

# Vatican Apostasy

## Background

The Fatima Visitations are the most famous in the world. The repeated occurrence on the 13<sup>th</sup> day of each month during the summer of 1917, the Miracle of the Sun on October 13, with 70,000 witnesses, and early recognition by the Roman Catholic Church made them an influential phenomenon throughout the Catholic world. Their appeal to millions of Catholics heightened their fame.

The Three Secrets of Fatima have always been of the highest importance in the Church. They contain material that impacts on its social policies, its relationships with respect to the governments of nations, especially that of Russia, and its religious worship format. Through the three shepherd children the Secrets have been a compelling influence since they first became known. Later apparitions reported by Lucy dos Santos, the leading Fatima seer, intensified this influence.

In 1970 I published an apocryphal version of the Third Secret, but later withheld publication because of my concerns over its authenticity.

The Fatima Secrets carry much more concern to the Church than other apparition revelations because of early official recognition, and their fame. Other major revelations, such as Garabandal, never achieved such recognition. As I shall show, the Fatima Third Secret was even weightier in its content about the doom of the nations.

On top of all this, the contents of the Secrets are counter to modern humanistic and apostate attitudes among major segments of the Church, and the Church hierarchy, including the Pope. Although the first two Secrets were published in the early 1940's, before the current theological attitudes became a controlling influence in the Church, they contained material that raised great theological concerns. However, since they were on the historic record, the Church had no power to deny them. As most informed persons know, the Third Secret, at the request of Lucy dos Santos, was to be published in 1960. This never happened because the content is flatly counter to Church secular policies.

Then, as a consequence of continued intense interest, the highest officials at the Vatican, headed by Cardinal Josef Ratzinger, to allay passionate curiosity, to control political positions, and to reduce theological implications, finally published a fraudulent Third Secret on June 26, 2000. This "official" version, and interpretation by Cardinal Ratzinger may be found at:

[http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_20000626\\_message-fatima\\_en.html#top](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html#top)

Cardinal Ratzinger is Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Pope Paul III founded the Congregation in 1542. Originally it was called the Sacred Congregation

of the Universal Inquisition, later commonly known as the Holy Office. Its duty was to defend the Church from heresy. It is the oldest of the Curia's nine congregations.

Tarcisio Bertone, SDB, Archbishop Emeritus of Vercelli, and current Secretary of the Congregation, provided an Introduction to the fraudulent Secret:

**CONGREGATION  
FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH**

***THE MESSAGE  
OF FATIMA***

**INTRODUCTION**

**As the second millennium gives way to the third, Pope John Paul II has decided to publish the text of the third part of the “secret of Fatima”.**

**. . . And so we come to the final question: What is the meaning of the “secret” of Fatima as a whole (in its three parts)? What does it say to us? First of all we must affirm with Cardinal Sodano: “. . . the events to which the third part of the ‘secret’ of Fatima refers now seem part of the past.” Insofar as individual events are described, they belong to the past. Those who expected exciting apocalyptic revelations about the end of the world or the future course of history are bound to be disappointed. Fatima does not satisfy our curiosity in this way, just as Christian faith in general cannot be reduced to an object of mere curiosity. What remains was already evident when we began our reflections on the text of the “secret”: the exhortation to prayer as the path of “salvation for souls” and, likewise, the summons to penance and conversion.**

The opening statement shows that John Paul II made the decision to publish this fraud. He was directly involved in the deception of God’s people. If Bertone cited the Pope as authority, but unknown to the Pope, then John Paul II is a dupe. This last possibility is too far-fetched to be real.

This next statement by Bertone boldly and flatly contradicts any expectation of an apocalyptic content to the Third Secret. The fraud was specifically designed to deflect such interpretation.

For the sake of God's people among Roman Catholics we must address this pernicious deceit, and the motives behind this action.

## Josef Ratzinger

With an outstanding theological career in German universities Ratzinger rose rapidly in the Catholic Church hierarchy, becoming a German Cardinal in 1977. On November 25, 1981 John Paul II appointed Ratzinger as Prefect for the CDF. If revelations have content counter to modern humanistic theologies, Ratzinger has the responsibility for bringing God's word into line with such secular attitudes. Apostate minds do not believe in divine prophecies spelling the doom of the nations. The hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church does not believe in apocalyptic prophecy; it despises all people who do.

