

Clarification and Dialogue Regarding the Movement for a Fifth Marian Dogma and the Reported Amsterdam Apparitions

MARK MIRAVALLE, S.T.D.

In the 2021 issue of *Marianum* (released January 2022), an article entitled, “La Controversa Questione delle ‘Apparizioni Mariane di Amsterdam’ e Il Tema della Mediazione e della Reiterata Richiesta del V Dogma Mariano” (“The Controversial Question of the ‘Marian Apparitions of Amsterdam’ and the Theme of Mediation and the Repeated Request for the V Marian Dogma”)² was authored by Italian theologian, Fr. S. Perrella, S.M. While the over seventy-page article poses numerous theological statements that certainly lend themselves to further dialogue and debate, there are also certain hypotheses presented in the article which, unfortunately, are based on complete and serious factual and historical errors.

I will here offer a synthesized clarification in seven points to certain theological arguments presented in the article, inclusive of the necessary correction of direct factual errors hypothetically asserted by the author. These corrections are important for anyone who seeks an objective and honest analysis of the international Catholic movement, *Vox Populi Mariae Mediatrici*, which seeks the solemn definition of the Virgin Mary as the Spiritual Mother of All Peoples. They are likewise essential for those truly and sincerely interested in an objective and theologically professional evaluation of the reported Amsterdam apparitions in pursuit of a just and proper application of the 1978 norms of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith in evaluating private revelation.

1. The *Vox Populi Mariae Mediatrici* movement constitutes an international Catholic movement spanning five continents with an international representation of over 180 countries. The movement has the support of over 600 cardinals and bishops, and over 8 million faithful globally. To represent this movement, therefore, as an “American” movement of “soliciting” petitions (p. 264), could give the mistaken impression that this movement is predominantly American in nature and scope, rather than a documented global movement which has received

² Salvatore M. Perrella, “La Controversa Questione delle ‘Apparizioni di Amsterdam’ e il Tema della Mediazione e della Reiterata Richiesta del V Dogma Mariano,” *Marianum* 83 (2021): 257–328.

more petitions in a quarter century than any other petition movement in the history of the Catholic Church.

The article reports a response of “justified perplexity” (p. 265) by the Holy See and the Pontifical Marian Academy [PAMI]³ to this international petition drive. If accurate, this response is puzzling. Why would a worldwide request of the People of God in the form of 8 million petitions—joined by hundreds of global cardinals and bishops—constitute a reason for “justified perplexity” on the part of the Holy See and PAMI? Should it not rather be a response of “ecclesial openness” and “synodal listening” to the largest per annum petition drive in Catholic history? This seemingly dismissive response appears to run antithetical to the current “synodal way” which is so strongly being directed by the Holy See. Moreover, this apparently negative disposition runs contrary to the esteemed counsel of St. John Henry Cardinal Newman, so consistently referenced at the Council, who in his famous 1859 treatise on “Consulting the Faithful on Matters of Doctrine” instructs that when examining the possibility of a dogma related to devotional elements (as is the case concerning the potential definition of Our Lady’s Spiritual Motherhood), that the *voice of the laity should be specifically consulted and preeminently respected*: “In most cases when a definition is contemplated, the laity will have a testimony to give; but if ever there be an instance when they ought to be consulted, it is in the case of doctrines which bear directly upon devotional sentiments.”⁴

2. All bishops and theologians of the *Vox Populi* Movement who have written in support of a new Marian dogma have likewise been ardent supporters of the Second Vatican Council, and have consistently articulated the Council’s clear and unambiguous teaching on Our Lady’s unique, active and subordinate cooperation in the Redemption accomplished by Jesus Christ.⁵

It seems unfair and misleading to assert that theological and episcopal “advocates” of this new dogma are guilty of an “underestimation”

³ PAMI = Pontificia Academia Mariana Internationalis.

⁴ John Henry Newman, “Consulting the Faithful on Matters of Doctrine,” *The Rambler*, p. 33. (penultimate page in most editions).

