

21 of 30 people found the following review helpful

THE LADY OF THE CARRASQUEIRA

By [EDMUND J. GRANT "Ed"](#) on August 28, 2009

Format: Paperback **Verified Purchase**

CELESTIAL SECRETS : THE HIDDEN HISTORY OF THE FATIMA INCIDENT, is the second volume of a trilogy of books (English translations), whose primary author is Portuguese professor/writer Joachim Fernandes, with some volumes co-authored by Fina D'Armada. These two writers have been among Portugal's most prominent UFOlogists for many years. Additional material from other authors, editors and translators, is also used liberally in this trilogy. The other volumes of the trilogy series are HEAVENLY LIGHTS : THE APPARITIONS OF FATIMA AND THE UFO PHENOMENON and FATIMA REVISITED: THE APPARITION PHENOMENON IN UFOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY AND SCIENCE.

The three publications above represent the producers' long-term traditional work (thirty plus yrs.), of linking the famous Fatima, Portugal events of 1917 to UFO(s). The core theme of all three texts is seeking to make the case that the well known Fatima visionary occurrences, were in reality a prime example of a visit to Earth by an extraterrestrial(s) aboard a UFO(s), during that year. This position of course is in strong contradiction to the Roman Catholic Church's studied conclusion that these events were in fact heavenly visits that are worthy of belief, (with no requirement for the faithful to believe), and that these miraculous occurrences were none other than supernatural apparitions of the "Holy Virgin Mary," the mother of Jesus.

The primary sponsor, editor and main promoter of this trilogy for the American market is the highly controversial amateur scientist, UFOlogist Andrew D. Basiago. He has been heavily involved in various writings focusing mainly on "uncovering the cover-ups," including his version of NASA's "secret" space programs; so it is no surprise to find that he is a main driving force behind the production of this particular "Fatima debunked" enterprise in America.

First, I think it will be helpful to set the stage by giving a brief summary of these sensational events from the early twentieth century.

At the village of Fatima, Portugal, in 1917, there were reported to be six major apparitions by a heavenly young female on a small holm-oak tree (Carrasqueira). They were witnessed by three very young shepherd children, Lucia ten yrs., Francisco nine yrs. and Jacinta seven yrs. old, beginning on May 13, 1917 and ending on October 13, 1917. The children repeated that the lady stated on her final October visit that she was "The Lady of the Rosary," (Fatima Shrine archival publication DOCUMENTACAO CDF...Vol. I, p. 129), who is known to Roman

Catholics worldwide of course, to be none other than Jesus' holy mother Mary herself.

Incredibly, this last visit of October 13th was reported to have climaxed with a fifteen minute display of a totally spectacular series of cosmic and solar phenomena, that were later recounted by the secular and religious press of the day as the "Miracle of the Sun." Amazingly, directly following the solar display, witnesses also stated that their previously drenched clothes had become suddenly dry, as did the wet and muddy ground, that had been thoroughly soaked due to the many hours of steady rain that had fallen since the day before. Approximately seventy thousand people, from up to forty miles away, reportedly witnessed these events.

The overflowing crowd was drawn to be present at the Fatima apparition site on October 13th, based on a widely disseminated prediction by the children seers. They related that this prediction was disclosed to them on the previous July 13th by the heavenly figure, namely, that she would perform a miracle for all to see and believe in three months, (i.e. October 13th, `17). This foretelling is first seen in the archived notes of the skeptically unmoved parish priest Father Ferreira, dated July 14, 1917, and a copy is found in DOCUMENTACAO CDF...Vol. I, p. 15. This July prophecy had then spread rapidly throughout all of Portugal and Western Europe, including to the non-believing secular newspapermen and state authorities in Lisbon.

The fact of the stunning prediction coming to fulfillment as forecasted at high noon on October 13th, was reported worldwide by even the secular press, and this event's completion on the predicted date and time of day has been considered by some secular, religious and scientific journalists to be the REAL Fatima miracle.

Returning to the book under review, it is interesting that when advertising CELESTIAL SECRETS ..., (C.S.) the dominant instrument used by the authors and promoters to convince the reader of their research prowess and to buildup interest and credibility for their product, is the highlighting of their previous visit to the secured Fatima Shrine archives, in 1978. During that visit they were permitted to view the largely unknown personal notes of the local Fatima priests of that year of 1917, especially those who had directly interviewed the children. Since then they have created their own unique version of that archival data by displaying all of their so-called meticulous research activity, some of which is debunked below, (that in the final analysis is nothing but a sham)!

Very significantly since then, the Fatima Shrine authorities have produced several volumes of this same archived Fatima apparition documentation; which

include the above priests' personal notes. The first edition to be published is titled DOCUMENTACAO CRITICA DE FATIMA: VOLUME I, INTERROGATORIOS AOS VIDENTES-1917, (Interrogations of the Seers), (Santuário de Fátima, 1992). For brevity's sake, I will refer to this work in the remaining text as DCDF...Vol. I. The producers of C.S. utilize this same exact Volume I often as a frequent reference, in support of their own postulations contained in this product under review. I also possess a copy of this identical book published from the Fatima shrine archives itself, which I have used extensively for my own research and reference.

Moving along with the internals of CELESTIAL SECRETS...as mentioned above, its writers incredibly attempt to make their case that the Fatima events of 1917 were in reality a UFO(s) visit. To assist in this effort, the authors have laid out their strategy of accusing the Roman Catholic Church of employing a considerable amount of manipulative and conspiratorial conduct to concoct and promulgate a false scenario of these apparitions. However, they do not make a compelling case in my view, due to their failure to provide any solid evidence to support these reckless allegations.

Furthermore and most deplorably, the writers have fashioned their principal weapon of attack on the Catholic Church and on the Lady of Fatima in particular, to be one of a calumnious and over-the top impugment of the moral character of Fatima's heavenly figure herself. This is chiefly done by narrowly fixating and obsessing on a few disjointed and enigmatic entries (that are in the minority), that appeared in the skeptical local parish priest's early private notes, that were reproduced many decades later in some of the earliest documents of DCDF...Vol I. These entries indicate some verbal testimony from the two young female seers of a knee-length skirt/dress description of the visionary figure's clothing. However, as mentioned, these particular notes by the priest occurred only during the earlier apparitions, with the remainder of the seers' testimony over the months ahead describing the more expected, typically longer lengths.

What the authors have done here is to seize upon and brazenly over-sensationalize these few knee-length descriptions, lowering them deeply into a scandalous category that was even beneath that accorded to "...ladies of the night...", to directly quote from C.S. p. 151. Moreover, the ensuing and conflicting longer length entries that are in the majority, are simply ignored and totally omitted by the writers. This is an obviously specious attempt to level serious, irreparable damage to the heavenly lady's moral character and reputation, for their own motives.

Also, it is noteworthy that these initial recorded accounts by the two young female seers above are tellingly conflicting with the young seer Francisco's

descriptions, where the only knee-length clothing that he reports throughout all of his testimony was the mantle headpiece, a distinction again passed over by the writers, but more on this interesting subject further below.

Regretfully, I am obliged to spend more time than I would honestly like on this knee-length skirt/dress length issue, because of the authors' intense focus on it, and due to their concentrating most of an entire chapter on it in C.S. Part III # 2, "The Secret of the Sanctuary." The authors have clenched onto this length issue like a pack of pit bulls and have continued to maintain it as the centerpiece of their calumnious attack on the lady of the heavenly vision's believed religious origins. They can hardly be interviewed by the media about their UFO/Fatima activity without quickly mentioning the skirt issue, showcasing it as critical new evidence, pried out by their so-called "meticulous" research.

(Unfortunately, this deeply flawed CELESTIAL SECRETS publication has been exposed to be the prime source for all of the widespread, calumnious, and distorted knee-length skirt material related to Fatima, that has eventually found its way into countless books, Weblogs, Websites, Internet Encyclopedia sites and other similar printed matter, throughout the world).

Before moving more deeply into the details of C.S. , it is helpful to quickly note that a few plausible possibilities do exist for the presence of these above confusing knee-length entries in the parish priest's initial private notes and they are fully detailed later below, but at this point, a few other considerations about what constitutes a short skirt length should also be mentioned.

Interestingly, there do exist indeed... period photos that exist on the Internet and in other public records showing both Lucia and Jacinta, ten yrs. and seven yrs old, who at the time of the apparitions were wearing dresses much shorter than full ankle-length. In fact, a well-known photo taken shortly after the apparition of July 13, 1917, shows Lucia with a typical "mid-calf" dress and Jacinta with a "slightly higher than mid-calf" dress. (Coincidentally and to the point, this initial heavenly figure of the earlier visions was described by Lucia in the apparition documents of DCDF...Vol. I, p. 355, to be only the size of a local 12-yr. old childhood friend, but more on this below).

Therefore...those adamant anti-Fatimists who maintain that anything shorter than full ankle-length skirts would have been considered inappropriate or scandalous clothing, even for the children of 1917 Portugal, are making statements that are obviously NOT correct. Of course some might just brand the two children's clothing of the above photo with the same scandalous labels as they have applied to the heavenly vision, but we all know that history can be full of surprises.!

Getting back now into the heart of C.S. , ...the authors continue this character assassination, by employing a well-known fallacious evidence presentation method called "cherry picking." In this particular example, once having seized onto these questionable notes of knee-length descriptions that are in the distinct minority as mentioned above, they proceeded to totally ignore and virtually omit all of the other more numerous conflicting descriptions of the longer skirt/dress lengths, (that I assume would help to ruin their story). These latter, more common and representative accounts appear throughout the course of the many other apparition related interview records and documents, which are recorded by several different interrogators, and are readily available to be seen in this same volume of archived files, i.e. DCDF...Vol I. These include descriptive phrases such as...the middle of the leg (mid-calf), or...down to the ankles or...down to the feet. (e chegava aos pes).

The fact alone that the producers of this so-called investigative work have deceptively relied heavily on this fraudulent "cherry-picking" evidence collection method, is in itself a serious and fatal betrayal of the overall veracity of this work.

