

Setting the Record Straight

A Reply to Father Thaddeus Doyle Concerning the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary

by Christopher A. Ferrara

Introduction

In the October 2010 issue of his newsletter *The Curate's Diary*, Father Thaddeus Doyle of Ireland accuses Father Nicholas Gruner and me of “twisting” the famous statements by John Paul II on March 25, 1984 indicating the late Pontiff’s recognition that his consecration ceremony on that date did not fulfill Our Lady’s requirements for the consecration of Russia, and that Our Lady was still awaiting the consecration of that nation to Her Immaculate Heart.

Father Doyle’s article is the latest in a series of broadsides he continues to publish no matter how many times his errors on the subject of Fatima are corrected by Father Gruner or some other knowledgeable Catholic. (For example, he continues to insist that Father Gruner is “suspended” despite having been informed of Father’s incardination and good standing in the Archdiocese of Hyderabad, and despite Father Doyle’s own admission, in response to a letter from Father Gruner, that he has no information on the alleged grounds for the non-existent “suspension”.)

One has the impression that Father Doyle is vying to replace the late Father Robert J. Fox as champion of what I have called “a New Fatima for the New Church”. By this I mean a politically correct and “ecumenical” revisionist “interpretation” of the Message of Fatima that

would consign its dramatic prophecies and urgent warnings to the past, reducing it to a generic prescription for prayer and piety at the very time even non-believers—including Hollywood producers!—can see that the world has entered into an apocalyptic downward spiral Our Lady succinctly described at Fatima as follows: “various nations will be annihilated.” Like Father Fox before him, Father Doyle presents a version of the Fatima message containing neither cause for alarm nor grounds for giving offense to the “modern world”.

Indeed, Father Doyle is an avid promoter of the thoroughly discredited “apparitions” of a religiously indifferent “Virgin Mary” to the alleged “seers” of Medjugorje, who deliver “Our Lady’s” supposed “messages” with the frequency of news bulletins, including what Father Doyle publishes in the aforesaid edition of his newsletter as “Our Lady’s Message” for August 25, 2010. Father Doyle promotes and defends the Medjugorje “apparitions” even though the “seers” have spouted heresy after heresy which they attribute to the Mother of God, including these:

“All religions are equal before God,” says the Virgin.

The Virgin: “I do not dispose of all graces... Jesus prefers that you address your petitions directly to Him, rather than through an intermediary.”

“In God there are no divisions or religions; it is you in the world who have created divisions.”

“God directs all denominations as a king directs his subjects, through the medium of His ministers.”

“Each one’s religion must be respected, and you must preserve yours for yourselves and for your children.”

The Virgin added: “It is you who are divided on this earth. The Muslims and the Orthodox, like the Catholics, *are equal before my Son and before me*, for you are all my children.”¹

The “seers” have also claimed to receive “messages” conveniently tailored to assist them in their conflict with the former local ordinary of the Diocese of Mostar, Bishop Zanic, who steadfastly rejected the apparitions. Consider this one, for example, wherein “Seer Ivanka” claims the “Virgin Mary” warned Bishop Zanic to accept the apparitions or suffer the wrath of Jesus:

June 21, 1983: The Virgin states: “Tell the Father Bishop (Zanic) that I request his urgent conversion to the events of the Medjugorje parish... I am sending him the penultimate warning. If he is not converted, or will not be converted, my judgment as well as that of my Son Jesus will strike him.” (Seer Ivanka writing to Bishop Zanic)²

Needless to say, Jesus did not strike Bishop Zanic, who retired in 1993 no more convinced of the “apparitions” than he was ten years earlier, when “Seer Ivanka” delivered her bogus “warning from Heaven”. And Bishop Zanic’s successor, Bishop Peric, has taken up where his predecessor left off, warning the faithful

that “regarding the events of Medjugorje, on the basis of the investigations and experience gained thus far throughout these last 25 years, the Church has not confirmed a single apparition as authentically being the Madonna,” and that the “so-called apparitions, messages, secrets and signs do not strengthen the faith, but rather further convince us that in all of this *there is nothing either authentic or established as truthful.*”

Clearly, Father Doyle is not a reliable source concerning the authenticity and correct understanding of Marian apparitions.

Russia Has Not Converted

Before answering the charge that prompted this reply, a charge that is easily refuted, I wish first to address the fundamental underlying issue: Has the Consecration of Russia been accomplished? Putting aside for the moment all arguments concerning what the Pope said or failed to say in 1984, and the meaning of it, let us focus on what no one who professes to believe in the Message of Fatima disputes: that Our Lady promised the conversion of Russia if Russia were rightly consecrated to Her Immaculate Heart.

