

The Last Prophecy of Fatima and the Consecration by Pope Francis on March 25, 2022



by PAUL STARK
April 17, 2022

Pope Francis consecrated Russia and the Ukraine to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, a gesture that was inspired by the rising conflict in the Ukraine in recent weeks. It was a significant event in the history of the famous prophecy of Fatima which foretells the pivotal role of Russia in the fate of humanity.

The consecration took place at St. Peter's Basilica in Rome on March 25, 2022 at the end of the 5pm Mass, with a simultaneous consecration from the Shrine of Fatima in Portugal, where the famous prophecy about Russia and the consecration was first revealed to three shepherd children, at the very height of World War I. In the decades after the war, the consecration of Russia by a Pope was supposed to prevent Communist Russia from spreading "*her errors throughout the world, causing wars and persecutions against the Church.*" The hundred-year-old prophecy published by the Vatican warned that "*The good will be martyred, the Holy Father will have much to suffer, various nations will be annihilated,*" unless Russia is publicly consecrated by a Pope.¹ Today, we are seeing images of Russian attacks on the Ukraine which now risk turning into a global conflict, and this consecration by Pope Francis was clearly a response to the request of the Fatima prophecy, and a hope it will finally trigger the time of peace that the prophecy's final prediction says will follow.

¹ See https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html

It was a remarkable prayer. Francis appeared sincere. The words chosen sounded genuine in their appeal for peace through Mary's intercession. In the end, he did consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, not just Russia mind you, but Russia was emphasized.

I want to believe that this will usher in a miraculous time of peace, and I desperately hope it does, for all our sakes, because the world is in a very dark place now. We will see in the weeks that come, whether God will choose to grant humanity the promised miracle of Fatima, the promised time of peace, or whether Russia's conflict with the Ukraine will persist, or transform, or escalate into the devastations predicted by the prophecy of Fatima. Only time will reveal that to us.

But the consecration of March 25 now reignites the decades-old question about whether this consecration finally fulfilled the conditions exactly as instructed by the prophecy of Fatima, because Lucia, the seer of Fatima, always referred explicitly to the specific conditions necessary for the consecration to be done correctly. There are so many examples of her pointing out the necessity of these elements every time a consecration of Russia was attempted by popes of the past. The conditions are certainly not complex. An eight-year-old could understand them, so it's easy to recognize when they are missing. It has been fair to ask ourselves, therefore, why there has been such a stubborn reluctance to fulfill what seems so obvious to the humble observer.

If we take a quick review of the history, this consecration had been attempted already by several popes, but there was always something deficient from its basic requirements. In **1942**, during World War II, Pope Pius XII did a consecration of the world twice in the same year, and both times he didn't name Russia, and neither of those consecrations involved all the bishops. Lucia insisted that these two requirements are essential, and in the spring of 1943, she said that World War II would be shortened because of those consecrations, but the world peace promised in the prophecy of Fatima would not come to pass because the consecrations had omitted the explicit elements. Lucia spoke about it in her memoirs and in letters to the clergy. In **1952**, Pope Pius XII actually consecrated Russia, but it was in the form of a written letter, so Lucia said it didn't fulfill the essential requirement for a solemn, public ceremony with all the bishops of the world. In **1964**, Pope Paul VI did a consecration of the World during the Second Vatican Council, but he did not name Russia. This would have been an opportune time to do it, because the world's bishops were already assembled for the Council in Rome, but there was something preventing them. It was an agreement between the Vatican and Communist Russia, which restricted the Pope from fulfilling the requirements of the consecration in 1964.

The agreement was made in 1962 and is known as the "Vatican Moscow Agreement" (or "Metz Pact") in which the Pope had promised that if Russia – which was behind the iron curtain of Communist rule – allowed Catholic bishops and particularly the Russian Orthodox representatives to attend the Council in Rome, the Vatican would promise not to condemn Communism at the Council, nor from that point forward.