MOST SIGNIFICANTLY...the producers have adopted many other misleading, distorted references while using the legitimate source DCDF...Vol. I. To list just a few...they have employed as shown above a lack of full disclosure, ...outright fabrication,...and grossly altering the context of official archival records by the omission of obvious counterpoint information from the same paragraph, of these priests' personally written notes reproduced in DCDF...Vol. I. Several different examples follow below of the above gross misrepresentations.

To start, an especially explicit and pertinent example of the writers' employing fallacious evidence by a lack of full disclosure, is shown by reading the text from p. 25 of DCDF...Vol. I. Here in the same personal notes of unresponsive Fr. Ferreira above, the priest describes Lucia as saying that during the last vision of the heavenly visitor, which was framed near the Sun on October 13th, 1917, that the holy lady had worn a white and long skirt...that arrived at the feet. "A saia era branca e comprida e chegava aos pes..." However, this "long skirt" entry is another "inconvenient fact" for the authors, which is directly contrary to the main focal centerpiece of C.S. , and therefore is tellingly ignored and is totally disregarded by the authors, as they continue to omit or pass over anything other than their poison-pen, so-called scandalous skirt lengths.

(In my view, this final Oct. 13th visual memory of "The Lady of the Rosary" is what Lucia related to sculptor Jose Thedim, who then went on to produce some of the more familiar, devotional statues of "Our Lady of Fatima," always showing s full-length dress to the feet).

Also, a shameful situation of outright fabrication is shown where contrary to the authors' statements on p.151 of C.S., (that is also referenced by them to be found in the DCDF...Vol. I), there is really no entry among Father Lacerda's rough notes...of any "knee-length" anything. This is an example of the writers' strong proclivity to be using duplicity throughout and a resorting to "piling on" to drive their point home.

FINALLY AND DISGRACEFULLY, perhaps the most egregious component of this falsified, sophistic exercise is where the context has been grossly altered of some of the original private notes of Canon (Father) Formigao, one of the interviewers of the children. This was done by cleverly deleting significant counterpoint phrases from within the referenced paragraph of the same recorded archived material, which effectively gives the reader an entirely different meaning to the intention of the priest's notes contents and his impression of the situation. (DCDF...Vol I, p. 66). This reconstituted and counterfeited excerpt is then highlighted as solid evidence for their "knee-length skirt" argument in C.S. on p. 153.

To illustrate the above point...the original archival statement shows this same priest musing that...Jacinta affirms that Our Lady's dress fell only to the knees. Cleverly, the authors then removed the next few counterpoint sentences immediately following which are...Lucia and Jacinta have declared that it (the skirt/dress) goes down, ... NEXT TO THE ANKLES...The priest then remarks about...a point of confusion on the part of the children?, especially the youngest (Jacinta). As can be plainly seen, the authors have again deliberately "cherry-picked" and retained only the knee-length segment of Jacinta's statements, and have totally omitted the priest's perplexity over the children's other conflicting, longer length testimonial descriptions, which was suggesting to him confusion on the part of the female seers. This new distorted rendering has naturally produced a falsified accounting of the priest's originally recorded stream-of-consciousness personal musings, which again are incorrectly provided by C.S. as representing Fr. Formigao's actual archival record. The statement by the priest is also treated as if it was a formal report of some kind, instead of notes that are more akin to diary type entries.

(This entire Fr. Formigao statement above was recorded on Sept. 27, 1917, which coincides with the date of his first interviews with the children, done earlier that day. Therefore, these various dress descriptions that he refers to above would also have to include those taken from an earlier occasion(s) by someone else, most likely referring back to the puzzling prior private notes of Fr. Ferreira's, indicated earlier. Also, Fr. Formigao's unofficial very late involvement with the children seers' testimony didn't begin until 15 days prior to the final apparition on

Oct. 13th, 1917, which he did only as an interested party. The local parish priest Fr. Ferreira continued to maintain his official responsibilities for conducting and recording the interviews with the children throughout, including making his official reports to his superiors in Aug., 1918, on the matter of the visions, after their conclusion the preceding year).

In retrospect, as mentioned above, it is possible to only reasonably speculate as to why the least mentioned of the clothing descriptions in the private priests' notes have a description of a knee-length skirt in the early apparition notes in the first place. To be helpful, some plausible possibilities are given below...but not in any order of priority.

First, the early visits were described by Lucia to be from someone only the size of a young neighborhood girl known as Virginia, (12 years old). DCDF...Vol. I, p. 355. Contrast this prior statement with the ones in later apparitions where the heavenly figure was described to be that of a young woman, the size of a 15 to 18 year old, where the skirt/dress was described as falling to longer lengths, and with the final more mature vision of Oct.13, 1917 being described by Lucia as noted above, as "falling to the feet", ("...e chegava aos pes "...DCDF...Vol I, p. 25).

On another conceivable scenario...could there have been some communications problems or semantic confusion between the young illiterate children and the note-taking priests, particularly with the skeptical, and visibly unsympathetic local parish priest Father Manuel Marques Ferreira? I think that it is a distinct possibility, but it cannot be said for certain! However, Father Ferreira does appear to have been very uncomfortable with the spotlighted position that he found himself in, as the assigned parish priest at Fatima during the time of these supernatural events, which were gaining more and wider attention by the day. In a major letter written on Aug. 14, 1917, he became very defensive about his role at Fatima to that point, and he strongly rejected some unproven allegations of controversial activities by him that occurred in the months previous.

Additionally, on Aug. 6, 1918, about ten months after the apparitions had ceased, Father Ferreira produced his official Parochial report on this entire subject of the heavenly visions of the previous summer/fall.of 1917. In this report, his murky description of the visiting figure's skirt/dress is also at some variance with various details of his own personal interview notes, which were recorded after each apparition's occurrence. Interestingly, I could find no record of Fr. Ferreira's where he shows any concern about any of these dress lengths at any time, or any effort to reconcile his own recorded differences in this area. As a visible skeptic, he possibly didn't see the need to get any clarification to this issue any further, which is unfortunate.

Be that as it may, in all due fairness to Fr Ferreira and to the other priests involved as well, they certainly didn't expect that their personal notebooks would be subject to such fine scrutiny and worldwide publication seventy plus years later. Their official reports written after the fact, are of course a different matter. It should be noted though, that some of these earlier knee-length skirt notations of Fr. Ferreira's personal notes and the items of his official report do appear to differ from the children's skirt-length testimony recorded by another interviewer of the children, Fr. Jose de Lacerda, in his report of Nov. 15, 1917, document #50 and p. 355 of DCDF...Vol. I. Now, I'm NOT suggesting that deceit was involved on the part of Fr. Ferreira, (nor of Fr. Lacerda).

However, some parts of Fr. Ferreira's complete records are lacking in total internal coherence in this clothing description area, and it appears to me to be a sign of possibly incautious record keeping, whether caused by confusion, inattentiveness or irritability. This situation also would likely be aggravated by his continuing skepticism of these visionary events and the unplanned, undesired public role that he was thrust into.

Importantly though, it is NOT possible nor is it righteous for me to attempt to make any firm definitive judgments relating to Fr. Ferreira's real motivations nor his exact conduct with regard to these events; and he did give every indication to those that knew him to be a very dedicated and holy priest. For whatever the reason, again...these few out of place and unexplained knee-length early skirt record entries were in the minority of the dress descriptions from the total record, (just waiting to be jumped on and "cherry-picked" by the C.S. authors several decades later). In any case, his experiences at Fatima in 1917 and 1918, were no doubt a very trying and difficult period for him, leading him to take leave of Fatima in June of 1919.

It is worth mentioning that because the children could not read or write at that particular time (Lucia learned later in life), there exists no direct written testimony available from the young shepherd seers at that time of 1917. Therefore, everything included in the archived records that has been attributed to them, comes from the hand and brain of someone else, which naturally introduces a possibility of inaccurate communications, whether intended or not.

Another possible consideration for the knee-length skirt entries, is that the vision was reportedly situated over top of a short holm-oak tree (Carrasqueira), but the heavenly figure herself was elevated even further above the tree-top by a small cloud under her feet. In the stunning intensity of the moment, this partially obscuring cloud along with the additional height of the figure could have given the female children an illusory perception of actual dress lengths etc., in those

early visions. Also, as the children were close to the tree looking up, and with the apparition elevated well above them, it would have presented an unusually sharp angle to provide very accurate visual perceptions.

Another possible key to understanding some of the above visual differences is the likelihood that Francisco's rendering of these clothing description details is the most credible all of the individual children's recorded testimony in this area. As mentioned earlier, although he generally agreed with the girls, his only description of anything "knee-length" was when referring to the vision's mantle headpiece, with his noting that the dress then went on down to at least the mid-calf, as is written in DCDF...Vol. I, p. 93.

His credibility in this area is strong I believe, for the following reason. Notably, Francisco's testimony was that he was NOT given the benefit of hearing the Lady's audio presentations during any of the six visions (reason unknown), and Lucia brought him up to date later, on what was said after each visit. Therefore, as his sight was the only sense available to him (of the vision) and with no audio communications to him from the Lady to capture his attention, he naturally had a better opportunity and inclination than the girls to focus most of his attention on the details of her visual appearance, so as to make good descriptions of it later.

Also, he was a young boy serious in nature as per Sister Lucia, and as the nine-year old older brother of young Jacinta, he was not as excitable and as easily confused as his younger sister. (Perhaps this knee-length mantle reference is a candidate for the origination of the girls' initial knee-skirt confusing remarks?).

Supporting this theory is that Lucia did openly confess to having some uncertainty over such small visual details as...the Lady's wearing of socks or not, or of the color of her feet, because she said that she was focusing on the Lady's face, (reported in Fr. Ferreira's official Parochial report of August 6, 1918, DCDF...Vol I, p. 258). In this same report, it is significant that the unsympathetic parish priest also stated the following regarding Lucia's interview testimony "All the times that I questioned her she never contradicted herself in the essentials..." (DCDF...Vol I p. 269).

