só se refere a essa
 graça da Rússia....
 Coimbra 13 IV - 1980
 S. Lucia

Again, on March 19, 1983, at the request of the Holy Father, Sister Lucy met with the Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Portalupi, Dr. Lacerda, and Father Messias Coelho. During this meeting, Sister Lucy confirmed that Pope John Paul’s consecration of 1982 did not fulfill the requests of Our Lady. Sister Lucy said:

In the act of offering of May 13, 1982, Russia did not appear as being the object of the consecration. And each bishop did not organize in his own diocese a public and solemn ceremony of reparation and Consecration of Russia. Pope John Paul II simply renewed the consecration of the world executed by Pius XII on October 31, 1942. From this consecration we can expect some benefits, but not the conversion of Russia.²⁵⁴

²⁵⁴ *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, p. 165.

She concluded, "The Consecration of Russia *has not been done as Our Lady had demanded it*. I was not able to say it [before] because I did not have the permission of the Holy See."²⁵⁵

A year later, on March 25, 1984, Pope John Paul II made an act of offering wherein he again consecrated "the world", not Russia. As with the 1982 consecration, "each bishop did not organize in his own diocese a public and solemn ceremony of reparation and consecration of Russia". Concerning this ceremony Frère François writes: "In the months which followed the act of offering of March 25, 1984, which was only a renewal of the act of 1982, the principal scholars of Fatima agreed in saying that the consecration of Russia had not yet been done as Heaven wished it."²⁵⁶

Such was also the conviction of Father Antonio Maria Martins,²⁵⁷ and of Father Messias Coelho who, on the eve of March 25, 1984, had announced in *Mensagem de Fátima*, of which he is the publisher-editor, "Consecration of Russia: It will not be done yet this time."²⁵⁸

These theologians based their statements not only on the bald fact that a consecration of Russia needs to mention the word "Russia", but also on the testimony of Sister Lucy herself.

On Thursday, March 22, 1984, three days before the act of offering, the Carmel of Coimbra was celebrating Sister Lucy's seventy-seventh birthday. She received on that day, as was her custom, her old friend Mrs. Eugenia Pestana. After extending good wishes to her Carmelite friend, Mrs. Pestana asked, "Then Lucy, Sunday is the Consecration?" Sister Lucy, who had already received and read the text of the Pope's consecration formula made a negative sign and declared, "That consecration cannot have a decisive character."²⁵⁹

The "decisive character" which is the stamp of the proper consecration is the miraculous conversion of Russia. Although the new "ecumenical orientation" of the Church has confused the issue, the conversion of Russia means conversion to *Catholicism*. This is not only a matter of common sense, but it is also found in the testimony of Father Joaquin Alonso, probably the foremost Fatima expert of the 20th Century. Father Alonso, who had many interviews with Sister Lucy, wrote in 1976:

... we should affirm that Lucia always thought that the 'conversion' of Russia is not to be limited to the return of the Russian people to the Orthodox Christian religion, rejecting the Marxist atheism of the Soviets, but rather, it refers purely, plainly

²⁵⁵ Reported within an article by Father Pierre Caillon of Centre Saint Jean, 61500, Sées, (Orne) France. This article was published by the monthly periodical *Fidelite Catholique*, B.P. 217-56402, Auray Cedex, France. English translation from *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 13-14, (October-December, 1983) p. 3.

²⁵⁶ *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, p. 172.

²⁵⁷ See *Fatima e o Coração de Maria*, pp. 101-102.

²⁵⁸ *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, p. 172.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 167-168.

and simply to the total, integral conversion of Russia to the one true Church of Christ, the Catholic Church.²⁶⁰

In a 1985 interview in *Sol de Fatima*, Sister Lucy was asked if the Pope fulfilled the request of Our Lady when he consecrated the world in 1984. Sister Lucy replied: “*There was no participation of all the bishops, and there was no mention of Russia.*” She was then asked, “*So the consecration was not done as requested by Our Lady?*” to which she replied: “*No. Many bishops attached no importance to this act.*”²⁶¹

Even Father Rene Laurentin, a comrade of the progressivists, admitted in 1986 that “*Sister Lucy remains unsatisfied*²⁶² ... Lucy seems to think that the Consecration has ‘not been made’ as Our Lady wanted it.”²⁶³

Then on July 20, 1987, Sister Lucy was interviewed quickly outside her convent while voting. Here she told journalist Enrique Romero that the Consecration of Russia has not been done as requested.²⁶⁴

More of Sister Lucy’s affirmations that the 1984 consecration did not fulfill Heaven’s conditions could be cited,²⁶⁵ but the point is made: the then-Msgr. Bertone and the former Cardinal Ratzinger, following Sodano’s Party Line, relied *entirely* on a single, manifestly bogus letter to overcome more than fifty years of unwavering testimony by Sister Lucy on Heaven’s requirements for an effectual consecration of Russia. They had not dared to ask Sister Lucy about the matter themselves—or, if they had, she had not provided answers consistent with the Party Line.²⁶⁶

The Party Line on Fatima and World Peace

This brings us to Msgr. Bertone’s second contribution to the farce. It came in the form of this statement, which is here photographically reproduced from their June 26, 2000 statement (*TMF*), on page 9:

The decision of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to make public the third part of the “secret” of Fatima brings to an end a period of history marked by tragic human lust for power and evil, yet pervaded by the merciful love of God and the watchful care of the Mother of Jesus and of the Church.

