

# Chapter 3

## CARDINAL SODANO AND THE PARTY LINE

What has been the overall effect of the sudden, unprecedented and quite dramatic changes in the Church that began after Vatican II? Here—with due allowances for the inadequacies inherent to all analogies—it would be helpful to consider that the process bears an eerie resemblance to what was called at the time “the Adaptation” of the Russian Orthodox Church to the demands of the Stalinist regime.

### *The “Adaptation” of the Catholic Church*

Stalin’s subversion of the Orthodox Church is certainly among the developments in Russia foreseen by the Virgin of Fatima. This is precisely why She came to call for the consecration of Russia to Her Immaculate Heart: so that Russia would embrace the one true religion and the one true Church, not the schismatic Orthodox Church founded in a rebellion against Rome when it left the Mystical Body of Christ a millennium ago, thus losing divine protection against Russian Orthodoxy’s total Adaptation to Stalinism.

The Orthodox Adaptation began officially when the Metropolitan Sergius of the Russian Orthodox Church published an “Appeal” in *Izvestia* on August 19, 1927. The Appeal of Sergius, as it came to be known, set forth a new basis for the activity of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Russian layman Boris Talantov described this as “an Adaptation to the atheistic reality of the U.S.S.R.” In other words, the church had to find a way of living, so the argument goes, with the “atheistic reality” of Stalinist Russia. So Sergius proposed what came to be known in shorthand as the Adaptation.

The Adaptation consisted first and foremost of a false separation between the so-called spiritual needs of man, the purely religious needs of man, and his socio-political needs. In other words, following the Masonic principle of separation of Church and State, the church was to satisfy the purely religious needs of the citizens of the Soviet Union but without touching on the socio-political structure that had been erected by the Communist Party.

The Adaptation required a new administration of the church in Russia according to guidelines which were set forth after the appeal of Sergius was published. Basically this came down to an agreement not to criticize the official ideology of the Soviet Union under Stalin. And this would be reflected in all of the activities of the church. Any church opposition to the Soviet regime would henceforth be considered a deviation from pure religious activity and a form of counter-revolution to be crushed immediately.

In effect the Orthodox Church, through its silence, became an arm of the Soviet state. In fact, Sergius would go on to defend this betrayal and even call for the condemnation and the sentencing to concentration camps of his own fellow Orthodox for so-called counter-revolutionary activities. Talantov, who condemned the whole Adaptation, described it this way: “In actual fact all religious activity was reduced to external rites. The church preaching of those clergymen who held strictly to the Adaptation was totally remote from life and therefore had no influence whatever on hearers. As a result of this, the intellectual, social and family life of believers, and the raising of the younger generation, remained outside church influence. One cannot worship Christ and at the same time in social and family life tell lies, do what is unjust, use violence, and dream of an earthly paradise.”<sup>83</sup>

This, then, is what the Adaptation involved: The church would be silent about the evils of the Stalinist regime. It would become a purely “spiritual” community “in the abstract”, would no longer voice opposition to the regime, would no longer condemn the errors and lies of Communism, and would thus become the Church of Silence, as Christianity behind the Iron Curtain was often called.

The Appeal of Sergius caused a split in the Russian Orthodox Church. The real believers, who rejected the Adaptation, denounced the Appeal and remained attached to the Metropolitan Joseph rather than Sergius, were arrested and sent to concentration camps. Boris Talantov himself would eventually die in prison, a political prisoner of the Stalinist regime. The Church of Silence was effectively transformed into an organ of the KGB, with all the imprisoned or executed Orthodox clerics replaced by KGB operatives.

Shortly before Talantov died in August of 1967, he wrote as follows concerning the Adaptation:

The Adaptation to atheism implanted by Metropolitan Sergius has concluded (been completed by) the betrayal of the Orthodox Russian Church on the part of Metropolitan Nikodim and other official representatives of the Moscow Patriarch based abroad. This betrayal irrefutably proved by the documents cited must be made known to all believers in Russia and abroad because such an activity of the Patriarchate, relying on cooperation with the KGB, represents a great danger for all believers. In truth, the atheistic leaders of the Russian people and the princes of the Church have gathered together against the Lord and His Church.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> “The Moscow Patriarchate and Sergianism” by Boris Talantov, from *Russia’s Catacomb Saints*, (St. Herman of Alaska Press, Platina, California, 1982) pp. 463-486.

