

Fatima's False Friends



Editor's Note: Obedience to Our Lady of Fatima's request for the Consecration of Russia by the Pope and the bishops will bring about the devil's definitive defeat. Our Lady will crush the serpent's head (Gen. 3:15) – that is, the Prince of the World (Lucifer) will lose this final battle and Our Lady's Immaculate Heart will triumph.

The devil (Satan, Lucifer) knows that, for him to win, he must prevent Our Lady's plan from being fulfilled, so he causes the Message of Fatima to be opposed and obstructed in various ways. Some of his tactics are very sly. One of the most tricky tactics the devil (Lucifer) uses against Fatima is to promote grave errors and false ideas about Fatima and the Church by getting some well-intentioned people who are misled and in error to promote their false version of Fatima. Christopher Ferrara spoke to the "Consecration Now!" Conference about "Fatima's False Friends" and is in the process of writing a book by that same title. Here we present a short extract from his upcoming new book.

by Christopher A. Ferrara

Fatima For Today: A Response

In his recent book, *Fatima for Today*, on what he calls "the Urgent Marian Message of Hope", Father Andrew Apostoli advances the Vatican Secretary of State's "Party Line" on Fatima. The result is not "an urgent message of hope" but yet another attempt to bury the Third Secret and defend the refusal to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

In my book *The Secret Still Hidden*, I examined the evidence that has proven beyond all serious dispute the existence of a text of the Third Secret of Fatima that ac-

companies and explains the vision of the "Bishop dressed in White," published by the Vatican on June 26, 2000. As I show in my book, the claim that the vision standing alone

is all there ever was to the Third Secret – a claim advanced by the Vatican Secretary of State in his attempt to end the Third Secret controversy – was in doubt from the very beginning.

Within a year of the vision's publication even a figure as prominent as Mother Angelica, foundress of the Eternal Word Television Network (EWTN), declared on live television: "I happen to be one of those individuals who thinks we didn't get the whole thing."¹ And, having examined the evidence with an open mind, even a figure as skeptical as Antonio Socci, the renowned Italian public intellectual, author and writer on Catholic themes, ended up abandoning his original conviction and making this declaration in his own book on the subject, *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*: "[T]hat there is a part of the Secret not revealed and considered unspeakable is certain. And today – having decided to deny its existence – the Vatican runs the risk of exposing itself to very heavy pressure and blackmail."²

In the eleven years that have elapsed since publication of the vision, the evidence for a companion text has mounted

to the point where an Italian journalist of the prominence of Andrea Tornielli, speaking to a television audience of millions on Italy's largest privately-owned TV network, could declare flatly that "the existence of two texts in two different places seems to me now a well established fact."³ Indeed it is.

Among many other things that have come to light since 2000 is the testimony of Archbishop Loris F. Capovilla, the still-living personal secretary to Pope John XXIII. Capovilla revealed in 2006 that there was an envelope containing a text of the Secret, kept in the papal apartments in a writing desk called "Barbarigo," on the outside of which Pope John XXIII had ordered to be written the names of all those who had read its contents and a notation of his decision to leave it to others to determine what to do with the text inside. Thanks to Capovilla's eyewitness testimony and his written records of the event, we know that Paul VI retrieved the "Capovilla envelope" from the Barbarigo desk and read its contents in 1963 – two years before Pope Paul read the text of the vision, accord-

ing to the Vatican's account.

Thus, Paul VI read two texts, not one. When confronted with this discrepancy in the dates by the Italian scholar Solideo Paolini, who asked whether it indicated two different envelopes and two different texts pertaining to the Third Secret, Archbishop Capovilla answered: "Exactly so!" [*"Per l'appunto!"*] Further, in a tape-recorded admission – reported in the Italian press and never denied by Capovilla – the Archbishop revealed there is an "attachment" to the text of the vision, which we have never seen. The Secretary of State has since been forced to admit the existence of the "Capovilla envelope" with its telltale notations, yet has failed and refused to produce it. The Secretary of State has never denied the existence of the "attachment" revealed by Capovilla.

