

Chapter 8

FATHER FOX'S MODERNIST MESSAGE OF FATIMA

After the famous press conference of June 26, 2000 with its attempted “funeral for Fatima,” the Secretary of State’s Party Line on Fatima underwent a development to incorporate the “official” version of the Third Secret, which (as we saw in the previous chapter) was not “official” at all but represented only an “attempt” at an “interpretation” by Cardinal Sodano, who had no authority in the matter in the first place. Now the Party Line was thus:

First, the Third Secret has been revealed entirely in the form of the enigmatic vision of the “Bishop dressed in White” as “interpreted” for us by none other than the Secretary of State, who opines that the vision relates only to events of the 20th century culminating in the failed attempt on the life of John Paul II in 1981 and that it contains no prophetic warnings for the Church or mankind.

Second, the consecration of Russia was accomplished in 1984 by means of a ceremony that made no mention of Russia but which, insists the Secretary of State, complies with Our Lady of Fatima’s request for Russia’s consecration.

Third, since the Secret has been revealed and the consecration done, the prophetic content of the Message of Fatima now belongs to the past and “what remains” is only “the summons to penance and conversion.”¹⁹⁸ To recall Sodano’s announcement at Fatima on May 13, 2000 concerning the impending publication of the vision on June 26, 2000: “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 start of the twentieth century, remains timely and urgent today.”¹⁹⁹

In short, as of 2000 the Party Line in its totality could be summed up in one phrase: “Fatima is finished.” At least so the Secretary of State would have it, applying pressure from above. And, true to form, members of the party of the innovators among the rank-and-file clergy and laity would adhere to the Party Line, applying pressure from below by dutifully attacking faithful Catholics who declined to go along with the Secretary of State’s expedient human revision of

¹⁹⁸ *The Message of Fatima* (2000), “Theological Commentary,” www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html

¹⁹⁹ “Announcement by Cardinal Angelo Sodano, Secretary of State,” in *The Message of Fatima* (TMF).

Our Lady's heavenly message.

No one among the rank and file clergy set himself more eagerly to the task of enforcing the Party Line than the late Father Robert J. Fox (1927-2009). It is fair to say that Father Fox's "Fatima Family Apostolate" became the exact antithesis of Father Gruner's Fatima Center. That is, it was dedicated to the work of obliterating the authentic Message of Fatima while preserving the appearance of a pious attachment to it. As early as 1989, when the first order came down from the Vatican (not the Pope) that no one must seek any longer the Consecration of Russia, Father Fox had been proclaiming Russia's non-existent conversion following the 1984 ceremony which made no mention of Russia. Father Gruner, of course, had done just the opposite: warning that Our Lady's request had yet to be heeded, as one can hardly consecrate a particular place while deliberately avoiding any mention of it, and that the Church and the world would suffer the consequences of fallible men playing games with the consecration the Mother of God had specified on God's authority.

Father Fox's defense of the Party Line necessarily placed him in direct conflict with Father Gruner. The conflict reached a fevered pitch in the April-June 2004 issue of Fox's *Immaculate Heart Messenger*. Citing the many letters he had received objecting to his position on Fatima, Father Fox devoted two articles and six pages to an attack on Father Gruner. As do all partisans of the Party Line, Fox avoided the merits of Father Gruner's eminently reasonable claim that a consecration of Russia requires *mention* of Russia. Instead, he descended to character assassination.

Fr. Fox's Argumentum Ad Hominem

"Father Gruner—A Suspended Catholic Priest," screamed the headline of one of the stories. Here we go again. We have already seen (see Chapter 3) that Father Gruner was not "suspended," but rather was the victim of a canonical ruse engineered by Secretary of State Sodano, which failed when Father Gruner achieved incardination in the Diocese of Hyderabad without objection by the Bishop of Avellino, who had no interest in Father Gruner's "return" to Italy after an approved absence of sixteen years. And, it must be stressed again, *the Vatican itself has never taken any disciplinary action against Father Gruner*. Rather, the Congregation for the Clergy has merely pointed to the Bishop of Avellino, who in turn has done nothing to contradict or countermand Father Gruner's valid incardination in Hyderabad.

That the "suspension" of Father Gruner is non-existent was clearly recognized by no less than the Pope's personal secretary for forty years, Archbishop Stanislaw Dziwisz. In 1996 Archbishop

Dziwisz, in a moment captured by a photographer for *L’Osservatore Romano*, was personally handed a copy of Father Gruner’s canonical recourse to the Pope, detailing the Secretary of State’s machinations. Thereafter, Archbishop Dziwisz sent Father Gruner personal notes of encouragement for his work on three different occasions. The last was a note of January 12, 2004 in which the Pope’s secretary acknowledged Father Gruner’s Christmas greeting by conveying “prayerful good wishes and blessing for the New Year to you *and the faithful entrusted to your care at The Fatima Center.*” Now the Pope’s secretary receives many thousands of Christmas greetings at the Vatican, yet he responded to Father Gruner’s greeting with a personal note, addressed to “*Father Nicholas Gruner,*” referring to and encouraging his work at the Fatima Center. The Pope’s secretary, who is well aware of Father Gruner’s situation, would hardly send a *series* of such notes to a “suspended priest.”

But even if we assume for the sake of argument that Father Gruner were “suspended,” what would that have to do with whether the Consecration of Russia has been accomplished? Nothing, of course. As Fr. Fox well knew, he was engaging in an illegitimate *argumentum ad hominem*, attacking the man rather than addressing the merits of the man’s arguments—the oldest and cheapest debating trick. It behooved Father Fox to address the merits of the Fatima controversy in a manly manner, instead of kicking his adversary in the shins and running away. To the end, however, he avoided any attempt to confront the overwhelming documentary and testimonial evidence against his position and in support of Father Gruner’s position.

Who Wasted Millions of Dollars?

Rather, the shin-kicking continued with Fr. Fox’s arch observation that “It would be interesting to see how many millions of dollars Father Gruner has collected over the years...” What did the amount of donations to Father Gruner’s apostolate have to do with whether Russia has been consecrated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary? Nothing, of course. At any rate, Father Gruner has not “collected” one penny. The donations to his apostolate are made to a non-profit organization of which Father Gruner is president, and the amount of those donations is a matter of public record.

It must be said that Fr. Fox’s question about millions of dollars in donations could fairly have been turned against him: How many millions did Fr. Fox raise to promote the delusion that a consecration of the world is just the same as a consecration of Russia? How much money did he and other similarly situated advocates of the Party Line spend trying to persuade Catholics that the current state of

Russia, the world and the Church represents the fulfillment of Our Lady's promises at Fatima? How much money has been squandered to support a misguided effort to *delay fulfillment of Our Lady's request* by promoting the fiction that Her request has already been honored? Why should any Catholic give money to a "Fatima apostolate" that *works against* the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart by impeding the Consecration of Russia that will bring it about?

A Simple Request Unheeded

If words have meaning, then the words of Our Lady of Fatima do not correspond to the Party Line, imposed from above, that Father Fox assiduously promoted from below. Aside from the lifelong testimony of Sister Lucy, already noted, that the Consecration of Russia must mention Russia, we note here that Sister Lucy explained that the object of the Consecration must be Russia, *specifically and distinctly*, because when that particular nation is converted following a ceremony consecrating only that nation to Mary, it will be obvious to everyone that Heaven has deigned to produce this miracle in honor of Her Immaculate Heart. As Sister Lucy revealed to her confessor on May 18, 1936: "Recently, I asked Our Lord why He would not convert Russia without the Pope making that consecration." Our Lord deigned to answer her, as Sister Lucy recorded in her letters: "Because I want My whole Church to recognize that consecration as a triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in order that My Church will later on place devotion to the Immaculate Heart beside devotion to My Sacred Heart."