²⁶⁰ *La Verdad sobre el Secreto de Fatima, Fatima sin mitos*, Father Joaquin Alonso, (2nd edition, Ejercito Azul, Madrid, 1988) p. 78. English translation by Joseph Cain. Original Spanish reads: “... *podríamos decir que Lucia ha pensado siempre que la ‘conversión’ de Rusia no se entiende solo de un retorno de los pueblos de Rusia a la religion cristiano-ortodoxa, rechazando el ateismo marxista y ateo de los soviets, sino que se refiere pura y llanmente a la conversion total e integral de un retorno a la unica y verdadera Iglesia, la catolica-romana.*”

²⁶¹ *Sol de Fatima*, September 1985.

²⁶² *Chrètiens-Magazine*, March 1987, #8. Cited from *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, p. 189.

²⁶³ Father Laurentin, “*Multiplication des apparitions de la Vierge aujourd’hui*”, (Fayard, September, 1988), p. 45. Cited from *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, p. 189.

²⁶⁴ This testimony of Sister Lucy was reported in the early August (1987) edition of *Para Ti* published in Argentina. See *World Enslavement or Peace ... It’s Up to the Pope*, Father Nicholas Gruner (The Fatima Crusader, Fort Erie, 1988), pp. 212-213.

²⁶⁵ For more testimony, see Chapter VI of *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*.

²⁶⁶ The reported November 17, 2001 interview between Archbishop (now Cardinal) Bertone and Sister Lucy is treated at length in Chapter 11, “Muzzling and Hiding the Witness”.

It is difficult to find words to express the offensiveness of this absurd claim. Here Sodano's Party Line seriously proposes that *an entire era of human lust for power and evil has been brought to an end* with the Vatican's "disclosure" of the obscure vision of the "Bishop dressed in White." In which case, why did the Vatican wait forty years to bring on world peace, when all it had to do, according to Msgr. Bertone, was stage a press conference in 1960 to publish this vision?

Cardinal Sodano evidently recognized that he must provide the faithful with some sort of counterfeit to take the place of the triumph of the Immaculate Heart, which had never materialized following the 1984 "consecration of Russia." The press conference of June 26, 2000 was thus presented as the great culmination of the Message of Fatima!

But somehow Msgr. Bertone and Cardinal Ratzinger seemed to ignore the obvious implications of Sister Lucy's letter, entirely in her own handwriting and *purportedly* (we emphasize "purportedly" for reasons that will soon be clear) addressed to the Pope on May 12, 1982. A cropped portion of the purported letter to the Pope was photographically reproduced in *TMF*. We present that photographic reproduction here, just as it appears in *TMF*:

E se

não vemos ainda, o facto consumado, do fim desta profecia, vemos que para
 a realizarmos a passos largos. Se não recusarmos no caminho do pecado
 do ódio, da vingança, da injustiça e tropeçando os direitos da pessoa hu-
 mana, da imortalidade e da violência etc.

E não digamos que é Deus, que assim nos castiga, mas sim, que são
 os homens, que para si mesmos se preparam o castigo.

We also reproduce below, exactly as it appears in *TMF*, the actual typeset English translation of the Portuguese handwritten fragment reproduced above:

And

*if we have not yet seen the complete fulfilment of the final part of
 this prophecy, we are going towards it little by little with great strides.
 If we do not reject the path of sin, hatred, revenge, injustice, violations
 of the rights of the human person, immorality and violence, etc.*

*And let us not say that it is God who is punishing us in this way;
 on the contrary it is people themselves who are preparing their own
 punishment.*²⁶⁷

This purported letter to the Pope in 1982 makes *absolutely no reference* to the 1981 assassination attempt a year before; much less does it characterize the attempt as any sort of fulfillment of the Third Secret. Clearly, a year after the attempt Sister Lucy remained worried

²⁶⁷ The Vatican translation "we are going towards it little by little with great strides" is clearly defective. The words "little by little" do not appear in the handwritten Portuguese original published on p. 9 of *TMF* provided by the Vatican itself.

about a global chastisement in consequence of the Church’s failure to heed the imperatives of the Fatima Message. She certainly was not writing to the Pope about the triumph of the Immaculate Heart, but rather the annihilation of nations.

Also very curious is that the same letter from Sister Lucy, which *TMF* represents as being addressed to Pope John Paul II, contains the phrase: “The third part of the secret that ***you are so anxious to know*** (*que tanto ansiáis por conocer*)”. Why would the Pope be “so anxious to know” the third part of the Secret if he already had the text in his possession at the Vatican, where it has been lodged since 1957? Why would His Holiness in 1982 be “so anxious to know” what he had already read in 1981 (as Ratzinger/Bertone claim), or as early as 1978, as papal spokesman Joaquin Navarro-Valls told the Portuguese press?

It is highly suspicious that the phrase “you are so anxious to know” is deleted *from every Vatican translation of the original Portuguese letter* in the various language versions of Bertone and Ratzinger’s commentary (see also pages 349-350 of this book). Even the Portuguese language version of *TMF* omits the phrase “you are so anxious to know” from the *Portuguese* typeset reproduction of the original letter. Clearly, the Vatican apparatus wanted to avoid a storm of questions about how the Pope could be anxious to know something he already knew. But by the time reporters could compare their translations with the original Portuguese letter, the press conference was over and no further questions could be asked.

Two conclusions are possible: Either the letter was not really written to the Pope, or there was something more to the Secret which the Pope really did not know as of May 12, 1982, the date of the purported letter from Sister Lucy. As Sir Walter Scott’s famous aphorism goes: “Oh! What a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive.”²⁶⁸ The first deception—that Fatima belongs to the past—leads to a tangled web of other deceptions in order to cover up the first.