It was the birth of a policy now known as Ostpolitik (“East Politic”) which is a policy preventing opposition to Communism. In this way, the Pope made an unprecedented compromise with Communism at precisely the time when the prophecy was calling on him to condemn it through the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary; to sanctify the place in our world where Communism had taken root – as predicted in the prophecy of Fatima three months before the historic October Revolution in 1917 which established Communist tyranny in Russia.

Pope John Paul II did at least five consecrations of the world, but none of them ever named Russia explicitly, nor did any of them have the full participation of the bishops. The Vatican refers to John Paul II’s consecration of the world on March 25, 1984 as “the one” that fulfills it correctly, but it didn’t name Russia, and many bishops did not participate. John Paul II actually wanted to name Russia in that consecration exactly 38 years before Francis, but the fact that he was prevented from doing so tells us, as the former Chief Vatican Exorcist – Father Gabriele Amorth – has told us, that the Pope was restricted from exercising his supreme authority over his Church, because he was told he cannot name Russia. Someone in the Vatican didn’t allow it (see www.TheVaticanDeception.com).

The seer of Fatima explained the deficiencies of these consecrations consistently over decades, every time a consecration was done incorrectly, but subsequent consecrations were never performed correctly, and unusual contradictions about its basic requirements began to surface in the 1980s.

So now we come to the consecration by Pope Francis on March 25, 2022. It appears to have finally fulfilled the instructions properly, because Russia was named, and many bishops around the world did participate in the ceremony, but here are some observations.

To begin with, the prophecy was explicit about the need for the consecration to be done by a Pope in the exercise of his papal authority. In other words, he must assert himself as the supreme authority of the Catholic Church by commanding all the Catholic bishops to join him when he fulfills the consecration of Russia, to ensure they are unanimous in their union with the Pope.

There are two difficulties with this, the most significant one being the controversial question around the legitimacy of Francis’ papacy, and the legitimacy of Benedict’s unprecedented retirement. This is an entire topic on its own, but it’s important to recognize that the consecration would be inadequate if not performed by a validly elected pope, so here we have a legitimate doubt, because there is no precedence in Catholic history for an elected Pope going into retirement. There were very rare instances many centuries ago when false Popes completely abdicated their papal title and office to resolve a crisis in the Church, but never a circumstance when a Pope only partially resigned (he didn’t resign the “munus”²). Benedict then went into retirement and held on to his papal title while a second Pope was elected to replace him. According to the

² See <https://tradcatknight.blogspot.com/2017/08/fr-kramer-benedict-xvi-did-not-renounce.html>

doctrines of the Church, there can be only one Pope at any given time, and because now there are two, there are profound implications that need to be sorted out.

The Church will render a decision on all this one day, but until then, it is therefore relevant to consider that if Francis is not the legitimate one between these two apparent Popes, this single deficiency alone would be sufficient to render a consecration by him as invalid and ineffective according to the conditions of the Fatima prophecy. Perhaps the living Pope Benedict XVI Emeritus is the only man alive with the power to do the proper Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

But even if we put that controversial question aside and work from the assumption that Francis is a legitimate Pope, there is the all-important question about Petrine authority, which Father Malachi Martin (advisor to three Popes) often spoke about when discussing the Fatima prophecy. Petrine authority is the Catholic doctrine that says the Pope (also referred to as the Holy Father or the Roman Pontiff) is the supreme authority of the Catholic Church (Canon 331, 333³, and Catechism Paragraph 882 and 937⁴):

“the Roman Pontiff, by reason of his office as Vicar of Christ, and as pastor of the entire Church has full, supreme, and universal power over the whole Church, a power which he can always exercise unhindered.”

Father Martin, who read the missing text of the Fatima prophecy, spoke about Petrine Authority specifically when referring to the prophecy of Fatima. He spoke about the loss of faith in Catholic doctrines – particularly the lost belief in the doctrine on Petrine authority. “Because that is the crux,” he said. “That is the aim of the revolt of the bishops: to get rid of the Petrine authority.” It is by this authority that the Pope is entrusted primarily to protect the teachings of his Church, to defend it against heresy, and here we have a consecration where that authority is missing, despite being an explicit requirement specified in the prophecy.