What is there about the Virgin's request that is difficult to understand? Nothing at all. Even a child can understand it, which is why it was delivered to three simple children who could not even read. For as Our Lord Himself said (with the contemptibly sophisticated Pharisees in view): "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come to Me: for the kingdom of heaven is for such... Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." (Matt. 19:13, 10:16)

The Pope's advisors, however, seem to be under the impression that God sent His Mother to earth to ask for a gratuitous insult to the Russian Orthodox and a gesture that might provoke war—an absurdity we will address in Chapter 13. And so, instead of a Consecration of Russia, these papal advisors have given us substitute ceremonies from which any mention of Russia was deliberately omitted so that *no one would think Russia was being consecrated*. This, according to Fr. Fox and like-minded low-level defenders of the Party Line, is what Our Lady requested at Fatima.

The Neo-Modernist Deconstruction of Fatima

The failure to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary for fear of offending the schismatic Russian Orthodox and the Moscow regime is only part and parcel of the disastrous liberalization of the human element of the Church carried forward by the party of the innovators whose program we have already sketched. We have noted thematically that the Consecration has been impeded by the novelties of “ecumenism” and “dialogue” which suddenly appeared in the Church during and after the Council. And we have seen that too late did Paul VI recognize that “the opening to the world has become a veritable invasion of the Church by worldly thinking.” When all is said and done, it is worldly thinking—or, to be more precise, *Modernist* thinking—that has prevented the consecration of Russia since the Council’s close.

Recall that a Modernist is one who practices the subtle art of undermining the Catholic Faith, not through blatant heresies that are easily identified, but rather ambiguities, studied omissions of truth, and “modern ways of speaking.” By these means, the Modernist seeks to change the traditional meaning of Catholic terminology so that, in the end, the Faith is totally destroyed, just as a house is totally destroyed by the activity of termites, even though it still has the outward appearance of solidity.

Recall as well that in *Pascendi* (1907), discussed in Chapter 1, Pope St. Pius X succinctly defined Modernism—and the definition applies with equal force to today’s neo-Modernists—as nothing less than “the synthesis of all heresies.” As that sainted Pope declared: “Were one to attempt the task of collecting together all the errors that have been broached against the Faith and to concentrate the sap and substance of them all into one, he could not better succeed than the Modernists have done.”

The basic technique of the Modernist is to pay lip service to Catholic verities—such as those enunciated in the Message of Fatima—while undermining them completely. The false appearance of orthodoxy is what makes Modernism so dangerous to the Faith. The heretics of old, such as Martin Luther, did not hesitate to proclaim their heresies openly and explicitly, thus subjecting themselves to exclusion from the commonwealth of the Church, once the Church had exposed and condemned their clear errors as heresy. The Modernist, however, is a far cleverer fellow. He endeavors to remain within the Church while attempting to bring her into line with his heretical views, passed off under the guise of seemingly Catholic terminology.

As St. Pius X warned in *Pascendi*, these ecclesial termites “are striving, by arts *entirely new and full of subtlety*, to destroy the vital energy of the Church, and, if they can, to overthrow utterly Christ’s

kingdom itself.” Their principal technique, said Pius, is to appear to affirm Catholic truth at one moment, only to cast doubt upon it in the next by means of ambiguity or studied omission: “Hence in their books you find some things which might well be expressed by a Catholic, but on the next page you find other things which might have been dictated by a rationalist. When they write history they make no mention of the divinity of Christ, but when they are in the pulpit they profess it clearly; again, when they write history they pay no heed to the Fathers and the Councils, but when they catechise the people, they cite them respectfully.”

St. Pius X noted how the Modernists, professing loyalty to the Magisterium, “express astonishment” at being exposed as enemies of the Faith. Nevertheless, they are “the most pernicious of all the adversaries of the Church. For as We have said, they put their designs for her ruin into operation not from without but from within; hence, the danger is present almost in the very veins and heart of the Church, whose injury is the more certain, the more intimate is their knowledge of her.”

The key, then, to the great advance of Modernism in the post-conciliar period is that it is being carried forward by men who inhabit the very veins and heart of the Church, and who hold themselves out as exemplars of sound orthodoxy—and may even believe that they are!—even as they empty orthodoxy of its objective content. As Pius X made clear, Modernists can succeed in eating away at Catholic doctrine only to the extent they are able to cloak themselves in ecclesiastical legitimacy and respectability, thus persuading the faithful that they speak the mind of the Church and ought to be followed. That is why Pius called for the Oath Against Modernism to be taken by every Catholic priest and theologian, and for the exposure and removal of Modernists from every position of authority in the Church. After Vatican II, however, the Oath Against Modernism was abandoned by Paul VI, along with any systematic effort to eliminate Modernists from positions of authority. We have seen the results of this aspect of “the opening to the world.” And we have seen the results with the Party Line concerning Fatima, which produces a Modernist version of the Fatima message.

The Modernist “Consecration of Russia”

Father Fox is no longer with us, and may God rest his soul. But in his time, he was emblematic of how, at the level of the rank-and-file clergy, the Modernist *modus operandi* produced an “interpretation” of the Fatima message that, like Ratzinger’s theological commentary in *TMF*, is really an attempt to debunk it. Fr. Fox paid lip service to Fatima at the same time he eviscerated its prophetic content, leaving

nothing that would offend the proponents of “ecumenism” and “dialogue”—Fr. Fox included. Let us see how Fr. Fox did what he did.

First there was Fr. Fox’s Modernist “interpretation” of the Consecration of Russia. To “consecrate” means to set a place or thing apart for a sacred purpose. We have already mentioned the self-evident fact that in order to consecrate a place, one must *mention* the place being consecrated. It would be absurd for a bishop to insist that he could consecrate a new cathedral by consecrating his whole diocese without mentioning the cathedral, on the theory that the cathedral is part of the diocese. Yet Fr. Fox, following the Party Line, seriously proposed that the Pope could consecrate Russia by consecrating the world, *even if all mention of Russia is deliberately avoided* so as not to offend the Orthodox.

In support of his claim, Fr. Fox trotted out what he claimed was “a personal letter from Sister Lucia saying that the Collegial Consecration was accomplished” by the 1984 ceremony deliberately omitting any mention of Russia. This “personal letter” (from 1990) was one of five “personal letters” generated by a word processor and purportedly signed by Sister Lucia, who did not type letters on word processors but rather wrote her entire voluminous correspondence (not to mention hundreds of pages of memoirs) by hand. We have already noted that one of these “personal letters,” to a Mr. Noelker in November of 1989 (*see* Chapter 3), states that during his visit to Fatima in 1967 Pope Paul VI consecrated the world to the Immaculate Heart—an event that never happened. Since Sister Lucy, who witnessed Pope Paul’s visit, could not have made such a mistake, it could only have been made by the uninformed person who created the “personal letters” on a word processor. We have noted also that, oddly enough, the plainly discredited Noelker letter is *the one and only piece of evidence* cited in Cardinal Bertone’s commentary to support the claim that the Consecration has been done (*see* Chapter 5). Recall how no effort was made to obtain Sister Lucy’s personal testimony on the matter, even though she was readily available. *She was not even asked to authenticate the Noelker letter*—an omission that speaks volumes.