⁵ See, for example, the three Mariological volumes of *Mary Co-redemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate: Theological Foundations I, II, III*, Queenship Publishing, 1997-2001; and the nine volume Mariological series, *Mary at the Foot of the Cross*, Academy of the Immaculate, 2000-2009.

of the teachings of the Council (pp. 265-266). The rationale posited for this assertion is the alleged failure of fifth Marian dogma supporters to integrate adequately Mary's cooperation in the Redemption and her mediation of grace "with her multiform maternal intercession of grace, mercy, example, and spiritual maternity."⁶ Such an accusation, however, fails to see that supporters of the new dogma find much support for their position in the council itself. Vatican II, for example, articulates Mary's active cooperation in the overall redemptive mission of Christ, which necessarily includes the Redeemer's role in the historical acquisition of redemptive graces. *Lumen Gentium*, 56, 57, 58, and 61 all refer to Mary's active cooperation in the Redemption, as numerous texts and articles of supporters of the Fifth Marian Dogma, once again, dynamically and repeatedly articulate.⁷ *Lumen Gentium* does not limit itself to Mary's "application and distribution" of graces. It also affirms her active participation in the objective historical obtaining of grace with and under Christ. To fail to see this would, ironically, be an actual underestimation of the Council's Marian teaching. St. John Paul II's papal commentary on Vatican II's Marian teaching authoritatively reiterates that Mary's subordinate role with Jesus culminating at Calvary "contributed to the Redemption of all."⁸ St. John Paul's encyclical teaching, which remains the mouthpiece of the ordinary and universal papal magisterium, likewise teaches that Mary "shares in the gift which the Son makes of himself" on Calvary, and that she "offers Jesus" for the same redemptive goal—both acts which constitute a true cooperation in the one-time historic attainment of the graces human redemption:

Standing by the cross of Jesus" (Jn. 19:25), Mary shares in the gift which the Son makes of himself: *she offers Jesus, gives*

⁶ Perrella, 266. It should be noted that Fr. Perrella, in the same article also acknowledges Mary's role in the acquisition of grace: "Coredemption (historical-messianic cooperation) and Mediation (celestial cooperation) are always relative and successive one to the other, and together they express the two significant and supportive moments of Mary's spiritual maternity towards humanity, namely—to express it in the classical language—: the *action of the acquisition of Grace* and that of its *application* to individual men and women redeemed by Christ" (p. 321).

⁷ See the three Mariological volumes of *Mary Co-redemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate: Theological Foundations I, II, III*, Queenship Publishing, 1997-2001; and the nine volume Mariological series, *Mary at the Foot of the Cross*, Academy of the Immaculate, 2000-2009.

⁸ St. John Paul II, Apostolic Letter, *Sabvific Doloris*, Feb. 11, 1984, no. 25.

him over, and begets him to the end for our sake. The "yes" spoken on the day of the Annunciation reaches full maturity on the day of the Cross, when the time comes for Mary to receive and beget as her children all those who become disciples, pouring out upon them the saving love of her Son: "When Jesus saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved standing near, he said to his mother, "Woman, behold, your son!" (Jn. 19:26).⁹

3. The *Vox Populi Mariae Mediatrici* petition requests the solemn definition of Mary's singular doctrinal role as Spiritual Mother of All Peoples, inclusive of her three maternal functions as Co-redemptrix, Mediatrix, and Advocate. The article asserts that the petition for a fifth Marian dogma requests the "dogmatization of the titles of Co-redemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate" which "have their own history and their own different content between them, and for this reason cannot be used indifferently" (p. 263). This objection fails to recognize that the three titles of Co-redemptrix, Mediatrix, and Advocate denote *three specific expressions of the one common doctrine of Mary's spiritual Motherhood*. In harmonized unity, Mary's role as human Co-redemptrix constitutes her maternal suffering with Christ (cf. LG 58) in order to "restore supernatural life to souls" (LG 61). Her role as Mediatrix of all graces manifests her function as "mother to us in the order of grace" (LG 61), that "taken up to heaven, she did not lay aside her saving office, but by her manifold intercession continues to bring us the gifts of eternal life" (LG 62). Her role as "Advocate" (LG 62) expresses her maternal function of protection and defense for humanity through her motherly intercession.¹⁰

Three maternal roles do not conclude to three mothers. Nor are her three specific maternal functions within her overall spiritual maternity interchangeable. Rather, this doctrinal truth reveals one mother, the Mother of all humanity, who manifests her powerful spiritual maternity at the service of both Christ and humanity as the Mother Suffering, the Mother nourishing, the Mother pleading in seeking, as true subordinate mediation demands "to unite man to God."¹¹

⁹ St. John Paul II, Encyclical, *Evangelium Vitae*, March 25, 1995, n. 103.