Little do God's people in the Church know the state of religious affairs in the Holy See. As I shall show, the vast majority of Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests conceive God as a projection of the human psyche, not as a real, living personality. Hence he does not exist as an objective reality. Therefore, he cannot know the future, and cannot provide descriptions of the future spelling the doom of the nations.

Cardinal Ratzinger was a close friend with Hans Kung, a well-known German liberal theologian who believes in humanistic solutions to world problems. For example, Kung was editor of *Yes to Global Ethic*, 1996. Refer to:

<http://astro.ocis.temple.edu/~dialogue/Antho/kung.htm>

which publishes his godless solutions. This work was developed into a full-length book: *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, Translated by John Bowden, Oxford University Press, February 1998. Kung has published numerous other books and works in a similar philosophical vein.

In addressing the effects of Ratzinger's policies on the Catholic Church, Hugo Young writes on the evolution of the relationship between the two men at:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,3604,473936,00.html>

**Ratzinger, once a liberal colleague of Kung's in a German university, presides over a doctrinal regime that in some ways pre-dates Vatican II, deeming other religions to be beyond the possibility of truth, issuing multiple documents that reaffirm the church as patriarchal, intolerant and triumphantly backward-looking. This performance is as unsuccessful as it has been, in the wider liberal world, aberrant. It has not done the church much good. Not merely is church attendance falling and the priesthood shrinking in Europe and North America, but Rome's former authority is being quietly rejected.**

Gerry McCarthy, a liberal Catholic hailing from Canada and publisher of *The Social Edge*, comments at:

<http://www.thesocialedge.com/archives/gerrymccarthy/columns-oct2003.htm>

**It's no secret Cardinal Ratzinger wields enormous power in the Vatican today. But I'm fascinated by what caused him to change from progressive (liberal) theologian in the 1960s to what Kung calls the "Roman Grand Inquisitor" of today. In his memoir, Kung writes that Ratzinger was his colleague at the University of Tubingen in the late 1960s.**

The pervasive result of humanistic attitudes and liberal minds upon the Fatima revelations by Cardinals, Bishops, and Priests may be found at

<http://www.fatima.org/croncover.htm>

where Father Nicholas Gruner, long known by the Church hierarchy for his support of the Fatima revelations and opposition to Vatican policies, presents a chronology of the cover up of the Fatima Third Secret. He names many people.

Because of his adamant opposition to Church apostasy, Father Gruner may be the most controversial priest in the Roman Catholic Church today. He has a constant running battle with the Vatican over the Third Secret. Behind this is Church political maneuvering with respect to Russia, counter to the Message of Fatima, which called for its righteous consecration.

Amidst this apostate environment Ratzinger has evolved toward a Grand Censor who will pervert revelation for the preservation of modern Vatican philosophies. He is a major impetus behind continuing suppression of the Third Secret.

In a 1996 interview with Portugal's main Catholic radio station about the Fatima message, Cardinal Ratzinger said, *"To all the curious I would say I am certain that the Virgin does not engage in sensationalism; she does not create fear. She does not present apocalyptic visions, but guides people to her Son."* Through her apparitions to small children Mary's purpose was *"to call the world back to simplicity, that is to the essentials: conversion, prayer and the sacraments."*

These remarks are a vivid illustration how Ratzinger will defuse the apocalyptic judgment we saw so clearly in other Marian revelations, and in biblical prophecy. In Ratzinger's godless eyes God's holy words are sensationalist. Contrary to the content of all the Marian apparitions, including Fatima, in his eyes they do not present apocalyptic visions, merely emotional fear. Since God does not exist as an objective reality, Ratzinger must deny judgment on a godless world. Then he advises that we return to the simplicity and essentials of Christian relationships, and reject such foolish notion as holy justice. In other words, let's all be good to one another, and forget promised judgment.

I also am certain that the "Virgin" and other celestial agents do not engage in sensationalism. They provide holy promise. If godless men regard revelations as sensations they do not have a living relationship with God. They have only intellectual deflection of God's truth.

