

## Father Malachi Martin's Visit to the Senate and Our Lady of Fatima

### --Epigraphs--

On the Gift of Fear (*Donum Timoris*) as Part of the Order of Fear (*Ordo Timoris*):  
“One of the last verifiable [components] of the theses that define the image of man for our time holds that it is not seemly for man to be afraid. Waters from two sources are mingled in this attitude. One is an **enlightened liberalism** that relegates fearfulness to the realm of the unreal and in whose world view, accordingly, there is no room for fear except in a figurative sense. The other is an **un-Christian stoicism that is secretly allied with both presumption and despair** [*i.e.*, the two forms of hopelessness, both of which are also grave sins against the Holy Ghost, in “the classical theology of the Church”] and [this stoicism] confronts in defiant invulnerability—without fear, but also without hope—the evils of existence, which it sees with admirable clarity.

“The classical theology of the Church is especially removed from both the oversimplification of liberalism and the desperate rigidity of stoicism. It takes for granted that fears are a reality of human existence. And it takes equally for granted that man will respond to what is objectively fearful with fear [*e.g.*, such as being permanently separated from the beloved, to include Our Beloved Lord and *Vita Aeterna* also with the Blessed Mother]....On the basis of this theology one must assume, then, that something is not quite in order [in the due and proportioned “*ordo timoris*”] when a man is afraid of nothing [“*intimiditas*”], and that the ideal of 'stoic' invulnerability and fearlessness is based on a false interpretation of man and reality itself. Thomas Aquinas points, in particular, to three passages of Holy Scripture, which, incidentally, are hardly known to contemporary Christianity, as proof that fearlessness as a fundamental attitude—which, in any event, **can 'be maintained' only through 'self-deception'**—is nothing short of unnatural. According to Thomas [II-II q. 126 a.1], the first passage, which is from **the Book of Job, refers to fearlessness that has its source in a presumptuous pride of mind:**‘...He was made to fear no one’ (Job 41:24)...**In the present context, however, we are speaking of fear only 'insofar as it somehow turns us to God'** [II-II q. 19 a. 2], that is, we are speaking of the 'fear of the Lord' [“*Timor Domini*”]....It is not easy for contemporary man [even modern Roman Catholics] to come to an understanding of what is really meant by the classical concept of 'fear of the Lord' and 'fear of God': **too many liberal and stoic obstructions stand in the way.**” (Josef Pieper, *On Hope [Über die Hoffnung]* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), pp. 77-80—my emphasis added.)

\*\*\*

“These doctrines [*e.g.*, “the Sacrament of Penance” and “the equally staggering doctrine of the Divine love for man”] seem to me to link up my whole life from the beginning to end, as no other doctrines could do; and especially to settle **simultaneously** the two problems of my childish happiness and my boyish brooding. And they specially affected one idea; which I hope it is not too pompous to call **the chief idea of my life**; I will not say the doctrine I have always taught, but the doctrine I should always have liked to teach. **That is the idea of taking things with gratitude, and not taking things for granted.** Thus the Sacrament of Penance gives a new life,...but it does **not** do it as the optimists and the hedonists and the heathen preachers of happiness do it. **The gift is given at a price, and is conditioned by a confession.** In other words, **the name of the price is Truth**, which may also be called **Reality**; **but it is facing the reality about oneself...For indeed, I never saw the two sides of this single truth stated together anywhere, until I happened to open the Penny Catechism and read the words, 'The two sins against Hope are presumption and despair.'**” (G.K. Chesterton, *The Autobiography of G.K. Chesterton* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1936), pp. 341-342—my emphasis added)

\*\*\*

“Fear of the Lord [*Timor Domini*] and the theological virtue of hope are naturally ordered to one another; they complement one another [*Summa Theologiae* II-II q. 141 a. 1 ad 3]....Fear of the Lord **assures the genuineness of hope.** It eliminates the danger that hope may be turned into its *falsa similitudo*, its false image: [*i.e.*,] into **the presumptuous anticipation of fulfillment** [prematurely]. Fear of the Lord keeps **ever** before the mind of one who hopes **the fact** that [final] fulfillment has '**not yet**' been accomplished. Fear of the Lord is the **constant** reminder that human existence...is...**perpetually threatened** in the *status viatoris* [condition of a wayfarer] by the closeness of nothingness [hence by one's permanent defectibility, and by one's own possible and freely chosen defection from the blessed end, from hope's final fulfillment in *Vita Aeterna*: Beatitude]....'**Holy fear** guards the **summit of hope.**'...'**They who fear the Lord trust in the Lord**' (Psalm 115:11). (Josef Pieper, *On Hope* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), pp. 87-88—my emphasis added)

\*\*\*

While attempting with integrity to preserve a *memoria fidelis* (“a memory faithful to the truth of the past”), the following tale proposes to help us guard against **self-deception** and **presumption**. The latter, we should fittingly recall, is both a form of pride, but also **one of the two forms of hopelessness** (along with despair) so prevalent and so subtly dangerous today, especially in the sentimental corruption and self-deception of an “unconditional” mercy. Since the Laws of God are Acts of Love, the warnings from the Merciful Heart of Mother of God—Our Blessed Lady of Fatima—might not now be genuinely accepted, nor sufficiently adhered to, nor thus perseveringly lived out with loyal love.