Targeting Father Gruner

But there was more to be done in this campaign to bury Fatima in the past. What about “the Fatima priest”, whose apostolate’s publications and broadcasts were persistently and quite effectively hammering home the point that the Vatican apparatus, pursuing its new vision of the Church, had turned its back on the Virgin’s requests? At the end of the June 26 press conference, the then-Cardinal Ratzinger mentioned Father Nicholas Gruner by name, stating that he is a serious man. But he then went on to imply that Father Gruner must conform himself to “the Magisterium” on the question of the Consecration of Russia, which (so the Party Line goes) was now over and done with. But the Magisterium—the authoritative teaching office of the Church—had

²⁶⁸ “Marmion: A Tale of Flodden Field”, Canto 6, stanza 17. Poem by Sir Walter Scott.

taught nothing of the kind. There was only the Sodano Interpretation of Fatima, and *TMF's* non-binding “attempt” to explain away all of the specific prophetic content of the Fatima Message²⁶⁹ (leaving only prayer and penance).

Ratcheting up this persecution, Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos had, only days before the June 26 press conference, sent Father Gruner a letter containing the astounding threat that he would be excommunicated from the Catholic Church. This letter was followed up with a communiqué to the bishops of the Philippines (where Father Gruner's apostolate is strongly supported), advising that Father Gruner would be excommunicated unless (among other things demanded) he “reconciled himself to Church authorities”—that is, according to Castrillón Hoyos, return to the Diocese of Avellino (where Father Gruner was no longer incardinated), close down his apostolate and bow to the Party Line on Fatima. For his own part, the Bishop of Avellino had never needed Father Gruner's services, never supported him financially, and had never taken any steps to secure a proper immigration visa for the “return” to Avellino. The Bishop of Avellino was nothing but a pawn in the Secretary of State's chess game. (We will have more to say about this travesty in later chapters.)

In his remarks about Father Gruner at the end of the June 26 press conference, the then-Cardinal Ratzinger had also noted that Father Gruner was no doubt suffering from *angoscia*—the Italian word for mental anguish. The Cardinal must have known of the threat of excommunication, which would indeed cause *angoscia* in any faithful priest who loves the Church. But Father Gruner's plight is only emblematic of the plight of the Church as a whole in the post-conciliar epoch: a priest who has committed no offense against faith, morals or ecclesiastical discipline is personally threatened with excommunication by the very head of the Congregation for the Clergy, while throughout the Church predators in Roman collars molest altar boys or spread heresy as their bishops move them from place to place or conceal their activities and protect them from punishment; and the Congregation for the Clergy does nothing.

What is to explain this outrageous disparity of justice? There seems to us only one sensible explanation, based on what we have shown thus far: In the Catholic Church of the post-conciliar Adaptation the one unforgivable offense—just as in Stalinist Russia—is to buck the Party Line. And Father Gruner had bucked the Party Line on Fatima.

²⁶⁹ It should be noted that the then-Cardinal Ratzinger himself said regarding the Vatican's interpretation of the Third Secret, “The Church does not want to impose an interpretation”. This quotation was reported in: “Final Secret of Fatima Published by Vatican”, *Boston Herald*, June 27, 2000; “Vatican's Secret is Out”, *The Express*, June 27, 2000; “Vatican Unease as it Reveals the Full Third Secret of Fatima”, *Financial Times (London)*, June 27, 2000; “Fatima ‘Snapshot of Martyr's Past Century’”, *The Irish Times*, June 27, 2000.

Exit Our Lady, Enter Gorbachev

We have claimed that this mockery and obscuration of the Fatima Message—the Party Line on Fatima—was intended to bury it once and for all, so that Cardinal Sodano could get on with his pursuit of the Church’s new orientation. Here is a particularly compelling example of what we mean:

Fatima having been “gently debunked” (to quote the *Los Angeles Times*) by Ratzinger and Bertone on June 26, the Vatican apparatus, led by Cardinal Sodano, immediately got down to what it considers the serious business of the Church. The very next day Mikhail Gorbachev was seated as a guest of honor between Cardinals Sodano and Silvestrini at a Vatican “press conference.” What was the purpose of this press conference? It was called to celebrate one of the key elements of the Church’s new orientation: *Ostpolitik*, the policy of “dialogue” and accommodation with Communist regimes (including Red China) that persecute the Church. The immediate occasion for the press conference was the posthumous publication of the memoirs of Cardinal Casaroli, the grand propagator of *Ostpolitik* and Cardinal Sodano’s predecessor in enforcing the Party Line against Fatima.²⁷⁰

In true Stalinist fashion, no questions from the press were permitted at this curious “press conference”—a press conference with no questions from the press! Evidently the Vatican wanted to be sure that no one bucked the Party Line with any questions about Fatima, or why the Vatican was honoring the likes of Mikhail Gorbachev, a man who admits he is still a Leninist and whose tax-free foundations are promoting the use of abortion and contraception to eliminate five billion people from the world’s population.²⁷¹ This is not even to mention this blood-drenched character’s public defense of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan when he was still head of the Soviet Communist Party—a genocidal campaign that included planting bombs disguised as toys, so that Afghan children would have their limbs and heads blown off.²⁷²

Could there be a more dramatic demonstration of the fundamental opposition between the Church of all time and the Church of the Adaptation? On June 26, 2000 Our Lady of Fatima was shown the

²⁷⁰ News of June 27, 2000 press conference. “Gorbachev Helps Introduce Casaroli Memoirs”, *Catholic World News*, June 27, 2000.

²⁷¹ In September 1995, Gorbachev held his “State of the World Forum” in San Francisco. Over 4000 of the world’s “elite” paid \$5,000 per person to attend the 5-day event. In a closing plenary session of the forum, a philosopher/author named Sam Keen provided a summary and concluding remarks on the conference. It reveals the Forum’s anti-life, anti-Christian ethos. To the conference participants, Keen said: “there was very strong agreement that religious institutions have to take the primary responsibility for the population explosion. We must speak far more clearly about sexuality, about contraception, about abortion, about the values that control the population, because the ecological crisis, in short, is the population crisis. *Cut the population by 90 percent and there aren’t enough people left to do a great deal of ecological damage.*” See “World’s elite gather to talk depopulation,” John Henry Western, *The Interim*, April 1996.