Lucia went on to state in her first written document on the apparition events, written on Jan. 5, 1922, that the intensity of the brilliant and strong light prevented her from looking at these uncertain visual details, as the light almost blinded her. Lucia also had openly testified later at an appearance before her official cross-examination on July 9, 1924, that she was uncertain at the time of the visions on a couple of nonessential items, such as the lady being barefoot or not or on her use of earrings or not.

These minor testimonial differences among the seers should not be a surprise here, and please keep in mind that we're dealing with young children at that time of 1917. Ask any policeman or detective about even sincere, well-meaning ADULT eyewitnesses giving confusing, conflicting testimony among themselves. It happens...all the time! I know, I work with them.

Finally, due to the young, tender ages of the children at the time (seven to ten years), and perhaps with the heavenly Lady wishing to not frighten them, I believe that it's possible there could have been a maturing of the heavenly figure's presentation to the children from the first one on May 13th to her final one on October 13th, '17, where she finally and gloriously appeared as the familiar Queen Mary Mother of Jesus with the "Holy Family," DCDF...Vol. I, p.128, (with her dress "falling to the feet," as documented in the archives).

For me, it is a likely scenario that a final fully matured appearance was presented by the heavenly Mother in this last apparition in the sky near the Sun, and that her recorded clothing differences could have been a part of that six month long process. However, at no time could I judge from the totality of the evidence in the official records that anything was worn consistently by the heavenly lady over the six-month period, that would have raised concern or could have been legitimately viewed as inappropriate for 1917 Portugal mores, in my humble opinion.

In recapping the results of all of my research to date on this fallacious, scandalous clothing issue highlighted in CELESTIAL SECRETS..., I conclude that there exists many reasonable possibilities as described above for these few early knee-length skirt entries (that again are in the minority), but unless or until further evidence is forthcoming, these postulations of mine above will have to remain as academic speculations, although likely some very feasible ones.

More importantly however, is that for certain it can be said...these authors' of CELESTIAL SECRETS have NOT produced any valid... "SMOKING-GUN" evidence that the heavenly figure who was represented in the May through October apparitions at Fatima in 1917, was anyone other than "Mary, the mother of Jesus." Instead, they have produced a plentiful supply of "red herrings."

In encapsulating what the writers have obviously attempted to do in their C.S. publication...it is seen that they have cleverly but erroneously juxtaposed a few "cherry picked," enigmatic, knee-length skirt/dress descriptions from questionable records of the earlier child sized images of the apparitions, onto the final majestic figure that is well known to Roman Catholics throughout the world as "The Lady of Fatima;" who was standing alongside of St. Joseph and the Child Jesus during the final apparition on October 13th, '17. (DCDF...Vol. I, p. 128).

By thus shamelessly constructing and trying to attach this fabricated package of a scandalous fashion characterization onto the heavenly figure, (again in the authors' words "...not even ladies of the night' wore anything so provocative," C.S. p. 151), the authors have obviously hoped to block any further consideration of the visions to be that of Mary, the Mother of Jesus. Using this calumnious, distorted evidence producing process, the writers of this fantasized scenario have attempted to steal the centerpiece of these truly miraculous events for their own theoretical and UFO borne extraterrestrial figure, thought to be free now to come onto center stage.

As mentioned earlier, my time spent discussing this knee-length skirt issue is indeed unfortunate, but I feel that because of the continuing and undeserved focus on it by the writers of this publication and many others as well, and after observing its constant repetition over and over again in the many internet blogs, websites and similar anti-Fatima books, that it had to be dealt with seriously with some detailed length, at this point.

Summarizing, the authors of this work have made extensive use of free association, in their logical case to support all of their UFO theories. They have also freely employed against the Catholic Church and the Fatima visions a form of the classical sophistic argument method, where a few murky details are wrapped up with distorted, misleading statements and the selective use of out-of-context phrases from a legitimate reference source. This has generated a work that is too clever-by-half, a deceiving story package that is disguised as a serious research effort, and in the final analysis has ultimately resulted in a sloppy, overwrought and fallacious product, in my humble opinion.

In closing, I believe in the attitude of "to each his own" preference when it comes to the general subject of UFOlogy, and if one would enjoy a disjointed work on a New Age subject for their reading list, then that is one's own choice. Nevertheless, CELESTIAL SECRETS...decisively fails the test of attempting to effectively discredit the Roman Catholic Church's studied conclusions and pronouncements on what she terms as "Our Lady of Fatima and her Message", being "worthy of belief."

P.S. Although there are also many other very fine books available for use as a reference source on the Fatima apparition events, in this review and in other similar writings, I try to use the Fatima Shrine archival documents publication DCDF...Vol I as my main reference tool, to a great extent. For accuracy's sake, I normally prefer to stay as close to source documents where practical and it is telling that the authors of CELESTIAL SECRETS have also employed this particular volume as a reference source as well.

UPDATE !!! August 28, 2012 - SEE THE NEWS OF A STUNNING "SMOKING GUN" BOMBHELL IN MY COMMENTS of 08-28-2012 and 09-02-2012

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#)6 months ago

Report Abuse

Elaine, thank you for your very kind words. I really appreciate them.

Ed Grant

[elaine](#)6 months ago

Report Abuse

a serious note of sanity among frenzied sensationalism. A proper historical approach.

[John Babe](#)8 months ago

Report Abuse

My friend you have not answered the concerns I put to you:

- Do you believe a short dress (in Our Ladies First Apparition) would deny the truth of the Fatima apparition? If so why?

- Neither "Disgusted" (nor I) appear to deny the long dress in all apparitions after the first.

- You stated one of the quotes from Celestial Secrets re the short dress left out 36 words from DCDF if I recall correctly.

It would be helpful to readers here to quote the complete paragraph including those missing words if you wanted to make your case more strongly.

For example, the following paragraph (allegedly from Canon Formigao and printed in the DCDF Document you possess) is widely quoted on the Internet: "Jacinta declares that Our Lady's dress goes down only to her knees. Our Lady can only appear dressed, obviously, in the most decent and modest way. The dress would have to come down to her feet. Any other way constitutes the most serious obstacle to the supernaturalism of the apparition and makes us think that it is a mystification prepared by the Spirit of Darkness. But how can we explain the belief of so many thousands of people, their living faith and burning piety, the modesty and the composure they show in all their acts, the silence and behavior of the crowd, the numerous and astonishing conversions caused by the events, the appearance of extraordinary signs in the sky and on the earth, verified by thousands of witnesses? How can we explain, I repeat, all these facts and conciliate them with divine providence and the laws that rule the supernatural world, above all after the establishment of Christianity, if the Demon is the cause of such events?"

I invite you to provide readers your own acceptable version which does true justice to the DCDF document from which it allegedly comes. Please include any words or phrases that you believe have been omitted and render a better translation of the Portuguese if you believe the above is poorly translated.

Readers probably are not interested in further defensive commentary. You have done that well already.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 8 months ago

Report Abuse

To the newly anonymous John Babe:

Whoever you are...I regret to say that several of your statements in your Comment of today are replete with many careless errors of fact found in your premises and show assumptions of yours made without any basis in my written history on this subject. Tellingly, this Comment also includes your obvious ignoring of issues that have been already fully addressed in the review above. So, call it by whatever misdirected adjective or phrase you like...it would be meaningless for me to attempt to answer such a series of obviously provocative and loosely manufactured set of statements.

As an example...you indicated in your Comment a need to see some of the original Portuguese that I have referred to in my criticism of the authors. Well, if you look again carefully, the following is taken from paragraph #23 of my review above.

"To start, an especially explicit and pertinent example of the writers' employing fallacious evidence by a lack of full disclosure, is shown by reading the text from p. 25 of DCDF...Vol. I. Here in the same personal notes of unresponsive Fr. Ferreira above, the priest describes Lucia as saying that during the last vision of the heavenly visitor, which was framed near the Sun on October 13th, 1917, that the holy lady had worn a white and long skirt...that arrived at the feet. "A saia era branca e comprida e chegava aos pes..." However, this "long skirt" entry is another "inconvenient fact" for the authors, which is directly contrary to the main focal centerpiece of C.S. , and therefore is tellingly ignored and is totally disregarded by the authors, as they continue to omit or pass over anything other than their poison-pen, so-called scandalous skirt lengths".

[John Babe](#) 8 months ago

Report Abuse

Well I have found "Disgusted"'s comments, while I do not agree with his inferences and conclusions, quite helpful for providing new details I have not seen published or spoken of before.

I have found Ed's comments, while I agree with his overall conclusions (Fatima is true), rather unhelpful as new detail is not provided - and the ad hominem attacks with a pretence of professional indifference, somewhat disturbing.

Why can you not simply provide a paragraph or two from the Fatima Sanctuary Source material which gives the lie to the "Celestial Secrets" which you say quotes incompletely and translates poorly? Obviously it will be in Portuguese, that is fine. You are not the only person in the world capable of getting things accurately translated.

Obviously they "cherry pick". Readers are not stupid. It is quite clear the majority of descriptions by the children were as per the official Fatima statue so have no fear there. However the dress accounts do have contradictions wrt the first apparition and so this difficulty and material should be openly acknowledged. I am not afraid, and I do not think this negates the truth of Fatima (unlike some of the interviewers).

You are very afraid of the "short dress" thing. I do not understand why. It seems you agree with some of those 1917 priests that to accept this is to intrinsically say the apparitions are likely of the devil. Why on earth should that be so - esp if local young girls of the same age as Mary acceptably dressed that way. It seems traditional dress of that region could have similar lengths as well.

It seems to me then that the "of the devil" "necessity" is really just an "inference". - a personal concern of some priests but not really connected with the accepted local Catholic, traditional peasant culture and custom.

[Disgusted](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

There's no cure for your condition

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

Well, today there has been a sudden barrage of rapid-fire, negative COMMENTS (five separate ones over a thirty-one hour period, seven all told to this point), that have been posted by the anonymous DISGUSTED ID against my review above. I

have been thinking it over...I suppose that this Commenter illustrates the case that we all have the ability and the choice....to create a provocative, safely anonymous ID, and then feel the freedom to proceed to post away apace, supplying multiple, nasty, negative COMMENTS that are filled with a trove of false, misleading, distorted anti-Fatima invective. But most of us would chose not to go this route.