In 1990, just after the release of his latest book—*The Keys of This Blood: The Struggle for World Domination Between Pope John Paul II, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the Capitalist West*—Father Malachi Martin—an earlier-laicized, former Jesuit Priest—twice visited a private office in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, one of the three office buildings of U.S. Senate in Washington D.C.<sup>1</sup>

Each visit was almost two hours in length, and the second meeting was conducted exactly one week after the first one, while Father Martin was still in or about Washington. At both deeply searching discussions with Father Martin, there were about eight other persons present, all of whom were professed Roman Catholics, but for one highly intelligent and learned man, who was himself Greek Orthodox, and who, in his own witty words, has been “demoralized ever since the Battle of Manzikert [1071 A.D.]” (I myself was one of the professed Roman Catholics present there for both of those memorable, but highly disturbing, meetings.)

Father Martin presented us each with a gift of his newly released book and we discussed his book rather thoroughly over our two weeks together. His lengthy book of some 700 pages could also be considered as a book on Strategic-Cultural Warfare and a Combined Study in Religious Culture and Geo-Politics. For, it even contains a brilliant and lucid study (in Chapter 13) on the thought and pervasive influence of Antonio Gramsci—one of the two founders of the Italian Communist Party. This far-sighted philosophical chapter is entitled “Antonio Gramsci: The Haunting of East and West.”

In the remainder of this brief essay, it is my primary intention to give a factual report of these two sessions with Father Martin, whom I had never met before, although I had read some of his books, such as *The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church* (1987-1988)<sup>2</sup>.

When I first met Father Martin in Dr. James Lucier's office in the Dirksen Building, Father and I found ourselves to be seated together to one side of the large room and politely asked to wait for the other invited persons to arrive, which would likely be in fifteen minutes or so. Thus, I had time to introduce myself and to ask him some questions in private, just the two of us.

“May I ask you a few questions about your book on the Jesuits? I read it closely and appreciatively almost two years ago.” Father: “Oh, please ask me anything you wish.”

“If you were to come out with another edition of your book, *The Jesuits*, would you now make

---

1 Malachi Martin, *The Keys of This Blood: The Struggle for World Dominion Between Pope John Paul II, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the Capitalist West* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990), 735 pp.

2 Malachi Martin, *The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988), 525 pp. There was an earlier, lesser-known publication of this book in February of 1987, by Linden Press, a former imprint of Simon & Schuster itself.

any revisions—any corrections or any new inclusions?” Father: “No, nothing at all. I'd leave it just as it is. Why do you ask?” I replied: “Well, I noticed, for example, that you have written about the revolutionary Liberationalist, Father Gustavo Gutierrez, and have called him a Jesuit. The Peruvian leader and Latin American Father of Liberation Theology, Father Gustavo Gutierrez, is certainly a very important and influential man, but he is not a Jesuit. He is a Secular Priest. Another thing, and a much more important one, I think, you did not at all mention the dogmatic and disciplinary case of Father Leonard Feeney, S.J. and the larger reasons for his eventual expulsion from the Jesuit Order, partly because of his disobedience to his superiors in the Massachusetts Province and in Rome, most of the conflict transpiring in the later 1940s and in the 1950s. The larger issue was how to understand adequately and to implement properly the thrice-defined linchpin Dogma, '*Extra Ecclesiam, Nulla Salus.*' For, many Liberal Jesuits (and others) were more progressively wanting to attenuate the meaning of the Irreformable Dogma, so as to say, for example, '*Sine Ecclesia, Nulla Salus*' or even something much laxer and more inclusive and ecumenical.” Father Martin replied: “I don't know if my editors at Simon & Schuster would have really welcomed that complex case; in any event, I don't know very much about that case myself.”

“Father, it is my understanding that your main thesis in *The Jesuits* is something like this: the Jesuit Order was founded by Saint Ignatius in the Sixteenth Century to be a special Defender of the Divine Institution of the Papacy amidst the cumulatively grave challenges coming from both the Renaissance and the Protestant Revolt; but the Jesuit Order has now become a sort of Counter-Papacy. Moreover, the current Jesuit Apparatus appears to combine three main elements: Neo-Modernism, Teilhard's Science of Biological and Spiritual Evolutionism, and the Concrete Praxis as well as the Theory of Liberation Theology. Did I understand you aright and sufficiently here?” Father: “Yes, you have certainly understood my thesis and strategic analysis correctly.”

After some more discussion between the two of us, all of those invited had arrived, including my Greek Orthodox friend, James Jatras, whom Father Martin was to admire and respect very much and to be especially attentive to.

When we started to discuss his new book, *The Keys of This Blood*, Father Martin summarized his thesis, something like this: in the three-way international struggle for prominence and dominance between the Red International, the Gold International, and the Black International, as of 1990, Pope John Paul II is an especially gifted Geo-Strategic Grand-Strategic Pope, and indisputably the key figure

in the Black International (the *Sacerdotium*, or priestly religious, global authority and power). The Red International is the Socialist-Communist Camp, and the Gold International is the higher international *Nomenklatura* of the Capitalist Camp (high Finance included). In Father Martin's argument, Pope John Paul II is shown to be the master of location, the master of his communications and master of maneuver able to counterpoise and effectively dominate the other two strategic compositions and powerful embodiments.