Would Father Doyle really care to defend the proposition that we have witnessed the conversion of Russia since 1984? How, then, would he account for the reality that today—more than a quarter-century after the “consecration” Russia is a neo-Stalinist dictatorship with the highest per capita abortion rate in the Western world? Is this the conversion of Russia?

As a U.S. government source reports: “Abortion remains the most widely practiced form of birth control in Russia. In 1995 some 225 abortions were performed for every 100

¹“The Medjugorje Hoax,” www.catholicapologetics.info/catholicteaching/privaterevelation/medjugo.html. The source provides exact references to Medjugorje-related sources for the “messages” quoted, which have been cited in numerous other publications.

² Ibid.

live births, up from a rate of 196 per 100 in 1991.”³ Another source reports that, according to the World Health Organization, “a country’s health is in serious danger if the annual per capita consumption of alcohol exceeds 8 liters,” whereas “Russia’s per capita consumption (mainly vodka) is roughly 16.5 liters” and Russian male life expectancy “has dropped from 63.8 years in 1990 to 59.8 years.”⁴ Why? Because Russian men are drinking themselves to death. Is this the conversion of Russia?

And how would Father Doyle explain Russia’s emergence since 1984 as the world capital of child pornography? In Russia there is “no law against the possession or procurement of child pornography, which is considered a minor, victimless crime...” and “there has been little public outcry in response to Russia’s explosion of paedophilia and child pornography rings.”⁵ Is this the conversion of Russia?

In Russia today, Catholics remain a minuscule minority, less than one percent, most of whom reside in Siberia, where Stalin sent their ancestors. These few Catholics are served almost entirely by foreign-born priests who cannot remain in the country for more than 90 days at a time because the 1997 Russian law on “freedom of conscience” treats them as ministers of a foreign sect. Russian Muslims outnumber Russian Catholics by six-to-one. Is this the conversion of Russia?

The best evidence that Russia was not consecrated in 1984 is the abysmal state of Russia today, 26 years later; it is still “that poor nation,” as Lucia called it. There has been no conversion of Russia, and to say that there has been is to insult Our Lady. Case closed.

The Requirements for a Valid Consecration of Russia Have Not Been Met—as Father Doyle Himself Concedes!

Nevertheless, let us examine Father Doyle’s argument in support of his claim that Russia was consecrated to the Immaculate Heart 26 years ago. To begin with, Father Doyle himself concedes that the 1984 ceremony could not have fulfilled Our Lady’s requirements for Russia’s consecration, for he himself notes that when the papal nuncio went to visit Sister Lucia in order to ascertain what the Consecration of Russia would entail, Sister Lucia informed him (to quote Father Doyle) that “[t]here were two elements in particular that had led to *previous consecrations being deemed insufficient*: either the Pope was not joined by the bishops of the world or *Russia was not specifically consecrated*.”

Now, the 1984 consecration ceremony at the Vatican *suffered from precisely the same infirmities as the 1982 ceremony*: neither of the two requirements was met. Therefore, if the 1982 ceremony was invalid, as Father Doyle admits, then so was the 1984 ceremony. This is easy to demonstrate.

Let us consider the second requirement first: that the bishops of the world participate. This need not detain us long, as there is no evidence whatever for Father Doyle’s claim that “the vast majority” of the world’s bishops participated in the 1984 ceremony and that only “a small number of bishops, sadly, may not have participated...” Quite the contrary, the reverse is true: only a small number of bishops acknowledge having participated, while the vast majority simply ignored the event. Nowhere in the United States of America, for

³ Glenn E. Curtis, ed. *Russia: A Country Study* (Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1996), hyperlink “Health,” at <http://countrystudies.us/russia/>.

⁴ Linda De Laine, “Sex and the Future of Russian Society,” www.russianlife.com/article.cfm?Number=771.

⁵ Peter Graff, “Child porn videos sold from Russia in ‘National Geographic’ boxes,” *The Independent*, March 26, 2001, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/child-porn-videos-sold-from-russia-in-national-geographic-boxes-689163.html>.

example, was there any sign that on March 25, 1984—a Sunday—the American bishops were reciting together with the Pope the prayer of consecration he had sent them months before. As Sister Lucia observed afterward:

Q: So the consecration was not done as requested by Our Lady?