¹⁰ It should be noted that various Mariologists have used the three titles in reference to Mary's role in the work of redemption, her mediation of grace, and her advocacy as spiritual Mother. See J.M. Friethoff, OP, *A Complete Mariology* (London, 1958) and G. Alastruey, *Tratado de la Virgen Santissima* (Madrid, 1952).

¹¹ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, III, Q. 26, a. 1.

The international *Vox Populi votum* does not constitute a “triple dogma” request of three unrelated Marian titles, any more than the three complimentary aspects of *virginitas ante partum*, *virginitas in partu*, and *virginitas post partum*, contained in the dogma of Our Lady’s Virginité constitute a “triple dogma.” Only a failure to understand the organic complementarity of these three specific maternal aspects of her one spiritual Motherhood in relation to humanity would lead to the mistaken conclusion of its non-definability in a single dogmatic declaration.

4. The 20th century movement for a fifth Marian dogma was initiated by the renowned prelate and scholar, Désiré Cardinal Mercier, a cardinal of international pre-eminence during the first decades of the 20th century. Mercier’s Mariological-petition movement, which itself gathered hundreds of cardinal and bishop endorsements, as well as hundreds of thousands of petitions from clergy, religious, and faithful, similarly petitioned for the dogmatic definition of Our Lady’s universal mediation of grace under various formulations.¹² In his many documents, Mercier associated the theological foundation of her Spiritual Maternity upon Marian coredeemption.¹³ The three papal commissions established by Pius XI to study the definability of the Mercier petition reportedly accumulated well over 2500 pages of theological support for the proposed Marian dogma.¹⁴ Once again, the principal Mariological foundation for her spiritual maternity by world class Mariologists (e.g., the Spanish Jesuit, José Bover) was her role as human Co-redemptrix with the Redeemer.¹⁵

It would be unjustly minimizing to the Mariological and historical significance of the stature and magnitude of Mercier’s movement for a fifth Marian dogma to dismiss it with only a passing comment as to its “theological”, “linguistic”, “pastoral” and “ecumenical” inadequacies (p. 259). In fact, the international meeting of Mariologists in Rome on Dec. 1,

¹² NB: “Universal Mediation of Grace”, “Mediatrice of all graces”, and “Spiritual Motherhood” were also common formulations related to the proposed fifth Marian dogma used by Mercier and others at the time over the years of petitioning from 1906 to 1925, cf. Manfred Hauke, *Mary, Mediatrix of Grace, Mary’s Universal Mediation of Grace in the Theological and Pastoral Works of Cardinal Mercier*, Academy of the Immaculate, 2004, pp.17-91.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

1950 chose to continue the essence of the Mercier petition with a collective *votum* to Pope Pius XII for the dogmatic definition of Our Lady's universal mediation, and that just one month following the dogmatic definition of the Assumption. Moreover, over 400 hundred bishops sought the continuation of the heart of the Mercier petition for defining Mary's mediation under various Mariological formulations at the initial stages of the Second Vatican Council.¹⁶ To assert, therefore, that the substantive 20th century Mercier movement for a fifth Marian dogma just "faded way" after his death in 1926 would be both historically and theologically inaccurate.

There is, furthermore, a critical imperative for contemporary post-conciliar Mariology to incorporate the papal wisdom and instruction of Pope Benedict XVI for a positive and unifying "hermeneutic of continuity," rather than a negative and divisive "hermeneutics of rupture." This should be substantively implemented between pre-conciliar and post-conciliar Mariology in general, and the pre-conciliar and post-conciliar petition for the dogma of Mary's Spiritual Maternity in specific.

The historic precedent of the dogma of the Assumption, first requested by hundreds of bishops at the First Vatican Council, then declined due to a judgement of inopportuneness, only later to be solemnly defined in the century to follow, serves as one fruitful example of an authentic Mariological hermeneutic of continuity.

5. The Co-redemptrix title has been used in papal addresses on at least 9 occasions by Pope St. John Paul II XI and Pius XI before him.¹⁷

¹⁶ Cf. Michael O'Carroll, "Mediation" in *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, Michael Glazier, 1982, p. 242.