James Jatras, himself a former Foreign Service Officer (FSO), then irrepressibly asked his first trenchant question to Father Martin: “Am I to understand that it is now the main mission of your Pope to be a great geo-strategist, especially when your Church is falling apart on so many fronts?” Our Greek Orthodox friend then fairly presented what he specifically meant by giving to Father several illustrative examples. Father Martin seemed stunned by these momentous words and challenges, and he promptly showed his admiration and even started to call my friend, “Jim.” This was only the beginning, for Jim is also a knowledgeable specialist in Eastern Europe, Russian History, and the Soviet Union—and he even has some worthy insights and questions about Fatima, as seen from the vantage point of a Russian Orthodox Christian believer.

When we started talking about Russia and Our Lady of Fatima and her message of mercy and of warning, our discussion then became even more concentrated and revealing of one's deeper faith and abiding trust.

Someone else asked Father Martin, I think it was the gifted Hungarian-American Stephen Koczak—a retired Foreign Service Officer himself—what he understood the decisive importance of Our Lady of Fatima to be in Pope John Paul II's own larger cultural strategy, not just in his missionary strategy.

After Father Martin spoke about Fatima for a while, someone asked him whether or not Our Lady's request about the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart had been (as of 1990) sufficiently accomplished. I do not remember his answer, because it was somewhat convoluted—and others saw that too. Then, someone asked him whether he knew the as-yet-publicly-undisclosed Third Secret of Fatima, inasmuch as he himself was still a Jesuit Priest and scholar working in Rome in 1960, when the remainder of the Fatima Message was purportedly to have been openly and publicly revealed.

Father Martin's immediate responses and our differentiated counter-questions were especially memorable. I shall now try to reproduce that rapid exchange to the best of my *Memoria Fidelis* (my memory loyal to the truth of the past):

“Do you know the full content of Third Secret?”—“Yes.”—“Have you read it?”—“No.”—“Then how do you reliably know what it says?”—“Someone told me who had read it himself.”—“What does it say?”—“I am not permitted to tell you.”—“Could you give us any hints?”—“Some terrible physical destruction will come—even parts of continents will break off.”—“How was this reported to you?”—“Well, I'll tell you this: In 1960 John XXIII called in five or six Cardinals to be present when he opened the remaining parts of the message of Fatima. One of them who was then present was my superior and mentor Cardinal Bea, S.J. [The German Fr. Augustin Bea, S.J. (1881-1968), himself of ethnic Jewish heritage, had been made a Cardinal by John XXIII himself and had also become his personal confessor, as he had earlier been for Pius XII.] I was waiting outside the door when Cardinal Bea came out and with his eidetic, photographic, memory he then told me what was in the message. He also told me that John XXIII said that this message would have no affect upon his plans for the upcoming Ecumenical Council; and, moreover, the third secret would, thus, not be made public.”

Father Malachi Martin made no reference at all to moral destruction or a spiritual subversion and devastation in the Church, and he explicitly disavowed that it was anything like the darker messages of Our Lady of La Salette; but he did return to talking about physical destruction, under some conditions, or if certain (but unnamed) things were not done. It was all very confusing to us.

When we then returned to Pope John Paul II's strategic plans for dealing with Russia (the Soviet Union), Father Martin said he was part of a confidential—secret—apparatus with a specific strategic mission for, and in, Russia. I then asked him: “Is there a new *Russicum*, as there was under Pius XI and filled with Jesuit operatives and directors such as the secretly consecrated Bishop Michel d'Herbigny, S.J. [1880-1957] and the loyal Father Walter Ciszek, S.J. [1904-1984]?”

Father Martin immediately replied, “Yes.”

And I then added a further query: “And maybe also a little like the anti-modernist *Sodalitium Pianum*—or *La Sapinière*—under Pope Pius X?” Father then said: “I don't think so, for we now have a different focus and challenge. But, under certain emergency conditions—recalling the covert work of Bishop Michel d'Herbigny, S.J. himself, and of the *Russicum* network—I may myself ordain priests.”

Jim Jatras looked at me in a strange way, giving a sign of doubt. But, we could then go no further in that first meeting, because the time was up and Father Martin looked rather tired and did not appear to want to go into this whole matter of a secret apparatus and hierarchy any further—at least not then.

Jim Jatras, my learned Greek Orthodox friend, came up to me out in the hall immediately, as we

were departing that first of two sessions with Father Martin. Jim said: “Am I right in inferring, therefore, that Father Martin must already be a validly consecrated bishop himself? Or, do I not understand your likely Catholic Doctrine and Canon Law on this matter? For, may a Priest validly ordain another Priest?” I replied, “No. That’s why Archbishop Lefebvre had to do what he has done—also to consecrate a new bishop. If Father Martin is a Bishop himself, he should also be able to consecrate another Bishop. We shall ask him about this matter next week, if and when he returns. But you should first ask him, for he is especially attentive to you as a Non-Catholic—and because you are also so articulate and charming!”

Well, it happened. In the same office the following week, James Jatras placed a lucid and succinct question to Father Martin, after Father had asked if there were any questions left over from the previous week. He also **once again** effusively and smoothly flattered our group as a whole, saying that he had never met and been among such a well-informed and intelligent collection of characters—so knowledgeable about secular foreign affairs and even about Church history and the like. His words were a little thick and somewhat embarrassing—but we appreciated his politeness even as we tried to resist and deflect his mounting flattery of our pride!

Then Jim asked his keen and lucid question: “Father Martin, last week you said that, under certain conditions, you may and can ordain new priests. That must mean that you are already a consecrated bishop yourself. Is that not so?”