In any case, Fr. Fox never made the least effort to explain how the purported “personal letters” of 1989-90 could be squared with Sister Lucy’s constant testimony, both before and *after* the 1984 ceremony, that Our Lady specified a consecration of Russia by name, not a consecration of the world (*see* Chapter 3). Again and again Fr. Fox was confronted with Sister Lucy’s prior testimony by the publications of Father Gruner’s apostolate; again and again he ducked the challenge to explain how his “personal letter from Sister Lucy” could be reconciled with that testimony. Instead, he signed

on to the Modernist “ecumenical” version of the Consecration: a ceremony in which everything *but* Russia was mentioned. Hence, since 1984 we have seen not only a consecration of the world, but (on October 8, 2000) a consecration to Mary—called an “act of entrustment”—of a whole list of beneficiaries from which Russia was conspicuously omitted: “all people,” “the babies yet unborn,” “those born into poverty and suffering,” “the young in search of meaning,” “the unemployed,” “those suffering hunger and disease,” “all troubled families,” “the elderly with no one to help them,” and “all who are alone and without hope.”

No one could argue that consecrating (or “entrusting”) all these different groups to Mary is a bad thing. On the contrary, it is a good thing. But here we see another Modernist technique at work: emphasizing one good in order to obscure another—as, for example, when the Modernist speaks incessantly of God’s mercy in order to obscure His justice, or the humanity of Christ in order to obscure His divinity. By consecrating everything and anything on the face of the earth but the one thing Our Lady asked to be consecrated, the purveyors of the Modernist version of Fatima endeavor to make us forget the reason Our Lady came to earth in the first place: to call for *Russia’s* conversion as the harbinger of the Triumph of Her Immaculate Heart and peace in the world. Fr. Fox was instrumental in this Modernist obfuscation of the simple truth of Fatima.

The Modernist “Conversion of Russia”

Having promoted a Modernist “consecration of Russia,” Fr. Fox and others in his camp likewise committed themselves to defending a Modernist version of Russia’s supposed “conversion” since 1984. In the aforementioned article irrelevantly headlined “Father Gruner—a suspended Catholic priest,” Fr. Fox himself conceded that “there are still wars, violence in the world and *Russia is far from converted.*” He then noted the objection no doubt posed to him by many of his own supporters: “If the Consecration is Accomplished, Why is Russia Not Converted?” Rather than answering the objection, Fr. Fox rhetorically sneered at those “who hold to a position that a paradise on earth, a Russia suddenly turning itself into a people of converted holiness and even as Roman Catholics must immediately follow a Collegial Consecration.” That is, Father Fox sneered at the very miracle Our Lady of Fatima promised, caricaturing it as “paradise on earth,” when what the Virgin promised, rather, was a period of peace for the world and the salvation of many souls.

In other words, Fr. Fox, driving a dagger through the heart of the Fatima message, maintains that Our Lady of Fatima did not promise the twin miracles of a period of world peace and the conversion

of Russia to the Catholic Faith, and the consequent healing of a thousand-year-long schism. According to him, Our Lady promised nothing more than what we see today: no world peace, and no conversion of the Russian people. But if that were so, then what was the point of the Fatima apparitions? Did the Mother of God come to earth and call down the Miracle of the Sun only to announce that miracles would *not* happen upon the fulfillment of Her requests? What sort of nonsense is this? It is Modernist nonsense, which affirms and denies the Fatima event at one and the same time.

As Fr. Fox knew very well, however, Our Lady’s intervention on earth did in fact produce the miraculous conversion of the entire nation of Mexico. Some nine million souls lost in the darkness of paganism were baptized and received into the Catholic Church over the short span of only nine years following the apparitions of Our Lady of Guadalupe in 1531. Yet *twenty* years after a “consecration of Russia” in which Russia was never mentioned—today, it is twenty-eight years after—Fr. Fox was still insisting that we could not expect Our Lady to produce a similar miracle in Russia or, indeed, to convert any considerable number of Russians to the Catholic Faith! And this, mind you, was the man who portrayed himself as a great champion of Our Lady of Fatima and the Triumph of Her Immaculate Heart.

When one thinks about it for a moment, one realizes that what Fr. Fox and those of like mind have argued is simply this: *God cannot bring about the miraculous conversion of Russia.* His vision clouded by the ecumenical fog that has bedeviled the Church since Vatican II, Fr. Fox implicitly denied divine omnipotence.

Compare Fr. Fox with the shining example of Fr. Leonid Feodorov (1879-1935), who journeyed to Rome when he was still a Russian Orthodox theology student and was united to the Catholic Church at the Gesu on July 31, 1902—fifteen years before Our Lady of Fatima came to ask all the Russian Orthodox to follow Feodorov’s example. Feodorov was ordained a Catholic priest and elevated to head the Byzantine Rite Catholic Church in Russia as its Exarch, only to be sentenced to ten years in prison by the Bolsheviks in 1923 for the “crime” of promoting the reunion of the Orthodox with Rome. Concerning his sentence Fr. Feodorov declared: “It is all one to me whether I am shot or I am sentenced to ten years’ imprisonment; yet I am no fanatic. Since the moment I gave myself to the Catholic Church my sole thought has been to bring my country to that Church, which I believe *is the only true Church.*”

Our Lady of the Russian Orthodox?

In his attacks on Father Gruner in the magazine he dared to call *Immaculate Heart Messenger*, Fox made light of “horror stories about

Russia as evidence that no Consecration was accepted by God.” Glossing over the “horror stories” (which he could not explain away) Fr. Fox cited, apparently in all seriousness, the view of Orthodox Patriarch Alexy II—a former KGB agent!—that he (Alexy) “believes” that the Russian Orthodox Church is undergoing a “rebirth.” This is the same Alexy II who not long ago screamed that the Pope was “invading Russian territory” when His Holiness conducted a *closed-circuit* TV broadcast to a small group of Catholics in Moscow—closed-circuit because the TV stations controlled by Mr. Putin refused to broadcast images of the Pope to the Russian people at large.

So, Fr. Fox, a self-styled apostle of Fatima who loudly proclaimed his loyalty to the Pope, suggested that the Mother of God came to earth to bring about a “rebirth” of the Russian Orthodox Church—the same schismatic church that utterly rejects communion with the Pope and will not even allow him to visit Moscow unless the Catholic Church renounces any effort to make converts in Russia! But Our Lady did not come to Fatima to give aid to schismatic Russian Orthodoxy, but rather to reconcile the Russian people with the Catholic Church, as we see in the historic conversion of Fr. Feodorov.

Perhaps recognizing the absurdity of his own position, Fr. Fox attempted to claim papal authority for his Modernist “conversion of Russia” by claiming that John Paul II “speaks of the Orthodox as our sister Church.” But Fr. Fox was wrong again, as are all the proponents of this falsehood of the party of the innovators. On June 9, 2000 the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a doctrinal note, specifically approved by the Pope, which warns that

one cannot properly say that the Catholic Church is the sister of a particular church or group of churches... Consequently, one should avoid, as a source of misunderstanding and theological confusion, the use of formulations such as our two churches which, if applied to the Catholic Church and the totality of Orthodox churches (or a single Orthodox church), imply a plurality not merely on the level of particular churches, but also on the level of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church confessed in the creed, whose real existence is thus obscured.

Thus, in defending his neo-Modernist “conversion of Russia,” Fr. Fox indulged in a bit of Modernist ecclesiology which even the relentlessly “ecumenical” Vatican apparatus was forced to condemn to avoid theological confusion—the same confusion caused by the ecumenical initiatives of certain Vatican bureaucrats. Such is the “diabolical disorientation of the Church” remarked by Sister Lucy.

