



Malachi Martin:

'The terrorists were all trained by the Jesuits'

The following interview with Malachi Martin, the Vatican expert for William Buckley's National Review magazine, was made available to the EIR by an investigative reporter who recently interviewed Mr. Martin in New York City.

Martin was trained in theology at the Jesuit University of Louvain in Belgium, receiving a doctorate in "Semitic Languages, Archaeology, and Oriental History." After further studies at Oxford and Hebrew University, Malachi Martin, S.J. became a Jesuit professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome.

Martin "quit" the Jesuit order in the mid 1970s, and authored the well known book, The Final Conclave. As the book's arguments reveal, officially or otherwise, Malachi Martin's mind remains loyal to Jesuit "liberation theology" doctrine.

The Final Conclave is a "scenario" forecasting the decentralization and disintegration of the Vatican in terms of temporal power. Martin forecasts a "revolution" within the church to make it the vehicle of a revolution in the world. Shed of its "political financial and diplomatic baggage," the church becomes a guerrilla church, an agent of revolution to overthrow the Kingdom on Earth, destroying the institution of nation-states that, in Jesuit theology, deny the Kingdom of Heaven by their emphasis on material progress. For Malachi Martin, a dedication to Jesus, and to terrorism, are quite the same thing.

Q: I'm doing a background report on the Colombian situation that will go through the question of the relationship between the violation of human rights, the sociological environment, and how that leads to this kind of terrorist activity. What I'm interested in is the degree to which this kind of thing is going to occur elsewhere.

M: The impression I have, and that a lot of my collaborators have, is as follows. Things have got to such a pass, that there is no end in sight for the moment to these outbreaks—whatever form they take. They may even

take the form of a mass suicide, because the examples have been set and because there are political and ideological causes waiting. More often than not in the near future they will take the form of the Bogota incident.

The analysis that we have made of it goes deeper than merely, say, human rights like a living wage, or housing, or piped water, or justice in the courts, and agrarian reform, etc. A far more fundamental cause of this sort of disruption, especially in the Middle East, is the following. (I take banal examples): If a woman has her period, Islam as a religion provides her with an entire ceremonial, both in actions and words, to deal with that—before, during, and after. If she was going to cook rice, and there is a lot of rice there, there was an entire ceremonial developed over centuries. It's still the same as was used back in the 15th century.

Now we come along and give them tampons; and we give them Uncle Ben's rice or some other equally efficient thing. And we wipe out what ceremonial and ritual they had. If you apply that to the entire area of human living, what we are finding is that, of course behind the Ayatollah there is much more than the Ayatollah. And behind the students on Teheran street in Teheran, there is much more than merely hot-eyed a-la-sixties students. But it would seem that because Islam, their way of life, was the only thing they knew, and it was being entirely disrupted by hasty, or over-hasty, or anyway quick modernization, the Ayatollah was almost ... well, if he hadn't been there he would have had to be invented.

Just as for instance, the new Saudi plan, which involves \$200 billion which will be spent in two years. One would say, a priori and at this distance, that they are spending their way into chaos.

Terrorist 'backwash'

Q: So by extension you would argue that any similar process in Latin America would be heading for the same thing?

M: Yes, because they regard this as their right. Now, modernization that we effect, or that American companies effect, or that the Americans bring with them, which remains at a distance but changes the fundamentals of their lives at the same time—because they are affected by our music, and by our fast foods, and by our way of living—that seems to affect them more than anything else. It is true, too, that basic human rights are lacking. Nobody seems to be able to analyze this, because they remain on the plane of material things. They cannot reach beyond into a dimension which isn't necessarily religious, but at least is moral and ethical and of the spirit—without any connotation of Judaism or Christianity or Islam, for that matter, as religions. There is a dimension of human beings which hasn't been taken care of. And we have apparently reached the saturation point, and at that saturation point there are sufficient disruptive forces and sufficiently organized, to warrant our saying that in the near future there is no end in sight to the use of terrorism. There probably will be a backwash of the use of terrorism of the Bogota or Teheran style in this country.

Q: In the United States?

M: Yes. The big fissure in the Catholic consensus today is not over premarital sex, or abortion. They are squabbles. The big fissure is the socio-political question. And that's what the present Pope is facing ... But the weight of the church, the preponderance of feeling in the Church at the present moment is for terrorism and revolution.

Q: You say that is the case not only for Central America, but for Colombia and the rest of the world?

M: Yes. And in Africa, places like Rhodesia. In Colombia it is the same thing.

Q: Well I've noticed that the Theology of Liberation is very much talked about in certain orders—the Jesuits seem to be very active.

M: Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans. But they go much further. I mean, they actually trained the Marxist guerrilla in their military tactics. And we have photographs of nuns in Guatemala shouldering machine-guns in the jungles, in the scrub. They have gone that far.

Q: Would the same apply to the Colombian situation, with the M-19?

M: Yes, the very same.

Q: Would that be like the people around Camilo Torres, or what sort of people are you talking about?

M: Yes.

Q: I didn't know there were still many followers of Camilo Torres.