Father Martin got very nervous—once again—and he bluntly said: “Jim, I never said that I could ordain priests.” I then said, in support of the veracity of my friend: “Yes, you did, Father, and I too heard it. You more than implied that you were part of a secret hierarchy.” Father became more nervous.

After resiliently recovering his characteristic poise and arts of blandishment, Father Martin said that we must have misunderstood him, for he was, admittedly, a little intimidated, being amongst so many disciplined and searching minds—and so well-informed, to boot. We chose not to embarrass him any more, but, instead to hear his other reflections about John Paul II's larger strategy and about the deeply divided and wounded situation of the Catholic Church.

In this context, I should therefore bear witness to one last set of his challenging comments, and then a few of our fittingly responsive questions and observations.

For, while Father Martin was trying to help us understand John Paul II's larger religious-political-cultural Grand Strategy and, specifically, that part of it which dealt with Central-Eastern Europe and

with the Soviet Union and its Empire, he started commenting on the gravely weakened and highly vulnerable condition of the Roman Catholic Church. The tale he had to tell was dark. And it became darker as his eloquent narrative gifts once again showed themselves in his vivid presentation. As those who have met him know, he is a very accomplished rhetorician—to include his gestures and tones of voice and his dramatic pauses.

As he continued his grim depiction of the Church's situation in 1990 (less than a year before Archbishop Lefebvre himself was to die, on 25 March 1991), some of us thereby came to consider that **the Cultural Immune System of the Church**, as it were, **was not only debilitated, but also self-sabotaging—as if she had contracted an auto-immune disease.**

At least, that was the way I was coming to understand his demoralizing meaning, and I told him so: “Father Martin, after listening to your grim depiction, I now understand better why more than a few of your own many readers have felt the way many readers feel after reading the dark, Jansenist-tinged novels of François Mauriac—even when there are glimpses of Grace sometimes only and suddenly at the end of his works, as in the *Vipers' Tangle* [*Le Nœud de vipères—The Knot of Vipers*]. Mauriac was always troubled that his novels had such a mournful effect, as if there was no way out—no exit, as it were. Many admitted that his books led them to despair, or close to a sense of futility: 'What's the use?'" I continued in my response to Father Martin, as follows: “Mauriac repeatedly said that he certainly never intended to foster, much less produce, such a consequence. However, you have now, analogously, not only shown the deep divisions in the Church, but also the untrustworthiness of the current supernatural apparatus of the Church: especially the whole Sacramental Order. Priests' ordinations are, putatively, now often in doubt, and also the new rite for the consecration of bishops; hence the doubt about certain sacraments, such a Penance and Confirmation, as well as Holy Orders. We wonder whether a true sacramental Absolution can still be widely given, and not only in rare instances. Many things you have told us certainly have the effect of undermining our trust. Was this a valid Sacrifice of the Mass? Did I receive a valid Absolution just now? In doubt, will the principle of '*Ecclesia Supplet*' now more often apply, through the generous and merciful mediation of the '*Communio Sanctorum*'? Are we being reliably taught the full Catholic doctrine of supernatural Grace? Father Martin, I am in the married state and a father of eight children—the youngest being five and the eldest being fourteen. What am I to say to my children? What should I now teach my children? Whom and what are they to trust?"

Father Martin was unexpectedly stunned by my words, at least at first, and he kept a recollected quiet. Then he dolefully and elegiacally replied: “Oh, Robert, I don't know. I don't know what to say. I'll have to think about it. It is, indeed, a very difficult time—and certainly for **the adventure** of first **founding** and then sustaining a family, as Captain Charles Péguy [d. 1914] himself so eloquently said it, both in his prose and often implicitly in his haunting poetry, even before World War I, where he was to die on the battlefield.”

After these moving words, I asked to make another comment, and he welcomed it politely: “Father Martin, your forceful words about the equivocations and untrustworthy ambiguities of the current apparatus of the **Visible** Church are disturbing enough; but your presentation of a **Spiritual** Church—a seemingly **Dis-Incarnate or Pneumatic** Church—are even more unsettling, at least for me. For, it sounds somewhat like the claims of the mediaeval sect of the 'Spiritual Franciscans' and their own concept of an invisible Pneumatic Church. That orientation resembled some of the earlier Gnostic Sects, as well, except it was not so pessimistic and life-negating. In any case, the concept and reality of a Spiritual-Pneumatic Church and its Religious Orders has certainly called into question the whole Sacramental Order (visible and invisible), as well as the Incarnation itself. Are you not suggesting such similar things today amidst so much unreliability and untrustworthiness, perhaps even coming to us from the **visible** Magisterium? As Jacques Maritain even said—in his earlier, sounder, and more rooted Thomistic Writings—for us fallen human beings there is always the danger and the permanently alluring temptation of '**Angelism**,' which is a false escape and a deceit. Is my attempt at clarity here understandable to you? My fuller meaning is rooted in the Humility of God in the Incarnation—and then its continuation in the divinely established Sacramental Order of Grace itself.”

Although he decided not then to reply specifically *ad Rem*, Father Martin did say that he certainly hoped not to be associated with those “gnostic and spiritualizing heretic Franciscans—God forbid!” and then he courteously added: “We shall have many such substantive things to discuss further in our conversations over the next several months, and more! What a challenge you all have been for me. What an inspiration. Thank you. And I hope you will all come now to read closely my new book, *The Keys of This Blood*, copies of which I have left as a gift for all of you—it is in this box here beside me, which I have already given to Dr. Lucier. Thank you, once again, for your warm and very stimulating hospitality.”