Most also would not retain the option to go on making new negative postings to this same Review endlessly, as new thoughts come to our mind, no matter how far afield they may be from the points made by the author of the original review. Such has been the case with these Comments from this individual. However, the problem with this continuing scenario is that these multiple entries from DISGUSTED have shown that they:

1) ...primarily do not address the detailed findings of my attached REVIEW which contains clear critiques of the CELESTIAL SECRETS (CS) publication literary abuses, but instead ramble on with "straw man" positions of his/her own choosing, providing very little reference support other than an occasional book title without page numbers and perhaps a suspect internet article.

2) ...plainly show a stubborn state of denial in the author's mind regarding the validity of the Fatima Shrine's historical archival documents (DOCUMENTACAO CRITICA DE FATIMA ...VOL I (DCDF), that I have used as my main reference repeatedly in my Review and Comments (moreover, DCDF was employed as a valid reference in CS by the authors themselves).

3) ...illustrate a persistent and ingrained proclivity of the author to violate ordinary standards of decency by...using malicious and personally insulting language against this author,... to make totally out of line, despicable ethnic slurs against Jews e.g. "...is the kind of miracle that the Jews demand." (06-15-12), and today's (2:03 PM) outrageous statement about Sister Lucia deserving a beating as a tender 10 year old child "...and the Church should have left her to her mother to get the beating she so richly deserved."

Today...after again reading such an atrocious threesome of quick-fire, incohesive, RANTS from DISGUSTED, my overall reaction tonight is to say that...

I truly regret that my Review and its Comments have apparently provoked or unleashed such a wellspring of a heightened, extended state of anxiety, vitriol, derision and focused attack on the part of this anonymous individual towards me and my Fatima related Review. It certainly wasn't my intention to cause such an adverse reaction.

My personal recommendation for DISGUSTED is that he/she takes this particular Review off his/her mind now that it has been vented many times over more than necessary, and he/she gets away for some extended quiet and rest somewhere, so that on the return, he/she will be well on the way to feeling much better...real soon.

I sincerely hope that it happens for he/she.

[Disgusted](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

And, Mr. Grant, your calling everyone and everything "anti-Catholic" is ridiculous at this stage of the game. The hierarchy in the Church which throughout history shows that they have been, far too often, unfaithful, negligent, corrupt, heretical, miserable currs, and if those outside the Church are given reason to complain about them, don't blame it on their "anti-Catholicism". They they blame the church, rather than to the church's unfaithful and perfidious Catholics, is an error that can be appreciated by all. Fatima lost souls, it gained nothing for God or for anyone's salvation. Anyone looking on at these shennigans ought to be disgusted because the falseness of the apparition for anyone scratching only its surface is all too clear. That the hierarchy continues to perpetuate this silly thing is just another reason why the pews of the Church are empty.

What is left inside the Church are Catholics who must dumb-down to keep their faith, or swallow a story as stupid as "the two Sr. Lucia's" That girl is that woman, and that woman is that nun, and they are the same person - a person who changes her story incessantly from the time she was a little girl up to the time of her death. Her mother knew her best, and the Church should have left her to her mother to get the beating she so richly deserved.

[Disgusted](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

To applaud the lack of a scrutiny as an affirmance of the validity of the apparition is evidence of nothing better than the askew thought-process of the author of this piece about its deficiencies. A close scrutiny of this article tells you that they did not have a scrutiny at all of this apparition. In my opinion, they could not. What I myself know about this matter tells me unequivocally that the apparition could not stand up under any scrutiny. But they were already allowing Pontifical Masses to be said at the site, the Pope was handing out holy cards of Our Lady of Fatima; the papal nuncio was making public appearances at the site; the bishop was acting like a fool. They all had an agenda that Fatima satisfied. How could Fr. Formigao tell the members of the commission what he found out, no less allow them to discuss all the evidence that he had gathered. Instead, he met with them once, at the end, with an approval in his hand, and, in a complete dereliction of

duty and negligence so gross as to make any thinking Catholic cringe, they all signed on to the approval like compliant wives.

[Disgusted](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

Sorry, you are wrong. Fr. Formigao took over the investigation. Fr. Ferreira did not go to the Miracle of the Sun, for he did not believe it. Further, he was accused by Tia Marto of helping the Mayor "kidnap" the children. Fr. Ferreira was no friend to the Fatima apparition, and if you want to weep, as you should at the carelessness on the part of the Church, who was holding Pontifical Masses at that site before the approval, read about the scrutiny from one of the "true believers" of Fatima:

While the hierarchy in the Church was able to retrieve their political power in Portugal especially with the election of Salazar, all attributable to Our Lady of Fatima, the faith was weakened. The Church did not abide by its own rules in determining the validity of an apparition. Instead, they looked at the processions, the money, the number of people going on pilgrimage there, their ability to wield power over the people, and finally their retrieval of their political clout with the government of Portugal.

The faith, the truth took second seat to all they had gained on an earthly level.

<http://www.catholicvoice.co.uk/fatima2/ch2-3.htm>

THE DEFICIENCIES OF THE DIOCESAN INQUIRY

«In spite of this, one must record a lamentable fact, clearly affirmed by the last survivor of this commission, Dr. Marques dos Santos: the work of the commission was too slow, and spaced out over too long a time...

«There was not even a single study session whose minutes are available;

properly speaking the commission did not organize any dossier, and it met only at the end, on April 13 and 14, 1930, in a single session during which the report, written exclusively by Doctor Formigao, was read and unanimously approved.»

Why this disappointing inactivity? Father Alonso exposes the reasons. A postulator would have had to be named, with the duty of animating the process and keeping it going. Only Canon Formigao could have played this role. «We know from his letter of April 20, 1922, that he was ready to abandon his important occupations at Lisbon and Santarem to devote his full time to the process. Why didn't Bishop da Silva see that this was absolutely necessary for the process to preserve the desired rhythm and tone? (LY: In other words, why have Formigao at all? I know why.) .. The other members undoubtedly possessed the qualities needed to contribute to the process, but precisely because Canon Formigao had a sort of monopoly on the knowledge of the facts of Fatima, this paralyzed all action that might have been attempted when he was not present...

«The other deficiencies of the process are the consequence of this lack of effective constitution of the commission. Also, there was no study and discussion session. In number and quality, the official interrogations were very feeble in comparison with the possibilities Fatima offered then, possibilities which are now lost forever...

«When the commission was named in May, 1922, the wonderful healings at Fatima were an obvious fact, on everybody's lips. Formigao collected them in his first book. However, no expert research has been done on that subject. Nor was any sort of sub-commission named to work in the company of the experts.» No real study of the healings was made. That is a shame!

«Everything was left to the improvisation of the moment», Father Alonso continues, visibly inconsolable over such negligence. «It seems that in addition to the apparitions, Our Lady was expected to do the investigation also! This seems to be the meaning of certain phrases attributed to Bishop da Silva. In any case, what was done was due solely to the initiative and activity of Doctor Formigao. The bishop himself, whom we have seen all these years filled with a vigilant attention for developing devotion to Our Lady of Fatima, did not seem to have any interest in the process. (LY; IT WAS A DONE DEAL)

«Thus time was merrily allowed to pass by, and witnesses slowly disappeared... Facts and circumstances which today are so difficult to re-establish could have been reconstructed very easily by methodical work from the commission. And we would have had a wonderful history of Fatima, which we could have followed like a detailed chronicle of society.

«All these defects should not have existed in the process of apparitions so stupefying, so close to our time, so clear and even evident, with a multitude of witnesses so qualified by their presence, their social position and their psychological objectivity...» Indeed Father Alonso, who speaks here as a historian, is a hundred times correct! A well conducted canonical inquiry could have been able to furnish us with all the material for a fully scientific and exhaustive history of the events of Fatima.

Conclusion of Fr. Alonso (evidencing an Orwellian thought process)

Precisely because there was no serious opposition against the apparitions, because the striking signs were innumerable and unanimously observed by all, it had seemed unnecessary to constitute an exhaustive dossier on the events. The deficiencies of the canonical process, regrettable in themselves, thus indirectly bear witness to the unquestionable truth of the apparitions.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

Unfortunately, the anonymous DISGUSTED is persisting in a habit of advancing an agenda of providing even further false statements related to this Fatima based review of mine,...including every word stated in the very first sentence of this

recent COMMENT, which is nothing less than a malicious and personally insulting TOTAL fabrication.

For the sake of concerned and interested readers...to take only one direct quote from his/her COMMENT above that is totally in error...(that should be considered a sufficient example of the veracity of this individual):

+ Quote ..."Fr. Ferreira did not interview these children after the initial stage. By the time the apparition of the sun happened, he was almost totally out of the picture"

+++ The reality...The parish priest Fr. Ferreira conducted and recorded an interview in the days following each and every one of the six apparitions, (involving at least one of the children on each occasion), commencing in May 1917 and concluding on October 16th, 1917. Fr. Ferreira's official report regarding all these apparition interviews was provided on August 6th, 1918, (well after the "apparition of the sun" on October 13, 1917).

NOTE: My reference for the above statement is taken from pp. 3 to 25, of my personal copy of the Fatima Shrine archives publication titled DOCUMENTACAO CRITICA DE FATIMA ...VOL I..., which is the same reference document used by the authors of CELESTIAL SECRETS..., and is the main basis for my critique of their book in my review above. These May through October 1917 interviews by Fr. Ferreira are also documented in other publications available, but I prefer to stay as close to the source as possible.

Also, common sense teaches that providing only a book title or titles of a set of books to be submitted as a reference for support of the accuracy of statements, without indicating at least any page numbers, is obviously deceptive and next to virtually useless.

In summary, today's second additional text from the safely anonymous DISGUSTED, merely reinforces the sentiments posted in my previous response COMMENTS, as indicated earlier this day.