M: Oh, God, there's a tremendous amount. In fact, it got so bad towards the middle of the 70's that bishops were shipping them back to Dublin. You see, a lot of them were recruited straight from the seminaries. They had a man who went around to all the Irish seminaries in the 50's, 60's and 70's called the "Circulator"—literally, it means a fellow who goes in circles—looking for people who were willing to go to some mission in Latin America. Then they went to Cuernavaca or some place like that, to Ivan Illich when he was flourishing there; they trained them in Spanish, and the customs... And then they went off to Latin America. They became so revolutionary there they had to be shipped back to Dublin, Ireland, and Cork. And then they started the Theology of Liberation over in Ireland. The whole thing then blew up—like lighting a cigar—blowing up in the face of the Archbishop.

So in Latin America you could safely say on figures... I was talking with this man in Mexico City last year. We agreed that all the statistics would show that certainly well over two-thirds of priests and nuns want a Marxist state. They have decided that they want it, but they have decided that it can only come by armed revolution. Like the Bishop of Cuernavaca, who says that he is a Marxist and he is hoping for the day when there will be a revolution. Mendez Arceo is his name, Sergio Mendez Arceo.

Q: I know of this Mendez Arceo case, and I know that in Mexico much of the church has this approach. And I know that in the case of Panama you have people like Padre Xabier Gorostiaga.

M: That's right. Well you know, a man like McGrath (Archbishop of Panama) is not adverse to the advent of an extremely socialist government.

Q: Yes, and then you have Archbishop Romero in El Salvador, who is playing a very prominent role.

M: I know. They are playing a very prominent role.

M-19 and the clergy

Q: The question that remains on my mind is what about the Colombian situation. What are the church layers that would be tied in there to the M-19?

M: The higher clergy in Colombia are dead set against any collaboration with Marxism or communism. If you take the ordinary run of priests and nuns working with the people, they would say—most of them behind closed doors and a lot of them in public—this is the only way we can make them listen.

Q: But in the case of El Salvador you have a public figure like Romero. In the case of Mexico you have a Mendez Arceo. In Colombia, though, who would be connected to this?

M: Specifically about Colombia, you'd like to have the name there? Yes... I can suggest a man who will put you in contact with them, but I'd rather you met him first. What is his name? He's a Jesuit, a Belgian... Vekemans, Roger Vekemans. There is nothing Vekemans does not know, about what's going on. Now he took refuge in Bogota, because he would have lost his kneecaps or worse if he had stayed on in Chile. He's a very knowledgeable individual. It's hard to get to him, but I'm sure you'll find your way. He can actually give you names there....

Q: The Colombia takeover seems to open up a whole new phase of things.

M: It does. It's meant to be a signal, for other people, to catalyze them. Like the situation in Northern Africa, Iran and Afghanistan. They are afraid to do too much suddenly. I don't think they want to test the American mood too much, for the moment.

Q: You mentioned in the same breath, and I understand why, the situation in Iran, the situation in Colombia. Is there any coordination on the level of the people who are thinking that way?

M: Yes. Yes, there is.

Q: In other words, would the Iranian revolutionaries talk to the M-19, or talk to the Jesuits?

M: Yes, yes. Well, put it like this. They all talk to one another... There is something that is above them all. Think on it, and you will come across it. They are all part of a loose coagulation which is tight enough to keep them talking, and keep them supplied. Essentially to send arms in their direction, and give them money to escape with.

Q: Are you talking to Moscow?

M: Not directly. Certainly it is Moscow-related.

Q: Do you have any other hints?

M: Well, I hate the phone and, anyway, it would be better for you to think it around and find it out yourself. It's quite detectable. But certainly the thing is coordinated very much. It's damnable coordinated... They haven't yet decided whether they should test out nerves. Thirty or 60 days will make the difference. In the meantime pray that the Algal well in Saudi Arabia isn't taken hostage, or something like that.

Other targets

Q: What countries do you think will be targets of this, since this is just the opening salvo?

M: Turkey, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia. If Tito dies, the only thing the Russians can do without really making us angry, making us do something drastic, would be to get

the Serbs and Croats to split. We'd have to put up with that. Jordan is always a precarious state.

Q: In Latin America, I've heard of Ecuador and Venezuela.

M: In Latin America, yes, those two are ready to explode.

Q: What about Mexico?

M: Well, the fact about Mexico is that it is heartening in one sense and disheartening in another. The amount of penetration on the level of government is very disheartening, on the one hand. On the other hand, the way everything is locked up by an oligarchy is heartening, in the sense that they have control of things for the moment. But that of course has a negative, a real ricochet, you know.

Q: It'll explode all the more forcefully at a certain point?

M: That's right. That's right.

Q: But you don't see that immediately around the corner?

M: I don't see that coming around the corner immediately. But what I do see is Central America exploding. And I see about four or six countries in South America exploding. Besides Ecuador, and Venezuela; Bolivia is almost ready, almost ready. Venezuela is in a very dangerous position, even if you don't believe it, but it is in a very dangerous position. The man who will be able to give you facts and figures and dates and movements on this and the others, would be Vekemans. Part of his job is to monitor all that. To put it all together.