A: No. Many bishops attached no importance to this act.⁶

In fact, in 1988-89 Father Gruner obtained the signatures of some 400 Catholic bishops on a petition calling for the consecration of Russia and expressing their willingness to undertake it if the Pope would give the order. None of these bishops seems to recall the worldwide Catholic episcopate having conducted a consecration of Russia together with the Pope in 1984—or in 1982, for that matter.

But even if the “vast majority” of the world’s bishops had participated in 1984, it would not have mattered, for the first requirement was not met: Russia was never identified as the object of the consecration. That Russia must be identified *solely and specifically* as the object consecrated is in the very nature of the request. For without such a clear identification of Russia as the place consecrated to the Immaculate Heart, its conversion would not be seen as an unambiguous miracle obtained precisely through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary. As Father Joaquin Alonso, who was no less than the official Archivist of Fatima, recounted:

If they ask Sister Lucy why God does not convert Russia without the necessity of having recourse to such difficult means, she answers: “Because I want (it is Our Lord Who speaks in the

first person) all My Church to recognize that Consecration *as a triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in order that thenceforth Her veneration will be extended*. I also want the devotion to My Divine Heart to be placed alongside the devotion to this Immaculate Heart.”⁷

Instead of specifically identifying Russia, however, the Pope referred to “this human world,” “all men and all peoples,” “individuals and peoples,” “humanity and the world,” “individuals and nations,” and “those individuals and nations which particularly need to be thus entrusted and consecrated”—in short, almost literally everything in the world but the one nation whose consecration Our Lady requested.⁸ And even John Paul’s use of the word “nation” was always plural, precisely to avoid the suggestion that *one* nation—Russia—was being consecrated to Mary.

Hence, as Sister Lucia observed of the 1984 ceremony in the interview quoted above:⁹ “There was no participation of all the bishops, and *there was no mention of Russia*.” And, as she stated to her old friend and confidant Maria Eugenia Pestana on March 22, 1984, only three days before the 1984 ceremony (evidently having read the text of the Act of Consecration the Pope had sent to the bishops): “That consecration cannot have a decisive character because *Russia does not appear in it as the sole object of the consecration*.”¹⁰

I will not burden this article with a lifetime worth of similar testimony by Lucia, or with the never-documented claim that she “changed her mind” around 1989 and decided that the 1984 ceremony was sufficient, after all.¹¹ At any rate, arguments about what Sister Lucia is alleged

⁶ *Sol de Fatima* magazine (September 1985).

⁷ Father Joaquin Maria Alonso, S.T.D., Ph.D., “Meaning of the ‘Consecration’ of Russia,” reprinted in *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 51, p. 16ff.

⁸ *L’Osservatore Romano*, March 26-27, 1984, pp. 1 and 6 (Italian edition).

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Fatima, Tragedy and Triumph*, pp. 172-173.

¹¹ For a thorough refutation of this canard, see Ferrara, “A New Fatima for a New Church,” *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 76, pp. 65ff and *The Devil’s Final Battle*, Ch. 8.

to have said post-1984 cannot alter the reality that a consecration must identify what is being consecrated. To consecrate a person, place or thing means “to declare or set apart as sacred: *consecrate a church*.” (*American Heritage Dictionary*). One can no more consecrate a nation without identifying it as the object of the consecration than one can consecrate a church without specifying the church that one is consecrating—that is, *this* church in particular.

According to Father Doyle, however, a bishop could consecrate a new church by referring to “those churches especially in need of consecration,” or the hands of a newly ordained priest by referring to “those hands especially in need of consecration.” And so on and so forth *ad absurdum*. Like all advocates of the theory that Russia was consecrated without mention of Russia, Father Doyle is untroubled by the absurdity of the position he defends.

Ignoring the very meaning of the word “consecration” and the evidence of Russia’s failure to undergo conversion, Father Doyle argues that John Paul II did “specifically consecrate Russia” in 1984 by means of a combination of hints and veiled references Father Doyle claims to detect in the text of the Act of Consecration.

First of all, he places great reliance on John Paul’s reference, in the prefatory remarks of the Act of Consecration, to a consecration “ceremony” by Pius XII in the form of a radio message to the Portuguese people in October 1942. But Pius made no mention of Russia by name on that occasion. Ten years later, on July 7, 1952, Pius did issue a document that declared an explicit consecration of Russia to Mary, but he did not even attempt to fulfill the second requirement—admitted by Father Doyle—of participation in this act by the world’s bishops, evidently because he was not aware of it.