[Disgusted](#) 2 years ago

[Report Abuse](#)

You know, Mr. Grant, and I know you are NOT Mr. Grant, you are twisting the facts, not only about this book, but about your own readings. Fr. Ferreira did not interview these children after the initial stage. By the time the apparition of the sun happened, he was almost totally out of the picture. Lucia told him on her first interview with him that the skirt was knee length, and later told Fr. Formigao at the time of the second to last apparition that the skirt was to the middle of her leg.

So Lucia told both Fr. Ferreira and Fr. Formigao that the skirt was too short. You had better read Fr. DiMarchi's books Fatima: The Facts and the Immaculate Heart of Mary because the transcripts of the children's testimony during the time of the apparitions are contained in those books, and there you will see that not only did she tell Fr. Ferreira in his original interview that the skirt was short, but she later told Fr. Formigao that the skirt was short. And if you read those two books you will also see the coaching that was going on by Fr. Formigao when he was not getting the right answers from these children, and how he pressed them and suggested the right answer when they did not give one. Certainly, at some point Lucia knew that she gave the wrong answer about the skirt and subsequently "changed her mind" about what she saw and later gave the right answer, but that certainly does not make this apparition any more credible. And it was typical of Lucia. She has been "changing her mind" about many things from that time all the way up to the time of her death.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

Today's COMMENT from an obviously determined individual using an ID of DISGUSTED, is the third separate negative entry in a series that has been posted against this same review of mine, the previous ones having been presented on Nov 7th, '11 and June 15th, '12... from the same anonymous him/her.

These mainly unsupported comments of today are much in character with those from the first two iterations, therefore I will let stand on the record my earlier posted replies of Nov. 14, '11 and June 26, '12, to be considered a sufficient response.

[Disgusted](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

This is more an ad hominem attack than anything else. The ad hominem attack surrounds and camouflages all the weak factual assertions made. However, the very fact that the children gave so many descriptions on how the BVM was dressed is simply more evidence that the apparition is false. The inconsistencies in the testimony of the children not only about the skirt, but about many other matters, abound, and all are excused as "mistake" or by reason of their "immaturity", but the excuse rings false for too many of their statements. Corrections were made by clear "coaching" of the witnesses (See their testimony about the "end of the war"). We even changed the date of WWII to accommodate the children's testimony. Despite all the allowances made to the children because of their age, (they were questioned with kid gloves) they were simply not credible. The fact that there was no scrutiny, in any sense of that word, (read The Whole Truth About Fatima), is significant. The church demands scrutiny, but Fr. Formigao

very clearly sqw that the apparition could not hold up under one, which explains why no discussions were ever held about the "evidence."

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

ALSO...TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT: Another diversionary "strawman" issue has surfaced recently, which is a statement used in another venue regarding me and this subject of Fatima. To wit... "To the reviewer (myself) any attempt to deal with this Fatima episodes is a kind of sin."

Nothing could actually be further from the truth and this charge reeks of utter desperation, as this is yet another complete and libelous falsehood. I have NEVER stated or even so much as thought of any such thing...as I have understood for decades that any level of assent or belief in the 1917 Fatima events (or any other similar apparitions), is plainly NOT a requirement to be a faithful member of the Catholic church. Moreover, it is NOT a sin to have differing and varying opinions on this subject, relating to the reality or meaning of these events of long ago. To the diametric contrary of the false statement above, I have also affirmed this well-known fact in other previous review Comments.

Obviously, the main concern for all should really be to have "intellectually honest" arguments, theories and positions, on all of these matters, I fully respect those that are, and I certainly don't consider them to be anti-Catholic. The lack of this fundamental "honesty" in order to sell more books is where the real problem has been manifesting itself...with certain publications of recent years.

This same position of faith...NOT being a necessary requirement for Fatima or other apparitions for Catholics, has been taken by all of the Pontiffs since 1917 and it is certainly something in which I place my full assent and belief. The Church after years of investigation has offered its "studied conclusion" that the Fatima events and messages are "worthy of belief," that present yet another "trustworthy" opportunity for prayerful devotion, for the faithful.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

AN UPDATE TO MY PREVIOUS COMMENT OF AUGUST 28, 2012

In my preceding Comment of 8-26-2012, I mentioned that "Some of the other Fatima archival statements of the Email are also incorrect." This is of course referring to the Professor Joaquim Fernandes' Email communication of 08-23-2012. Today's additional Comment is my follow-up to that entry, and it will provide further details on two additional major errors of facts, from that particular Email statement.

To illustrate...the following is another excerpt directly quoted from that same Fernandes Email:

"According the original documents (the Parochial Inquiry conducted by the priest Jose Ferreira de Lacerda, probably in October 1917) it was Lucia that made the description of the Lady wearing a short skirt. The same description had been made yet previously to the Fatima priest Manuel Ferreira Marques, in August 21, 1917" (sic).

My first comment is that no serious, legitimate researcher would ever use the very imprecise "...probably in October 1917," when referring to the original 1917 historical documents, that are all very detailed as to dates, authors and sources.

More importantly, while Father Jose Ferreira de Lacerda did indeed interview the children on "October 19, 1917", the original documents of 1917 do NOT show Fr. Lacerda mentioning any "knee length" NOR "short skirt" anything in his interview records and reports, as is stated above. This was all very thoroughly reported and described in my 2009 review of the professor's book of CELESTIAL SECRETS...(C.S.) titled "The Lady of the Carrasqueira."

Also, no surprise here...and very much to the direct contrary... what Fr. Lacerda ACTUALLY recorded was the following in Portuguese, taken from his "Conversations with the three children," found on p. 355 of DOCUMENTACAO CRITICA DE FATIMA ...Vol. I, (DCDF)... "O vestido era todo branca. A saia chegava-lhe aos artelhos e tinha mais brancas." Translated...The dress was all white. The skirt reached her ankles and she had white socks.

Significantly, this is also another example of several available for my conclusion regarding the excerpt from the Email covered in the previous Comment, regarding Professor Fernandes's totally erroneous statement that in the original 1917 documents "... we can not see any witness provide details of the Lady wearing a long dress..."

The second sentence from today's quoted excerpt above is also in grievous error. Although the local parish priest Fr. Ferreira did conduct a very brief interview with the children on August 21, 1917, there is no recorded discussion of any short skirt/dress description regarding the heavenly visitor, during that particular interview. The previously known use by Fr. Ferreira, (acknowledged by this author in the review "The Lady of the Carrasqueira") of a confusing knee-length skirt description was actually written in the personal notes of his earlier interview of the children after the June 13th apparition, as was reported in my 2009 C.S.

review. Frankly, this is a statement that a serious researcher, author should NOT have been so mistaken about.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

NEW SHOCKING DEVELOPMENTS AS OF AUGUST 26, 2012

The author of FATIMA SHOCK (F.S.), Bob Thiel, has suddenly posted an extract from a purported recent Email message, on his website COGwriter.com, dated August 26, 2012. This website has some identification with his sect's LIVING CHURCH OF GOD (LCOG) organization. In this new entry, he is claiming that the Email was regarding the Fatima "short-skirt" controversy, received from the above Professor Joaquim Fernandes, dated August 23, 2012, one day following the professor's Amazon COMMENT of Aug 22nd above.

In this latest message, the Portuguese professor is again trying to defend the indefensible, and Bob Thiel is using this latest communication from the main author of CELESTIAL SECRETS...(C.S.) to defend his own thoroughly spurious material in FATIMA SHOCK, (F.S.).

ALERT!!!.....this new posting confirms some new game-changing evidence of an undeniably explosive and betraying nature on this controversial subject of the professor's self-manufactured "short-skirt" fallacy. This new information effectively turns all that we have heard from the professor and his co-authors, about all of their self-described painstaking and intensive research on the Fatima apparitions' archives...over on its head.

LOOK CAREFULLY...reproduced here is the KEY final sentence of this communication from the public internet, and it reads: ..."Although some seem to wish to re-write history, in the original 1917 documents we can not see any witness provide details of the Lady wearing a long dress, which is how the Lady is normally now shown." This statement is of course diametrically contradictory to reality and the results of my own Fatima archives research. Some of the other Fatima archival statements of the Email are also made...in error!

To briefly review...as has been shown for some time in my review of the professor's CELESTIAL SECRETS...(C.S.) publication titled "The Lady of the Carrasqueira," I mentioned that the majority of the dress length descriptions actually refer to phrases such as...the middle of the leg (mid-calf), or...down to the ankles or...down to the feet. Moreover, in paragraph #14 of my review, I had in short detailed one example of all of these more frequent longer dress descriptions.

Having this fortunate opportunity to again defend the veracity of my own research, I will now reproduce for everyone the original Portuguese words used for that same detailed description of paragraph #14 above, which are taken from the top of p. 25 of my personal copy of the original 1917 documents published in the Fatima Shrine's DOCUMENTACAO CRITICA DE FATIMA...Vol. I, (DCDF...Vol I), 1992, Santuario de Fatima. This is where the young visionary Lucia dos Santos is again interviewed by the same parish priest Fr. Ferreira, and she describes her memory of the Lady following the heavenly figure's then recent and final appearance on October 13, 1917.

This statement from Lucia reads as follows from Document 6 dated 1917-10-16... "A saia era branca e comprida e chegava aos pes;..." This is translated as "The skirt was long and white and came to the feet;..." This statement is obviously directly contradictory to the quotation reprinted above from the professor's EMAIL, and this simple example of where the truth really lies, identifies the professor's highly-vaunted Fatima archives research as a "deeply and irrevocably flawed" product!...especially as there are too many other similar examples of the above Portuguese phrase speaking the truth, that are available to be seen in DCDF...Vol I.

CONCLUSIVELY...this quotation from the message above is per se an item of prima facie SMOKING GUN evidence that identifies it, as it is written, to be a totally exposing, egregious falsehood...that Bob Thiel is now trying to employ to provide some desperately needed credibility for the professor's fallacious research, that he has already used multiple times in his work of F.S. For added support, Bob Thiel is also repeating this phrase, word for word on his new August 24th YouTube video, on the same "short skirt" subject. I'm sorry, it is totally erroneous!

Thank God,...this component of the fraudulent Email message from Professor Fernandes is finally providing for everyone an easily verifiable, solid piece of evidence, to prove the undeniable truth of the matter on all of these directly contradictory statements on the Fatima "skirt" distortions and misrepresentations.