<sup>84</sup> “The Moscow Patriarchate and Sergianism: An Essay by Boris Talantov,” found at [www.orthodoxinfo.com/ecumenism/cat\\_tal.aspx](http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/ecumenism/cat_tal.aspx).

Here Talantov refers to the same Metropolitan Nikodim who would later induce the Vatican to enter into the Vatican-Moscow Agreement, under which (as we showed in Chapter 2) the Catholic Church was committed to a pact of silence concerning the evils of Communism, and in particular Soviet Communism. Thus, the same Orthodox prelate who betrayed the Orthodox Church to the Kremlin was instrumental in an agreement by which the Catholic Church was likewise betrayed. At Vatican II, Pope John, the Secretary of State, Cardinal Casaroli, and his emissary Cardinal Tisserant, cooperating with Nikodim, agreed that the Catholic Church, too, would become a Church of Silence.

In consequence, since the Council the Catholic Church has almost everywhere unquestionably fallen silent not only as to the errors of Communism—which the Church has almost completely ceased condemning, even in Red China, which viciously persecutes the Church—but also as to the errors of the world at large. We recall that in his opening address to the Council, Pope John freely admitted that the Council (and most of the Church after him) would no longer condemn errors but would open herself to the world in a “positive” presentation of her teaching to “men of good will.” What followed, as Pope Paul VI himself admitted, was not the hoped-for conversion of “men of good will” but what Paul VI himself called “a veritable invasion of the Church by worldly thinking.” In other words, to the extent that this is possible in the Catholic Church—which can never completely fail in her mission—there has been a kind of Sergian Adaptation of Roman Catholicism.

### ***The Party Line on Fatima***

If, as Antonio Socci says, the Message of Fatima is “a great sign of contradiction that makes evident a kind of blinding of the pastors” during the unprecedented crisis that now afflicts the Catholic Church, then no element of that Message could be more of a sign of contradiction than the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Here, in that one simple request of the Madonna of Fatima, we have practically every element of the “old” and “triumphalistic” Catholicism that was supposedly superseded after the “opening to the world” and the conciliar *aggiornamento* Pope Paul was forced to admit had been a disaster.

And so, just as the Communist Party dictated a Party Line containing whatever official lies were necessary to advance the Communist cause—including the lie that the Sergian Adaptation of the Russian Orthodox Church was what the Orthodox really wanted—so would the Vatican Secretary of State dictate a Party Line on the “Adaptation” of Fatima. What precisely do we mean by Party Line? A Party Line is the “official” version of the truth—in reality a

pack of lies—that everyone who belongs to the Party is expected to believe and to propagate under pain of expulsion, ostracization or worse. The Party Line generally consists of a Big Lie—in this case, as we shall see, the reduction of Fatima to a prophecy already fulfilled and a mere call to prayer and penance. In support of the Big Lie one finds an assortment of supporting lies sufficient to persuade the uninformed public that no further inquiry into the truth of the matter is necessary, that the “official” version must be true. In this case, as we shall see, the supporting lies consist of the propositions that Fatima involves a mere “private revelation” which the faithful can take or leave at their pleasure, that Russia was “consecrated” without mention of Russia, and that the Third Secret pertains only to events of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, culminating in the failed attempt on the life of John Paul II in 1981. Further, Party members and those who enable them dutifully parrot the Party Line as the “official” substitute for the truth. Here we will see how the Party Line on Fatima, dictated from on high by the Vatican Secretary of State, has produced a lockstep conformity of opinion among all the false friends of Fatima, both low and high, whose statements are to be examined on these pages. This absolute uniformity of opinion is no coincidence; it is imposed from the top.