¹⁷ Cf. Pius XI, *Allocution to Pilgrims from Vicenza, Italy*, November 30, 1933, *L'Osservatore Romano*, Dec. 1, 1933, 1; Pius XI, *Allocution to Spanish Pilgrims*, *L'Osservatore Romano*, March 25, 1934, 1; Pius XI, *Radio Message for the Closing of the Holy Year at Lourdes*, *L'Osservatore Romano*, April 29-30, 1935, 1.

¹⁷ Pius XI, *Allocution to Pilgrims from Vicenza, Italy*, November 30, 1933, *L'Osservatore Romano*, Dec. 1, 1933, 1; see also Domenico Bertetto, S.D.B., ed. *Discorsi di Pio XI* 2:1013; John Paul II, General Audience, 10 December 1980 (*Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo* [Inseg] II, III/2 [1980], p. 1646); General Audience 8 September 1982 (*Inseg* V/3 [1982], p. 404); Angelus Address 4 November, 1984 (*Inseg* VII/2 [1984], p. 1151); Discourse at World Youth Day 31 March 1985 (*Inseg* VIII/1 [1985], p. 889-890); Address to the Sick 24 March, 1990 (*Inseg* XIII/1 [1990], p. 743); Discourse of 6 October, 1991 (*Inseg* XIV/2 [1991], p. 756). Moreover, in a homily in Guayaquil, Ecuador on January 31, 1985, John Paul II spoke of the "co-

Lumen Gentium 25 speaks about the “frequency” of papal statements as a criterion in indicating its authoritative level.¹⁸ The Co-redemptrix title was approved three times by congregations of the Holy See under the pontificate of Pope St. Pius X (twice directly by the Holy Office).¹⁹ Pope Leo XIII had already approved a laud of Mary as the “co-redemptrix of the world” in 1885.²⁰

René Laurentin stated earlier in his theological career that in light of the papal usage of the Co-redemptrix title, it “would at least be gravely temerarious to attack its legitimacy.”²¹ Laurentin went on to conclude that in light of its repeated papal-magisterial incorporation “it is certain that the use of co-redemptrix is now legitimate,”²² and this long before John Paul’s six time repetition of the title.

The co-redemptrix term constitutes a single word denotation of the doctrine of Marian coredemption. Marian coredemption is consistently

redemptive role of Mary (*el papel corredentor de María: Inseg VIII* [1985], p. 319), which was translated as “Mary’s role as Co-redemptrix” in *L’Osservatore Romano*, English ed., March 11, 1985. Cf. also A. Calkins, “Pope John Paul II’s Ordinary Magisterium on Marian Coredemption,” *Mary at the Foot of the Cross*, Vol. II, New Bedford, MA, Academy of the Immaculate, 2002.

¹⁸ Second Vatican Council, *Lumen gentium*, n. 25.

¹⁹Congregation of Rites, *Decretum quo festum Dolorum B. M. V., Dominicæ tertiæ Septembris affixum, ad ritum duplicem secundæ classis elevatur pro universa Ecclesia* (May 13, 1908) *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, 41 [1908] in which the Congregation itself uses the Co-redemptrix title in granting the feast of the Seven Sorrows of Mary to be raised to the rank of double class; the Congregation of the Holy Office also uses the title, Co-redemptrix, in a decree of June 26, 1913, *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* [AAS] 5[1913], 364; and in another decree of January 22, 1914, AAS 6, [1914], 108.

²⁰ See Pope Leo XIII’s approval of Lauds to Jesus and Mary on July 18, 1885. One laud refers to Mary as “co-redemptrix of the world” (*corredentrice del mondo*). See *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* [ASS] 18 [1885] p. 93.