In any case, what Fr. Fox presented as the “rebirth” of Russian Orthodoxy is a myth. It is well known that nearly all of those who designate themselves Russian Orthodox do not practice their

religion. As *The Economist* noted in 2000: “Russia is suffering a crisis of faith... 94% of Russians aged 18-29 do not go to church.”²⁰⁰ Thus it is hardly surprising that the moral degeneration of Russian society continues to accelerate: two abortions for every live birth (an average of five to six abortions for each Russian woman), rampant alcoholism and violent crime which has lowered between 1991 and 2004 the life expectancy of the average Russian male from 68 years down to 60, a burgeoning AIDS epidemic following the legalization of homosexuality by Boris Yeltsin, a flourishing child pornography industry thanks to Russia’s porn-friendly legal system (another way that Russia spreads its errors throughout the world), and so forth. (See Chapter 13.) The “rebirth” of Russian Orthodoxy, like Fr. Fox’s entire attempt to revise the Message of Fatima along “ecumenical” lines, was a fraud.

And What of the Catholic Church in Russia?

Tellingly, Fr. Fox’s attacks on Father Gruner avoided discussing the undeniable truth that there is no sign whatever of the conversion Our Lady actually prophesied: the conversion of the Russian people to the Catholic religion and their return to Rome. On the contrary, while Fr. Fox promoted his Modernist substitute for the conversion of Russia the persecution of the Catholic Church under the Putin regime worsened with each passing day.

Thanks to Russia’s 1997 law on “freedom of conscience,” the Church’s very existence in Russia has been at the sufferance of “ex-communist” Russian bureaucrats who issue the annual permits for operation of Catholic parishes, while Russian Orthodoxy, Judaism, Islam and Buddhism are granted legal status without need of permits. Treated as foreign missionaries, Catholic clergy are required to renew their visitor’s visas every three months in order to remain in the country. Key Catholic clerics have since been expelled following visa denials, including the very secretary of the Russian Catholic Bishops’ Conference, Father Stanislaw Opiela, who was denied an entry visa three times without explanation: “I don’t think I’ll try again. It’s just not worth it,” he said. “Maybe there will be some kind of protest.”²⁰¹ In April of 2002, Bishop Jerzy Masur, assigned by the Vatican to administer to the vast (but sparsely populated) region of Siberia, was also expelled from Russia, his entry visa confiscated without explanation. Bishop Masur learned that he had been added to a secret “list” of Catholic clergy who are considered “undesirables” and will no longer be allowed to enter Russian territory.

At the same time Father Fox was attacking Father Gruner—some

²⁰⁰ Zenit news report, December 22, 2000.

²⁰¹ Catholic News Service Report, May 8, 2001.

twenty years after the “consecration” of 1984—the Catholic Church was keeping (and still keeps) such a low profile in Russia that the Moscow office from which Archbishop Kondrusiewicz conducted Church affairs was “tucked behind a military commandant’s office and bears no signs saying it houses the Catholic Church’s Russian leadership.”²⁰² Catholics remain a tiny, benighted minority in the country; there are perhaps 500,000 nominal Catholics in a nation of 144 million people. The small percentage of Catholics who even go to Mass on Sunday (most of them in Siberia) is dependent almost entirely on non-Russian priests, whose visas can be revoked at will. In all of Russia, there are today only 200 Catholic priests of which only ten are Russian-born—vastly fewer than there were *before* the Bolshevik Revolution in October 1917.

All of these developments prompted Archbishop Kondrusiewicz to issue a formal protest on behalf of the Conference of Catholic Bishops of Russia, entitled “Religious Liberty in Russia Is in Serious Danger.” The protest declares:

Catholics in Russia ask themselves: What will happen next? Are the constitutional guarantees valid also for them, including liberty of conscience and of the right to have their own pastors, which comprises inviting them from abroad, not forgetting that for 81 years the Catholic Church was deprived of the right of forming and ordaining its own priests? Perhaps the State really considers Catholics second-class citizens? Are they (the State) returning to the times of persecution of the faith? ... The expulsion of a Catholic bishop who has not violated any law, surpasses all imaginable limits of civilized relations between the State and the Church. ... With grave worry, we express our decisive protest in respect to violation of the constitutional rights of Catholics.²⁰³

Even as he failed to produce any evidence of Russia’s religious conversion besides the mythical “rebirth” of schismatic, anti-Roman Russian Orthodoxy, Fr. Fox was forced to admit that “Unfortunately, the Orthodox Church in Russia still has a mentality of confidence in the state for the furtherance of religious purposes.” Confidence in the regime of Vladimir Putin, the pro-abortion former head of the KGB! What more needs to be said?

Just as Soloviev pointed out more than a hundred years ago, the Russian Orthodox Church, cut off from Rome and the universal Church, is little more than a creature of the state. Yet the non-existent “rebirth” of this state-controlled puppet Church, whose ex-KGB “patriarch” works hand-in-glove with Mr. Putin to persecute the

²⁰² AP report and photograph, February 28, 2002.

²⁰³ *National Catholic Register* Online Web Edition, April 28 - May 5, 2002.

Catholic Church, is what Fr. Fox relentlessly attempted to pass off as the “conversion of Russia.”

Here, too, Fr. Fox dutifully promoted the Party Line of Cardinal Sodano, according to which “conversion” as used in the Message of Fatima has been redefined to exclude any embrace of the Catholic religion. Likewise parroting the Party Line, no less than the Secretary General of the Conference of Roman Catholic Bishops of Russia, Igor Kovalsky, declared on May 6, 2004 that “There is no proselytism as a directive on the part of the Holy See, *nor is there any intention to convert Russia to Roman Catholicism.*”²⁰⁴

There we have it: the anti-Fatima elements of the Vatican bureaucracy, aided and abetted by Fr. Fox, are now *diametrically opposed* to God’s own design for the conversion of Russia to the Catholic Faith. They openly declare that Russia shall *not* be Catholic. And yet these same characters, Fr. Fox included, present themselves as devotees and reliable interpreters of the Fatima message. Cardinal Sodano’s own “interpretation” of the Third Secret, which pretends that the vision of the Pope being executed by a band of soldiers signifies John Paul II *not* being killed by a lone assassin in 1981, was cited no fewer than four times in Cardinal Ratzinger’s commentary on the Third Secret. Sodano’s “interpretation,” like the rest of the neo-Modernist revision of Fatima, has one purpose only: to relegate Fatima to the past, and to oblivion.

No Conversion of Any Kind in Russia

Indeed, Fr. Fox was unable to demonstrate how Russia has converted in *any* sense, besides a certain liberalization of the consumer economy, which is hardly what Our Lady came to announce. Despite the “fall of Communism” in 1991, Russia today is an authoritarian state whose virtual dictator, Vladimir Putin, has seized control of the mass media, jailed or exiled all of his chief political opponents, banned the formation of grass roots opposition parties and prevented the emergence of an independent judiciary. As *The Washington Post* observed in late 2003, while Father Fox was still promoting his sham conversion of Russia: “We must now recognize that there has been a massive suppression of human rights and the imposition of a de facto Cold War-type administration in Moscow.”²⁰⁵ In a recent statement to Congress, Republican Congressman Christopher Cox told the truth that Fr. Fox never reports in his “don’t worry, be happy” magazine: “Russia does not enjoy an open, competitive political system that protects freedom of expression and association and its government

²⁰⁴ Itar-Tass news report, May 7, 2004.