Now effectively the “prime minister” of the Church thanks to the “reform” of the Roman Curia, and in control all the major levers of Vatican administration, the Secretary of State was uniquely positioned to impose a Party Line that requires an Adaptation of the Fatima event to comport with the overall Adaptation of the Church, including *Ostpolitik*. The Adaptation of Fatima was deemed necessary because the Consecration of Russia and the related prophecies of its miraculous outcome embody exactly what the supposed “new orientation” of the Church since Vatican II cannot abide:

- that the Pope and bishops of the Catholic Church have the power to convert a non-Catholic nation by a single public act;
- that this power—the power of divine grace—has been given to the Catholic Church alone to wield in this miraculous manner;
- that the Russian people are in need of the grace of conversion, which only the hierarchy of the Catholic Church—not the Russian Orthodox hierarchy—can obtain for them by this singular act;
- that the Russian people, including their Orthodox clergy, are called to reunite with Rome as members of the Catholic Church upon their miraculous conversion;

- that this miracle of conversion will be a testament to the intercession of the Virgin Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces, whose Immaculate Conception is a defined dogma of the Catholic Faith and of no other religion;
- that the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary upon Russia’s consecration and conversion will mean a worldwide and uniquely Catholic devotion to the Immaculate Heart;
- that this Triumph, and the resulting period of peace granted to the world, will thus be a triumph for the Catholic Church as well.

All of this, of course, is quite intolerable to the party of the innovators, intent as they are on the program of “dialogue,” “ecumenism,” and *Ostpolitik* inaugurated at Vatican II. Thus the Secretary of State would usurp authority to “manage” the Fatima event according to his requirements and those of the party of the innovators in general. We will see that, quite curiously, the Secretary has even arrogated to himself the authority to “interpret” the Third Secret of Fatima—an interpretation that binds no one. His office has no pastoral or teaching authority over the universal Church or even so much as a single diocese; yet from him would emanate the Party Line on Fatima. Before we examine its elements, a few words about the career of Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Angelo Sodano, first enforcer of the Party Line, are appropriate. We need to place in perspective the utter incongruity of this man’s involvement in the custody of the precious Message our Mother brought to us from Heaven.

### ***An Ecclesiastical Politician***

Former Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Angelo Sodano provides a prime example of how the office of the Vatican Secretary of State commingles worldly concerns with what should be purely spiritual affairs over which a functionary of the Vatican city-state ought to have no jurisdiction. It was none other than Sodano who was instrumental in protecting for decades the now-infamous Marcial Maciel Degollado, head of the Legionaries of Christ, who molested boys, fathered children out of wedlock, abused drugs, and engaged in financial improprieties throughout his long career as an immensely successful ecclesiastical entrepreneur. As *America* magazine has observed: “The key Vatican figure in protecting Maciel in the 1980s and 1990s was Cardinal Angelo Sodano, the all-powerful secretary of state [sic] under John Paul II and now Dean of

the College of Cardinals.”<sup>85</sup> All-powerful indeed—so powerful that he took control of the Message of Fatima, although, as we shall see, Providence confounded his attempt to neutralize it. The respected Catholic pro-life website Lifesitenews.com summarized the evidence of Sodano’s complicity in the Maciel scandal as presented in an exposé in *National Catholic Reporter*:

Maciel developed a close relationship with Angelo Sodano, who served as Pope John Paul’s Secretary of State, effectively the Vatican’s Prime Minister, from 1991 to 2006.... The Legion hired Sodano’s nephew as consultant when they built their flagship institution, Regina Apostolorum University in Rome.... [M]uch later, efforts to reveal Maciel’s machinations and sexual improprieties were actively blocked by “pressure from Maciel’s chief supporter, Cardinal Angelo Sodano.” Berry reports that after nine former members of the Legion who claimed to have been sexually abused by Maciel filed a canonical case against the founder with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1998, Sodano “pressured” Cardinal Ratzinger to halt the proceedings.<sup>86</sup>