²⁷² See interview with Afghan official Abdul Shams in *Review of the News*, July 1985.

door, Her heavenly message audaciously censored and revised by men who would dare to consign it to oblivion. Then, a day later, Mikhail Gorbachev entered the Vatican to celebrate the Church's new orientation, as implemented by the late Cardinal Casaroli and by his successor, Cardinal Sodano.

Gorbachev, leader of the culture of death, was honored by the Vatican again on November 4, 2000 when he addressed the Pope and other prelates at the "Jubilee of Politicians"—a dinner gala for about 5,000 of the world's rulers of godless secular republics. The photographers captured the Pope listening very attentively to a speech by this key promoter of the abortion holocaust.²⁷³ This grotesque mixture of a Jubilee—a spiritual tradition in the Church derived from an Old Testament custom—with speeches by pro-abortion politicians on secular matters, is only typical of the new orientation, which constantly seeks to merge the Church with the world in the great Adaptation of Roman Catholicism to "modern civilization".

Enforcing the New Orientation in a "Post-Fatima" Church

The months following the June 26 press conference witnessed an acceleration in the campaign to impose the new orientation on the Message of Fatima onto the Church at large.

For example, on June 29, 2000, only two days after the Gorbachev farce, a seemingly unrelated but actually quite relevant event took place. Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos issued a letter in his capacity as the head of the Ecclesia Dei Commission, which is supposed to insure access to the traditional Latin Mass for those who seek it. The letter announced something quite remarkable at a time of general lack of discipline in the Church: The General Chapter (meeting) of the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter (chartered by Pope John Paul II to serve the needs of traditional Catholics who have not welcomed the changes in the Church) would be suppressed. Its election would not be held. The Fraternity's priestly members would not be allowed to re-elect as their superior Father Josef Bisig, who was expected to be nominated and re-elected by an overwhelming majority at the Chapter. Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos would simply impose upon the Fraternity a candidate more to his liking. Further, the rectors of the Fraternity's two seminaries would be removed and replaced with more liberal-minded priests.

The rationale for the Cardinal's actions is stated in his letter:

You know quite well that your seminary is observed by many people in the Church and that it must be exemplary in all respects. In particular, it is required to avoid and combat *a certain spirit of rebellion against the present-day Church*, which spirit easily finds followers among the young students, who like all young people

²⁷³ Photograph published in *Catholic Family News*, January 2001, p. 13; see also the photo on page 153 of this book.

already are inclined to extreme and rigorous positions.²⁷⁴

In a later interview in *30 Days* magazine, the Cardinal further explained that he was only helping the Fraternity “to strike a balance between their original charism and the outcome of their insertion *within the ecclesial reality of today*.”²⁷⁵

Consider these two phrases together: “a certain spirit of rebellion against the present-day Church”, and “their insertion within the ecclesial reality of today”. Now, the seminarians of the Priestly Fraternity are baptized Catholics. They were born and raised in the “mainstream” Catholic Church. They were young men who came from the “mainstream” and joined the Fraternity’s seminaries to be formed in a traditional manner and to celebrate the traditional Latin Mass.

And yet these young men, who have never gone into schism (so-called), are being told that nonetheless they must be inserted into the “present-day Church” and “the ecclesial reality of today”. But if they are already Catholics, then what is this thing into which they are being “inserted”? Is it the Holy Catholic Church? Clearly, it is not. What the Cardinal is speaking of—whether he knows this explicitly or not—is *the Church of the Adaptation*; the Church of the new orientation. We know this because the priests and seminarians of the papally chartered Fraternity of Saint Peter are indubitably Catholics, so that if they are being inserted into anything it is not the Holy Catholic Church proper, but something else, something new and strange.

And that is why we speak of the Sergian Adaptation of the Church (to recall that infamous “adaptation” of the Russian Orthodox Church to the demands of Stalin and of Soviet Communism under the Metropolitan Sergius). It is not as if the Church has been completely overthrown and has ceased entirely to be what She was, for this is impossible, given the promise of Our Lord that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church. Rather, a sort of Trojan Horse has been set up inside the Church—a church within the Church; a collection of novel practices and attitudes never before seen in Church history—that now wishes to insist that *it* is the Church. And whomever wishes to get along with this “present-day Church” must consent to be inserted into this “ecclesial reality of today” that has somehow set itself up *within* the perennial ecclesial reality of the Holy Catholic Church, alongside all the traditional beliefs and practices which have never been, and can never be, abolished, as Pope Benedict XVI confirmed so dramatically when he declared in *Summorum Pontificum* that the traditional Latin Mass was “never abrogated.” But while the “ecclesial reality of today” is only a temporary phenomenon that God will surely rectify because of the untold damage it has caused the Church, Cardinal Castrillón and his collaborators, following the Party Line of the Church’s new

²⁷⁴ Letter to the General Chapter of the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter, June 29, 2000.

²⁷⁵ *30 Days* magazine, No. 11, 2000, p. 17.

orientation—the Sergian Adaptation to the “modern world”—wished to pretend that it was to be a permanent thing.

One could not ask for a better proof of the existence of the Church's new orientation—her Stalinist Adaptation, as it were—than the Cardinal's brutal treatment of the Priestly Fraternity. Such actions would never be taken against the Jesuits or the other priestly orders that have been undermining the Church since Vatican II. Why? Because these morally and doctrinally corrupt orders *adhere to the Adaptation, to the Party Line, to the new orientation*. In the current crisis, the only thing the Vatican is willing to enforce with immediate and vigorous action is the Adaptation of the Church to the world—not sound doctrine, not sound practice, which are flouted throughout the Church with virtual impunity—but only the Adaptation. We have seen that since this book first appeared, Pope Benedict has made some effort to change this frightful situation, but the situation still dominates the ecclesial landscape.