Father Doyle contends that John Paul “spiritually embraced into his consecration

the explicit mention of Russia in Pope Pius’s consecration,” thus conflating Pius’s 1942 radio address with his 1952 document mentioning Russia by name. But John Paul’s reference to Pius XII assiduously *refrained from mentioning Russia* as the object of Pius’s efforts, stating only that Pius had in view “peoples for which by reason of their situation you [Mary] have particular love and solicitude.”

The question Father Doyle must answer is this: Why did John Paul II decline simply to identify Russia in the 1984 ceremony (or the one in 1982) when it would have been a simple matter to do so as opposed to reciting a series of circumlocutions? Here is Father Doyle’s attempt at an answer:

While most people believed that this consecration would require the explicit naming of Russia, Pope John Paul decided instead to clearly refer to Russia without actually naming Russia. Why did he do this? He knew the situation of Christians in communist countries first hand. *The very lives of bishops, priests and laity were at stake* [emphasis in original]. If he infuriated the communist leaders, it could have dire consequences.... All the bishops of the world knew exactly to which individuals and nations Pope John Paul II was referring. And I am confident that Our Lady and everyone in Heaven knew exactly to which individuals and nations Pope John Paul was referring.

This defense of a “consecration of Russia” that deliberately avoided naming Russia falls under a hail of obvious objections:

- Are we to believe that the Mother of God prescribed a consecration of Russia *knowing* that there would be genocide of Christians in communist countries if Russia were mentioned by name?
- If Our Lady knew that mention of Russia would provoke genocide, then

why did She herself not prescribe the supposed “stealth consecration” Father Doyle imagines to have occurred in 1984?

- Or, are we to believe that the Mother of God *failed to foresee* that mention of Russia would lead to genocide and that the Pope had to make a “prudent” revision of what Mary, Seat of Wisdom, requested in order to save innocent lives from Her imprudence?
- Are we to believe that the Mother of God could not obtain divine protection of the Russian people from genocide, along with the promised conversion of that nation upon its consecration by name to Her Immaculate Heart?
- How could Russia have been consecrated in a ceremony that deliberately avoided any mention of Russia so that *Russia’s leaders would not think Russia was being consecrated* and thus would not be “infuriated”?
- How does one specifically consecrate a particular nation in a public ceremony designed to *conceal* the consecration of that nation from its leaders?
- On the other hand, if “everyone knew” that the Pope meant Russia, then why didn’t the Russian leadership know it too, and why was it not “infuriated” by what “everyone knew”?
- If everyone, including the Russians, knew that the Pope meant Russia, then why did the Pope not simply mention Russia by name, since the verbal camouflage employed would not have fooled the Russians anyway?

Father Doyle’s defense of the consecration—that-wasn’t leads to absurd and even blasphemous conclusions, given that Mary appeared at Fatima as the messenger and

prophet of God—indeed, the most august prophet in salvation history, as She is no less than the Mother of the Word Incarnate.

Now, the same question I have posed to Father Doyle could fairly be posed to me: “Well then, Mr. Ferrara, what is *your* explanation for why the Pope failed to mention Russia by name?” In fact, we have the answer to that question from one of the Pope’s closest advisors, Cardinal Jozef Tomko, who told *Inside the Vatican* magazine in 2000 that Russia was not mentioned in the 1984 ceremony because “Rome [i.e., certain of the Pope’s advisors] fears the Russian Orthodox might regard it as an ‘offense’ if Rome were to make specific mention of Russia in such a prayer, as if Russia especially is in need of help when the whole world, including the post-Christian West, faces profound problems ...”¹² Tomko added: “Let us beware of becoming too literal-minded.”

Thus it was not fear of genocide but rather fear of giving offense to the Russian Orthodox that prompted the Pope’s advisors to recommend a “consecration of Russia” that, absurdly enough, studiously refrains from identifying its object and mentions only “nations” and “peoples.” According to them, the Pope must not give the impression that “Russia especially is in need of help” even though that is precisely why Our Lady called for Russia’s consecration and consequent miraculous conversion. As Sister Lucia told Father Fuentes in 1957: “Many times the Blessed Virgin Mary told me and my cousins, Jacinta and Francisco, that Russia is the instrument of chastisement chosen by Heaven to punish the whole world [for its sins] if we do not beforehand obtain the conversion of that poor nation.”

So, Our Lady’s request for the specific consecration of “that poor nation” was “amended” to suit human wisdom in the

¹² *Inside the Vatican*, November 2000. The editor confirmed to me in person that the advisor in question was Cardinal Tomko.

pursuit of “ecumenism,” a pastoral policy of fallible men who evidently think themselves more prudent and less “literal-minded” than the Virgin Mother of God. John Paul II refrained from mentioning Russia because his advisors told him it would be an “ecumenical” setback. That the Pope felt his hands were tied by this advice is reflected in the very words Father Doyle accuses Father Gruner and me of “twisting”.