By late 2004, however, the future Pope Benedict XVI would put an end to the scandal. After a Vatican ceremony in November 2004 during which John Paul II honored Maciel, “Ratzinger broke with Sodano and ordered a canon lawyer on his staff, Msgr. Charles Scicluna, to investigate. Two years later, as Pope Benedict, he approved the order that Maciel abandon ministry for a ‘life of penitence and prayer.’”<sup>87</sup> Maciel died shortly thereafter. Despite his deep involvement in the Maciel scandal, Sodano left office without consequences in 2006 to be succeeded by Cardinal Bertone, becoming Dean of the College of Cardinals. The journal *First Things* rightly observed that “Cardinal Sodano has to go. The Dean of the College of Cardinals [is]... an ongoing embarrassment to the Church he serves.”<sup>88</sup> Yet to this day, Sodano remains Dean of the College of Cardinals. This, then, is the man who maintained the Party Line on Fatima first dictated by Cardinal Casaroli in July-August 1989, which has been carried forward unswervingly by his successor, Cardinal

<sup>85</sup> Austen Ivereigh, “Will Sodano Resign Over Maciel?,” *America*, April 13, 2010, [http://www.americamagazine.org/blog/entry.cfm?entry\\_id=2749](http://www.americamagazine.org/blog/entry.cfm?entry_id=2749).

<sup>86</sup> Hilary White, “Sodano’s ‘Head Should Roll’: Report Reveals Close Ties Between Vatican Cardinal and Disgraced Legion,” Lifesitenews.com, April 14, 2010, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive/ldn/2010/apr/1004140>.

<sup>87</sup> Jason Berry, “Money paved way for Maciel’s influence in the Vatican,” *National Catholic Reporter*, April 26, 2010, <http://nronline.org/news/accountability/money-paved-way-maciels-influence-vatican?page=2>.

<sup>88</sup> Joseph Bottum, “The Cost of Maciel,” *First Things*, May 12, 2010, <http://www.firstthings.com/onthesquare/2010/05/the-cost-of-father-maciel>.

Bertone. The result is a mockery of the Fatima event and grave injustice to the Church and the world.

### *The Elements of the Party Line on Fatima*

In its original iteration, the Party Line was this: There is to be no consecration of Russia, for this would offend the Russian Orthodox, causing a setback for ecumenism, while challenging the Moscow regime, causing a setback for *Ostpolitik*. Fatima, then, was to be reduced to a generic call to prayer, penance and personal piety rather than a heavenly plan for the conversion of Russia, the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart, and a period of peace won for the world by Mary's intercession. The Pope was to be dissuaded from any explicit mention of Russia in any ceremony he might attempt in compliance with what Our Lady of Fatima had prescribed. This is the Big Lie concerning Fatima.

In support of the Big Lie is the underlying proposition that, in any event, the Fatima apparitions are merely a “private revelation” that can safely be ignored by the faithful and the leadership of the Church. According to this element of the Party Line, the Message of Fatima is merely “a help which is offered, but which one is not obliged to use.”<sup>89</sup> We must dispense immediately with that foolhardy contention.

By its very terms the Message is not “private,” but rather is addressed to the whole world, even if the Virgin Mary chose to deliver it to three children. Accordingly, Lucia pleaded with “the Lady in white” “to work a miracle so that everybody will believe that You are appearing to us,” for the local anti-Catholic authorities and other critics were mocking the apparitions and suggesting that the children were liars and fakes. In fact, at one point Lucia and her cousins were literally kidnapped and carted off to jail by the Freemasonic mayor of nearby Ourem, seat of the local judicial district. The children were threatened with torture and death if they did not recant what they had seen and heard in the Cova. All three refused to do so, and the mayor released them after two days of captivity.<sup>90</sup> To silence the critics and persecutors of the children, the Lady promised that on the 13th of October, the date of the last apparition at the Cova, “I

---

<sup>89</sup> Cf. *The Message of Fatima*, n. 2, [http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_20000626\\_message-fatima\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html).

<sup>90</sup> This incident is abundantly documented in the historical sources, both secular and religious. See e.g., Frère Michel de la Sainte Trinité, *The Whole Truth About Fatima*, Volume I: *Science and the Facts* (Buffalo, New York: Immaculate Heart Publications, 1989) pp. 214-231; and “The Seers Kidnapped (August 13-15, 1917)”, at <http://fatima.org/essentials/opposed/seerkidn.asp>.

will perform a miracle for all to see and believe.”<sup>91</sup> And, as we have seen, on October 13, 1917, a crowd of 70,000 people assembled in the rain-drenched Cova to witness the first pre-announced public miracle in the history of the world, and the first miracle Heaven had ever deigned to grant in answer to a challenge by the Church’s enemies: the Miracle of the Sun.