²¹ René Laurentin, *Le Titre de Corédemptrice: Étude historique*, Editions “Marianum; Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, Rome, 1951, p. 28: “*Il serait gravement téméraire, pour le moins, de s’attaquer à sa légitimité.*”

²² *Ibid.*, p.36: “*Ce qu’il y a de certain, c’est l’emploi de corredemptrice est dès maintenant légitime.*” N.B. Clearly, Laurentin’s position changed on the subject in later years, but his personal change of position does not in itself negate the legitimacy of his earlier theological rationale in defense of the Co-redemptrix title.

taught in conciliar teaching and even further developed in the Papal Magisterium of St. John Paul II.²³ It is therefore surprising to see a certain pattern by some mariologists of methodologically “passing over” the vast Mariological contribution of St. John Paul II when discussing post-conciliar Mariology in general and Marian coredeemption in specific, and instead returning back to St. Paul VI’s *Marialis Cultus* of 1974, almost as if it were the last relevant papal post-conciliar instruction in Mariology. This, too, would represent a certain unwarranted selectivity regarding papal discourse on authentic Mariological development.

On the topic of Marian papal teaching and possible selectivity, the article presents long, complete quotations of the 3 addresses in which our present Holy Father, Pope Francis, adds *ex tempore* comments, negative in connotation, concerning the Co-redemptrix title, which were offered “off the cuff” in two homilies and one Wednesday audience. Yet, the article contains no papal quotations of the six usages of the Co-redemptrix title by Pope St. John Paul II, which were at times surrounded by a rich Mariological commentary on the Council’s treatment on Marian coredeemption in *Lumen Gentium* 58;²⁴ nor quotations of the three papal references of Pius XI, one of which includes an actual explanation and defense of the Co-redemptrix title.²⁵ This, then, could give the appearance of a theological double standard regarding the significance, or lack thereof, of non-encyclical papal texts.

6. The historical and personal motivations for the origins of the *Vox Populi Mariae Mediatrici* movement have, in fact, absolutely no intrinsic relevance to the question of a solemn definition of Spiritual mediation. The

²³ Cf. A. Calkins, “Pope John Paul II’s Ordinary Magisterium on Marian Coredeemption,” *Mary at the Foot of the Cross*, Vol. II, New Bedford, MA, Academy of the Immaculate, 2002; A. Calkins, “Pope John Paul’s Teaching on Marian Coredeemption,” *Mary Co-redemptrix, Mediatrix, Advocate Theological Foundations II: Papal, Pneumatological, Ecumenical, Queenship*, Santa Barbara, pp. 113-149.

²⁴ For example, in a homily in Guayaquil, Ecuador on January 31, 1985, John Paul II spoke of the “co-redemptive role of Mary (*el papel corredentor de María: Inseg VIII* [1985], p. 319), which was translated as “Mary’s role as Co-redemptrix” in *L’Osservatore Romano*, English ed., March 11, 1985, within the context of five paragraphs of rich Mariology on Marian coredeemption in light of *Lumen Gentium* 58.

²⁵ Cf. Pius XI, *Allocution to Pilgrims from Vicenza, Italy*, November 30, 1933, *L’Osservatore Romano*, Dec. 1, 1933, 1.

latter issue must be based on a) the doctrine's solid presence in the sources of divine revelation; and b) its opportuneness, with the ultimate discernment coming from the Successor of Peter. With this expressed disclaimer as to the theological irrelevance of this issue, I will succinctly identify the original motivation for initiating this movement for the sake of factual clarification in light of mistaken postulations.

Vox Populi Mariae Mediatrici was initiated after reading numerous Mariology texts of the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's which spoke of the definition of variations of Our Lady's mediation with such manifest certainty that several treatises concluded with the implication of not "if" but rather "when" this doctrine would soon be solemnly defined.²⁶ It was after reading several such articles that I decided, in October 1991, to meet with the curial cardinal, Edouard Cardinal Gagnon, at past President of the Pontifical Council on the Family as well as President of the Pontifical Committee for Eucharistic Conference in Rome, who at that time had already submitted a significant number of episcopal endorsements for the fifth Marian Dogma to the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. It was at that time decided to essentially revive the Mercier campaign for a fifth Marian dogma through Mercier's threefold approach of theological support, ecclesiastical support from the hierarchy, and petitions from the lay faithful. It is a matter of historical fact that the *Vox Populi Mariae Mediatrici movement was neither founded nor based upon any private revelation*. It was only in the years following the 1991 meeting with Cardinal Gagnon, as word spread of the VPMM movement, that I was first introduced to the reported Amsterdam apparitions.