²⁰⁵ “The Failure of Putin’s Russia,” Bruce P. Jackson, *Washington Post*, October 28, 2003, p. A23.

does not uphold universal standards of human rights.” Russian analyst Nikolai Zlobin of the Center for Defense Information put it most simply: “We’re fighting a kind of new Cold War.”²⁰⁶

Yet Fr. Fox belittles these developments as “horror stories,” thus covering up the crimes of the Putin regime, much as leftist reporters in the West covered up the crimes of Lenin and Stalin, thus earning Lenin’s appellation “useful idiots.” Today, useful idiots in the Catholic Church cover up the true state of affairs in Russia in order to foist their “ecumenical” version of Fatima upon the faithful. To Fr. Fox one must say in all candor: You are complicit in the persecution of the Church in Russia, because you have abandoned the cause of Russia’s conversion for the sake of a failed human program of “ecumenical dialogue.” In fact, you use your “respectable” apostolate to *oppose* the consecration of Russia, as you dare to collect money from the faithful in the name of Our Lady of Fatima.

Russia Suffered, as Fr. Fox Boasted of His Russian Shrine

While the Russian people, Catholics especially, continued to suffer, Fr. Fox patted himself on the back for raising money to build a small Fatima shrine in St. Petersburg, Russia: “It was constructed with funds my apostolate gathered,” he boasted. Fr. Fox noted that the shrine was dedicated by Archbishop Kondrusiewicz back in 1998—the same Archbishop Kondrusiewicz who was decrying the persecution of the Church in Russia at the same time Fr. Fox pretended it was not happening!

Having congratulated himself for collecting money to build the shrine, Fr. Fox sniffed that “Father Gruner continued his negative approaches.” By “negative approaches” Fr. Fox meant remarking the obvious about the consequences of failing to honor Our Lady’s request: that Russia will not convert, that Russia will suffer, that the Church will suffer, that the world will suffer. Fr. Fox apparently believed that the Putin regime’s toleration of his little shrine represented some sort of triumph for the Church in Russia. A triumph it was not. Since the date Fr. Fox’s shrine was dedicated, the persecution of Russian Catholics has only worsened, as demonstrated by the developments described above. Putin today, like Lenin and Stalin before him, makes a great show of allowing a few Catholic parishes to operate while persecution of the Church continues unabated. As Fr. Fox applauded himself, the tiny Catholic apparatus in Russia was enduring (and still endures) systematic state oppression. Irony of ironies, there are far fewer practicing Catholics in Russia today (2012) than there were in the time of Lenin and Stalin.

Perhaps Heaven expects a bit more from the Catholic hierarchy

²⁰⁶ Fox News, May 6, 2004.

than Fr. Fox’s Marian shrine in St. Petersburg. Perhaps Heaven expects what Our Lady of Fatima requested: *the consecration of Russia* to Her Immaculate Heart. But Fr. Fox insisted until the end that Our Lady of Fatima came to prophesy a consecration that is not a consecration, and a conversion that is not a conversion. In true Modernist fashion he “interpreted” the Message of Fatima into extinction.

The Scheme to Create an “Inter-religious” Fatima

The road Fr. Fox chose to follow does not end with the elimination of the consecration and conversion of Russia in their traditional Catholic sense. Having set off down the road toward a Modernist Fatima, Fr. Fox had to go the whole distance, or risk losing favor with the anti-Fatima ecclesial bureaucrats upon whom, ironically enough, his purported Fatima apostolate depends for its very existence. This meant that Fr. Fox had to be willing to defend the last stage in the Modernist transformation of Fatima: the creation of an “inter-religious” Fatima Shrine.

Hence, in the second of his articles attacking Father Gruner, “Fatima Will Retain Its Catholic Identity,” Fr. Fox showed that he was willing and eager to do so. Notice, first of all, the curious phraseology of the article’s title: Fatima will “retain” its “Catholic identity.” Since Fatima is a Catholic place by definition, this is akin to saying that “St. Peter’s Basilica will retain its Catholic identity.” Clearly, something is going on at Fatima that required Fr. Fox to make this strange, and less than reassuring, affirmation.

Fr. Fox knew very well what was going on at the Fatima Shrine. In connection with an unprecedented “inter-religious congress” of Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, Orthodox, Anglicans and Catholics held at the Shrine in October 2003, the Rector of the Shrine, Fr. Luciano Guerra, now retired, declared that:

The future of Fatima, or the adoration of God and His Mother at this holy Shrine, *must pass through the creation of a shrine where different religions can mingle.* The inter-religious dialogue in Portugal, and in the Catholic Church, is still in an embryonic phase, but the Shrine of Fatima is not indifferent to this fact and is already open to being a universalistic place of vocation.

This remark, widely reported in the Catholic press (including the *Universe* and *Catholic Herald*), as well as the secular press in Portugal (*Noticias de Fatima* and *Portugal News*), provoked a storm of international protest by concerned Catholics. In response, Rector Guerra issued a series of equivocal statements, none of which actually denied that he had made the remark. On the contrary, the “denials” only *affirmed* that Guerra intended to promote “inter-religious”

activities at the Shrine. For example, Guerra's "official" response on the Fatima Shrine's website declared:

And, *when it seems to us to be opportune, after what is already happening in many other sacred places, this new basilica would be able to receive brothers from other faiths, who may want, in a brotherly manner, to know how we pray.*

Guerra was referring to the grotesque new "basilica," resembling a gigantic concrete banjo, that now disfigures the sacred ground of the Cova da Iria, near the original basilica of traditional Catholic design. As we can see, the "basilica" will be largely buried underground, thus serving as the perfect metaphor for what Guerra is trying to do with the Message of Fatima.

Guerra clearly had in mind for his new "basilica" something more than members of other religions observing how Catholics worship God at Fatima, for this they can do already in the existing basilica. Rather, Guerra expressly linked his plans to "what is already happening in many other sacred places," which he will evidently allow to happen at Fatima when, as he put it, "it seems to us to be opportune."

To show his inter-religious audience "what is already happening in many other sacred places," Guerra invited to address the conference one Fr. Arul Irudayam, Rector of the Catholic Marian Shrine Basilica in Vailankanni, India. This Shrine receives millions of pilgrims a year, including many Hindus, and Fr. Irudayam rejoiced to inform the audience that, as a further development of "inter-religious dialogue," *the Hindus now perform their religious rituals in the shrine at Vailankanni*. The audience, including Rector Guerra, applauded this sacrilege. The commandment "Thou shalt not have false gods before Me" was evidently lost on this crowd.

On January 9, 2004, nearly three months after his remark, Guerra finally admitted to a reporter from the English journal *Catholic Herald* that he had indeed stated that "the new shrine at Fatima, Portugal would be a place 'where different religions can mingle,'" but claimed that his statement had been "taken out of context." The "context," however, was a gathering of Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, Orthodox and Anglicans, addressed by an Indian priest who permits Hindu worship in a Catholic Marian shrine in India—to the applause of Msgr. Guerra.

Here it must be noted that Guerra's conference was also addressed by neo-Modernist "theologian," Fr. Jacques Dupuis. As eyewitness John Vennari reported, Dupuis's address contended that God has *positively willed* the existence of other religions as part of His plan for salvation, and that one should not even refer to other religions as non-Christian. *Noticias de Fatima* quotes Dupuis as follows: "The

religion of the future will be a general convergence of all religions into one universal Christ which will satisfy everyone.”