Since those dramatic days in the Cova, the Message Lucia and her two cousins received from the Madonna has been treated as worthy of belief by a series of Popes. Pope John Paul II, who attributed his escape from death on May 13, 1981 to the intervention of Our Lady of Fatima (on the very anniversary of the first Fatima apparition) definitively removed the Fatima apparitions from the category of the so-called “private revelation” by a series of papal acts. The Pope beatified Jacinta and Francisco in May 2000, proclaiming February 20th as their Feast Day, elevated the Feast of Our Lady of Fatima on May 13th to the altars of every Church in the world by ordering its inclusion in the Roman Missal, and declared at Fatima in 1982 that “The appeal of Our Lady of Fatima is so deeply rooted in the Gospel and the whole of Tradition that the Church feels herself bound by this message.”<sup>92</sup> Moreover, the Fatima prayers (“O my Jesus, etc.”) have been incorporated into the Rosary, while the Five First Saturdays devotion is practiced throughout the entire Church.

In view of these facts and circumstances, Socci has best summed up the approach any Catholic should take to the Message of Fatima: “The Fatima event has received on the part of the Church—which in general is very cautious concerning supernatural phenomena—a recognition that has no equal in Christian history.... It is really impossible—after all this—to continue to speak of a ‘private revelation’ and of the relative importance of the Message.”<sup>93</sup> It is not only impossible but completely irrational and indeed reckless to dismiss the Fatima message, and the Third Secret in particular, as a “private revelation,” a mere “help” that one “is not obliged to use.” Any reasonable Catholic, and even a non-Catholic inclined to believe in supernatural phenomena, should be prepared to agree that the Message of Fatima is in a category by itself. So much, then, for the “private revelation” canard.

---

<sup>91</sup> In *The Whole Truth About Fatima*, Vol. I, pp. 180-181.

<sup>92</sup> “Il contenuto dell’appello della Signora di Fatima è così profondamente radicato nel Vangelo e in tutta la Tradizione, che la Chiesa si sente impegnata da questo messaggio.” *Sermon at the Sanctuary of the Virgin of Fatima*, May 13, 1982, at [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/homilies/1982/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_hom\\_19820513\\_fatima\\_it.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/homilies/1982/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_19820513_fatima_it.html).

<sup>93</sup> Socci, *Fourth Secret*, p. 17.

Now, the existence of the Party Line on Fatima first became apparent to the general public in 1982. On May 13 of that year—the first anniversary of the failed attempt on his life—Pope John Paul II, acting alone, consecrated the world but *not Russia* to the Immaculate Heart in an attempt to comply with the Virgin’s request for the Consecration of Russia. Then, on March 25, 1984 the Pope conducted a consecration ceremony in Saint Peter’s Square from which any mention of Russia was again omitted. Why the failure to mention Russia? Answer: it had been ruled out by the Party Line.

In the November 2000 issue of *Inside the Vatican*, a leading Cardinal, identified only as “one of the Pope’s closest advisors” (it was, in fact, Cardinal Tomko) expressly admitted that today “Rome fears the Russian Orthodox might regard it as an ‘offense’ if Rome were to make specific mention of Russia in such a prayer, as if Russia especially is in need of help when the whole world, including the post-Christian West, faces profound problems ...” By “Rome” the Cardinal did not mean the universal Church, but rather certain members of the Vatican bureaucracy as coordinated by the Secretary of State as “prime minister” of the Church. The same Cardinal-advisor added: “Let us beware of becoming too literal-minded.”

Later, Bishop Paul Josef Cordes would reveal the twin aims of the Party Line on Fatima: avoiding any “offense” to the Russian Orthodox and any “provocation” of the regime in Moscow:

I recall that [Pope John Paul II] thought, some time before [the Consecration], of mentioning Russia in the prayer of benediction. *But at the suggestion of his collaborators he abandoned the idea.* He could not risk such a direct provocation of the Soviet leader. The Pope also decided not to mention Russia directly *out of sensitivity to the Orthodox bishops* he had invited to join in the consecration prayer. So for good reasons, he followed the discreet approach of Pope Pius XII and of the bishops at the Second Vatican Council, where he [John Paul II] himself was very prominent.<sup>94</sup>

This “discreet approach at the Second Vatican Council” was none other than the Vatican-Moscow Agreement, already discussed, by which the Council had shamefully agreed to remain silent about the evils of Soviet Communism in exchange for the attendance of two Orthodox “observers.”