This man, entrusted with the doctrinal foundations of Christian faith, does not know what he is talking about. To maintain a godless theological position (what contradiction!) counter to the evidence of revelation is to engage in deception and delusion on a grand scale, a mental state bordering on insanity. Such intellectual and spiritual poison then sweeps through the Church, causing untold millions of people to deny cosmic realities, and leading them to perdition.

## **The Foundations of Apostasy**

We can trace Vatican apostasy by examining the state of affairs in the modern Catholic world, and the path by which it reached this delusional condition.

The problem goes back to the contest between objective science and religious authority at the time of Galileo in the 1600's. Prior to that time we had religion based strictly on biblical authority, without serious modification by increasing knowledge. We could cling to the ages old attitudes of life and religious guides derived from the writings of the Apostles. Then, as human knowledge evolved, Galileo came along to throw a monkey wrench into that intellectual world. The anachronistic Church was not able to properly come to grips with that encounter, the embarrassment it created, and the growing contradiction between literal interpretation of Holy Authority, the Bible, and the developing facts of science. The Church was not competent to explain God and his Creative Acts amidst increasing objective knowledge, the intellectual damage that knowledge did to the old world-views, and the evolving godless attitudes of modern secular science.

This dichotomy was magnified by the biological evolutionary theories of Darwin in the 1800's, and the impact of the discoveries of astronomy on our notions of physical reality in the 1900's.

We all know that man stands at the apex of a long and complex series of biological forms. His physical attributes plainly appear as though he evolved from lower creatures. The fossil record supports the idea that the biological world progressed from simple microbes over long geological time, ending in man. The unfortunate aspect of Darwin's theory used to explain this evidence is its implied rejection of a master guiding hand. This earlier and more primitive evolutionary view led to the notion that God did not have anything to do with the process, that it was a blind accident of time. Then man was a blind accident also.

However, existence was anything but chaos; it showed clever design. Hence our efforts to find an explanation for the origins and process of existence necessarily invoked the idea of an intelligent being superior to man, a Creator, with personality and other discrete attributes.

Since the new evolutionary images implied blind existence, that designing intelligence did not really exist. Then man's invocation of a superior being, in attempt to reconcile the dichotomy, could not be anything but a self-creation. In other words, in the beginning

man created God in his own image. According to this existentialist view such notions could not derive from anything but man's inner psyche. Man's inner impulse toward God did not have a spiritual origin; it had psychological origin. Modern theologies then evolved toward the notion that this blind accident was devoid of a living connection with a real higher being. Those theologies, kowtowing to the intellectual supremacy of evolutionary blindness, became godless and continue to revolve around the earlier, more primitive, Darwinian notions.

Only in recent decades, with sophisticated DNA studies, and a reexamination of the biological chain, are we beginning to recognize serious faults in the Darwinian theory. We have absolutely no evidence for smooth transitions from lower to more complex species. All evidence points toward mysterious (miraculous) jumps in the species chain. Darwin witnessed species adaptation, not species creation. But the world in general, and godless theologies in particular, has not caught up with these glaring fractures in blind evolutionary theory. The hierarchy of the Church, trained in modern secular universities and seminaries, is still influenced by that simple-minded godless misunderstanding.

Astronomy compounded the acute contradiction. It discovered the amazing depth of space, reaching back billions of light-years. When we look at distant galaxies we believe we see the beginning of time. Estimates of this beginning agreed with estimates of the duration of biological evolution. Since these two major conceptual elements apparently agreed with one another in age why should we not assume that the origin of existence was merely a blind accident? But again, earlier assumptions of astronomical evolution contained serious flaws that are now only beginning to be uncovered. Astronomy is facing new data that does not fit a simple-minded big-bang scheme. There is a macro-structure to space that cannot derive from such simpleton explanations. The current sophisticated mathematical modeling of the universe to explain this macro structure is merely a cat wrapping himself in a big ball of yarn.