Dupuis descended into outright heresy when he pronounced as a “horrible text” the *infallible dogmatic definition* of the Council of Florence (1442), already mentioned, concerning no salvation outside the Church. To recall what the Council of Florence declared:

The Holy Roman Church... believes firmly, professes and declares that none of those who are outside the Church, not only pagans, but also Jews or heretics and schismatics, can reach eternal life, but will go into the eternal fire ‘prepared for the devil and his angels’ [Matt. 25:41] unless before death they are united to it... *No one*, no matter how many alms he has given, even if he pours out his blood in the name of Christ, can be saved, if he does not remain in the bosom and unity of the *Catholic Church*.

As Vennari personally observed, Dupuis’s address, including his dissent from this infallibly defined dogma, was applauded not only by Guerra, but also the Bishop of Leiria-Fatima, D. Serafim de Sousa Ferreira e Silva, and even the Papal Nuncio. Indeed, the next day, as Vennari reports, Archbishop Michael Fitzgerald stated to the conference: “Father Dupuis yesterday explained *the theological basis* of the establishment of relations with people of other religions.”

To date, Guerra has not explicitly denied his apparent intention to allow inter-religious activities, including non-Catholic rituals, on the grounds of the Fatima Shrine. When asked to issue such denials in an email and fax sent by this writer, Guerra waited two months to issue a “reply” that completely avoids the issue.

Confronted with an international wave of outrage over Guerra’s antics, the anti-Fatima elements of the Vatican bureaucracy, speaking through Archbishop Fitzgerald, later issued one of those “denials” so typical of the post-conciliar revolution: calculated to mollify the overly credulous, while providing cover for the launching of the revolution’s latest trial balloon. According to the English Catholic journal *Universe*, Fitzgerald said that Guerra’s motley inter-religious gathering “was merely ‘part of an ongoing reflection’ on the sanctuary’s ‘inter-religious dimension’ in the Church and the modern world,” but ““there were no practical conclusions.”²⁰⁷ This is rather like a married man who protests that in flirting with other women he is merely engaging in an “ongoing reflection” on adultery but hasn’t yet decided how to commit it. But Fitzgerald conspicuously failed to deny that Msgr. Guerra had said, as the *Universe* reported: “The future of Fatima, or the adoration of God and His mother at this Holy Shrine, must pass through the creation of a shrine where different religions can mingle.”

²⁰⁷ *Catholic Times* online, November 18, 2003.

A Scheme Long in the Making

Guerra's pan-religious gathering in Fatima was but the latest point reached in a trajectory toward an "inter-religious Fatima" that he had established as early as 1992. In that year *The Fatima Crusader* reported that Guerra had invited to speak at a conference in Fatima Professor Robert Muller, Chancellor of the United Nations University for Peace. Muller dared to enlist the Pope himself in the cause of creating a one-world religion under the aegis of a one-world government: "Ecumenism is outmoded now," he declared to Guerra's congress. "We must now move to universal religiosity and spirituality under the aegis of one-world government, which will soon see the light of day, and under the impetus of John Paul II, who would be honored if he gave the Church this programme." Note the symmetry of remarks between Guerra's guest in 1992 and his guest in 2003, Fr. Dupuis, who, as noted earlier, declared that "The religion of the future will be a general convergence of all religions into one universal Christ which will satisfy everyone."

Who did Msgr. Guerra and Archbishop Fitzgerald think they were fooling? The Fatima revisionists floated a trial balloon; the trial balloon was shot down by outraged Catholics; and now, at least for the moment, they were trying to backpedal, but without actually shelving the plan to open the Fatima Shrine to "inter-religious" activity when "it seems to us to be opportune."

Two steps forward, one step back. The Fatima Shrine may not be an inter-religious Mecca today, but Fitzgerald implanted the suggestion that the shrine has "an inter-religious dimension" on which the unprecedented conference was part of "an ongoing reflection." Stay tuned for the "practical conclusions."

Hindus in the Capelinha

And the "practical conclusions" were soon revealed. Even as Fr. Guerra and Archbishop Fitzgerald hid behind equivocal "denials" that deny nothing, Guerra continued to move ahead with his scheme for an inter-religious Fatima Shrine.

In a stunning development that received no advance publicity, on May 5, 2004 Guerra allowed a busload of Hindus to conduct a pagan ritual in the Capelinha, or Little Chapel of the Apparitions, which stands on the very spot where Our Lady appeared in the Cova. A Hindu "priest," wearing Hindu robes and the mark of Shiva (a dot) on his forehead, took to the altar in the outdoor portion of the Capelinha and made an offering of food and flowers. One of the Hindu worshippers told a Catholic eyewitness that Hindus go to Fatima because they believe in many gods, and it is always better to

approach the wife of a god (meaning Mary) than the god himself.²⁰⁸

No one is permitted to use the Capelinha without Guerra’s permission. Moreover, during television coverage of the event by Portugal’s SIC channel, Guerra provided approving comments on the Hindus’ use of the Capelinha for their pagan idolatry. So, in the very midst of the explosive controversy his own remarks had caused, Guerra brazenly proceeded to do that which he “denied” having any intention to do. This is a man who clearly believes he has the full support of the Vatican apparatus and will be protected against any adverse consequences for allowing this sacrilege. And it is this man who was placed in charge of the holy ground of Fatima for some 30 years.

Fr. Fox Covers Up the Scheme

What did Fr. Fox have to say about Guerra’s outrageous antics? As he did with the consecration and conversion of Russia, he engaged in a cover-up. He dismissed Father Gruner’s public protest against Guerra’s words and deeds as “slanted and sensational reporting,” but never really disputed that Guerra said what he said and did what he did. While conceding that Guerra “was quoted as saying ‘The future of Fatima, or the adoration of God and His Mother at this holy Shrine, must pass through the creation of a shrine where different religions can mingle,’” Fr. Fox observed merely that “Msgr. Guerra, who is personally known to me, would never speak of ‘adoration’ with regard to Mary.”

This is very curious. If Fr. Fox knew Msgr. Guerra personally, why did he not simply *ask Guerra* if he had made the statement attributed to him? The answer seems clear enough: Fr. Fox knew full well that Msgr. Guerra had made the statement, for, as noted above, Guerra *admitted* that he had made it, claiming only that it had been taken “out of context”—which is what every politician says when his own words come back to haunt him.

Fr. Fox only dug himself a deeper hole when, in keeping with his usual approach, he cloaked his position with the apparent authority of a Vatican bureaucrat who really had no authority at all. He quoted Archbishop Fitzgerald, who told Zenit news agency that “As far as I know, there are no plans that the building is designed *specifically* for inter-faith purposes. We recognize that Fatima is a place of pilgrimage for many religions [since when?]. . . [T]he shrine nonetheless retains its Catholic identity.” Hence the title of Fr. Fox’s article.

A Wall Street litigator could not have crafted a more lawyerly statement than Fitzgerald’s loophole-riddled “denial”: *as far as he*

²⁰⁸ TV broadcast on Portuguese channel, SIC, May 5, 2004. See *Father’s Fox’s Modernist Assault on Fatima*, <http://www.fatima.org/news/newsviews/062504rfox3.asp>.

knows the new “basilica” is not designed *specifically* for inter-faith purposes, and the new structure will “retain” its “Catholic identity.” That is hardly a denial of what Guerra actually said: that the new structure would be a place where the different religions can “mingle,” even if its “Catholic identity” is “retained” in some manner.

Even worse, as Fr. Fox himself noted with evident approval, Fitzgerald endorsed Guerra’s view, posted on the Fatima Shrine’s website in defense of Guerra’s “inter-religious congress,” that “the Fatima apparitions were exhortations to ecumenical dialogue. Mary knew that her choice of the site in Portugal would one day be associated with the Islamic prophet Mohammed, whose daughter’s name was Fatima.”