Once the substitute ceremonies of 1982 and 1984 were out of

---

<sup>94</sup> Father Andrew Apostoli, *Fatima for Today: the Urgent Marian Message of Hope* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), p. 251. This work, as we shall see, is a prime example of a production by the false friends of Fatima. It actually negates any element of urgency in the Message of Fatima, reducing it to prayer and personal piety in keeping with the Party Line.

the way—all mention of Russia having been “safely” avoided on the advice of men who thought themselves more prudent than the *Virgo Prudentissima*—the word came down from the Vatican that the subject of Russia’s consecration was now to be considered closed. Frère Francois de Marie des Anges, an historian of the Fatima event, recounts that in 1988 “[A]n order came from the Vatican addressed to the authorities of Fatima, to Sister Lucy, to diverse ecclesiastics, including Father Messias Coelho, and a French priest [evidently Father Pierre Caillon] very much devoted to Our Lady, ordering everyone to cease pestering the Holy Father with the Consecration of Russia.” Fatima devotee Father Caillon confirmed the issuance of this order: “An order came from Rome, obliging everyone to say and think: ‘The Consecration is done. The Pope having done all that he can, Heaven has deigned to agree to this gesture.’”<sup>95</sup>

### ***Sister Lucia’s contrary testimony***

This command to adhere to the Party Line ignored a lifetime of testimony by Sister Lucia about the necessity of an explicit consecration of Russia by name in a public ceremony conducted jointly by the Pope and the Catholic bishops of the world. As Socci notes: “precisely this lack of a specific object (Russia)” is why Sister Lucia “has repeated a thousand times... that there has not been a response to the request of the Virgin.”<sup>96</sup> Moreover, before and after the 1982 and 1984 ceremonies Sister Lucia insisted that Our Lady had requested nothing less than the explicit public consecration of Russia by the Pope and the bishops and that, accordingly, a consecration of the world would not comply with the Virgin’s request. We note here some keynotes of that testimony:

1946: On July 15, 1946 Sister Lucia gave the following testimony to the eminent author and historian, William Thomas Walsh, as recounted in his seminal history of the Fatima apparitions, *Our Lady of Fatima*, which sold over one million copies:

Lucia made it plain that Our Lady did not ask for the consecration of *the world* to Her Immaculate Heart. What She demanded specifically was the consecration of *Russia*.... She did not comment, of course, on the fact that Pope Pius XII had consecrated the world, not Russia, to the Immaculate Heart in 1942. But she said more than once, and with deliberate emphasis: “What Our Lady wants is that the Pope and all the bishops in the world shall consecrate Russia to Her Immaculate Heart on one special day. If this is done, She will convert Russia

<sup>95</sup> *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, pp. 189-190.

<sup>96</sup> Socci, *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, pp. 29-30.

and there will be peace. If it is not done, the errors of Russia will spread through every country in the world.”<sup>97</sup>

1952: In *Il Pellegrinaggio della Meraviglie*, published under the auspices of the Italian episcopate, we read (as noted earlier) that the Virgin Mary appeared to Sister Lucia in May 1952 and said: “Make it known to the Holy Father that I am always awaiting the Consecration of Russia to My Immaculate Heart. Without the Consecration, Russia will not be able to convert, nor will the world have peace.”<sup>98</sup> Thus, *ten years* after Pope Pius XII’s 1942 consecration of the world, Heaven itself informed Sister Lucia that Russia will not be converted, nor will there be peace, unless and until that nation is consecrated by name specifically.