But I guess the timetable is held up by the inevitable delays in Afghanistan and Iran. The international brouhaha about it has been slightly disconcerting for them. And Iran has been recalcitrant because they just can't quite control Islam, though they seem to be doing damn well for the moment anyway, with our connivance. But I think the timetable has been held up; far more than Nicaragua was supposed to have gone by now.

I suppose it all depends finally on what Moscow decides. If Moscow decides that Jimmy Carter is going to be elected—and they like Jimmy, they don't want a Republican—they may decide to have a peace offensive, and therefore things will quiet down. If they decide that a dangerous Republican will be elected, they may hurry up the whole process. Then, they have set things in operation which they may not be able to stop. It's a very iffy situation; 30-60 days will throw an awful lot of clarity on both ends.

Q: What I find most interesting in the conception you're laying out is the global approach, that you look at the Middle East together with Latin America and not to divide it up.

M: You see, the amazing thing about today is that we

now have only three to four human contingents. Before, and even after, the Second World War, you could find no common determination in human power from nation to nation that would cover an awful lot of them together. Whereas, today, there are about two to four blocs. The only virulent one, the one that seems to have power of recoil, power of lasting, is Islam. Catholicism has none; Christianity has none; Judaism has none. Whereas, the West, by which I take North America, Russia, Britain I suppose, and New Zealand, and perhaps some of Europe, share one consensus of feeling about the human condition of what they should live in life or should live for. Arrayed against that you have what we'd never had before, you have a bloc of consensus, of Latin Americans who feel the same as the PLO. And you have Irish IRA who feel the very same as the PLO, and as the Iranians. Then you have whatever people really feel that Russia is the leader of their destiny, and there are certainly millions that do follow that and will fight for it. And beyond those three blocs, there's nothing else moving in the world. And what we're talking about here is the real power, the real source of power that maintains this thing. A leader can get hold of it and the people and lead them to hell or heaven.

In this country, it's gone dormant...

But in this world around us, there is the strange unanimity, that makes a Fedayeen fighter the same as a Sandinista. Sometimes he is using the same gun...

Yes, it's all been unified. It's all been coagulated. We're not faced with a simple figment; we're not faced with trouble in Iran and trouble in Latin America. There is a coordinating thing, and unfortunately, it's not merely in the mind of some vile and mischievous coordinators. There a *reality*, because the poor see no hope. They don't see themselves getting any better. And between you and me and the wall and Milton Friedman, they're not going to get better, socially and politically; they're not going to get better. Their babies are going to die; poverty is going to continue.

Terrorism for a world government

Q: There's going to be more terrorism?

M: That's right; there's no way out of it. I remember I was on a show with Bill Buckley once and I was talking about this and he said, "Well, we have one great thing to export; we export modernization and that helps raise people's living standards."

But it took me about three hours later over dinner to explain to him what I thought, that this was the very thing that was going to give them indigestion. And we disrupt the whole thing, because they're not ready for it. They can't take it and they have a human right not to be disturbed...

I'll tell you, I'll tell you something. I think it's all too

facile an answer to say Moscow. They're behind a hell of a lot. But, supposing I give you a scenario.

Supposing you were convinced, you, yourself, you're convinced that if we go as we go, that there is no way of feeding and taking care of the human population in 1990 and after 2000. And supposing you know in addition that people will not change, and they will not give up the 'good life' for the sake of the Cambodian boat people, or they will not disrupt an ally like the Shah because he is useful for oil, or Saudi Arabia, because they're useful for oil, or they will not disrupt whatever monopolistic relations they have with Latin American countries because it's too good for politics. And they will not disturb our relationship with Israel because of the tremendous political wallop that they have in this country—nobody can be elected.

You would say, OK, let's create disruption so that finally the idea of—not exactly One World Government—but the idea of the total inter-dependence of all the blocs is so livid and vivid and brought home in such concrete ways that they have to do something about it. And we can avoid the greater disaster of starvation and disease and the terrible social and political tearing of the fabric that would be the consequence of that.

Then, I could see you planning to do that, especially if you were, happily or unhappily aided by the desire of Moscow to subvert and to play upon the misery of millions. In other words, I think it's not quite as simple, it is an element, but it is not a simple thing to just say Moscow.

Q: I've looked at this question of terrorism, and I know that there are people who are looking at the thing from the standpoint of the necessity of establishing a kind of New World Order or an international juridical approach which will solve these problems, and that unless you do it on a kind of global basis it won't work.

M: That's right. It won't work.

Q: I've noticed, for instance, that Richard Falk has written something on this which is similar. So that's the kind of thing you're talking about?

M: So that's the kind of thing I'm talking about. Even the so-called oil shortage or the rising price of gasoline or inflation—it still can't get anything moving. No amount of film about boat people or Cambodians or Pol Pot's atrocities or Idi Amin's atrocities, nothing moves us.

Q: Won't the United Nations serve as a kind of vehicle for establishing these global concerns?

M: No, no. I don't think so.

Q: Why not?

M: Because its charter would have to be changed.