This brings me to a reply to Father Doyle’s charge, which is really almost an afterthought given his utter failure to prove his ultimate claim: that Russia has been consecrated to the Immaculate Heart.

Who is “Twisting” the Pope’s Words?

As Father Gruner and I have pointed out, joining numerous other commentators on the subject of the Message of Fatima, *after* having mentioned as the objects of his consecration “our human world,” “men and peoples,” “humanity and the world,” “men and nations,” and “those men and those nations which particularly need to be thus entrusted and consecrated,” John Paul spontaneously added these words to the text of the Act of Consecration that had previously been sent to the bishops: “Mother of the Church! Enlighten especially the peoples of which *you await* our consecration and entrustment.”

Why would John Paul speak of peoples who “await” his consecration to Mary if he had just consecrated “men and peoples” and “humanity and the world”? Ironically enough, “the peoples for whom *you await* our consecration and entrustment” were distinguished from the peoples previously mentioned as objects of the consecration. Thus, if anything, the Pope intends here to single out the peoples he has *not* consecrated—meaning, of course, the peoples of Russia he was counseled not to identify as

such.

Father Doyle contends that the reference to peoples awaiting consecration “is clearly embedded in the Act of Consecration and it is most certainly NOT [his emphasis] something ADDED [his emphasis] after it as they would have you believe.” Yet no consecration of those peoples-in-waiting follows the first and only reference to them. Instead, the Pope declares “Help us to live in the truth of the consecration of Christ for the entire human family of the modern world,” and then adds: “Entrusting to you, O Mother of God, all men and all peoples, we entrust to you also the same consecration of the world, placing it in Your maternal care.”

That is, after introducing the concept of peoples who are awaiting his Act of Consecration, the Pope consecrates nothing further but merely refers back to what he has already consecrated, mentioning also a “consecration of Christ” of uncertain meaning. At no point going forward in the text does the Pope ever pronounce a consecration of the peoples he identifies as awaiting consecration; he merely asks that they be “enlightened”.

All doubt in the matter was removed when, about three hours after the consecration ceremony, at 4 o’clock in the afternoon, the Pope appeared inside Saint Peter’s Basilica before ten thousand people and the pilgrim statue of the Virgin of Fatima to utter “a word of thanks” to the Virgin. In the course of these remarks, the Pope referred to “those peoples for whom you yourself *await our act of consecration and entrustment*”¹³—a reference that would be nonsensical if those same peoples had been consecrated and entrusted to Mary hours earlier. And then the Pope added these telling words: “All of this we have been able to do according to our *poor human possibilities*, in the dimension of our human weakness.” That

¹³ *L’Osservatore Romano*, March 26-27, p. 6 [Italian edition]. *See photographic reproduction on page 12 of this booklet. The same remarks were reported in *L’Avvenire*, the official newspaper of the Italian bishops conference, on March 27, 1984.

is, the Pope was saying, in essence, “I did what I could under the circumstances.” He expressed precisely the same sentiments on May 19, 1982, six days after the 1982 consecration of the world which also failed to mention Russia: “I tried to do everything possible in the concrete circumstances to emphasize the collegial unity of the Bishop of Rome with all his brothers in Episcopal ministry and service in the world.”¹⁴

Confronted with this undeniable evidence, Father Doyle resorts to the argument that during his afternoon appearance in Saint Peter’s the Pope “didn’t just repeat this one phrase [about peoples awaiting consecration]. He repeated the entire prayer of consecration...” In other words, according to Father Doyle, in the afternoon the Pope did what Our Lady was awaiting in the morning.

That is simply false. In Saint Peter’s the Pope merely expressed gratitude to the Virgin; he repeated *nothing* of the Act of Consecration from that morning, much less did he consecrate the peoples who were still awaiting consecration. Father Doyle would have known this if he had had the pages of the March 26-27 edition of *L’Osservatore* before him, as I did during the writing of this piece.

Under the melodramatic caption “Exposing Their Falsehoods,” Father Doyle notes that the headline of an article in *The Fatima Crusader* magazine states that “The Pope Publicly Declares *After* the 1984 Consecration of the World, that Our Lady is ‘Still Awaiting’ the Consecration of Russia”. He quibbles that “while he [the Pope] did use the word ‘awaiting’... he did not use the word ‘still.’”