## CODA

It has been my intention in this essay to present, with a few exceptions, my own private and public discussions with Father Malachi Martin during his two visits to an office in the U.S. Senate in the late-Spring 1990, where his audience then consisted of some eight well-educated persons, all but one of whom were Roman Catholics. But, the one who was a learned and loyal Greek Orthodox Christian was a very special catalyst (and much more) for our larger, and very candid, discourse.

Not long before our multi-layered discussion—on 9 November 1989—the Berlin Wall had come down. Not long after our gathering, the First Persian Gulf War commenced (2 August 1990-28 February 1991). In Europe, soon after our meeting—on 3 October 1990—the Reunification of Germany would take place. And, a little over a year later—on 26 December 1991—there would come the surprise of the Formal Dissolution of the Soviet Union and the declared independence of the former “Soviet Republics.”

Although we discussed many pertinent topics during both of our Spring 1990 meetings, I was especially interested in the religious and strategic matters. Thus, my selection of what to present and accent in this essay. Some of these Catholic religious topics would not be of special interest to my Greek Orthodox friend, James Jatras, but Jim certainly helped keep our discussions with Malachi Martin very vivid and attentive to many matters of moment—to include the matter of deception and the intimate breaking of trust (and trustworthiness).

Before Father Malachi Martin was to die some nine years later (on 27 July 1999), he would write several more books (non-fiction and fiction) and become even a more elusive and considerable challenge to many people, as to who he really was and what his guiding purposes were. However, I shall not at all discuss such things, for I have only wanted to present the manifold challenge he was to us.

Commenting on Father Malachi Martin's book *The Jesuits* (1987, 1988), Father John A. Hardon, S.J., told me in person that he agreed with 90% of Malachi Martin's book, although he did not then or afterwards specify those parts with which he disagreed and why so. However, he did say something potentially important when I asked him: “What do you think Father Martin omitted? Should he not have included the political and theological situation with the New England Provinces of the Jesuits in their conflicts with the Jesuit Father Leonard Feeney? Father Martin does not mention a word about this moral, doctrinal, and disciplinary case, which also involved the intervention of Rome.”

Father Hardon then told me he did not know anything important or substantive about the Father Feeney Case—also because he himself was from the Midwestern Jesuit Province. Moreover, he again told me about his own case as a Dogmatic Theologian and Teacher in the Jesuit Order, and about the pivotal year of 1957. For—as he earnestly told me many times over the years I was to know him closely (November 1980—December 2000)—it was in the year of 1957 that there manifoldly began his own trials in the Jesuit Order, after the new America leadership of the Jesuits returned from the General Congregation in Rome with new ideas of theological certification and with new ideas about Ecumenism. Furthermore, 1957 was some ten years after the Father Feeney Case had begun and later further erupted, also on the political front.

However, I recently discovered that Father Hardon knew something about the Jesuit Father Feeney and his challenging work in Boston across the street from Harvard University at the Saint Benedict Center, at least in the interval of 1949-1950. In his dissertation, Father Hardon knew enough about Father Feeney, S.J. and his doctrinal crusade with Saint Benedict Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts, at least enough to include it in his dissertation: and as is especially shown by his comments on one part of their well-circulated, somewhat provocative, anti-Modernist Journal, *From the Housetops* (Volume III, 1949).

For, I have found these references and Father Hardon's own doctrinal commentary upon them near the end of an English-language Edition of Father Hardon's 1950 doctoral dissertation, newly edited and introduced by James Likoudis, and published in Bardstown, Kentucky by the Eternal Life Network.<sup>3</sup> That dissertation had been approved some time in 1950 by his director at the Jesuit University of Gregorianum in Rome—*i.e.*, the Pontifical Gregorian University there. Father Hardon was later thus granted the doctorate, either late 1950 itself, or some time soon thereafter, in 1951 (the details here are not yet clear). However, the 1950 dissertation itself was to be first circulated in Rome some twelve years before the October 1962 opening of the Second Vatican Council. Touching upon Dogma and Ecumenism and Classical Ecclesiology, Father's dissertation is suggestively entitled *A*

---

3 Father John A. Hardon, S.J., *A Comparative Study of Bellarmine's Doctrine on the Relation of Sincere Non-Catholics to the Catholic Church* (Bardstown, Kentucky: Eternal Life—the 1950 reproduction was copyrighted by Inter Mirifica on July 2009), 186 pages. The dissertation has three Parts. Father Hardon's somewhat disapproving comments on a layman, Raymond Karam's own purportedly “rigorist” article published in *From the Housetops* (Volume III) are to be found in Part Three, Chapter 5 (pp. 125-147). This Chapter 5, moreover, is the last part of the text of Father's dissertation, after which come all the Endnotes (pp. 149-182) for the entire dissertation. The following endnotes refer to, or quote, Raymond Karam's own article on Ecclesiology and Membership in the Catholic Church and Eternal Salvation: endnotes 274-276; 288-291; 296 and 299-301; 304, 307, 313; 321-322, and 324. But, Father Hardon does not appear to mention Father Feeney, S.J. by name, however. Perhaps, it was a form of Jesuit discretion, or prudence, or mental reservation.