1982: Thirty years later Sister Lucia’s testimony remains unchanged. On May 12, 1982, the day before the attempted 1982 consecration, the Vatican’s own *L’Osservatore Romano* published an interview of Sister Lucia by Father Umberto Maria Pasquale, a Salesian priest, during which she told Father Umberto that Our Lady had never requested the consecration of the world, but *only* the Consecration of Russia:

At a certain moment I said to her: “Sister, I should like to ask you a question. If you cannot answer me, let it be. But if you can answer it, I would be most grateful to you ... Has Our Lady ever spoken to you about the consecration of *the world* to Her Immaculate Heart?”

“No, Father Umberto! *Never!* At the Cova da Iria in 1917 Our Lady had promised: *I shall come to ask for the Consecration of Russia ...* In 1929, at Tuy, as She had promised, Our Lady came back to tell me that the moment had come to ask the Holy Father for the Consecration of *that country* (Russia).”<sup>99</sup>

Sister Lucia confirmed this testimony in a handwritten letter to Father Umberto, which the priest also published. (See photographic reproduction of the pertinent section of Sister Lucia’s letter on next page.) A translation of the letter reads:

<sup>97</sup> William Thomas Walsh, *Our Lady of Fatima* (New York: Image-Doubleday, *Imprimatur* 1947), p. 221 (emphasis in the original).

<sup>98</sup> *Il Pellegrinaggio della Meraviglie*, p. 440, Rome, 1960. This same work, published under the auspices of the Italian episcopate, affirms that this message was communicated to Pope Pius XII in June. Also, Canon Barthas mentioned that apparition in his communication to the Mariological Congress of Lisbon-Fatima in 1967; see *De Primordiis Cultus Marianae, Acta Congressus Mariologici-Mariana In Lusitania Anno 1967 Celebrati* (Rome, 1970), p. 517; see also *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, pp. 21 and 37.

<sup>99</sup> *L’Osservatore Romano*, May 12, 1982.

Reverend Father Umberto, in replying to your question, I will clarify: Our Lady of Fatima, in Her request, referred *only* to the consecration of Russia ... — Coimbra 13 IV - 1980 (signed) Sister Lucia

J + M,  
 Sr. do Senhor F. Humberto  
 Responderdo a sua pergunta  
 ta escasso:  
 Nossa Senhora, ecco Fatima, no  
 ecco perdido, só se refere a consecraçã  
 da Russia....  
 Coimbra 13 IV - 1980  
 S. Lucia

1983: On March 19, 1983, at the request of the Holy Father, Sister Lucia met with the Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Portalupi, a Dr. Lacerda, and Father Messias Coelho. During this meeting Sister Lucia confirmed that Pope John Paul's consecration of 1982 *did not fulfill the requests of Our Lady*:

In the act of offering of May 13, 1982, *Russia did not appear as being the object of the consecration*. And each bishop did not organize in his own diocese a public and solemn ceremony of reparation and consecration of Russia. Pope John Paul II simply renewed the consecration of the world executed by Pius XII on October 31, 1942. From this consecration we can expect some benefits, but not the conversion of Russia.<sup>100</sup>

On this occasion Sister Lucia flatly concluded: "The Consecration of Russia *has not been done as Our Lady had demanded it*. I was not able to say it because I did not have the permission of the Holy See."<sup>101</sup>

<sup>100</sup> *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, p. 165. See also "Sister Lucy's Recent Authorized Statements", *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue #13-14, Oct.-Dec. 1983, p. 3 (<http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr13/cr13pg03.asp>); and "Fatima May 13, 1982—What Actually Happened? Was Russia Consecrated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary?", *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue #16, Sept.-Oct. 1984, pp. 22-23 (<http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr16/cr16pg22.asp>).

<sup>101</sup> Reported within an article by Father Pierre Caillon of Centre Saint Jean 61500

1984: On Thursday, March 22, 1984, three days before the consecration of the world at issue, the Carmel of Coimbra was celebrating Sister Lucia's seventy-seventh birthday. She received on that day, as was her custom, her old friend Mrs. Eugenia Pestana. After extending good wishes to her Carmelite friend, Mrs. Pestana asked: "Then Lucia, Sunday is the Consecration?" Sister Lucia, who had already received and read the text of the Pope's consecration formula, made a negative sign and declared: "That consecration cannot have a decisive character."<sup>102</sup>