Let us grant the point that the headline should have included only “awaiting,” not “still awaiting” within the quotation marks. What of it? The only sensible interpretation of the Pope’s remarks in the afternoon of March 25, 1984 is that he had not done in the morning of

that day what Our Lady requested, and that She was indeed *still awaiting* the consecration of Russia that afternoon, at which time, however, no additional consecration was performed. Ergo, Our Lady still awaits the consecration of Russia today—as the current spiritual, moral, social and political condition of Russia plainly demonstrates to any reasonable Catholic observer.

Resisting this obvious conclusion, Father Doyle provides an analogy he thinks convincing: “Suppose I say to you, ‘I bring you the project *which you are awaiting* from me,’ would I be saying that I wasn’t now bringing you the project? [emphasis in original] It most certainly would not mean that I wasn’t now bringing you the project.”

Like many analogies, this one limps, as the saying goes. For one thing, the Pope never said during the consecration ceremony on the morning of March 25 that he was *now performing* the consecration Our Lady was awaiting with respect to the nation and peoples of Russia. For another, during his afternoon remarks expressing gratitude to the Virgin, he repeated his statement that the nation and peoples of Russia “*await* our act of consecration and entrustment.”

Just as it would be absurd for someone to say “I bring you the project which you are awaiting from me” hours *after* he had already brought the project, so would it have been absurd for John Paul II to declare in the afternoon that Our Lady was awaiting a consecration already performed that morning. Father Doyle’s own analogy demolishes his position. If anyone is “twisting” the late Pope’s words, it is Father Doyle.

But, moving beyond March 25, 1984, there is further evidence from the Pope’s own words that he knew he had not succeeded in consecrating Russia specifically on that date or

¹⁴ *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 84, p. 17.

any other. We know, for example, that in August of 1984 Father Pierre Caillon, President of the Blue Army in France and thus no partisan of Father Gruner, was able to have a fleeting conversation with the Pope on the subject during a general audience. Positioned in the front row as the Pope walked by, Father Caillon said: “Most Holy Father... you asked me to leave you my address because I had been intimately involved in the question of the Consecration of Russia—” whereupon the Pope interjected: “Now it is useless, because the consecration is done ... *we cannot consecrate Russia apart by itself*. We have consecrated all of the nations and we have added a special mention for the nation of which Our Lady was expecting the consecration.” As shown above, the “special mention” did not include any identification of Russia as the object of consecration but only vague references to “peoples” and “nations.”¹⁵

We also know that six months later the same Father Caillon, having just concelebrated Mass with the Pope, posed to His Holiness the following question: “Most Holy Father, I have just returned from Portugal. Do you not realize that the Consecration of Russia has not been done as Our Lady wishes it?” Caillon reports that the Pope smiled and replied: “The Consecration is done. We do it every morning.”¹⁶

In other words, once again the Pope intimated that he has done whatever could be done under the circumstances he feels to have been imposed upon him. With all due respect to the Pope’s memory, however, his private consecrations of Russia, even if done every morning, were no more efficacious in obtaining the conversion of Russia and peace in the world than was the desperate attempt by King Louis XVI to consecrate France to the Sacred Heart of Jesus in his jail cell, one hundred years

after Our Lord had first called upon the King of France to conduct a *public* consecration of that nation to Him. Louis went to the guillotine and France descended into bloody revolution. For that very reason did Our Lord Himself warn Sister Lucia in August of 1931 as follows: “Make it known to My ministers, given that they follow the example of the King of France in delaying the execution of My requests, they will follow him into misfortune.”

And so they have. Pope Benedict himself confirmed this in the most dramatic fashion when he was asked by his own spokesman during his recent trip to Portugal whether the Third Secret concerns the sexual scandals that have wracked the Church since 2001. The Pope replied that the Secret concerns:

future realities of the Church which are little by little developing and revealing themselves.... As for the novelty that we can discover today in this message [the Secret], it is that attacks on the Pope and the Church do not come only from outside, but the sufferings of the Church come precisely from within the Church, from sins that exist in the Church. This has always been known, but today we see it in a really terrifying way: that the greatest persecution of the Church does not come from enemies outside, but arises from sin in the Church.

As the Pope further declared at the Cova da Iria on May 13, 2010, in a direct contradiction of the “party line” of the Vatican Secretary of State: “One who thinks that the prophetic mission of Fatima is concluded would be deceiving himself.” (“Si illuderebbe chi pensasse che la missione profetica di Fatima sia conclusa.”)