Francis did not command his bishops, as Lucia explained a Pope must do. Instead, he invited the bishops, and left it to each individual’s discretion whether or not to accept the invitation to join in the consecration with him. He didn’t obligate the bishops to join him. He gave them the choice to refuse.

So instead it was an invitation, and many bishops accepted it. But did enough bishops participate to call it unanimous? Does it really matter in the end, whether it was a command or an invitation, and whether it was 100% of the bishops, or 51%, or 95%?

Well, it did matter when Lucia communicated the instructions. Here’s what she said about it, because the instructions are very specific:

“In order that the bishops of the world be united to the Pope during the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the Pope

³ See https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic_lib2-cann330-367_en.html#Art. 1

⁴ See https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P2A.HTM

would have to either convoke all the bishops at Rome or in another place, at Tuy, for example, or indeed order the bishops of the entire world to organize, each one in his own Cathedral, a public and solemn ceremony of reparation and of Consecration of Russia to the Holy Hearts of Jesus and Mary.

If the Communist government prevented the Catholic Bishops from making the solemn and public ceremonies, those prelates could accomplish the Consecration in small chapels. And if the command of the Pope does not reach some Bishops because of the lack of religious liberty, the Good God would understand that, for He wants the moral unanimity of the Bishops, and not obligatorily arithmetical totality.”

The “moral unanimity” would mean that every bishop in the world who knows about the consecration must participate in it publicly if they can, but quietly if they don’t have religious liberty. If any bishops chose not to accept the invitation from Francis (which they had the option to do), it would no longer be a moral unanimity of the bishops, because unanimous means all of them. The instruction of Fatima only excuses those bishops who could not have known that the command was issued by the Pope.

But is it possible to take this instruction too literally? Why the need for this to be so public and precise and unanimous? I think the better question is: since the instructions are so explicit and easy to achieve, why would anyone not follow them precisely, just to be sure we did everything we could to get it right? To understand this persistent refusal, one has to dig beneath the surface to investigate the evidence that is publicly available to all who seek it⁵, but we actually do know something about why the instructions are so specific, and our insights about it come from Lucia, the seer of Fatima who has never been wrong about any other prediction she ever shared since 1917.

In a letter written May 18, 1936, Lucia said “*Intimately I have spoken to Our Lord about the subject⁶, and not too long ago I asked Him why He would not convert Russia without the Holy Father making that consecration?*” Lucia said the response she received was:

“Because I want My whole Church to recognize that Consecration as a triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, so that later on My Church will extend the devotion to the Immaculate Heart and place this devotion beside devotion to My Sacred Heart.” (emphasis added)

According to Lucia, the global event is intended to be witnessed publicly by all of humanity so that we can all plainly observe for ourselves the relationship between the consecration and the global miracle that is predicted to come after it, and so to be witness to such a prediction that we might understand it as a sign of divine nature, and as evidence of its authenticity, because we knew of the predictions in advance, and we can

⁵ See www.TheVaticanDeception.com

⁶ In her letter, Lucia said: "The Good Lord does not manifest this to me by means of apparitions, it is by means of an intimate and intense feeling of His presence in my soul."

observe what happens afterwards. Lucia has explained that if a valid pope meets the explicit conditions of the consecration, humanity will witness a miraculous time of peace.

So we come, finally, to the words of the Fatima prophecy concerning Russia. Lucia said on **July 13, 1917**, the Blessed Virgin warned her about the role of Russia in the devastations of our times, and she told Lucia:

“To prevent this, I shall come to ask for the consecration of Russia to My Immaculate Heart, and the Communion of Reparation on the First Saturdays.”

On **Dec 10, 1925**, Lucia reported that the Blessed Virgin did return to ask for the Communion of Reparation on the First Saturdays. And again, on **June 13, 1929**, Lucia reported that the Virgin returned to ask for the Consecration of Russia. This is where Lucia says she received more detail about the consecration. According to Lucia,

“Our Lady then said to me: ‘The moment has come in which God asks of the Holy Father to make, and to order that in union with him, and at the same time, all the bishops of the world make the Consecration of Russia to My Immaculate Heart’ promising to convert it because of this day of prayer and worldwide reparation.”