It is therefore a gross historical and factual error, completely bereft of any evidence, to propose the "disturbing hypothesis" (p. 286 ff) that *Vox Populi Mariae Mediatrici* was in any way founded or influenced by the wildly heretical, absurdly false apparitions claimed by the Canadian woman, Marie-Paule Giguère and her pseudo-apparitional "Army of Mary" movement.²⁷ I had absolutely no knowledge of these flagrantly false mystical claims throughout the early years of the *Vox Populi* Movement. Only years later did

²⁶ For two such examples, cf. S. Robichaud, S.M., "Dispensatrix of All Graces" in J.B. Carol, *Mariology*, Volume II, Bruce Publishing, pp. 426-458; J.B. Carol "Marian Coredeemption", J.B. Carol, *Mariology*, Volume II, pp. 377-424.

²⁷ On Marie-Paule Giguère and the Army of Mary, see Robert Fastiggi, "The Rise and Fall of the Army of Mary (*L'Armée de Marie*)" *Marian Studies* Volume LXIII (2012): 121-155.

I first hear of this unfortunately troubled woman who thought herself the reincarnation of Mary, and further perceived that herself and Mary combined constituted the “fourth person of the Trinity”!

I must unequivocally state that this hypothetical assertion in the above-mentioned article with absolutely no evidence to support it (nor could there be in light of its utter falsity) constitutes a theological and ethical violation of the norms of authentic scholarship, fundamental respect for personal dignity and reputation, let alone the dictates of Christian charity. Unfounded hypotheses may be acceptable in abstract philosophy or investigative fiction, but they have no legitimate place in respected journals of Theology such as the *Marianum*. Standard ethical norms of secular journalism, let alone the Christian responsibility and theological scholarship that should govern Catholic scholarly journals, rightly call for a complete public retraction of this slanderous, fictitious assertion by both author and publisher.

Let us, therefore, return to a theologically and factually based dialogue and analysis of the fifth Marian dogma issue, to be evaluated on its own merits or lack thereof in responsible avoidance of *ad hominem*, *post hoc propter hoc*, or all other forms of fallacious distractions.

7. The reported Amsterdam apparitions presently hold the status of a *non constat de supernaturalitate* apparition (i.e., the supernatural character has not been confirmed) in light of the December 30, 2020 statement of Bishop Henricks of Harlem-Amsterdam. This statement sought to return the previous 18 year standing status of *constat de supernaturalitate*, i.e., consisting of a supernatural origin (as declared by his predecessor, Bishop Josef Punt on May 31, 2002) back to a 1974 position of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. The 1974 CDF statement is not one of *constat de non supernaturalitate*, a category still in use at the time, which indicates that an alleged apparition is not supernatural. This return to the 1974 status fails to take into consideration over 40 years of positive development, which includes several written statements by the CDF itself to the Diocese of Haarlem in support of a more positive stance regarding the devotion to the reported apparitions;²⁸ as well as the active participation of numerous

²⁸ Cf. Bishop Josef Punt, “Bishop Answers Request For Clarifications Regarding the Amsterdam Apparitions,” *Mother Of All Peoples*, <https://www.mothersofallpeoples.com/post/bishop-answers-request-for-clarification-regarding-the-amsterdam-apparitions>, September 15, 2020.

cardinals and bishops in the annual Lady of All Nations Prayer days in Amsterdam during this nearly two decade period. It remains an interesting canonical/ecclesiastical question as to whether a succeeding bishop has the authority to overturn a declaration of a preceding bishop. Certainly, the CDF has such authority according to the 1978 CDF norms of evaluation²⁹ after a new objective investigation of the designated apparition (which, incidentally, does not appear to have taken place in this case). But in the Amsterdam case, it was not the CDF that officially changed the new Amsterdam status, but rather a declaration by the succeeding bishop. Could then, for example, Fatima's *constat de supernaturalitate* status be legitimately overturned by a future succeeding bishop of Leiria-Fatima?

Amsterdam, therefore, is not a condemned “non-apparition”, but a reported apparition whose supernatural authority has not been confirmed or “fixed”, along with a present restriction on the promulgation of the message, according to the German, French, Spanish, and Italian references to the 1974 CDF statement recorded on the Vatican website.³⁰ These reported apparitions should rightly receive a comprehensive theological, scientific and psychological analysis to justify any juridical change in canonical status—something similar to the comprehensive process undergone regarding the reported Medjugorje apparitions, which likewise presently possess the *non constat* status.