The Pope is right. For one thing, we have

¹⁵ *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 31-32, p. 28; originally published in French, in the February 1990 issue of *La Contre Reforme Catholique* (CRC).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

not yet seen the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart. As Benedict declared on May 13, 2009 during his visit to the Holy Land:

Mary, Health of the Sick, Refuge of Sinners, Mother of the Redeemer: we join the many generations who have called you “Blessed”. Listen to your children as we call upon your name. You promised the three children of Fatima that “in the end, my Immaculate Heart will triumph”. May it be so! May love triumph over hatred, solidarity over division, and peace over every form of violence!

But love has not triumphed over hatred, division and violence. On the contrary, the world continues to rush toward the “annihilation of nations” suggested by the post-apocalyptic scenario of the vision of the “Bishop dressed in White” (no doubt explained by the Virgin herself in the still-hidden companion text of the Third Secret): a wounded future Pope hobbling out of a half-ruined city filled with cadavers and making his way to the top of a hill outside the city, where he is executed by a band of soldiers, followed by the execution of bishops, priests, religious and laity. A vision, one must add, that corresponds quite closely to the vision of Pope Saint Pius X, who beheld one of his successors fleeing Rome over the bodies of his own priests.¹⁷

Yet it is not too late for the Pope and the bishops to prevent this catastrophe. While Our Lord confided to Sister Lucia that “they will do it [the consecration] but it will be late,” nevertheless it will not be *too* late, for as Our Lord told Sister Lucia at Rianjo in August of

1931: “It is never too late to have recourse to Jesus and Mary.”¹⁸

Conclusion

According to Father Doyle (following in the footsteps of Father Fox), Russia was consecrated without being mentioned, Russia has converted without being converted, and the Immaculate Heart has triumphed without any sign of triumph. As Pope Benedict has made clear, this is a delusion: the prophetic mission of Fatima is *not* concluded and the Third Secret continues to unfold before us. This can only mean that Our Lady of Fatima is still awaiting the public and collegial Consecration of Russia to Her, the *sine qua non* condition for the Immaculate Heart’s victory over what Pope Benedict himself described in his revelation of the contents of the Third Secret in 1984: “the dangers threatening the Faith and the life of the Christian, and therefore (the life) of the world.” (“i pericoli che incombono sulla fede e la vita del Cristiano e dunque [la vita] del mondo.”)¹⁹

We know the consecration remains to be done because John Paul II himself admitted as much. But even if he had not admitted it, we know it because Russia has not converted in any meaningful sense of the word, much less in the only sense Our Lady of Fatima intended: the sudden and miraculous embrace of the Catholic Faith by an entire nation, just as all of pagan Mexico was converted to Catholicism within 10 years after Her apparition at Guadalupe. Further, we know it because there is no peace in the world, as Our Lady promised there would be following Russia’s consecration and the triumph of the Immaculate Heart—an event

¹⁷ “What I have seen is terrifying.... What is certain is that the Pope will leave Rome, and that in leaving the Vatican he will have to pass over the dead bodies of his priests!... I have seen one of my successors, of the same name, who was fleeing over the bodies of his brethren. He will take refuge in some hiding place; but after a brief respite, he will die a cruel death. Respect for God has disappeared from human hearts. They wish to efface even God’s memory. This perversity is nothing less than the beginning of the last days of the world.” Quoted in Sylvia Browne, *End of Days* (New York: Dutton, 2008), pp. 89-90. Pius X’s reference to a successor “of the same name” may refer to Benedict XVI (Joseph Ratzinger) since Pius’s name was Joseph Sarto.

¹⁸ See, “The Message Addressed to the Church Hierarchy,” www.fatima.org/essentials/message/msgtohier.asp

¹⁹ “This is Why the Faith is in Crisis,” *Jesus* magazine, November 11, 1984.

Pope Benedict himself places in the future. Finally, we know it because, as Benedict has declared, the saga of Fatima is far from over.

Father Doyle concludes his jeremiad by declaring indignantly that “Father Gruner and his followers... will have to answer before the throne of God” for contending that John Paul II “knew that he wasn’t bringing Our Lady the consecration for which she had been awaiting.” But this is mere posturing, an appeal to the gallery of public opinion rather than reason. When all is said and done it is really quite simple: Our Lady keeps Her promises. If Father Doyle wishes to insist that the horrors we witness in Russia, the world and the Church today represent the promised triumph of the Immaculate Heart following Russia’s consecration to Mary, then I respectfully suggest he ought to consider whether it is he—not those he so vehemently accuses—who will have to give an accounting before the throne of God for all the souls he is leading into this delusion.