Perhaps God had his hand in existence after all. Perhaps this IS an evolutionary universe, but not a blind one. Perhaps this was God's method for creating a comfortable home for this creature to which he gave biological origin. Perhaps this poor, feeble, limited human being, arrogantly presuming to have the answers of all time, was also gifted with the ability to conceive of a Creator, but was in default for pretending to reach infinite levels of understanding on severely finite information.

Just as Galileo created an embarrassment for the Church, so now is increasing scientific knowledge beginning to shape a new embarrassment for godless theologies. Then the hierarchy of the Catholic Church has placed itself in the position of double, compounded, foolishness. Meanwhile it is taking its brood down the road to perdition. We do not have time to evolve to more sensible views of reality. The present crisis of civilization will bring the apocalyptic destruction the arrogant godless Vatican minds try to deny.

Only by a direct intervening hand, such as in Marian Apparitions, is God taking his people back to him, while discarding all the godless trash of the world.

This dichotomy in theologies has been addressed by a group of Catholic priests who work to overcome the massive apostate attitudes now pervading the Church. You may find their work at:

<http://www.rtforum.org/>

where *The Living Tradition*, an organ of this Roman Theological Forum, provides numerous papers on these struggling efforts. In the No. 93 issue for May, 2001, Brian W. Harrison wrote a paper entitled *Early Vatican Responses to Evolutionist Theology*. He visited the Vatican Libraries and searched the history of theological papers. He reviewed Church post-Darwin attempts to come to grips with the evidence that strongly suggests the evolutionary theory must be a denial of the simplistic statements of creation in Genesis. See also:

<http://www.rtforum.org/lt/lt69.html>

**For decades now many Catholic theological writers have been so influenced by prominent subjectivist thinkers as to have impaired their contact with the real objects of faith. We are faced today with psychological systems that have substituted themselves for the normal contemplation of objective truth. It is, in fact, now common even among Catholics to speak endlessly about the object of faith and about the Inspired Word of God without ever adverting to the question of whether the things that they are talking about are real or not. And, because such discussions are influenced and guided by the false principles of these non-believing thinkers, the supposition is that the objects under discussion are not real. Hence the challenge to Catholic theologians and philosophers is to take up the task of bringing Catholic theological discussion back to the reality that is or should be the object of its thought.**

**. . . the normal context of much theological thought has been distorted or obscured by false presuppositions which need to be corrected. Thus, the whole approach of modern existentialism needs to be critically examined . . .**

**. . . The approach that is supported by the Roman Theological Forum is the classic approach known as *moderate realism*, which accepts that the human mind can know what really exists outside of itself, but also in the limited way that the human mind is able to perceive and know. Moderate realism recognizes a double object of human understanding: the remote object that really exists objectively and outside of the mind of the human knower and the proximate object which is the intellectual medium or reconstructed object within the mind of the human knower. In the wake of the great wave of subjectivism that has passed into Catholic theological activity, many theologians have lost the clear vision of their own intellectual medium and of their need to analyze and synthesize the elements within that medium in a careful way, based upon valid principles of faith and reason. By drawing attention to the *concept of reality* as the common and distinctive element in the definition of every science as a science, we hope to clear up some confusion regarding the intellectual medium of certain sciences, especially those of theology, philosophy, and history, and thus to restore access to**

**the remote reality which is the true object of these sciences.**

**. . . There is no shortage of books and articles pointing out that deceptive systems of psychology are usurping the place of religion in the minds of many. How such alien psychologies as those of Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung have captured the thinking of so many Christians is an historical study in itself, but the fact exists, both in the field of theoretical psychology and in the practical area of human response, where it appears often in the form of liberal Christianity and secular humanism. In describing the typical progression of liberal religious thinking, James Hitchcock points out that from some more shallow consideration, such as that the creation accounts and certain other passages of the Bible are to be rejected as incompatible with the findings of modern science, the liberal mind goes on finally to conclude that the very idea of a personal God and Creator is just a projection of our own self-awareness. Such progressions, which resemble the act of "peeling the petals off of the rose" are themselves exercises in modern existentialist meditation as it has come to affect the thinking of religious believers, Catholics included. And this situation presents to theologians and philosophers who agree with the aims of the Roman Theological Forum both a challenge and an opportunity. It is a challenge, because true Christian faith is radically nullified by meditation based upon alien psychologies, and it is an opportunity, because new insights can be drawn from the residue of liberal thinking that has been analyzed properly and synthesized with the corpus of authentic Catholic thought. The Roman Theological Forum has taken up the challenge presented by liberal thinking within the Church by rejecting the radical pluralism of a mind admitting alien principles into its theological framework and by proceeding to analyze the results of liberal theology.**