Now...I am NOT going to do all of the rest of the undone sloppy research work for these authors and reproduce here all of the many other "more prevalent" examples of these longer skirt/dress length descriptions in DCDF...Vol I. Although the longer length descriptions' are strongly denied in the professor's above Email sentence, they are all in reality...plainly and easily available and visible for the professor and his assistants to view and report on, as they are taken from the very same publication that they use for reference in their own C.S. publication, which is identical to my own personal copy of DCDF...Vol I.

(Incidentally, there exists in the public record, photos of both Lucia dos Santos and Jacinta Marto wearing mid-calf length dresses at age 10 and 7. So those who are saying that they were considered inappropriate lengths even for children in 1917 Portugal are obviously in grave error).

In Bob Thiel's new August 24th YouTube.com video, most of his points of argument are mainly supported by his reading of quotes taken from his own F.S. book, (can you believe it?)...most of which are the same demonstrated mangled and distorted quotes of the professor's found in CELESTIAL SECRETS...FATIMA SHOCK has given attribution to C.S. for the same quotes in many "end notes" as its primary source for most of its "short-skirt" commentary.

If one wishes to view the new Bob Thiel's postings before this embarrassing new informational evidence is possibly removed from the public record, the following are links to both,

<http://www.cogwriter.com/news/cog-news/did-the-lady-of-fatima-wear-a-short-skirt/>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDR5oFcSIZU&feature=plcp>

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

Well...we hear again once again from Mr/Ms DISGUSTED, the emotional, patronizing commentator, who after an over 7 month hiatus from his/her original entry on Nov 7, 2011, is still firing away from behind the anonymous ID. The latest entry stays true to form as it continues on with the writer's now signature style of "ad hominem" personal attacks.

One thing seems for sure, the audacious DISGUSTED will always come loaded with super confident statements with few if any references to support them, and is usually accompanied by plenty of incendiary verbal hand grenades to keep things emotionally heated up

The misleading and distorted "knee-length skirt" statements that are a favorite hang-up of the anti-Fatimists, was extensively covered in my review THE LADY OF THE CARRASQUEIRA above, and I don't see anything in this latest invective that needs a response.

The only thing that I will say that I find the outrageous ethnic slur "...is the kind of miracle that the Jews demand." to be a totally despicable, slanderous statement that has no place in anyone's dialogue, let alone on this Amazon website.

[Disgusted](#) 2 years ago

Report Abuse

I am a Catholic myself and do not believe in Fatima. Anyone going back into the history would see the same, but they do not go back and do the historical research, despite all the doubt created by the actions of Sr. Lucia herself. And when an apparition such as this is disputed, the reactions of Catholics are far too vociferous as they are vicious, indicating that these matters are far more important to them than the faith itself, which should worry them all.. They should be as indignant and angry when immutable truths are assailed. But these authors, had you read the book, and I doubt you did, raised far more inconsistencies in the Fatima story than the knee-length skirt, but the reason the knee-length skirt is important is because it shows that the apparition does not pass the Church's litmus test as it concerns the apparition being consistent with faith and morals, and if it is that you do not mind the BVM wearing a knee-length skirt, it says more about your own loss of grace than it does anything else. These unhealthy attachments to apparitions by Catholics should be a matter of concern to all of us. In the 16th Century, if some Catholic claimed to have apparitions or God speaking to them, they were immediately arrested by the Inquisitional Courts and accused of being an alumbrados. The Dominicans of the Inquisition taught that it was heresy to claim that God or any other heavenly creature was speaking to you directly in regard to matters of faith. The Dominicans said that you learn the faith via being catechized, not by any direct communications from heaven. I am very sorry that we do not have these Inquisitional Courts set up anymore to arrest all the false mystics we have been saddled with for the last 200 years. The apparitionists today have turned a profound religion into a superstitious magic show. And incidentally, it has been said by more than one wise Catholic that the so-called "Miracle of the Sun" is the kind of miracle that the Jews demand.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 3 years ago

Report Abuse

In my experience, I am normally reluctant to respond to a comment from a recently created, anonymous, and emotionally charged ID, especially from one that has such a "provocative, judgmental" character to it. In my opinion, this type of persona normally betrays someone who holds strong opinions, is anxious to act as a moral judge, and is quick to resort to over-the-top condescending personal insults. Often times this behavior pattern occurs because the individual has some axe to grind.

I have witnessed this type of out-of-line behavior before on Amazon's reviews and comments, and personal attacks are a clear violation of the Amazon policy. This totally inappropriate conduct only serves to betray the person's inflated, and self-absorbed ego.

Experience teaches that if a Catholic is involved in conduct as above, the persona typically includes someone who enjoys lecturing others, as they pontificate on their own versions of the teachings of the Catholic Church, which in most cases are found to be erroneous.

Attempting a civil discourse with this persona type rarely results in a favorable outcome. Nonetheless, keeping these risks in mind, I will respond to this entry so as to not needlessly mislead and confuse serious readers, and I will deal with the above uncivil behavior at the end of my review comment.

To whoever cloaks their identity with the recently created anonymous ID of "DISGUSTED"

To begin...your chattering, rambling entry in the Nov. 7th review comment above is one where not unexpectedly, I totally disagree with almost all of the statements and arguments that you have included in its content.

In essence, your review comment is simply reusing as its cornerstone element, a previously discredited, misleadingly modified version of a familiar quotation, whose original text origin was found in the once unpublished notations of a Portuguese priest, Canon (Fr.) Formigao. This priest was one of the several interviewers of the 3 children visionaries involved, and was also a researcher, an investigator and a well known Church figure during the time of the Fatima, Portugal apparitions of 1917 and later.

You have not provided any source attribution for anything in your supplied text, but coincidentally this same quotation that you have listed is a word-for-word duplicate of the same fatally flawed one that is found on pg. 153 in the book under review, CELESTIAL SECRETS.... This same discredited, altered quotation is now also being used by your own review comment to make the same erroneous argument as the authors have made, one that is still being advanced to support the self-inflated importance of their self-created "short skirt" fixation, described in my review above.

This "skirt length" issue is only one of the many distorted and misleading arguments that these authors have used in this particular publication. Briefly, this specific flawed quotation is an example of where counterpoint phrases (approx. 36 words total) have been cleverly removed from the same original quotation of

Fr. Formigao's notations and the altered result (same as yours) is found in the distorted C.S. version on pg. 153. To avoid needless repetition here, this deceptive modification is fully detailed in my review above in paragraph #12.

Your choice of using the same invalid Fr. Formigao quotation and developing the resulting arguments from it, has done the exact same thing as the authors have done and the result is just as erroneous. My review statements above on this exact fatally flawed issue serve to refute the extraordinary compulsion that the authors have promulgated for this "short-skirt" finding of theirs. Unfortunately, they have maintained and have deplorably fashioned this calumnious attack as their prime weapon to openly impugn the moral character of the heavenly figure herself. This is being done for marketing purposes to create a "sensationalistic expose", in my opinion and that of others.

You as the anonymous commentator have obviously elected to totally ignore or discount the results of my research, found above in my review, of the specific disclosure of the missing words (36) ,which are the important counterpoint phrases detailed in the review. These phrases were removed from their copy of the original printed text taken from the reference book that was footnoted by the C.S. authors on pg. 155 of C.S. (footnote 5). It reads---FREIRE, Jose Geraldes (coordinator), DOCUMENTACAO CRITICA DE FATIMA, Doc. 7, op. Cit., pp. 66-67

It is naturally your own option to reject the results of my serious study on the Fr. Formigao statements in DOCUMENTACAO... as you have just obviously done. Therefore I submit that the only valid, viable solution available to you is to obtain your own copy of the above reference volume at issue, as I have done, and then see for yourself the valid original words and phrases used by Fr. Formigao. Then you will be in a legitimate position to continue your challenge or seriously dispute what I have disclosed, if that is still your position. Any additional critical statements forthcoming from you that rely on the continued use of this same modified, distorted Fr. Formigao quotation, would be to effectively continue with your unsupported ramblings on an argument that was previously discredited more than 2 years ago.

Other related comments:

One of your statements above begins with..."Further, you should be ashamed of yourself..."

First, your comment is a highly inappropriate, incendiary, and personally insulting one that is dripping with condescension and that should have no place in the Amazon Comments section. Your current use of the new anonymous ID does not

give you a free license for this type of patronizing personal attack. However, it does serve the purpose for me of betraying the nature of the source.

Secondly, my statements in the review above regarding the testimony of the children discussing the two different styles of skirt length (ankle-length is the far more predominant), are an accurate representation of the original Fr. Formigao statements found in DOCUMENTACAO CRITICA DE FATIMA...on pg. 66-67, as well as the other multiple entries from other witnesses provided in the reference volume that is foot-noted above in C.S. My defense of Fr. Formigao's statements effectively refutes the authors attempts to sensationalize their product with their "short skirt" obsession for their own marketing purposes, in my opinion. All of my descriptions and explanations of this issue are fully covered in my review above.

Another of your statements above begins..."You don't think the skirt is too short..." This is a complete falsehood and again is a patronizing, assumptive and another unsupported comment from you, that does not in any way, shape or form reflect my thinking on the matter, period.

Your failure to provide any source attributions for your highlighted quotation and for all of your statements regarding the Church, Our Lady and others is telling, but is not totally unexpected for this type of a review comment and it is generally in keeping with the chatty, amorphous and surreptitious nature of its overall content.

I have also reviewed other books from these same authors regarding the Fatima events of 1917 on Amazon, and they are also severely flawed and replete with misleading statements and arguments i.e. (HEAVENLY LIGHTS...and FATIMA REVISITED...)