In September of 2000 we encounter yet another dramatic example of the Church's Adaptation. From September 12-19, 2000, Cardinal Roger Etchegaray was in Red China to attend “a Symposium on Religions and Peace”. While there he celebrated Mass in the presence of the schismatic bishops of the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association (CCPA). The Mass was celebrated in the Shrine of Our Lady Help of Christians, which the Red Chinese regime has stolen from the true Catholic Church in China.²⁷⁶

The CCPA was formed in the 1950's to replace the Catholic Church after “Chairman Mao” declared the Catholic Church “illegal” in Red China. The CCPA is thus a human organization created by a Communist government and set up as a “church” which Chinese Catholics *must* join, forsaking the Roman Catholic Church, whose very existence has been declared “illegal” by the Red Chinese regime. *The CCPA constitution explicitly rejects submission to the Pope and declares the CCPA to be autonomous from Rome*. The CCPA bishops and priests, therefore, are all schismatics by definition.

Over 100 bishops have been consecrated illicitly by the CCPA without a papal mandate, in direct violation of the Code of Canon Law; worse still, those illicitly consecrated bishops publicly declared their primary allegiance to the Communist regime of China while disavowing (in the CCPA Constitution) any allegiance or submission to the Pope. As a result, these illicit bishops, and those who consecrated them, are excommunicated. In 1994 the CCPA bishops issued a so-called pastoral letter in which they endorsed China's population control policy, which includes forced abortions on all women who have one child already, calling upon Chinese Catholics to support this abomination.

In short, the CCPA is a Communist-created, Communist-controlled,

²⁷⁶ Zenit, September 19, 2000.

blatantly schismatic, blatantly heretical, pro-abortion organization, created by the devil himself, acting through Mao Tse-tung and his successor “President” Jiang. And yet the Vatican has declared no schism, nor any excommunication of these Communist-controlled, pro-abortion clergy. On the contrary, Cardinal Etchegaray went from the Vatican to China and openly and publicly celebrated Mass in the presence of CCPA bishops in a Marian Shrine which the CCPA, with the aid of Communist goons, stole from the Catholic Church and the Catholic faithful. Cardinal Etchegaray even stated that he “recognized the fidelity to the Pope of the Catholics of the official church [i.e., the CCPA]”. *Fidelity* to the Pope on the part of bishops who endorse forced abortion and whose Communist-controlled association rejects the papal primacy in its very constitution? What sort of nonsense is this?

While Cardinal Etchegaray was in China, an 82-year-old Catholic priest in the “underground” Catholic Church, which remains in union with Rome, was beaten into a coma and carted off to jail by “security” police.²⁷⁷ In accordance with *Ostpolitik*, the Vatican has issued no protest over the nearly fatal beating of this priest, nor any protest over the arrest, imprisonment and torture of loyal Catholic priests, bishops and laity by the Red Chinese regime. The Vatican apparatus is still chained to the Church’s new orientation—“dialogue” with the Church’s enemies and silence even in the face of blatant torture and persecution of faithful Catholics. This is the fruit of the new orientation’s abandonment of righteous opposition to evil. And this policy of the Adaptation of the Church will, in the long run, have the intended effect on millions more, who will lose their faith and apostatize, because the Vatican apparatus will no longer stand up and oppose evil with the righteous anger of old.

Here too we see the disparity of treatment as between traditional Catholics who in any way present an obstacle to the new orientation, and those who embrace the new orientation wholly and entirely. In contrast with the Vatican’s pandering to the CCPA, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre was publicly pronounced both excommunicated and schismatic in a *motu proprio* prepared for the Pope’s signature within 48 hours of Archbishop Lefebvre’s consecration of four bishops without a papal mandate²⁷⁸—an action the Archbishop took in an effort (however

²⁷⁷ *CWN News Brief*, September 18, 2000.

²⁷⁸ While it is true that in normal circumstances a bishop should not make a new bishop without explicit permission or authorization from the Pope, nevertheless it is foreseen both in law and in practice over the centuries in Church history that a bishop can and sometimes must consecrate—that is, make—another bishop without explicit permission and even to go against a specific direct order of the Pope. Canon Law recognizes the right of a subject to go against an explicit order of a higher authority—even that of a Pope—in a specific instance, after due reflection and prayer, to go directly contrary if his conscience, informed by Catholic doctrine, persuades him that he must do so. (See Canon 1323, especially Section 4; and Canon 1324, especially Section 1, subsection 8, and Section 3.) Furthermore, in law it is not *ipso facto* an act of schism for one to disobey in a specific instance while being subject to the authority of the Pope in general—but at

misguided some may think it to be) to maintain all Catholic dogmas and Tradition in a Church that appears to have gone mad.

The Red Chinese procure (through former Catholic bishops) the consecration of 100 bishops without a papal mandate for their pro-abortion “church” and the Vatican takes no punitive action. Quite the contrary, it sends a Cardinal (no less) as a representative to hobnob with some of the illicit bishops! Yet, when Archbishop Lefebvre consecrates four bishops to serve Catholic Tradition, he is immediately cast into outer darkness by the same Vatican apparatus, even though Archbishop Lefebvre and the four newly consecrated bishops consistently professed their loyalty to the Pope whom they were attempting to serve by preserving traditional Catholic practice and belief. Why this striking disparity of treatment? The answer, once again, is that Archbishop Lefebvre resisted the Adaptation; the Red Chinese bishops, on the other hand, *exemplify* it.