All of this, and much more, is documented in my book as well as Socci's book. Most of this evidence is now common knowledge in the Catholic world and will not be re-hashed here. Suffice it to note that there are at least thirty-three reasons* indicating the existence of a suppressed text

that explains the vision of the "Bishop dressed in White" and thus forms an integral part of the Third Secret of Fatima.

Promoting the Party Line of Fatima

Although the cat has been out of the bag for a long time now, the Secretary of State is sticking to his story; and there are still apologists willing to ignore all the evidence and defend his version of events. One of these apologists is Father Andrew Apostoli, who has written a book called *Fatima for Today* (FFT).

FFT is the same sort of work as *Last Visionary of Fatima* (LVF), the book-interview by the current Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone. Both works are seeming tributes to the Fatima prophecies, filled with pious statements about prayer and penance and the life and writings of Sister Lucia. But this material thinly conceals an overriding polemical aim found in key passages of the book: to persuade the reader to abide by the Secretary of State's "party line" on Fatima. This party line, first dictated by the preceding Secretary of State, Cardinal Angelo

Sodano, has three elements:

First, that 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 assures us 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, that 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, that 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."⁴ 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."⁵

In short, the party line is that "Fatima is finished." We are even expected to believe that the current state of Russia represents the "conversion" of that nation and the current state of the world the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart that Our Lady promised as the heavenly reward for Russia's consecration to Her.

By What Right?

The question that immediately presents itself to the thoughtful Catholic is this: By what right does the *Vatican Secretary of State*, who has no pastoral authority over the universal Church, purport to issue dictates concerning the Fatima event and its meaning for the Church and the world? The answer, of course, is by no right at all. The Secretary of State's views on Fatima bind no one. The Secretary of State is merely the Vatican prelate who "manages" political and diplomatic activities of the Vatican city-state. His office is neither doctrinal nor theological in scope. He is not

the Pope, and any attempt by him to exercise doctrinal or theological authority over the Church would be a usurpation of papal authority. The opinions of the Secretary of State on Fatima are, therefore, simply and only the opinions of the Secretary of State.

That is precisely why the former Cardinal Ratzinger, during the press conference at which the vision was published in 2000, made it clear that despite Cardinal Sodano's opinion on what the vision means, "*It is not the intention of the Church to impose a single interpretation.*"⁶ Note well: the Vatican Secretary of State *does not speak for the Church in this matter*. We are free to reject his position. And, in fact, the former Cardinal Ratzinger himself has done just that since becoming Pope.

The Pope Rejects the Party Line

The Pope himself pronounced emphatically against the Secretary of State's party line during his pilgrimage to Fatima in May of 2010, making it clear that the Third Secret is very much a part of the Church's present and future. During the flight

to Fatima the Pope answered a question he had personally selected concerning whether the Third Secret pertains in any way to the sexual scandals now convulsing the Church – a telling question indeed, given that no such thing is depicted in the vision standing alone. Speaking in Italian, the Pope gave this explosive answer:

"...[B]eyond this great vision of the suffering of the Pope, which we can in the first instance relate to John Paul II, are indicated *future realities of the Church* which are little by little developing and showing themselves. Thus it is true that *beyond the moment indicated in the vision* [!], it is *spoken* [!], it is seen, the necessity of a passion of the Church...

"As for the *new things* that we can discover *in this message today*, there is also the fact that attacks on the Pope and the Church *do not come only from the outside, but the sufferings of the Church come precisely from inside the Church*, from the sin that exists in the Church. This too we have always seen, but *today we see in a really terrifying way* that the greatest persecution of the Church does not come from external

enemies, but is born of sin in the Church, from the sin that exists in the Church..."⁷

Here the Pope clearly hints at the existence of a missing companion text to the vision, whose existence Antonio Socci has courageously declared despite his friendship with both the Pope and Bertone. This text would go "beyond the moment indicated in the vision" to *speak* ("it is spoken") of attacks on the Pope and the Church by *internal* enemies. There must be such a text because in the vision *there is no indication whatsoever of attacks on the Church from within*. Quite the contrary, the vision depicts only an *external* attack: i.e., the soldiers who kill a future Pope outside a half-ruined city and then proceed to martyr bishops, priests, religious and laity.