*Comparative Study of Bellarmine's Doctrine on the Relation of Sincere Non-Catholics to the Catholic Church* (186 pp.) Father Hardon's dissertation director was the Dutch Jesuit Priest, Father Sebastian Tromp, S.J., a well-known and influential scholar himself.

Moreover, concerning Father Tromp himself, one of the informed persons associated with the Inter-Mirifica/Eternal-Life publication of Father Hardon's 1950 dissertation wrote me the following words:

The great theologian under whose guidance Father Hardon wrote his dissertation was Father S. (Sebastian?) Tromp, S.J., who was the advisor of Pope Pius XII for writing the magnificent encyclical “Mystici Corporis” (1943), and in fact helped draft it. It was also Father Tromp's use of “subsistence” which was **to influence Vatican II's development in ecclesiology: “The Church subsists in the Catholic Church” to make room for the theological justification of the “imperfect communion” enjoyed by the separated Eastern Churches.**

Fr. Tromp also wrote “Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia” (3rd ed. Romae, 1946); an English translation was published by Vantage Press, NY 1960. Fr. Tromp also [had] various articles in *Gregorianum*. (e.g., “De biformi conceptu 'Christi Mystici' in Controversiis S. Roberti Bellarmini,” *Gregorianum*, XXII (1942), 274-90. Father Tromp was obviously an expert on Bellarmine. (My bold emphasis added, and one inserted bracket, as well. While still preserving the identity of this learned scholar, I acknowledge that this clarifying electronic message was politely sent to me on 18 May 2016 in the early evening.)

One of the matters unexpectedly raised by this message, however, is the unequivocal mention of “**Vatican II's development of ecclesiology**”—that is to say, this Pastoral Ecumenical Council's own purported Development of Doctrine. Since the Second Vatican Council was not a Dogmatic Council and did not make any condemnations of error, nor define any new positive, affirmative Dogmas, I am not yet sure as to how to understand this scholar's clear meaning. Perhaps, there is now somehow to be found a New Category: namely, a “Development of **Pastoral Doctrine**.” And, thus also a newly allowed application of clear Pastoral Praxis. In any case, this purported Development would **not** be truly Pastoral—much less wholesomely (and faithfully) Pastoral—**if it were to be confusing and to become MORE confusing**. For example, are the Greek and Russian and other Orthodox Elements now Members of the Church, Members of the Divinely Founded Catholic Church, or not? Are they, instead, gradually moving to a fuller “communion,” or not? What if they do not attain to full communion, then what? And how shall we know? Is their own eternal salvation then gravely jeopardized, or not? Or, would their sincerely expressed form of Hope not be, instead, in fact and objectively, what G.K. Chesterton may well call a form of Presumption, thus a form of Hopelessness, that also lacks the Gift

of Fear? Moreover, such a promulgated set of confusing concepts and uncertain consequences would not at all be a form of Mercy. In this proclaimed “Year of Mercy” in the Catholic Church, such unmerciful confusion would be even more questionable and disturbing to the faithful, would it not?

The wise old Latin maxim may be applied here: “*Suppressio Veri, Suggestio Falsi*”—by the conscious suppression of truth, the suggestion of something false comes about. That is so, also in putative “mental reservations”—those forms of slyness even practiced by Jesuits, as I have heard!

Here, however, is a more direct instance of a “suppression” or of a “holding back”: it is the case of a Roman Catholic Pope's actually holding back the proposed conversion of a potential convert, a well-known Orthodox leader and ecumenical diplomat. The highly esteemed Orthodox diplomat-philosopher, Charles Malik (1906-1987), was personally told by Pope Paul VI that, **as long as he accepted and fully believed in the doctrine, creeds, and ecclesiastical dogmas of 15th-Century Council of Florence (1438-1442)**, he need **not** formally and openly convert to the Catholic Church (as the rest of Malik's family had effectively done); inasmuch as (said the pope) Malik could thereby do **more** good by staying where he was and by helping his Orthodox brothers **also** to accept the Council of Florence in its entirety. This proposal was certainly something quite shocking, after they had worked together so closely and ecumenically; and after Malik himself first had sympathetically put forth the trenchant question about his own deeper and fitting and desired Conversion—a request put forth to the Catholic Pope, Paul VI, himself, in person. (It prompts us now also to look more deeply into the 1993 Balamand Declaration about the principles Ecclesiological Dialogue—and attempted Proselytism—between Catholics, Orthodox Christians, and the vulnerable “Uniates,” or Eastern Rite Catholics.)

Dr. Charles Malik's close boyhood and abiding friend, Brother Francis Fakhri Maluf (1913-2009), M.I.C.M, told me reliably, and in much detail, this entire story, which his friend Charles Malik had earlier told to him. Moreover, it was Charles Malik who had also earlier arranged two important Ecumenical Meetings between Patriarch Athenagoras and Pope Paul VI, the second one being conducted in Istanbul, Turkey in January of 1967. (It occurred while I was a military officer there—a young captain—not only gratefully stationed in Turkey, but also often dwelling just to the south of Istanbul itself; yet I then knew nothing at all about this meeting's importance nor about its longer-range ecumenical implications for a purportedly **less** “imperfect communion” or union.) And now there seems to be even **more** of an uncertainty about the criteria as to who is a sufficient member of the Church and thus willing indispensably (as a precondition) to accept all her Sacraments and her

Governance and the Divinely Founded Papacy itself. To me, the confusion is not perceptibly merciful, and the vulnerable ambiguities are, often enough, quite demoralizing. What is the truth here? Gradual and “Evolving” Membership and “Communion”? The Issues *de Ecclesia* and *de Membris* remain an important matter for authoritative decisiveness—without equivocation. To Saint Robert Bellarmine, S.J., these matters were certainly on high importance, and needing clear decisiveness.