Of course, as we have already seen, in January 2009 Pope Benedict XVI provoked massive outrage in attempting to rectify this preposterous injustice by lifting the “excommunication” of the bishops of Lefebvre’s Society of Saint Pius X. But the double standard continues. And indeed today, in a Church wracked by dissent and scandal, and a world filled with objectively heretical and schismatic sects, only the four bishops of the Society are still called “schismatic.” The practitioners of the “new orientation” of the Church literally apply the word “schismatic” *to only four men in the entire world*: the traditional Catholic bishops of the Society that the Pope is accused of wrongly “rehabilitating.” What better indication of the apocalyptic state of affairs that still confronts us today, seven years after this book first appeared?

But it is even worse. According to an Open Letter of protest to Cardinal Sodano and other members of the Vatican apparatus, published by the Cardinal Kung Foundation, priests of the CCPA—the Chinese Communist puppet “church”, which is schismatic, Communist-controlled, and pro-abortion—have been given *canonical missions and priestly faculties in American dioceses*. Thus, these Communist priests celebrate Mass and hear confessions of Roman Catholic faithful in their local parishes where these agents of a Communist government learn the secret sins of innumerable Americans which may provide material for blackmail to the Communist masters in China.

most it is an act of disobedience.

But it is not even an act of disobedience, at least subjectively, nor can it be a cause for automatic excommunication if one does not feel bound to obey the Pope when one believes that the preservation of the Faith and the good of the Church demands it. The act of Archbishop Lefebvre on June 29, 1988 in consecrating four priests to the rank of bishop is beyond the scope of this book, but there are very learned articles by canonists and theologians which make a strong case for the subjective and objective defense of this act. (See articles by Patrick Valdrini, Dean of Canon Law, Institute Catholique, Paris, France and by Count Neri Caponi, Professor Emeritus of the Faculty of Canon Law, University of Florence, Italy.) Even various Cardinals in the Vatican have publicly, in various degrees, defended Archbishop Lefebvre in this act.

These CCPA “priests” are also placed in a position to poison the minds and hearts of their American penitents with Marxist advice and package it as if it were spiritual direction. This was confirmed by Archbishop Levada of San Francisco (now Cardinal Levada who has been transferred to be Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome), who claims that the Vatican—and no doubt Cardinal Sodano was involved in this decision—has authorized the granting of “an apostolic mission” to these priests of the pro-abortion, Communist-controlled, schismatic CCPA.²⁷⁹

Here is a literal, visible penetration of Communist power into the body of the Church. There could not be a more dramatic demonstration of the Adaptation. But the presence of these Communist-controlled priests in American parishes is only an icon of the whole process that was propagated in Metz, France, back in 1962, when the drawbridge of the Church was let down and the forces of the world, the Church’s sworn enemies, began to march into the Church, leading even Pope Paul VI to speak of the invasion of the Church by worldly thinking.

Imposing the Falsification of the Message of Fatima on the Church

Nowhere can one find a sadder example of the Adaptation of the Church (see the previous chapter, pages 107-109) than what occurred on October 8, 2000: a ceremony at the Vatican “entrusting” various things to Mary—an “entrustment” for the masses, to take their minds off the consecration of Russia. During this ceremony “all peoples”, the world, the unemployed, even “youth in search of meaning”—anything and everything but Russia—were “entrusted” to Our Lady. The day before this ceremony the praying of the Rosary in Saint Peter’s Square was broadcast around the world by satellite. But one thing was missing: the Fatima prayers. No one at the Vatican would pray: “O my Jesus, forgive us our sins, save us from the fires of hell. Lead all souls to Heaven, especially those most in need.” One decade of the Rosary, however, was recited by Sister Lucy for the cameras in the convent in Coimbra. Looking perfectly miserable, Sister Lucy did recite the Fatima prayers—in Portuguese. She had been reduced to a prop in a publicity stunt.

Here we see the Sergianization of the Message of Fatima, the Adaptation of Fatima to the world. Our Lady of Fatima becomes Our Lady of the Unemployed, Our Lady of Youth in Search of Meaning; and the Rosary is stripped of the Fatima prayers.

And this brings us to early 2001. The year 2000 had been a busy

²⁷⁹ Cardinal Kung Foundation’s *Open Letter to the Vatican*, Sec. III, March 28, 2000 (www.cardinalkungfoundation.org/cpa/openletter.html). In reply to the Kung Foundation (quoted in the *Open Letter*), Archbishop (now Cardinal) Levada (for more information about him, see entry on page 381 of “A Glossary of Ecclesiastical Terms, Organizations and Persons”) reveals that the “apostolic ministry” of CCPA priests “is being carried out according to directives received from the Holy See.”

year for the Adaptation, but there was some mopping up to do. Father Gruner was still conducting his very effective Fatima apostolate. So on February 16, 2001, Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos wrote to Father Gruner to renew his threat of excommunication of the previous June. If Father Gruner did not stop what he was doing, then there would be “definitive measures that would be painful for all concerned.”

In the same letter Cardinal Castrillón provided another demonstration of the new orientation at work on the Message of Fatima. According to Cardinal Castrillón “the Blessed Mother appeared to the three little visionaries in the Cova da Iria at the beginning of the century, and *marked out a program for the New Evangelization* which the whole Church finds itself engaged in, which is even more urgent at the dawn of the third millennium.”²⁸⁰ Our Lady of Fatima was now Our Lady of the New Evangelization—about which She had said not a single word at Fatima!