Insanity! This is yet another Modernist subversion of the Fatima event, and Fr. Fox swallowed it whole. In truth, the village of Fatima was named after a Muslim princess who, following her *capture by Christian forces* during the Moorish occupation of Portugal, was betrothed to the Count of Ourem, converted to Catholicism, and was baptized before marrying the Count in 1158. Her baptismal name was Oureana, but her birth name had been Fatima, after Mohammed’s daughter.²⁰⁹ Thus, the naming of the village of Fatima is a testament, not to “ecumenism” or to the false prophet Mohammed, but to *the triumph of Christendom* over the Muslim occupiers of Portugal; it is a testament to precisely what Our Lady of Fatima came to proclaim: *the conversion of non-Catholics to the one true religion*, beginning with the Russian people. Contrary to Father Fox’s counterfeit Message of Fatima, Our Lady did not come to Fatima to exhort us to engage in “ecumenical dialogue” or to give honor to the daughter of “the prophet” Mohammed. Mohammed was no “prophet” but an agent of the devil, whose false religion plagues the world to this day.

Wandering farther and farther down the Modernist road to oblivion for the Fatima event—the very thing he so ostentatiously professed to be promoting—Fr. Fox quoted with approval Msgr. Guerra’s bizarre interpretation of the apparitions of the Angel of Peace at Fatima: “Communion under the species of bread is given to the oldest seer, while the two younger, Francisco and Jacinta, receive Holy Communion for the first time under the species of wine. Since the practice of receiving Holy Communion under both species has fallen out of wide use in the Latin-rite Catholic Church, but not in the Orthodox churches, the Message of the Angel of Peace is an exhortation to ecumenical dialogue with those Churches separated from Rome for a thousand years.”

Nonsense. First of all, Our Lady of Fatima did not ask for

²⁰⁹ There are many historical accounts of this event. See, for example, “Our Lady and Islam: Heaven’s Peace Plan,” by Fr. Ladis J. Cizik.

“ecumenical dialogue” with the Orthodox, but rather sought their outright, miraculous conversion through the consecration of Russia to Her Immaculate Heart—just as She miraculously converted the entire nation of Mexico. “Dialogue,” ecumenical or otherwise, would not be necessary.

Furthermore, Communion under both kinds has always been administered in Eastern-rite Catholic Churches, so what the Angel of Peace did can hardly be viewed as a favorable reference to the schismatic Orthodox. Also, neither Eastern-rite Catholics nor the Orthodox receive the species separately, but rather by intinction, with the species of bread being dipped into the species of wine and placed directly on the tongue. If anything, the Angel’s actions affirm the teaching of the Council of Trent, against the Protestants, that the Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Christ are received fully in the consecrated bread as well as the consecrated wine, and that *there is no need to receive both species* in order to receive the full grace of the Sacrament. The Angel also demonstrated that Heaven wishes us to receive *Communion on the tongue*, not in the hand, although Fr. Fox never voiced any objection to the latter.

Based on Msgr. Guerra’s own words and deeds, it is plain that he does not harbor good intentions concerning the “Catholic identity” of Fatima. As he told *Noticias de Fatima*, his inter-religious congress was only “a first step. We are like the engineers in Portugal who begin by examining the structures of the bridges to see if we can trust them in the future.” The Fatima Shrine’s own December 28, 2003 Communiqué confirmed that Guerra told the inter-religious gathering arrayed before him: “[W]e rejoice in the brotherly presence of the representatives of the various spiritual schools and we are sure that their presence here *opened the way for a greater future openness of this Shrine*; a Shrine that seems already vocationed, thanks to divine providence, for contacts and for dialogue (...).”

Only a willing dupe would try to depict remarks such as these as anything but a direct threat to destroy the exclusively Catholic character of the Fatima Shrine. But Fr. Fox, it seems, was willing to play the dupe for Msgr. Guerra and his Modernist friends, both high and low. Such is the business of those we call the false friends of Fatima.

Try as he might, however, Fr. Fox was unable to conceal what Msgr. Guerra was saying and doing at Fatima. He could not explain away the mountain of evidence Father Gruner had presented concerning Guerra’s heterodox agenda—including the public denial of defined dogma by a speaker he applauded. Knowing this, Fr. Fox descended once again to an underhanded *argumentum ad hominem*: “Father Gruner... has serious limitations as for years he has not been

able to offer Mass at any of the official altars of the Fatima Sanctuary in Portugal...”

Indeed it is true that Msgr. Guerra, whose henchmen physically assaulted Father Gruner in the Fatima Sanctuary in 1992,²¹⁰ will not allow him to celebrate Mass there. Such is the penalty for a faithful priest who stands up to the Modernists who, incredibly enough, have been placed in charge of the very place where the three seers received the quintessentially anti-Modernist Message of Fatima. But what bearing does Father Gruner’s lack of access to the altars of the Fatima Sanctuary have on Guerra’s public statements and actions evidencing his designs for an “inter-religious dimension” at the Shrine? None, of course. Fr. Fox, finding himself without rational arguments, took another cheap shot and ran away.

Lending Support to an Attack on Dogma Itself

Fatima scholars have been unanimous in their conclusion that the Third Secret of Fatima begins with the telltale phrase: “In Portugal the dogma of the faith will always be preserved etc.” From the context it is clear that the “etc”, added by Sister Lucy to the words of the Virgin, is a place-holder for what She said immediately thereafter about the fate of dogma in *other* parts of the Church. Indeed, we have seen that Fr. Joseph Schweigl, who in 1952 was entrusted by Pope Pius XII with the secret mission of interrogating Sister Lucy about the Third Secret, said this to a colleague upon his return to Rome the very next day:

I cannot reveal anything of what I learned at Fatima concerning the Third Secret, but I can say that it has two parts: one concerns the Pope; the other logically—although I must say nothing—would have to be the continuation of the words: “In Portugal, the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved.”²¹¹

The only reasonable deduction—for otherwise the reference to dogma in Portugal would make no sense—is that the Third Secret foretells a catastrophic loss of faith and discipline elsewhere in the Church through an attack on dogma. In other words, the Third Secret predicts widespread apostasy in the Church. Cardinal Mario Luigi Ciappi, who was nothing less than Pope John Paul II’s own personal papal theologian, and who had read the Third Secret, confirmed this unanimous view of Fatima scholars in a personal communication to a Professor Baumgartner in Salzburg, Austria: “In the Third Secret it is foretold, among other things, that the great apostasy in the

²¹⁰ Cf. article on the incident by J. Kaess, reprinted as an appendix in *Fatima Priest*, First Edition, (Good Counsel Publications, Pound Ridge, New York, 1997) pp. 360-364. See also Fourth Edition, pp. 154-155.

²¹¹ *The Whole Truth About Fatima*, Vol. III, p. 710.

Church will begin *at the top*.”²¹² (This no doubt explains why, in his commentary on the Message of Fatima, Cardinal Ratzinger removed this key phrase from the Message, placed it in a footnote and declined to discuss it.)

By aligning himself with highly placed proponents of a Modernist revision of the Message of Fatima—men such as Msgr. Guerra, Archbishop Fitzgerald, Cardinal Kasper, Cardinal Sodano and, yes, even the former Cardinal Ratzinger—Fr. Fox aided and abetted the very attack on dogma foretold by Our Lady of Fatima. Guerra’s pan-religious conference at Fatima was a direct attack on the dogma that is central to the Fatima message: that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church—a dogma whose infallible definition by the Council of Florence Fr. Dupuis pronounced “horrible” during Guerra’s congress.