Addendum:

In the same issue of his newsletter that prompted this reply, Father Doyle was rebuked by one of his own readers for devoting so many pages to attacks on Father Gruner, which the reader described as “individual ‘attacks’ on people” and “internal disagreements and bickerings [sic] of who said what to whom, or to read about evidence of certain things said or not said.” In response, Father Doyle simply repeated the same attacks!

First, Father Doyle declared that he feels that “people have a right to know that he [Father Gruner] was declared suspended by the Vatican even if he declares his suspension invalid.” In truth, *the Vatican never declared Father Gruner suspended*, but merely referred to an alleged suspension declared by the Bishop of Avellino, based on nothing and rendered utterly irrelevant by Father Gruner’s valid incardination in the Archdiocese of Hyderabad, where his apostolate now supports a school and

an orphanage.

Second, Father Doyle professed to be “concerned about what I consider false statements re: Fatima, and believe people are being led into error.” What false statements? What error? As I have shown here, it is Father Doyle who is propagating falsehood and error on this subject (and on Medjugorje as well).

Third, Father Doyle states: “I fear that once people have been led into error... some of them are vulnerable to being led into further error.” Again, what error? And who is leading people into error, if not Father Doyle?

Finally, Father Doyle—in a truly low blow—professes his “concern about the high powered fundraising efforts” of Father Gruner’s apostolate and his “fear that some vulnerable people can be taken to the cleaners financially.” This is pure libel, unsupported by any evidence—for there is none—that Father Gruner’s regularly audited apostolate, duly chartered by the Canadian government, has engaged in financial overreaching or any other impropriety.

Ludicrously enough, Father Doyle adds: “I try to keep coverage of the negative elements in the *Diary* as short as possible.” But at least one reader has had his fill of Father Doyle’s endless attacks on Father Gruner. And so should any fair-minded reader of his *Curate’s Diary*. I suggest it is time for Father Doyle to move on to a subject about which he is capable of writing fairly and accurately.

November 24, 2010

«Maria, aiutaci ad inaugurare un mondo nuovo perchè il vecchio è ingiusto, ci opprime, ci fa paura»

Madre di Cristo, Nostra Signora di Fatima, che ci hai fatto questo onore, oggi, terza Domenica di Quaresima, giorno del Ghibetto delle famiglie; che ci hai fatto questa visita in un giorno così pieno della nostra fede e della nostra speranza. Come Vescovo di Roma, voglio ringraziare Te, Madre di Cristo, Nostra Signora di Fatima per questa Tua visita nella Basilica di San Pietro, in un giorno in cui questa Basilica e questa piazza, tempio della Pellegrini dell'Anno Santo della Redenzione, hanno potuto assistere ad un solenne, profondamente sentito, direi solitario, atto di affidamento, atto rivolto al Tuo Cuore Immacolato e, nel nuovo perché spertimentato sempre più che il mondo vecchio, il mondo del peccato, ci opprime, ci fa paura, ci porta

Con una fiducia enorme nella

Thus we have willed to choose this Sunday, the third Sunday of Lent of the year 1984, still within the Holy Year of Redemption, for the act of entrustment, of consecration of the world, of the great human family, of all the peoples, especially of those who have such need of this consecration, of this entrustment, of those peoples for whom You Yourself await our act of consecration and of entrustment. All this we have been able to do according to our poor human possibilities, within the capacity of our human weakness. But with enormous confidence in Your maternal love, with enormous confidence in Your maternal solicitude.

This is the complete text of the prayer of thanksgiving addressed to Our Lady of Fatima spoken by Pope John Paul II at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, March 25, 1984. The text reported here is a photographic reproduction of the article published in *L'Osservatore Romano* on March 26-27, 1984. In the translated section, one can clearly read that Pope John Paul II knew that he had not fulfilled the request of Our Lady of Fatima for the Consecration of Russia.

The Fatima Center

NORTHERN IRELAND: PO Box 165, Newry BT34 2WZ
IRISH REPUBLIC: Apt. C School Road, Whitechurch, Co. Cork or PO Box 323, North City Delivery Office, Cork City
IN CANADA: 452 Kraft Road, Fort Erie, ON L2A 4M7 • **IN U.S.A.:** 17000 State Route 30, Constable, NY 12926
 Phone: 905-871-7607 • Fax: 905-994-7054 • www.fatima.org • E-mail: info@fatima.org

BT027