Our Lady did not come to Fatima to announce “the New Evangelization,” a slogan that describes a novel and ineffectual campaign to stimulate the dying faith of those who are already Catholics and who are taken in by the ongoing Stalinization of the Catholic Church.²⁸¹ Nor did Our Lady come to announce any of the other obscure slogans that have overrun the Church in the past forty years: “ecumenical dialogue,” “interreligious dialogue,” “solidarity,” “the civilization of love,” “inculturation,” and so forth. She came to announce the *Old* Evangelization, the perennial Gospel of Jesus Christ, Who is the same yesterday, today and forever—the selfsame Christ who warned the world that “He who believes and is baptized shall be saved; he who believes not shall be condemned.” As a group of Father Gruner’s supporters protested in their reply to the Cardinal:

Your Eminence, where can one find *any* of these elements in your rendering of the Message of Fatima? Where is Heaven and where is hell, for you speak only vaguely of “Ultimate Realities”—a term any Mason would find acceptable? Where is the *triumph* of the Immaculate Heart? Where are the consecration and *conversion* of Russia? Where are the warnings of Our Lady? Where indeed is the Message of Fatima at all?

Our Lady of Fatima’s message to the world was devoid of slogans such as “the New Evangelization.” She had uttered no slogans at all but only the simple Catholic truth: that many souls are burning in hell for lack of the Catholic Faith; that to save souls God ordains it necessary to

²⁸⁰ Letter to Father Nicholas Gruner, February 16, 2001.

²⁸¹ The New Evangelization is described as an Evangelization that is “new in its ardor, new in its method, and new in its expression”. It is under the umbrella of the “New Evangelization” that has “justified” the rowdy “Charismatic Movement” and Rock and Roll Eucharistic Congresses, World Youth Days nicknamed “Catholic Woodstock”, and other present-day aberrations in the Church. For a full treatment of the subject, see John Vennari, “Catholicism Dissolved, The New Evangelization” (Four-part series in *Catholic Family News*, from October 1998 to January 1999).

establish *in the world*—not just among those who are already Catholics—devotion to Her Immaculate Heart; that Her Immaculate Heart must *triumph* through the Consecration of Russia to that Heart; that only by this means can there be true peace in our time. And Our Lady of Fatima also gave us a warning about the consequences of failing to heed Her requests: wars and persecution of the Church, the martyrdom of the good, the suffering of the Holy Father, the suffering of the whole world—all of which are occurring at this very moment in history—and then, if we continue to ignore Her requests, the annihilation of various nations.

The Message of Fatima had, quite simply, been written out of existence, transformed into slogans of the Sergian Adaptation, or as some call it—the Stalinization of the Catholic Church. And in line with this Stalinist Adaptation of the Church there would be censorship of anyone who hearkened to the former understanding of the old terms. In the same letter of February 16, Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos had demanded that Father Gruner “publicly retract” certain opinions in his apostolate’s magazine that the Cardinal deemed objectionable. In a Church teeming with heretical literature which has undermined the faith of millions and endangered their souls, Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos wished to censor *The Fatima Crusader* magazine! And why? Because the magazine had dared to criticize, not Catholic teaching on faith and morals, but the prudential decisions of Cardinal Sodano and his collaborators—including their press conferences and dinners with the likes of Mikhail Gorbachev, their cozy relations with the schismatic CCPA and their attempt to bury the Message of Fatima under a mountain of false interpretations.

The treatment of Father Gruner, the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter, Archbishop Lefebvre, the Society of St. Pius X, and other perceived obstacles to the new orientation of Vatican II illustrates that the post-conciliar epoch presents a situation very much like that lamented by St. Basil at the height of the Arian heresy: “Only one offense is now vigorously punished: an accurate observance of our fathers’ traditions. For this cause the pious are driven from their countries and transported into deserts.”

Only one offense is now vigorously punished today: an accurate observance of the Church’s constant pre-conciliar traditions—summed up in the Message of Fatima. Strange to say, the then-Cardinal Ratzinger made the following observation about the so-called “Lefebvre schism” in his 1988 address to the Bishops of Chile:

That which previously was considered Most Holy (the form in which the Liturgy was handed down) suddenly appears to be the most forbidden of all things, the one thing that can safely be prohibited. It is intolerable to criticize decisions which have been taken since the Council. On the other hand, if men make question of ancient rules or even of the great truths of the Faith, for instance

the corporal virginity of Mary, the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the immortality of the soul, etc., nobody complains or only does so with the greatest of moderation. All this leads a great number of people to ask themselves if the Church of today is really the same as that of yesterday or if they have changed it for something else without telling people.

Stranger still, Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos has made the same admission. In the aforementioned interview in *30 Days* he said: “The great emergency of our time is to show people that the Church of today is the same as the Church has always been.” But why is there such an “emergency” in the first place? When in the entire history of the Catholic Church did it ever have to be *demonstrated* that the Church was still the same as before? Why would such a demonstration even be necessary if there were not a very good reason to suspect that the Church *has* been changed?

There is indeed good reason to suspect this, as we have shown: Since Vatican II the Catholic Church has undergone an Adaptation precisely along the lines predicted, plotted and carried out by Her worst enemies. And those in charge of the Church today *refuse to recognize* what has happened, even if they are not conscious agents of destruction themselves. They are, as Our Lord said of the Pharisees: “blind, and leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit.” (Mt. 15:14)

As Sister Lucy herself said: “This is why the devil has waged such a war against it [the Rosary]! *And the worst is that he has succeeded in leading into error and deceiving souls having a heavy responsibility through the place which they occupy ...! They are blind men guiding other blind men ...*”²⁸²

And, as Saint Paul declared concerning the same type of stiff-necked person: “There are none so blind as those who will not see.” It is also written in Sacred Scripture: “For the heart of this people is grown gross, and with their ears have they heard heavily, and their eyes they have shut; lest perhaps they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.” (Acts 28:27) They blindly and stubbornly defend the Adaptation of the Catholic Church as if it were a dogma of the Faith, while the real dogmas of the Faith are being undermined throughout the Church before their very eyes while they do very little or nothing to defend the Catholic Faith and the Catholic Church.