But the Modernist attack on dogma is not confined to particular dogmas as such; the Modernist seeks to destroy the very notion of dogma as an unchanging, infallible definition of objective truth revealed by God to man through Christ and His Church. As St. Pius X warned the Church in *Pascendi*, the Modernist maintains that believers “may pass through different phases” in their belief as the welling up of a vague “religious sentiment” from within, rather than the proclamation of the Gospel as divinely revealed truth. “Consequently, the formulae too, which we call dogmas... are (according to the Modernists), therefore, liable to change. Thus the way is open to the intrinsic evolution of dogma. An immense collection of sophisms this [is], that ruins and destroys all religion.”

An “evolution” of dogma that ends up destroying dogma is precisely what today’s Modernist termites are promoting, even at the highest levels of the Church. For example, in an address to a group of Anglicans during the reign of John Paul II, Cardinal Kasper dared to call for “a re-evaluation of *Apostolicae curae* (1896) of Pope Leo XIII, who declared Anglican orders null and void, a decision which still stands between our Churches. Without doubt this decision, as Cardinal Willebrands had already affirmed, must be understood in our new ecumenical context in which our communion in faith and mission has considerably grown.”²¹³

In the same address Kasper also attacked the infallible definition of the First Vatican Council on papal infallibility: “As well, the historical conditionality of the dogma of the First Vatican Council (1869-70), which must be distinguished from its remaining obligatory content, has become clear. This historical development

²¹² See Father Gerard Mura, “The Third Secret of Fatima: Has It Been Completely Revealed?”, the periodical *Catholic*, (published by the Transalpine Redemptorists, Orkney Isles, Scotland, Great Britain) March 2002.

²¹³ “A Vision of Christian Unity for the Next Generation,” *The Tablet*, May 24, 2003.

did not come to an end with the two Vatican Councils, but goes on, and so also in the future the Petrine ministry has to be exercised in line with the changing needs of the Church.” That is, Kasper openly declared that Leo XIII’s infallible papal declaration on the nullity of Anglican orders (and thus the lack of any true Anglican priesthood), and Vatican I’s dogmatic definition of papal infallibility, are historically conditioned and can change in the “new ecumenical context.” But if these infallible teachings can change, so can all the others. All dogmas are thereby destroyed, and the Faith itself is destroyed. This is the very essence of Modernism.

As this chapter has shown, Msgr. Guerra and his collaborators have brought the attack on dogma to the sacred ground of Fatima itself, as if to challenge the very prophecy of Our Lady that the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved in Portugal. Yet instead of opposing the assault on the Faith by these proponents of the “new” Fatima, Fr. Fox joined them and defended their heterodox pronouncements and gestures.

In *Pascendi*, St. Pius X spoke of the Modernist under various titles: the Modernist as believer, the Modernist as historian, the Modernist as theologian, the Modernist as reformer, and so forth, showing how the Modernist undermines belief, theology, history and everything else his way of thinking corrupts. Now we must add a new title to the many guises of the Modernist: the Modernist as professed devotee of Fatima. And Fr. Robert J. Fox was one of them. Like the Modernists described in *Pascendi*, Fr. Fox would no doubt have expressed “astonishment” at being declared an enemy of Catholic truth. But given the twisted version of Fatima he was prepared to defend to the hilt, no other conclusion was possible: unwittingly or not, Father Fox was no friend, but rather a determined foe of Our Lady of Fatima.

A New Fatima for the New Pharisees

This, then, is the counterfeit Message of Fatima Fr. Fox, false friend of Fatima, labored to pass off in place of the genuine article: a “consecration” of Russia with no mention of Russia; a “conversion” of Russia with no embrace of the Catholic Faith; “ecumenical dialogue” with no return of the dissidents to Rome. And this on the very ground of the Cova da Iria, where 70,000 souls gathered to witness an unprecedented public miracle invoked by the Mother of God to authenticate Her prophetic summons to achieve Russia’s conversion through its consecration to Her.

Fr. Fox’s Fatima was not the Fatima of the Catholic religion, but a new Fatima for the new Pharisees of the post-conciliar epoch—men who think themselves far too subtle to accept the notion that a

simple public ceremony could convert a nation and bring peace to the world. As we have seen, Fr. Fox himself contemptuously dismissed the whole idea as “paradise on earth.”

Like the Pharisees of old, the purveyors of the Modernist revision of the Message of Fatima exploit their prestige and positions of authority to promote falsehood and cow others into accepting it. The false argument from authority is what Fr. Fox deployed when he boasted of his Vatican connections and his good standing with the powers that be, while belittling Father Gruner as an outcast and a nobody. But who was speaking the truth, and who was promoting a lie?

As Our Lord admonished His disciples: “Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.” (Mt. 16:6) While at first they did not understand, soon our Lord’s meaning dawned on them: “Then they understood that he had not said that they should beware of the leaven of bread, but of the *doctrine* of the Pharisees and Sadducees.” (Mt. 16:12). In *The Devil’s Final Battle*, the definitive work on the relation between the Message of Fatima and the crisis in the Church, there is a discussion of a classic commentary on this passage in Scripture by Archbishop Alban Goodier, S.J. As Archbishop Goodier explained, Our Lord was warning His disciples to be on their guard against the *subtleties* of the Pharisees and their professed obedience to authority, which only masked their insidious opposition to the truth:

It was not so much their opposition that He feared for His own, it was their [the Pharisees’] *subtlety*. Before the Pharisees had blamed Him for His miracles and other good deeds; He knew that this would not take His friends away from Him. Now this morning they [the Pharisees] had come, with an affected simplicity, a show of desire to know the truth, an appeal to the *prophets, a zeal for tradition, a respect for law and order and obedience to the powers that be*; and all this, He knew, would be likely to affect His own *more than any open enmity*. Like leaven, unless they were careful, it would spread unconsciously among them.²¹⁴

The Virgin of Fatima, like Our Lord Himself, spoke with utmost simplicity and directness. But the new Pharisees of the post-conciliar period, just like the Pharisees of old, seek to obscure the simple truth with subtle interpretations and demagogic appeals to authority and obedience. While professing devotion to the Message of Fatima, they are actually its most dangerous opponents, precisely because

²¹⁴ Father Paul Kramer, ed., *The Devil’s Final Battle*, pp. 141-143. See also Archbishop Goodier, S.J., *The Public Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, Vol. I, (London, England: Burns, Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1932) p. 462.

they enjoy positions of respect. Spreading the corrupting leaven of their Modernist views throughout the Church, they pose as staunch defenders of the Faith.

Like the Pharisees who willfully blinded themselves to the truth of the Gospel, Fr. Fox willfully blinded himself to the truth about Fatima. Whether or not he ever recognized it, Father Fox had ceased to serve Our Lady of Fatima and had become, instead, effectively an *opponent* of the Consecration of Russia the Virgin requested. And this Father Fox did under the guise of a *Fatima* apostolate, just as the Pharisees who connived against Our Lord acted under the guise of defenders of the Law. For all their prestige and respectability, the late Father Fox and his prominent successors in the campaign against the consecration and conversion of Russia—for that is what it is—play the role of blind guides who would lead us into a ditch were we to follow them. But we must not follow them. We must follow the Virgin along the path She indicated at the Cova da Iria, the one that leads to the Triumph of Her Immaculate Heart. We should not wish to be in the company of those who, following in Father Fox's footsteps, mock Heaven itself by attempting to persuade the faithful that the present state of Russia, the Church, and the world represent the fulfillment of Her most glorious promises and that we must expect nothing more from the Mother of God.