Unfortunately, the article does not truly provide a substantial contribution to a much-needed objective and impartial theological/scientific/psychological analysis of the reported Amsterdam event according to CDF Norms. For example, in the place of a professional theological analysis of the reported message based on primary sources, the author instead quotes an extended secondary source summary of the reported message/event (pp. 286-289), and then uses over 10 pages of text in discussing, once again, the blatantly false Army of Mary event and the pseudo-visionary, Marie-Paule Giguère (pp 289-299ff).

²⁹ Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, *Norms of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith in the Manner of Proceeding in Examining Alleged Apparitions and Revelations*, Feb. 25, 1978.

³⁰ Cf. For various translations of 1974 CDF Statement on Amsterdam status, cf. Dr. Robert Fastiggi, “The Amsterdam Apparitions: Where Are We now?”, Mother of All Peoples, <https://www.motherofallpeoples.com/post/the-amsterdam-apparitions-where-are-we-now> posted March, 2021.

The principal justification for the article's perennial effort to associate Amsterdam with the Army of Mary is that the pseudo-visionary, Marie-Paule, made repeated efforts to connect herself with the Amsterdam visionary, Ida Peerdeman and with the reported Amsterdam message (pp.299ff). To posit this as justifying a thesis of essential connection between the two alleged apparitions would be a failure to acknowledge the all-too-common occurrence of false visionaries who seek to associate themselves with true visionaries for the obvious sake of credibility. At Lourdes, for example, numerous false visionaries sought to associate themselves with St. Bernadette and the authentic supernatural events, beginning in April 1858 and extending for months, as confirmed by Fr. Clos and in several cases by the local bishop, Msgr. Laurence.³¹ Should St. Bernadette be discredited, or the Lourdes apparitions considered false, due to the efforts of pseudo-visionaries to associate themselves with the authentic Lourdes visionary and Marian apparitions?

To suggest a causal relation, then, between the reported Amsterdam apparitions and the hopelessly fraudulent "Army of Mary" Canadian event is once again to posit an unfounded claim which does not serve a legitimate theological/scientific/psychological analysis on the former. To yet further hypothesize the possibility that the reported Amsterdam visionary, Ida Peerdeman may have actually "contaminated" Marie-Paule (p. 296) constitutes yet another serious violation of theological professionalism and ethical respect for the dignity of person and reputation of the reported Amsterdam visionary, who was in fact buried with public honor and reverence by presiding Haarlem-Amsterdam bishop of the time, Msgr. Bomers in 1996.

Conclusion

True Mariology is never divorced from the real world. The powerful intercession of the Mother of the Church and the Mother of all peoples commands an immediate relevance to the present global situation. Far from an ivory tower doctrine, the truth of Our Lady as spiritual Mother of all peoples holds critical significance to the present historic moment, as the contemporary world needs its Mother's *fullest possible intercession*, which, I

³¹ Cf. *False Visions Which Followed Lourdes*, <http://theotokos.org.uk/false-visions-which-followed-lourdes/> posted 2020.

believe, will require a formal recognition of this divinely designated Marian role for humanity.

Let the international Mariological community therefore seek, to the best of our abilities, the greatest possible unity and consensus³² in understanding, defending, and proclaiming the full truth about humanity's universal Mother. Mothers unite children in ways they cannot do on their own. The Mother of all peoples can unite nations in ways we cannot do on their own.

It is past the time for simply cultural Mariology. Let us articulate and invoke the Mother of all peoples, based on sound conciliar theology and devotion, through which we effect the maximum grace and peace for a troubled world.

Dr. Mark Miravalle

Ave Maria Chair of Mariology, Ave Maria University
St. John Paul II Chair of Mariology, Franciscan University of Steubenville
President, International Marian Association
March 25, 2022

³² M. Miravalle, *The Athanasian Solution to Mary's Role in Redemption*, <https://www.motherofallpeoples.com/post/the-athanasian-solution-to-mary-s-role-in-redemption>, motherofallpeoples.com, January 2022. See also Mark Miravalle and Robert Fastiggi, "Raggiungere il consenso sul ruolo di Maria nella redenzione: la soluzione atanasiana" in *La Theotokos: Portale di Mariologia* (26 Febbraio, 2022): <https://www.latheotokos.it/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=2256>.