As if to make clear beyond any doubt that the Message of Fatima is not consigned to the past, as the party line would have it, on May 13, before an audience of 500,000 pilgrims, the Pope issued this dramatic pronouncement during his homily in the very sanctuary of the Fatima shrine:

"One *deceives himself* who thinks that the prophetic

mission of Fatima is concluded."⁸

This clear papal negation of the party line prompted Socci to declare, in an article entitled "Why the Pope *Contradicts Bertone*," that the Pope has "reopened the dossier" on the Third Secret and is now "engaged in a great 'Operation Truth' on Fatima, at the cost of *contradicting the version* of the Vatican Secretary of State."⁹ In a related article, entitled "Advice to Bertone: *Mea Culpa and Penance*," Socci noted that the Pope has expressed "the exact antithesis" of Bertone's position and he called upon Bertone to consider "dedicating himself to prayer and meditation on the warnings and the maternal solicitude of the Queen of Heaven."¹⁰

An Ecclesiastical Politician

At this point the reader might be wondering: How did the Vatican Secretary of State become involved in this controversy in the first place? Here it is opportune to note the markedly political function the Secretary of State has been performing since the "reform" of the Roman Curia following Vatican II, which effectively converted the office

into a kind of ecclesiastical prime minister. The “prime minister” of the Vatican city-state has adopted a general “damage control” policy designed to serve the aims of “dialogue,” “ecumenism,” and relations with worldly powers.

It was Cardinal Sodano who feted Mikhail Gorbachev at the Vatican the day after the press conference at which the vision was published and (so Sodano thought) Fatima was consigned to the past. From the Secretary of State’s perspective the Fatima event in general and the Third Secret in particular, with its probable indictment of catastrophic failures of the upper hierarchy during the post-Vatican II crisis in the Church, is not a matter of our heavenly Mother’s prophetic warning to the Church and mankind but rather a public relations problem calling for a public relations solution: bury it and hope the public will forget it ever existed.

But this is not the first time the Secretary of State has tried to bury the truth. None other than Sodano was instrumental in protecting for decades the now-infamous Marcial Maciel Degollado, head of the

Legionaries of Christ, who molested boys, fathered children out of wedlock, abused drugs, and engaged in financial improprieties throughout his long career as an immensely successful ecclesiastical entrepreneur. As *America* magazine observes: “The key Vatican figure in protecting Maciel in the 1980s and 1990s was Cardinal Angelo Sodano, the all-powerful secretary of state [sic] under John Paul II and now Dean of the College of Cardinals.”¹¹ All-powerful indeed – so powerful that he took control of the Message of Fatima, although Providence has confounded his attempt to neutralize it. The respected Catholic pro-life website Lifesitenews.com summarized the evidence of Sodano’s complicity in the Maciel scandal as presented in an exposé in *National Catholic Reporter*:

Maciel developed a close relationship with Angelo Sodano, who served as Pope John Paul’s Secretary of State, effectively the Vatican’s Prime Minister, from 1991 to 2006.... The Legion hired Sodano’s nephew as consultant when they built their flagship institution, Regina Apostolorum University in Rome... [M]uch later, efforts



Christopher Ferrara with the Italian version of his book, *The Secret Still Hidden*, questions Andrea Tornielli during the Press and Clergy Q&A Session.

to reveal Maciel's machinations and sexual improprieties were actively blocked by "pressure from Maciel's chief supporter, Cardinal Angelo Sodano." Berry reports that after nine former members of the Legion who claimed to have been sexually abused by Maciel filed a canonical case against the founder with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1998, Sodano "pressured" Cardinal Ratzinger to halt the proceedings.¹²

By late 2004, however, the future Pope Benedict XVI had had enough. After a Vatican ceremony in November 2004 during which John Paul II honored Maciel, "Ratzinger broke with Sodano and or-

dered a canon lawyer on his staff, Msgr. Charles Scicluna, to investigate. Two years later, as Benedict, he approved the order that Maciel abandon ministry for a 'life of penitence and prayer.'"¹³ Despite his deep involvement in the Maciel scandal, Sodano left office without consequences in 2006 to be succeeded by Cardinal Bertone, becoming Dean of the College of Cardinals. I quite agree with the opinion expressed by the journal *First Things*: "Cardinal Sodano has to go. The Dean of the College of Cardinals [is]... an ongoing embarrassment to the Church he serves."¹⁴ Yet he remains Dean of the College of Cardinals.