Furthermore, on the evidence of history, amidst such pervasive situations and seemingly mutable contexts of ambiguity and confusion, **both deception and self-deception are also much more likely to occur.** (Incidentally, the strategic-minded financier George Soros' own Hungarian father told him and then further taught his son that one can—and one should—make more money in times of chaos—as was certainly the case there in Hungary in the immediate aftermath of World War II.)

Closer to my own life and formative education, it was in 1962 that a British Commando officer, a Captain in the elite British SAS, told me and taught me something that I was never to forget, although I did not fully understand his meaning at the time, much less his alertness and his deeper cautionary wisdom. As a young 19-year-old cadet at the U.S. Military Academy, and on my first trip to Europe, he suddenly said to me once—when we were speaking of the matter of military deception, both **strategic** deception, as well as **tactical** deception on the immediate battlefield : “Hickson, **the Principle of Deception is quite simple. You find out what someone wants to be deceived in, and you promptly set about deceiving him in it, sometimes more slowly and indirectly.**”

This officer had suddenly revealed to me **the interrelationship between Deception and Self-Deception.** He noted, moreover, that how one actually went about the deception—psychologically “profiling” someone and then “manipulating his cherished illusions” and “flattering his pride” and such things—will vary, as I later came to appreciate better; but the Principle itself is steady. There can be a “fast path” or a “slow path” in the deception; and there can be an indirect path as well as a direct path, but the principle which the SAS Captain first shared with me is manifoldly illuminating of reality. At least it has been so for me down the years: in the military; in the intelligence community; in the academic community, the teaching-and-scholarly life at a college and university; and, most painfully, in the Catholic Church, especially among the Prelates in Catholic Ecclesiastical Affairs. Sometimes it even seems to me that Vatican Diplomacy very effectively undermines the Faith, while mysteriously remaining within the Providence of God. (We shall certainly get in trouble **if** we say and believe that evil itself is **not** within the Providence of God! At least, Father Hardon assured me of that. Father

Hardon even once explicitly asked me a Test Question: “**Is evil within the Providence of God?**”)

Cardinal Silvio Oddi also once memorably said to me in person: “The faithful have a right to the truth; a claim in justice to receive the truth—and to receive it whole and in proper proportion.” And not ambiguously and equivocally, as if the principle of non-contradiction does not apply. That is to say, the *Onus Probandi* –the “Burden of Proof”—in presenting clear and trustworthy Doctrine is not to fall on the faithful, but, rather, on the Faculties of the Authoritative Teaching Church (*Ecclesia Docens*). Cardinal Oddi smiled warmly when I told him that I was reassuringly taught that “*Nothing that is intentionally ambiguous is binding on the Catholic Conscience.*”

The great lay benefactor, William M. Carrigan (d. 2000), who was especially devoted both to Our Lady of Guadalupe and to Padre Pio (d. 1968), often said to me what Padre Pio had first said to him, and more than once down the years (1944-1968), in person. For, Mr. Carrigan was first an altar boy for Padre Pio during World War II while in the American Red Cross in Italy. Then he became a friend and later was even the promoter of the canonical cause of Padre Pio for sainthood. While I was at Christendom College in the 1980s, Mr. Carrigan often quoted to me Padre Pio's own earnest words to him: “**The problem in the Church is hypocrisy in high places.**” William Carrigan himself was always resistant to any manifestation of Duplicity: *i.e.*, “hypocritical cunning.” He could somehow “sniff it out”—and promptly, as well as reliably!

Father Vincent P. Miceli, S.J. also used to say to me, while he was at Christendom College, that “**the greatest social effect of the lie is that it breaks trust.**” And, he added: “**once trust is broken, it is so hard to repair.**” These are what Hilaire Belloc called “**Searchlight Insights.**” Also like the SAS Captain's “Principle of Deception.”

Returning now to my concentrated experience with Malachi Martin in Washington, D.C. in 1990, I have a few more things to say, which may still be of help, at least for those of us who still carefully read his different books.

For, in listening to Father Martin in 1990, it was often enough quite difficult to discern what was a Fact and what was a “Factoid”—and one often sensed that the “Factoids” were imaginatively (and quite vividly) re-arranged to fit an Artifice—an undisclosed Artifice.

For example, the scholarly Father Malachi Martin, S.J. had been the personal secretary to Cardinal Augustin Bea, S.J. (1881-November 1968) between 1958 and 1965, or so; and he had assiduously helped the Cardinal prepare the Second Vatican Council, and also helped him very much

and indispensably **during** the ongoing Council, especially in Cardinal Bea's contacts and diplomacy with the Jewish authorities (not only in the United States). However, Father Martin was very reticent to speak about this time and these shadowy activities. When asked (now in 1990) some specific questions about those earlier matters, Father was very elusive and he seemed still to have some “mental reservations” about this whole matter of Jewish-Christian negotiations and somewhat confidential relations—as was also the case about the fuller message of Our Lady of Fatima (as glimpsed by him, **through** Cardinal Bea, in 1960). Perhaps, this preserved tacitness is another instance of “*suppressio veri, suggestio falsi*” or—in the words of Pope Saint Gregory the Great (in his *Moralia in Job*)—a new expression of “*prudencia carnis*” or “*prudencia carnalis*.”