[Disgusted](#) 3 years ago

[Report Abuse](#)

It is not only the authors who thought the skirt issue was important. The Church thinks it important, and so did Fr. Formigao, the canonist who was supposed to be "scrutinizing" this apparition, and the Church teaching is that if the apparition teaches against faith or morals, then it is supposed to be judged false. You don't think the skirt is too short, but you are a man of your own time, but I'm afraid Our Lady does not wear skirts that are not to the ground, whether it be in the beginning of this century or at the end of it. Further, you should be ashamed of yourself as you so blithely state that the testimony was both of a short skirt and a long skirt. This does not right the matter. It simply gives the Church another reason for declaring it false, since both answers coming from one witness seer or even two cannot be true. In any event, the more credible account was admitted

by Fr. Formigao who stated as follows: "Jacinta affirms that Our Lady's dress fell one to the

- > knees....Our Lady obviously could not have appeared other than
- > dressed with the utmost decency and modesty. The dress must have
- > fallen close to the feet. The contrary...constitutes a serious
- > problem, opposing the very validity of the Apparition, giving
- > rise in the spirit to the dread that this whole affair is a
- > mystification, prepared by the Prince of Darkness. But how to
- > explain the concurrence of so many thousands of people of living
- > faith and ardent piety; introspection of the crowds; the
- > numerous resounding conversations caused by the events; the
- > appearance of extraordinary signs in the sky and on the Earth
- > and reconcile them with Divine Providence and the economy that
- > the rules the supernatural world, after the establishment of
- > Christianity, if the Devil is the cause of such or similar events?"

Now, read above his attempt to justify this matter of the skirt. . His thinking is very Jesuitical. He says that the effect of this (false) apparition on the people is good..... Do you think this gives him license to disregard the matter of the skirt. He apparently does and did, for the apparition was "approved". But this is not what I would call a scrutiny, nor the thinking of the Church. The Church does not teach that pious lying is acceptable. That is the Jesuit teaching and there are lots and lots of Catholics who subscribe to it, but it is not the teaching of the Catholic Church. .

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 5 years ago

Report Abuse

The following is a response to another of the kind professor's commentary notes, posted today October 11th. (By the way...what does one call an additional note that comes after one's own prior final note? RE: Commentary of Sept. 10, '09).

Once again, this new posting is of course all getting away from and distracting the reader from the central points of my critical review above, but it is the professor's choice to continue down this path of creating another new "strawman", diverting attention.

Whatever Mons. Carlos Azevedo said or did not say, or about his having been a presenter of one of the professor's new books at Porto in 2002, is for the good Mons. (now Bishop) himself to authenticate. Because the professor obviously knows the Bishop very well personally (according to his own description), and as a fellow countryman of his who speaks the same language, I issue the professor a challenge for him to contact Bishop Azevedo's office in Lisbon and ask him as an old friend and book presenter of his to reply in a new post to this commentary.

It would be however he would wish, but mainly regarding these statements that the professor has made on the Bishop's position and actions on the matter. If he was glad and willing to present the professor's new book for him at Porto in 2002 and then making those kind and supporting statements about it at the time, then certainly he would not now object to commenting anew and in truth on that prior 2002 experience.

If the Bishop does respond, then it will all be a matter of public record of his own position, but it still would not alter the outcome of my review of this particular book. However, if the Bishop fails to do to the professor's request, the reader can then decide for himself or herself as to what appears to be either an obvious difference of opinion with the professor as to the facts of the matter here or a lack of interest in giving some needed support to an old author friend. The future posting or lack of one by the Bishop should be the definitive indicator on this issue and the reader can then make a decision for himself or herself as to what would be the obvious facts of this particular situation.

Starting in 1982, the professor was a prime author of "Intervenção Extraterrestre em Fátima - as aparições e o fenómeno OVNI" (Amadora, Livraria Bertrand) ("Extraterrestrial Intervention in Fatima - the apparitions and the UFO phenomenon"). Since that time the professor has written or co-authored many other books on this same subject of Fatima and UFOs, including the latest series which had to be put in a trilogy form to accommodate all that he wanted to disseminate about his strong arguments of extraterrestrials in UFOs at Fatima in 1917.

In the "Introduction" section of "Celestial Secrets..." its author and the book's English editor and main American promoter Andrew D Basiago indicates (paraphrasing) that after the authors uncovered all of the hundreds of facts from the time of the apparitions, that the world had to be told that the Fatima Incident was the first major UFO case of the 20th century.

A multitude of other writers' and reviewers' similar statements are available, but they shouldn't be necessary. If the author is now disavowing and firmly rejecting any suggestion that he himself is an UFO believer as he apparently just wrote above, well... he could have fooled me...and apparently a lot of others too, but I suppose he has a right and privilege to now take that position, strange as it sounds, even after 30 years of strong authorship on the subject, if he so chooses.

I haven't discussed my own faith in this entire series of comments, because it has never been at issue with the actual subject of the review (nor should it be), although the professor would apparently like it to be drawn into this discussion.

But I will conclude today's posting by wishing the kind professor to also be happy with his own faith...whatever that happens to be. (Remember though, it's NOT UFOS).

Edmund J Grant

[Dr. Joaquim Fernandes](#) 5 years ago

Report Abuse

Mr. Edmund: you have any conditions to doubt of what I said here about Mons. Carlos Azevedo presentation of our book at the Book Porto Fair. I noted that you DOUBT. The last word concerning all the Fatima experiences core is far to be achieved. But I trust on the Future and a new knowledge to illuminate the shadows. Can we expect that you can DOUBT a little more in future about Lucia's reports ? You can check with him what he said once in 2002. A last word: you are wrong; I am NOT a UFO believer; I refused that label. I am an historian interested to study and compare the beliefs evolution along the human cultures. Sorry but I don't know to discuss with a firm believer in the same grounds. Be happy with your faith.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 5 years ago

Report Abuse

First of all, my thanks to Professor Fernandes for providing the summary of his extended studies work at the University that COMPARES languages and cognitive processes from religious experiences or "anomalous experiences". The long list of the distinguished scholars and Catholic clergy that he states he has invited to his scientific symposia at the University study sessions only invites attention to his efforts in this area. The actual attendees' list of these sessions would be interesting. I am sure that these study sessions have left many questions to which there are no easy answers currently available, and that it would have to be a very interesting exploration of a very esoteric subject.

I would suggest that most reasonable people of average intelligence would agree that "ignorance and superstition is not the best way to progress in our spirituality path." This statement is one with which that I heartily agree, but I submit that it is not one that would primarily only be found in the minds of distinguished scholars gathered at symposia.

Yes, I am familiar with the statements regarding the apparitions of Fatima from Pope Benedict XVI (or as former Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger), and his writings on the subject have assured us all that he is a very fervent believer that the Fatima events of 1917 were actual appearances of the Blessed Virgin Mary to the 3 children, with a message to the world to pray often and to do penance. The Holy Father's recent remarks were mainly a part of warnings given in the midst and

the wake of the various emotionally driven controversies over Lucia's 3rd secret and others of past history. He cautions us to avoid the use of excesses, sensationalism and apocalyptic prophecies and focus instead on Mary's core message, in which she directs us, as always, to her beloved Divine Son, the Lord Jesus.

The professor may not agree with my description of the authors' writing content regarding their Catholic Church references as being an "attack," but the total volume of the authors' remarks over the last 30 years about the Church's alleged fabrications, concoction of cover stories, and general conspiratorial conduct, these I would not take to be merely "comments made in passing". Components of several chapters of the authors' works focus heavily on just this issue alone.

An important correction to the professor's commentary follows...I did not review the book, "Fatima nos bastidores do Secredo", published in 2002, as he has stated above, and also of my ignoring of his fact as he states. I have instead reviewed the book "Celestial Secrets: The Hidden History of the Fatima Incident", published for the American market in 2006, and it was in this particular volume where I found the problems that were detailed in my review, primarily the lack of proper reference source use and reproduction. These are the "inconvenient facts" to which I referred, a descriptor that the professor apparently has enjoyed repeating in several ways in his posts. It is significant that inside all of the introductory pages of "Celestial Secrets..." there is not one indication that it is a reprint or a translation of any other previously published volume, and there shouldn't be either, although I'm sure that a lot of the same material was probably used in both.

However, what we all do know is that "Celestial Secrets..." was a product of heavy promotion and editing for the American market by a controversial amateur scientist Andrew D. Basiago for a 2006-publication year. The previously mentioned book of 2002 vintage was not ignored by me at all, as it would have had no bearing whatsoever on anyone attempting a review of "Celestial Secrets...", published in English 4 years later. Once again, there is no burden or requirement on a reviewer who cites many improper reference source use errors found in a single, particular volume, to be familiar with most other or all documentation that was ever written on this very complex subject.

A presenter of a book at a Book Fair such as Msgr. Azevedo was alleged to have been in Porto in 2002 according to the professor, would usually be offering tacit or at least quasi-approval of the book's contents. I would invite and leave it to Msgr. (now Bishop) Carlos Azevedo of Lisbon to respond as to the exact accuracy of this statement made in the above commentary. Although I am sure the good Bishop is very knowledgeable about most of the Fatima records, I

sincerely doubt if he has all of the phrases of Fatima documentation as well as the authors' use of those same phrases, committed to his memory.

The professor alleges again that the good Msgr. Azevedo "expressed to the public that our work deserves attention and it should be studied"...well I for one have done just that and it is now available for viewing as posted above as "The Lady of the Carrasqueira".