Now, on the question of Fatima, the former Cardinal Ratzinger has again broken with Sodano. Yet Fr. Apostoli persists in his promotion of the party line Sodano first laid down eleven years ago with his absurd "interpretation" of the Fatima prophecies. He seriously suggests that the Church and the world entrust their fate to an ecclesiastical politician who was helping to cover up a sex scandal at the very moment – without the least authority – he purported to speak for the Mother of

God on the meaning of Her precious message to humanity. This outrage demands a reply, which is why this piece has been written.

Why This Book?

Why would Fr. Apostoli publish a book that perpetuates the Vatican Secretary of State's clearly discredited campaign to bury Fatima when no one has any obligation to heed his opinions? What is going on here? Only one answer seems reasonable: the Secretary of State is behind the publication of *Fatima for Today*. Like Bertone's *Last Visionary*, Fr. Apostoli's book is yet another exercise in "damage control" by the Vatican bureaucracy.

That conclusion is supported by the enlistment of a high-ranking Vatican prelate to give *FFT* the appearance of authority in the form of a preface: namely, Cardinal Raymond Burke, Prefect of the Apostolic Signatura, the Vatican's canonical high court. Like the Secretariat of State, the Signatura has nothing to do with Marian apparitions and has no more competence in this matter than the Secretary of State. Yet Cardinal Burke lends his

name to what is clearly an effort to strip the Message of Fatima of any prophetic content that should concern us.

Quoting one Fr. C.C. Martindale, S.J., the Cardinal assures us that there is nothing new in the Third Secret because, after all, "the first two parts of the secret contain nothing new" inasmuch as Hell is not a novel doctrine and thus the vision of Hell contains "no novel or startling *information* [emphasis in original]..." (p. xv). But it seems the Cardinal has overlooked a few pieces of "novel or startling information" in the first two parts of the Great Secret: (1) the imminent end of World War I; (2) the commencement of World War II after the appearance of a strange light in the night sky during the pontificate of Pius XI (identified by name); (3) the spread of Russia's errors throughout the world; (4) the loss of souls, further wars and persecutions of the Church, the martyrdom of the faithful, the suffering of the Pope, and the annihilation of nations; and (5) the express connection of these future events to an ultimatum: they will all take place unless Our Lady of Fatima's specific re-

quests are granted, including the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart and the Communions of Reparation on the First Saturdays.

According to the Cardinal, however, the Consecration of Russia and the Third Secret are mere “controversies” that have “distracted from Our Lady’s maternal instruction and have hindered others from attending to it.” (p. xiv). But the Consecration of Russia is at the very heart of Our Lady’s “maternal instruction,” while the Third Secret undoubtedly foretells the consequences of failing to heed that instruction, including “various nations will be annihilated.” It is, therefore, the party line that has hindered obedience to the instruction our Mother gave us at Fatima.

But promoting the party line is really what this book is all about. Hence in his preface Cardinal Burke also expresses the opinion – of course binding on no one – that “Pope Benedict concludes that the Secret is, in the end... ‘the exhortation to prayer’ ... and, likewise, ‘the summons to penance and conversion.’” (p. xv) In other words, the Cardinal states

the party line: The Message of Fatima no longer concerns future events. Catholics must now think only of prayer and penance when they think of Fatima. No other thoughts are permitted, as these are mere “distracting controversies.”