In this context, I shall reveal an incident of a purported “mental reservation” that occurred among Jesuits and Jesuit Scholastics themselves some fifty years ago. I do this, not only to disclose one illustrative instance of a morally ambiguous “mental reservation,” but also to show a little portion of its truly trust-breaking effect upon a young Jesuit Scholastic himself, whom I know and who is now himself a Catholic priest, but not a Jesuit priest.

Simply put, a learned and well-respected, and even venerable Jesuit priest and the teacher of their class in Catholic theology, passed out to his students a document which he had been given in confidence, and **on the strict condition** that he would **not** show that document to anyone else. The Jesuit teacher later made, at some point, more than one copy of this document, and then distributed some of the copies also to his students. And the teacher even thought this to be a legitimate way of still keeping his promise, as well as the donor's stipulated provision and restriction. However, that young Jesuit Scholastic was adversely and gravely affected by that trust-breaking act of cunning, which also seemed to him (both then and now) to have been both a deception and a self-deception. (Moral theologians may have more to say about this larger matter of “self-censorship” and “mental reservations.”)

Some priests and laymen I know have also observed and conjectured that certain things recently (or, for example, back in 26 June of 2000) coming publicly out of the Vatican—and even some things that are **not** now (or not yet) coming out of the Vatican—are **due to their own and self-justifying “mental reservations.”** The weakness and cowardice of “*prudencia carnalis*” could also be involved. (As one serenely courageous Catholic Bishop politely, but surprisingly, also put the matter in my presence two years ago: “**The Vatican doesn't lose face.**” Those words, when they are taken in

themselves and objectively so, certainly constitute a grave indictment of any purportedly Christian Enterprise or Organizational Apparatus or *Nomenklatura*. Would Christ Himself “never lose face”?)

When we read again the three Epigraphs at the beginning of this essay, we may now better see how the Gift of Fear is truly a Guard against Presumption. Presumption is not only a form of sinful pride, but it is also one of the two sins against hope—that is, one of the two forms of hopelessness, the second one being despair. Both of them are considered by Classical Catholic Theology to be, indeed, Sins against the Holy Ghost, and grave.

Most of us are aware of the presence and danger of corrosive despair—especially Final Despair; but it seems that, amidst much “sentimental theology” and “unconditional mercy,” we are today less aware of the nature, presence, and danger of sinful Presumption—and its connections with Intellectual and Spiritual Sloth. Nor do we seem to be especially attentive to the *Donum Timoris*—the Gift of Fear, especially the **protective** “Gift of Fear of the Lord.” (There are also the related factors of “*timor servilis*,” “*timor fidelis*,” and “*timor castus*” to consider and to incorporate into our fuller understanding.)

Hope itself, we must remember, is a Virtue only as an infused Theological Virtue, as part of the gift of the Supernatural Order. (Hope is not a Nature Virtue—it is not like the four Cardinal Virtues.)

One of the books of the Old Testament that Saint Thomas Aquinas cherished was the Wisdom Book of Ecclesiasticus (Sirach). Brother Francis (Fakhri Maluf), M.I.C.M., also always cherished the book, and he especially contemplated and often repeated the words: “**The fear of the Lord is the beginning of His love**” (“*Timor Dei initium dilectionis eius.*”) (Ecclesiasticus 25:16—the *Vulgate*)

May we be blessed to come to understand all of these interrelated insights much better, and also to pray for the sustaining “*Donum Timoris*” lest we become subtly or openly presumptuous, as well as slothful. For not only is the gift of final perseverance itself a great gift (a “*Magnum Donum*,” in the words of the Council of Trent), but we must remember that, **until the moment of our death**—and because of the very Gift and special “Dowry of Human Freedom”—**we retain the Permanent Possibility of Voluntary Defection**. That realization should help us strive for humility and for genuine hope.

My own beloved mentor, Josef Pieper, with his freshness of language, expressed two additionally profound insights **about the two forms of hopelessness**. Down the years of our knowing one another (1974-1997), he often also said these words to me in person: “Despair is the **premature** anticipation of

final non-fulfillment; and Presumption is the **premature** anticipation of final fulfillment.”

However, those who **hold to** the heresy of Universal Salvation—*Apokatastasis*—**or to** Hegelian and Teilhardian Progressive Evolutionism and Evolutionary Pantheism, do not at all accept Dr. Pieper's insights. Nor do the “Process Philosophers and Theologians” who blasphemously maintain that “**God needs us to complete Himself.**” This is part of the struggle that we are now in.

“O! the masses of doubt that are floating about!” (H. Belloc)—also among those whom Josef Pieper modestly called the “Non-Catholic Catholics.”

After hearing from Jesuit Father Malachi Martin in 1990 and now also trying to transmit a few of his uncertain, but fearsome, glimpses of the Fatima Apparitions, may we now be blessed to come to know more completely the entire Merciful and yet unmistakably Warning Message from the Heart of the Mother of God.

Our Lady of Fatima, please pray for us. Especially for the Little Ones—the *Parvuli*.

--Finis--

© 2016 Robert D. Hickson