We can see the hope that Harrison and the Roman Theological Forum have in somehow resurrecting the "old-fashioned" attitudes. He seems unaware that neither he nor anyone else will have the luxury of rational debate as we head into Judgment. Nor does he seem aware of the depth of the godlessness that now pervades modern religious churches and institutions, Catholic or otherwise.

We can never "prove" the existence of an invisible God on the basis of rational science. God is beyond the power of man to prove. But we may have experiences that demonstrate in a deep personal way that he does exist and that he can project himself upon us. Marian Apparitions are just one example. The testimony of men through history offers more examples. Deeper examination of our historic sources, many within the Bible, show that visible celestial agents were in living contact with men through the ages. The story of Moses and Seventy Elders visiting with the God of Israel in only one example: Exod 24:9-11. They had a banquet with those agents, but modern godless minds deny that evidence.

We are shortly about to experience the return of Jesus, as he promised, but not as the man. He will return as God, and many of us will know him in his Spiritual Power.

Apostasy is not limited to the Catholic Church. In 1989 I made an effort to understand the evil influences now pervading the mainline Protestant churches. I visited the library and bookstore of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, close to my home. I was shocked and appalled by what I found. The textbook of one of the theological courses was *Principles of Christian Theology*, by John Macquarrie, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1966 – 1977. Macquarrie was Professor of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York before moving to his position as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford University. Macquarrie does not believe in God as an external reality. He follows the modern psychological interpretation of religiosity as a projection of the inner psyche of man. He understands God as abstract Being, not A Being. He carries this concept to Jesus: *“In the New Testament the notion of being becomes associated with Christ . . .”* In modern philosophical views man comes at the head of an hierarchy of animal life, but *“There is, however, no reason why we should suppose that the series should terminate with man, and this is recognized by both contemporary philosophies which visualize levels of being beyond man's being and by ancient mythologies which introduced the idea of beings intermediate between man and God.”*

In other words, our religious heritage, deriving out of revelation, is mere psychic mythology that has become apostate Babel logy.

Macquarrie postulates the idea that Jesus, as the Christ, was needed by the human psyche because *“Man needs some concrete manifestation of God's activity . . .”* In other words we created Jesus as a Creator, Redeemer, and Savior because we had a psychological need. In a series of paragraphs he lists some of the events of Jesus that he believes comes out of the human mind:

- The nativity is regarded as a segment of . . . *stories that have come down to us as legendary rather than historical.”*
- The baptism of Jesus, *“whatever its original significance may have been, has been transposed into a mythico-theological framework.*
- The temptation of Jesus has, *“no publicly observable event behind the story, so the question of what is the historical “fact” may have been scarcely arises. The account as we have it is legendary and symbolical . . .”*
- The transfiguration of Jesus is nothing more than *“the transition that must have taken place from the disciples' acquaintance with the human Jesus to their faith in the same Jesus as the Christ --- a transition that has rightly earned the name of “transfiguration.”*
- The passion and death of Jesus *“become the events whereby the human Jesus is revealed as the Christ of faith, or whereby the presence of God manifests itself in this man.”*

- The resurrection of Jesus and “*the stories of an empty tomb and of accompanying marvels look like examples of the usual mythologizing tendencies . . .*”
- The ascension “*is a purely mythical event and reflects a cosmology that has long since been abandoned.*”

Macquarrie explicitly states that “*an act of God is not a publicly observable event or a phenomenon open to sense perception.*” Hence, visitation or apparition experiences as external observable events are mere psychological projections by which Abraham, Moses, the prophets, Peter, Paul, John, and Catholic children conversed with divine agencies.

I wonder what Macquarrie and Ratzinger and all those other godless theologians will do when Jesus comes, as God, and shows us his divine presence?

Ernest