With all due respect, the Cardinal’s reference to the Pope is misleading. He is not quoting Pope Benedict, who has recently rejected the party line, but rather the former Cardinal Ratzinger, writing eleven years ago in his theological commentary on the Secret in *The Message of Fatima (TMF)*, the booklet the Vatican published together with the vision. For some reason never explained, *TMF* parroted the party line even though the Secretary of State manifestly had no competence or authority to dictate it to the Church: “First of all,” wrote the former Cardinal Ratzinger in *TMF*, “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.’” We must affirm with Cardinal Sodano? And why must we affirm with Cardinal Sodano? No reason has ever been given, because

no reason exists. Quite to the contrary, as already noted, during the very press conference at which the vision and *TMF* were published the same Cardinal Ratzinger was at pains to note: "It is not the intention of the Church to impose a single interpretation."¹⁵

But Pope Benedict has declared that the Secret relates to "future realities of the Church which are little by little developing and showing themselves." In view of that papal affirmation, one would think the party line would be discarded once and for all, even by those who had defended it until now. Yet Fr. Apostoli presses ahead with the latest propaganda on behalf of the Secretary of State, assisted by another Vatican Cardinal with no competence in the matter, who would have us believe that there is nothing new or startling in the Message of Fatima.

The Promotion of a Demonstrable Falsehood

Before I discuss *FFT*'s arguments in favor of the party line – the standard litany of long-since-refuted contentions – I must first point out its unquestioning adoption of a claim by Cardinal Bertone,

Sodano's successor, that radically undermined Bertone's credibility and rendered his entire version of events unworthy of belief.

Echoing Bertone, *FFT* asserts that "Because *Sister Lucia had chosen the year 1960* as the time to reveal the Third Secret... curiosity and even dread about what the message might contain had heightened significantly over the years..." (p. 211). According to Bertone – in three conflicting versions of his story given between 2000 and 2007¹⁶ – Sister Lucia "confessed" to him during conveniently unrecorded interviews that she, not Our Lady, had fixed the year 1960 for disclosure of the Secret and that Our Lady had never said anything to her about this.

For seven years Bertone maintained that Our Lady had never told Lucia that revelation of the Secret was connected to the year 1960, which happens to be the year following John XXIII's announcement of the Second Vatican Council. Then, during the *Porta a Porta* telecast of May 31, 2007, the Cardinal blithely revealed to the world not one, but two, sealed envelopes on the outside of which the fol-

lowing appears in Lucia's own handwriting:


*By express order of Our Lady, this envelope can only be opened in 1960 by the Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon or the Bishop of Leiria.*¹⁷

Only one conclusion is possible: Bertone's claim that Lucia "confessed" that Our Lady had never said anything to her about 1960 is simply a lie. For it is impossible that the visionary would have taken it upon herself to decide when the Secret would be revealed, invented an "express order of Our Lady" justifying her arbitrary choice, recorded that express order on the outside of the two envelopes, and then allowed the Church and the world to believe for decades that, as she told Cardinal Ottaviani in 1955, the Virgin did not wish the Secret to be revealed before 1960 "because then it will seem clearer (*mais claro*)."¹⁸ Or, as she told the Bishop of Leiria-Fatima "because the Blessed Virgin wishes it so." Or, as she told Canon Barthas: "Our Lady wills that it can be published beginning in 1960."¹⁸

Either Sister Lucia, the visionary chosen by Heaven itself, was a serial liar on a fundamental point or it is

Bertone who has misled us. No argument is needed to establish which is the case. The envelopes speak for themselves. Yet *FFT* uncritically accepts and promotes Bertone's demonstrable falsehood – a falsehood clearly intended to negate the Virgin's linkage of the Secret to 1960 so as to support Bertone's "interpretation" of the vision as culminating with the 1981 assassination attempt. Even more important for the party line, however, is that any connection between the Secret and 1960 would raise questions about the completeness of the Vatican's disclosure in 2000, as there is nothing about the vision *standing alone* that would be clearer ("*mais claro*") in that year. Hence Sister Lucia had to "confess" that there was never any such connection and that she had simply made the whole thing up. The claim is an insult – both to the seer and to the faithful.

FFT's adoption of Bertone's blatant misrepresentation undermines the credibility of the book as much as it does Bertone's account itself, concerning which there are 101 reasons for doubt, of which this is but one. (See Appendix II in my book.) Nevertheless,

let us proceed to examine FFT's standard arguments in defense of the party line, lest credulous readers of FFT be taken in by any of them. 