This was the original consecration instruction, but the Catholic clergy asked Lucia questions about it, which prompted her to document even more specific details about it.

About a year later, Lucia sent a letter to Father Gonçalves in which she interpreted the vision about the Consecration of Russia to include the First Saturday reparatory devotion. In the letter, she said:

“our good Lord promises that the persecution in Russia will end, if the Holy Father will himself make a solemn public act of reparation and Consecration of Russia to the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary. His Holiness must also order all the bishops of the Catholic world to do the same, and promise that if this persecution ends he will approve and recommend the practice of the already mentioned (First Saturdays) reparatory devotion.”

Again, we see the requirement that the Pope must “order all the bishops”, but also these words of Lucia bring up an essential clarification – the actual purpose of the consecration which is to establish a special devotion in the Catholic Church to the Blessed Virgin. The miracle that is predicted to follow the consecration would serve as an observable sign to humanity that the promise to promote this devotion is pleasing to God. So the unanimity of the bishops seems intended to ensure that there are none among the faithful who are deprived of being witness to the historic miracle, but also that they are not deprived of knowing the promise that accompanies this global miracle.

Francis did not make that promise, and the Five Saturdays devotion was not even mentioned. So the absence of this explicit requirement adds a third reason to doubt that it sufficiently fulfilled the conditions of the prophecy.

It is relevant to mention that the consecration was supposed to be accompanied by the publication of the missing text of the Fatima prophecy, and yet this text was not published. The consecration also didn't uniquely name Russia, because it named multiple objects. While we can hope that this latter issue would not in itself be sufficient to render it invalid, we do know that there is a material difference between a specific consecration and a general consecration⁷. When a Pastor joins a groom to his bride in holy matrimony, that wouldn't be the same as joining ourselves, the Church, all of humanity, and especially the groom and his brother to the bride, and it seems that a similar difference applies when consecrating Russia to Mary's Immaculate Heart, versus consecrating ourselves, the Church and all humanity, especially Russia and Ukraine to Mary's Immaculate Heart. The requirements of the consecration have been so specific, that it would have been prudent not to include anything in the consecration that would introduce doubt in its fulfillment, so the specific and unique consecration of Russia would have given us the most certainty.

What we are seeing is that the common theme throughout all the deficiencies is an unwillingness to succumb to the divine will about which Lucia was so specific. A consecration that excludes these explicit requirements is man essentially saying "I will do it man's way and not God's way", and it's difficult to imagine that this could ever be acceptable to God, particularly on a request that is so specific, so simple, and so deliberate. Perhaps only when we seek God's way in this consecration will He dispense His blessings.

But it's not up to me, what God will choose to be acceptable. Only God can decide what is acceptable to Him. *Dei voluntas fiat* – "God's will be done". In the meantime, since the consecration of Pope Francis on March 25, 2022 was clearly intended to fulfill the request of the Fatima prophecy, we can observe what happens in the weeks to come, keeping in mind that there is sufficient reason to doubt that it fulfilled its essential instructions sufficiently.

It would be a fair question for us to ask ourselves if Pope Benedict XVI Emeritus might be more successful with the Consecration of Russia, if it followed all of the explicit requirements. The consecration may have been at least partly intended to resolve this question regarding which of these two Popes actually holds the title of supreme authority over the Catholic Church.

⁷ To consecrate means to set aside for a holy purpose. When a priest purchases a chalice from a vendor, it is not sacred because it has not yet been consecrated. If he placed that chalice in his church and then consecrated his entire diocese, this is a general consecration which doesn't set aside every object and person in the diocese for a holy purpose. However, when the priest consecrates the chalice itself, he is setting that particular item aside for a holy purpose. That particular chalice then becomes a sacred object used for the holy purpose of the Mass, and this is what is referred to as a specific consecration.