Edmund Grant

[Dr. Joaquim Fernandes](#) 5 years ago

Report Abuse

Mr. Grant, I can assure that this kind of discussion does not deserve irritation. There are other much more good causes for apply my energy. If you agree I will put here a final note of this discussion that has an information deficit: our study COMPARES languages and cognitive processes both in religious or profane "anomalous experiences", rather than explain the overall picture of the events. We opened hypothesis, not dogmas, trying to locate and extract parallels. Nor Virgin Mary nor ET's seems to us the ultimate answer for this kind of "subjective experiences", as Pope Benedict XVI remarks. If you still belief that I am trying to "attack Catholic Church, sorry; I can not do much more. Anyone before us had take that challenge related to Fatima reports. I must reveal a fact you ignore: this so "inconvenient" volume you review ("Fátima nos bastidores do Segredo") was presented here in Portugal at the Book Fair of Porto, 2002, by the current director for the "Documentação Crítica de Fátima, Mons. Carlos Azevedo, now co-Bishop of Lisbon, the most tolerant person I meet and an catholic thinker with whom is one want to discuss. In that presentation, Mons. Carlos Azevedo - you will agree that he knows well and deeply ALL the Fatima records ! - he expressed to the public that our work deserves attention and it should be studied. I currently invite for scientific symposia at the University other national eminent members of Catholic Church, from S.J. Company or O.P. Congregation, such as Dr. Alfredo Dinis, S.J., or Fr. Bento Domingos O.P., to mention only two example of well informed and open-minded religious scholars that feels that ignorance and superstition if not the best way to progress in our spirituality path. The same for foreigners thinkers as Dr. Corbally, from Vatican Observatory, Dr. Jacques Arnould, O.P., from Toulouse Sapce Agency and many others guest of our meetings. Our "inconvenient" research on Fatima events 1917 will rest against as a fair and honest approach of well-known understandings of our minds and cognitive errors. I repeat that future will elucidate us of the "apparitions" essence. May be we can encounter in that Future.

[This comment was deleted on Sep 8, 2009 8:04:15 PM]

[This comment was deleted on Sep 8, 2009 8:05:06 PM]

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 5 years ago

Report Abuse

My thanks goes out to Professor Joachim Fernandes for taking the time to again provide his commentaries posted to this book review thread over the last several days. I am pleasantly surprised that he obviously has felt that my book review of "Celestial Secrets..." posted above has merited his 3 commentary posts over such a short period.

Unfortunately, the professor has once again structured his earlier response of 5:06 AM today in an identical way to his first commentary of Sept. 3rd , by including another "straw-man" defensive ploy but he now throws-in some strong personal attack rhetoric in the process. His barely disguised strong inferences imply that I must be an obsessive North-American Fatima devotee, whose thinking falls into the fanatic group category that subscribes to a "blind-faith" in the Marian oriented belief system of the Fatima events of 1917. Nothing is further from the truth!.

This surprising personal attack coming from Professor Fernandes reeks of desperation, as the author knows absolutely nothing of my own belief systems, nor membership associations, nor of any of my activities of support for or against any Fatima causes. All of this has now come my way because of my review's criticism of the authors' literary methods and their lack of preservation of the integrity of their own references sources, used liberally by them in the book under review. My own private beliefs have not been enumerated here and they should not influence a professional reviewers work, in any case. Whether I am a member of any Fatima focused group or not, it does not make me unqualified to perform a serious literary review of "Celestial Secrets...". The volume was written in plain ordinary English and I had the reference source used by the authors in my personal possession. So to make a comparison of the referenced text material was a relatively simple exercise. I believe that anyone's cursory and unbiased reading of my original review of "C.S" posted above would come to that conclusion.

I'm sorry to again disappoint the professor and to disabuse another pet theory of his once again, but the unvarnished truth is that I am not currently a member of any of the several well known American, European, International, organizations or any other support group or group-think category that defends or promulgates the Catholic Church's version of the unique events of Fatima in 1917. This statement doesn't betray any of my personal beliefs either pro or con, it is just a statement of fact. Even if I was a member, that would change nothing insofar as the content of this book review is concerned. It was not an effort on my part to

detail or convince anyone of the numerous components of my own personal Fatima events belief system. Sorry!. You can throw that fanatic line away forever.

The highly irritated professor was obviously uncomfortable once again with defending the critical examples of reference use that were stated in my review. He apparently preferred to try to morph the commentary into an exchange of views around the types of people that would hold views that would run counter to his own strongly held views of the UFOlogy at Fatima position.

I'm sorry professor, maybe someday we can have a debate on the particular merits of that subject, but that is not what this review is all about. Maybe on another day, in another forum.

Nice try!!... at again avoiding the core critical points of my review but really...the personal attack rhetoric is all totally uncalled for, unbecoming for a distinguished college professor who is embarrassing himself and it betrays the real motives of the man..

I know that there are many devotees existing out there that believe in the use of UFOlogy theories to explain many unusual events. These beliefs of their's are for them to decide for themselves, without any help or criticism from me, and I have no quarrel with them. However, one does not have to be immersed in years of Fatima documents research to reach any conclusions about the writers' proper use of reference material chosen by the writers, not chosen by me, to promulgate a belief system of their own choosing, when both texts are laid open bare to the eyes.

The "inconvenient facts" that I referred to in my review were focused intentionally on my own simple examples given of my review's core criticisms, any other so-called "distortions and also falsified data" that you have claimed to have found notwithstanding. I'm sorry, the burden is not on the reviewer to verify or to not verify the entire collection of all documentation available in the "Documentacao..." Volumes or elsewhere in Fatima. However, to merit a credible working theory of one's own beliefs, it is incumbent on any writer to be very meticulous on the proper reproduction and use of reference material and context cited in the authors' text, that was originally produced from another source. To do otherwise, any writer including myself would risk a judgment of total incredibility from readers on the entire portfolio of a writer's production, not only of a selected single product.

[This comment was deleted on Sep 8, 2009 7:19:54 AM]

[Dr. Joaquim Fernandes](#) 5 years ago
Report Abuse

I see that North-American Fatima devotees are mostly obsessive with the alleged Fatima "message". The existence of fanatic groups, more "fatimists than Fatima" justify this blindness and posture that try to ignore ALL the political-social and cultural-mental parameters of the Fatima 1917 events. The Secret never dies, it needs to be feed, replicated ny the believers, as we know today from the current ET messages studied now by social scientist. If there is any assumption or lesson to take from Fatima perceptive process this is: any time/place culture produce its own meanings: the Marian iconography ONLY made sense in a rural and ignorant Portugal 1917 as the Alien/ET iconography emerged as an technological/scientific avatar of those religious representations in our contemporary societies. If we can repeat Fatima today what kind of belief system would be registered ?

I respect ALL the preconceptions in religion but I must inform Edmund Grant that the data studied in our research is more than those once can get from "Dcumentação Crítica" volumes. We found a lot of distortions and also falsified data, such as dates for example, among all the papers produced by Lucia's confessors as we proved in the "Celestial Secrets" title. So, we can talk about the so-called "inconvenient facts" if we ignore all the other reports and witnesses counterparts.

I want let here a final thought: the Catholicism is much more than Fatima 1917 and popular "Marian cult", an oriental heritage from Asia Minor goddess-mother tradition (Artemis, Diana, and others) that wins at Efeso Concilium (431 d.C) the Mary christotokos formula (Mary that conceive God !). Recently, Benedict XVI, alias Joseph Ratzinger suggested the Portuguese bishops at a Vatican meeting to prevent the excess of Marianism in Catholic Church intervention. I suggest any reader to read the Pope's interpretation of the "Private revelations" as Fatima 1917: an useful guide into human mental and cultural behavior, as we try to show in our 3th volume "Fatima Revisited". The Popes recognize that any message is a personal and subjective construct by the possibilities of each one; so this means that each particular culture acts as a model to the final result and contents of it. So, I invite Edmund Grant to read that document with the eyes of intelligence - and not only with his indisputable faith. Nevertheless, I think this quest for the truth is a fascinating one, and one which leaves us in no doubt that the traditional account of what happened at Fatima is sadly inadequate. I hope that future centuries will let us know the Truth.

[EDMUND J. GRANT](#) 5 years ago

Report Abuse

It should be noted that the professor's commentary of 09-03-09 has apparently elected to not respond to any of my several examples of the misuse of the book's footnoted sources that are given as the core elements of my critical review of this book. These examples cite the lack of quality reproduction of reference material directed by the authors' footnotes as having been taken from certain numbered

pages of the Fatima Shrine's Volume I of "Documentacao Critica de Fatima: Interrogatorios aos Videntes - 1917".

The commentary obviously chose instead to erect and then defend a "straw-man" issue that consists of his perception of my lack of letting others look for more prosaic answers than my own, regarding the Marian devotion at Fatima. That assumption on his part is of course a flawed one, but I suppose it is easier to defend oneself from a self-created subjective issue, instead of from a lot of the inconvenient facts that I detailed in the review.

I would want to assure the kind professor that I am a very tolerant individual who will always defend another's right to have a different point of view or belief system than my own. My library contains many well written, well reasoned volumes from authors on subjects on which I have a different point of view, on many religious and scientific matters.

The professor has to date participated in the writing of several books on the subject of UFOs at Fatima, going back over the last 30 years. Some have been written in Portuguese and now there is an English translation of 3 more that are a part of this recent trilogy. Honestly, I think the professor really has had ample time, opportunity and freedom to express his point of view on his UFO/FATIMA belief system, and I obviously have not stopped him from looking for prosaic answers to this belief system.

Not ever having been to Fatima myself, I have of course not visited its archives, nor have I looked at all of the published bibliography about those events. Nevertheless, I don't see that it has somehow left me as any less qualified to pick up a well written legitimate reference book such as "Documentacao Critica de Fatima, Vol I..." and make a judgment as to whether its words and context have been legitimately represented in another text that has used it as a direct reference in footnotes, for the use of its own words. The integrity of the use of the reference's material and its context was either preserved or it was not. I believe that I have demonstrated that it was not. IMHO.

Edmund Grant

[Dr. Joaquim Fernandes](#) 5 years ago
Report Abuse

Anyone can believe what one wants: that Sun goes around Earth; there are angels; Earth was created seven thousands ago; that Mary Mother was in flesh and bones at Fatima speaking with three young people; others believe that aliens

also come down into Earth to speak with Earth people. What is different ? The cultural context.

Both are system of belief expressions. Nor one nor another have any kind of superiority. Marian devotes or/and alien believers are made of the same stuff: belief. But belief is NOT an argument for TRUTH. Only a brief and temporary illusion that lead us to understand how our knowledge about cosmos is ridiculous and it needs for gods and goddess interventions. Nor the author's comment nor any other foreign writer went into Fatima sanctuary archive nor consulted AL the published bibliography about those events. When we want discuss Fatima 1917 we have to know ALL the political, social and cultural parameters of its context. There are no single events for any serious historian. If his Marian devotion helps OK be happy with it but let the others look for more prosaic answers