This extract published here is only one part of the chapter entitled: "Fatima for Today: A Response".

* For the 33 reasons, see "Friendly Reflections?", at www.fatima.org/news/newsviews/ferraraexpose.pdf

Notes: (1) "Mother Angelica Live," May 16, 2001. (2) Antonio Socci, *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, p. 173. (3) "Fatima: An Unfinished Business," Rete 4, Mediaset, June 23, 2010. (4) *The Message of Fatima* (2000), "Theological Commentary," www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html. (5) "Announcement by Cardinal Angelo Sodano, Secretary of State" in *The Message of Fatima* (TMF). (6) See "Vatican Issues Text of Third Secret of Fatima," *New York Times*, June 27, 2000, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/06/27/world/vatican-issues-text-of-third-secret-of-fatima.html>. (7) "...[O]ltre questa grande visione della sofferenza del Papa, che possiamo in prima istanza riferire a Papa Giovanni Paolo II, sono indicate realtà del futuro della Chiesa che man mano si sviluppano e si mostrano. Perciò è vero che oltre il momento indicato nella visione, si parla, si vede la necessità di una passione della Chiesa... Quanto alle novità che possiamo oggi scoprire in questo messaggio, vi è anche il fatto che non solo da fuori vengono attacchi al Papa e alla Chiesa, ma le sofferenze della Chiesa vengono proprio dall'interno della Chiesa, dal peccato che esiste nella Chiesa. Anche questo si è sempre saputo, ma oggi lo vediamo in modo realmente terrificante: che la più grande persecuzione della Chiesa non viene dai nemici fuori, ma nasce dal peccato nella Chiesa..." See www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2010/may/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20100511_portogallo-interview_it.html (paragraph breaks added). (8) "Si illuderebbe chi pensasse che la missione profetica di Fatima sia conclusa." From *OMELIA DEL SANTO PADRE BENEDETTO XVI* (Homily of the Holy Father Benedict XVI), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/homilies/2010/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20100513_fatima_it.html (9) "Perché il Papa smentisce Bertone (e Messori)," May 13, 2010, at <http://www.antoniosocci.com/2010/05/perche-il-papa-smentisce-bertone-e-messori/>. (10) "Consiglio a Bertone: mea culpa e penitenza," May 15, 2010, <http://www.antoniosocci.com/2010/05/consiglio-a-bertone-mea-culpa-e-penitenza/> (11) Austen Ivereigh, "Will Sodano Resign Over Maciel?", *America*, April 13, 2010, http://www.americamagazine.org/blog/entry.fm?entry_id=2749. (12) Hilary White, "Sodano's 'Head Should Roll': Report Reveals Close Ties Between Vatican Cardinal and Disgraced Legion," *Lifesitenews.com*, April 14, 2010, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive/ldn/2010/apr/1004140>. (13) Jason Berry, "Money paved way for Maciel's influence in the Vatican," *National Catholic Reporter*, April 26, 2010, <http://ncronline.org/news/accountability/money-paved-way-maciels-influence-vatican?page=2>. (14) Joseph Bottum, "The Cost of Maciel," *First Things*, May 12, 2010, <http://www.firstthings.com/onthesquare/2010/05/the-cost-of-father-maciel>. (15) See "Vatican Issues Text of Third Secret of Fatima," *New York Times*, June 27, 2000, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/06/27/world/vatican-issues-text-of-third-secret-of-fatima.html>. (16) See *The Secret Still Hidden*, p. 145 for a comparative chart of the conflicting versions, complete with ever-changing "quotations" respecting Lucia's alleged "confession." (17) See *The Secret Still Hidden*, pp. 124-148 for a discussion of Bertone's changing story concerning Lucia's "confession" and the photographs of the envelopes negating Bertone's claim. (18) Cf. *The Devil's Final Battle*, Ch. 4, pp. 30-31 (one-volume edition), pp. 21-22 (two-volume edition).