Summarizing the Evidence

It is now opportune for us to summarize what the evidence has shown so far concerning the “new orientation” or “Sergian Adaptation” of the Church and its intrinsic opposition to the Message of Fatima:

²⁸² See Sister Lucy's quote in *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. III, p. 758.

- The Message of Fatima is a divinely given prophecy for our time, authenticated by an unprecedented public miracle and vouched for by a series of Popes, including John Paul II and Benedict XVI.
- The prophetic warnings in the Message have mostly come to pass, save for especially the annihilation of nations that would be the consequence of failing to effect the Consecration of Russia in time.
- God has already demonstrated the benefits of a national consecration to the Immaculate Heart in the case of Portugal in 1931, whose miraculous overnight transformation from an atheistic, Masonic republic into a Catholic country was seen by the Portuguese hierarchy itself as a foretaste of what God would bestow upon the world after the Consecration of Russia.
- Instead of following the path marked out at Fatima, the leaders of the Catholic Church chose a different path—the path of a new orientation of the Church initiated at Vatican II, including an “opening to the world” and “reforms” of the Church which have fulfilled the dreams of Her worst enemies, who admitted that their goal was to bring about precisely such changes in the Church.
- In taking this path of a new orientation, the Church’s leaders have disregarded the repeated warnings of the pre-conciliar Popes (including Blessed Pius IX, Leo XIII, St. Pius X, Pius XI and Pius XII) that the Church’s enemies were plotting to remake Her in the very manner She has in fact been remade in the post-conciliar period.
- The changes began in 1960—the very year in which Our Lady commanded that the Third Secret be released, which had been promised by the Patriarch of Lisbon, and which Sister Lucy had insisted the Third Secret be revealed, because it would be clearer then.
- The result of these changes has been a catastrophic loss of faith and discipline in the Church which appears to be foretold in that part of the Great Secret of Fatima which begins with the words: “In Portugal the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved etc.”—a phrase that remains mysteriously incomplete, despite Cardinal Bertone’s claimed disclosure of the entirety of the Third Secret.
- Rather than admitting these incalculable blunders and their ruinous consequences for the Church, the current Vatican apparatus has obstinately pursued the new orientation, which is obviously inconsistent with the expressly Catholic imperatives of the Fatima Message: namely, the establishment of devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary in the world, the consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart, the conversion of Russia to the Catholic Faith, and the triumph of the Immaculate Heart, accompanied by a period of world peace according to the plans of the Most Sacred Heart of

Jesus in a Catholic social order.

- To the contrary, powerful members of the Vatican apparatus have willfully and deliberately refused to consecrate Russia by name to Mary's Immaculate Heart, but have instead conducted a systematic campaign to neutralize the Message of Fatima in order to subjugate it to the new orientation which they have imposed on much of the Church—*their* new orientation, their Adaptation of the Church to Masonic and Communist ideals—while persecuting loyal Catholics who do not follow the Party Line.
- The Vatican apparatus, led by the Secretary of State, deliberately scorns the prophecies, imperatives and warnings of the Fatima Message in favor of “enlightened” new ecclesial policies, which include not going against any of the provisions of the Vatican-Moscow Agreement (and apparently any of the errors of Russia) and avoiding any claimed “offense” to Russia by a public consecration of that nation.
- In consequence of these monumental errors of judgment, Russia has failed to convert, the Church is suffering an unprecedented crisis of faith and discipline, and the world continues to spiral downward in a cycle of violence and rebellion against God and His Holy Church—in response to which, the Vatican apparatus only redoubles its efforts to follow the utterly fruitless new orientation of the Church.

No wonder Pope Benedict has lamented, in his letter to the bishops concerning the lifting of the “excommunication” of the four bishops of the Society of Saint Pius X, that “in vast areas of the world the faith is in danger of dying out like a flame which no longer has fuel...” No wonder he has “liberated” the Latin Mass from its bogus “prohibition.” No wonder he has called for a “hermeneutic of continuity” between Vatican II and the traditional teaching of the Church.

No wonder the Pope declared in September 2009 (as we noted in Chapter 7) that “in the decades following the Second Vatican Council, some interpreted the opening to the world not as a demand of the missionary ardor of the Heart of Christ, but as a passage to secularization,” that “certain fundamental truths of the faith, such as sin, grace, theological life, and the last things, were not mentioned anymore,” and that the result is—incredible words, coming as they do from the Pope himself—a “secularized ecclesial environment” and “desert without God.” And no wonder that, as Pope, the former Cardinal Ratzinger has reconsidered, and (at least in part) disowned, his own revisionist statements nine years ago concerning Fatima, the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart as prophesied at Fatima, which he now admits *has yet to occur*.

Could it be that the Pope's moves in favor of Catholic Tradition, however incomplete and tentative they may seem, reflect his own

knowledge of the Third Secret and the calamities of which it warns—the same calamities his predecessor, Pius XII, was able to foresee precisely in the light of Fatima? We shall consider this possibility further on.

First, however, we must consider more closely that revisionist interpretation of the Message of Fatima which, despite the new pontificate, continues to weigh upon the Church like a boulder. In particular we must examine its attempt to “neutralize” the Third Secret.



Gorbachev admits that he is still a Leninist, and he continually promotes abortion, population control and his Leninist “principles” through his State of the World Forum. Gorbachev was invited by Cardinal Sodano to sit beside him at the Vatican press conference of June 27, 2000 to promote Cardinal Casaroli’s memoirs upholding the Vatican policy of *Ostpolitik*, which refuses to denounce the errors of Communism and state atheism. Pictured above is Gorbachev, invited to the Vatican in November 2000 to address the Pope and other Vatican curial officials and politicians at the “Jubilee of Politicians”.