1985: In *Sol de Fatima*, the Spanish publication of the Blue Army, Sister Lucia was asked if the Pope had fulfilled the request of Our Lady when he consecrated the world the previous year. Sister Lucia replied: "There was no participation of all the bishops, and there was no mention of Russia." She was then asked, "So the consecration was not done as requested by Our Lady?" to which she replied: "No. Many bishops attached no importance to this act."<sup>103</sup>

1987: On July 20, 1987 Sister Lucia was interviewed quickly outside her convent while voting. She told journalist Enrique Romero that the Consecration of Russia has not been done as requested.<sup>104</sup>

One could cite more of Lucia's affirmations that the 1984 consecration of the world (and that of 1982) did not fulfill Heaven's conditions, but the point is made.<sup>105</sup> We will consider in due course Cardinal Bertone's contention that during private, unrecorded "interviews" Sister Lucia abruptly changed her testimony on this matter.<sup>106</sup>

In any event, one would think it beyond debate that a consecration of Russia needs to mention Russia. As Dr. David Alan

---

Sees, (Orne) France. This article was published by the monthly periodical *Fidelite Catholique*, B.P. 217-56402, Auray Cedex, France. English translation from *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue #13-14, Oct.-Dec. 1983, p. 3 (<http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr13/cr13pg03.asp>); see also *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue #16, Sept.-Oct. 1984, pp. 22-23 (<http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr16/cr16pg22.asp>).

<sup>102</sup> *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, pp. 167-168; see also "The Requests of Our Lady of Fatima Are Being Deliberately Hidden," *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue #31-32, March-May 1990, pp. 28-42, 54-55 (<http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr31/cr31-32pg28.asp>).

<sup>103</sup> *Sol de Fatima*, September 1985.

<sup>104</sup> This testimony of Sister Lucia was reported in the early August (1987) edition of *Para Ti* published in Argentina. See "Sister Lucy States: 'Russia Is Not Yet Properly Consecrated'," *World Enslavement or Peace ... It's Up To the Pope*, Father Nicholas Gruner (Fort Erie, Ontario: The Fatima Crusader, 1989), pp. 212-213; also online at <http://www.worldenslavementorpeace.com/e6cp10.asp>.

<sup>105</sup> For more testimony, see Chapter VI of *Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*.

<sup>106</sup> *But see, e.g.,* Christopher Ferrara, "A New Fatima for the New Church," *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue #75 (Winter 2004), pp. 65ff (also at <http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr75/cr75pg08.asp>) for a thorough treatment of this subject.

White has put it, attempting to consecrate Russia without mention of Russia is like “publishing a recipe for beef stew that never mentions beef.” As should be apparent from the rise of Vladimir Putin as the militaristic, neo-Stalinist dictator of Russia—a development even the *New York Times* has noticed<sup>107</sup>—Russia has not converted, which can only mean that the Consecration remains undone.

And, in fact, Pope John Paul II never made any official declaration that the Consecration had been effected by him. Quite contrary, as many sources have noted, during the 1984 ceremony in Saint Peter’s Square, the Pope stated before hundreds of thousands of witnesses that Our Lady was *still awaiting* the explicit Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart, referring pointedly to “those peoples for whom You Yourself *await* our act of consecration and of entrustment.” Hours after the ceremony, speaking to a vast crowd in Saint Peter’s Basilica, the Pope clearly alluded to the inadequacy of what he had done earlier that day: “We have been able to do all this according to *our poor human possibilities* and the measure of human *weakness*, but with immense confidence in Your maternal love and immense confidence in Your maternal solicitude.”<sup>108</sup>

Consequently, if the Fatima message is taken seriously, as it ought to be, the world remains under the Virgin’s ultimatum: consecrate Russia or face the annihilation of nations and the eternal loss of countless souls.

---

<sup>107</sup> See, e.g., “With Tight Grip on Ballot, Putin is Forcing Foes out of Parliament,” *New York Times*, October 14, 2007 (detailing the moves by which Putin has created an authoritarian one-party regime in Russia like that of “the old days.”).

<sup>108</sup> *Avenire*, March 27, 1984; cf. *The Devil’s Final Battle*, Chapter 8.