

## Note to the Reader

This file includes the following documents:

1. The letter from the President of the Brazilian TFP sent to Atila Sinke Guimarães. This document presents Atila with an Ultimatum, demanding that he stop the dissemination of *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II* and the publication of the rest of his Collection or face expulsion from the TFP (pp. 1-6);
2. Two Declarations from TFP members supporting the arguments of the President's letter (pp. 7-10);
3. The *Defense* by Atila Guimarães, in response to the accusations of the aforementioned documents. (pp. 11-253).

### The Letter of the President of the TFP to Atila Sinke Guimarães

Brazilian Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property  
National Council  
São Paulo, November 20, 1997

Mr. Atila Sinke Guimarães  
Eremo de Elias  
Itaquera – São Paulo

Dear Mr. Atila,

Salve Maria!

I was shocked at the news you gave to Dr. Plinio Xavier on Saturday, November 8, saying that a book under your authorship would be published in the United States (under the title *The Murky Waters of Vatican II*) and that a text of Prof. Plinio would be used in its Preface.

In the last two years, Dr. Plinio Xavier had several conversations with you about this study of yours. In these conversations he insisted especially on the fact that our late and dear Founder did not desire this work to be published before he himself reviewed it in its entirety and that, with Prof. Plinio's absence, we were against its publication without an assurance that your writing was secure and the occasion timely.

In a letter addressed to Dr. Plinio Xavier, dated last February 27, you wrote at length about our concerns and, in particular, of the need for consulting professional theologians and philosophers.

In effect, a review to be made by high caliber theologians, after Prof. Plinio himself had made one, was already desired by him still in life (in the mentioned letter, you even provide the norms he had given in this respect). The death of our Founder made this [review] even more necessary than in his life, as well as an evaluation – in the tactical-political field – to be made by members of the TFP chosen by us and recognized as capable of issuing an opinion.

Our desire for a double review grew after you published a manifesto in *The Wanderer* on a talk given by Archbishop Quinn about new ways of exercising the Papacy. On that occasion, we were ob-

liged to write to you to demand that the TFP not be involved in this initiative and we noted important lacunas in that manifesto, calling particular attention to a forced interpretation of the words spoken by Archbishop Quinn. You even previously acknowledged this fact in conversations with Mr. Alfredo MacHale, alleging this to be a strategic resource to raise a polemic.

In a later conversation you had with Dr. Paulo Brito, you also accepted some critical remarks he made about the anti-Quinn manifesto, even agreeing to insert his proposals into it.

We, therefore, had reasons to fear that the work on Vatican Council II, incomparably more delicate and vast than the analysis of Archbishop Quinn's conference, could present similar problems.

In the aforementioned letter of February 27, 1997, you were prepared to provide the work to members of the TFP that Dr. Plinio Xavier would choose, thus putting into execution the consultations with professional theologians and philosophers. But you advised him that, from then on, you would deal with the matter of your work only by letter, thus interrupting the verbal dialogue maintained until that date.

This demand of a contact only by letter was reaffirmed in a later letter, dated last March, in which you made a complaint that, in a conversation with Mr. Leo Horvat, I had vigorously criticized initiatives that you were taking independent of the direction of the TFP, even to the point that we might be forced to execute drastic sanctions.

In effect, as you relate in this second letter, you favored starting an international campaign against the "We Are Church" movement, which even included a judicial process for fraud against the promoters of that revolutionary initiative, as well as the dissemination of a manifesto of your making.

Given the urgent character you gave your campaign proposal, Dr. Plinio Xavier responded to you two weeks later in an extensive letter, dated last March 16, showing the inconvenience of making that campaign against the WAC, at least in the way proposed. What led us to make that decision were the symptoms of failure that that revolutionary initiative was encountering in Catholic milieus. The complete lack of success of the WAC recent delivery of its petition to the Vatican only confirmed the accurateness of our proposal to abstain from the mentioned campaign.

In that letter, Dr. Plinio Xavier said nothing about the review of the book, the subject of the first of your letters. But it was implicit in this silence that he would also write you on this topic. He did not do so immediately because there was not a serene climate to deal with such a delicate matter after the friction raised regarding the Quinn manifesto and my telephone call to Mr. Leo Horvat (proof of this climate is your demand to deal with the matter only in writing). This prudent delay to allow the dust to settle would not gravely harm a work that had taken 13 years to be written and would take still more time to be reviewed. Incidentally, you have never asked Dr. Plinio Xavier for an answer.

In this context of a dialogue that had only been postponed, you (secretively) continued negotiations with the aim of publishing your work in the United States without waiting for our reply on the subject of a prior review. And now you surprise us with the imminent launching of the book, aggravated by the insertion of the already mentioned text of Prof. Plinio.

It is painful for us to say this, but such a procedure does not conform to the ideal of chivalric obedience practiced in our family of souls. Hence my shock at your recent communication.

As for the publication itself, it raises a question of supreme importance. In the preface of Dr. Marian Horvat – according to what you told Dr. Plinio Xavier – words of Dr. Plinio about the work undertaken by you were inserted.

Here are some questions: Wouldn't those words, justly praiseful of your person, imply the disregarding of a personal editing of Prof. Plinio that he still hoped to make in France in 1993? Wouldn't it also imply disregarding the editing by qualified theologians that he also desired?

Another question: Wouldn't the insertion of said words be taken by many as a supposed seal of approval of Prof. Plinio for your work just as it comes to light at the present moment? If so, what confusion could this generate? What inconveniences – perhaps even grave ones – could this bring to our sister organization, the American TFP? And for the other TFPs? If a polemic were raised over your book, wouldn't people think that the TFP was engaged in it also, despite our disapproval of the initiative? Can we, the older ones, allow the legacy of our Founder to run these risks? Upon whose shoulders would the diplomatic leadership – tactically and intellectually delicate – of such a polemic fall?

In effect, a precipitous and large publication of this work, if it were to appear to be inspired by us, would substantially change the nuanced position of the TFPs left by Prof. Plinio regarding the grave problems raised by the post-conciliar crisis.

Now then, it was not in the plans of Prof. Plinio to embark spear in hand on a public polemic about the problems of conscience that certain conciliar documents raise.

According to the testimony of the closest friends of our Founder, as well as those who helped you in the research, Dr. Plinio intended that a study be made that would expose the basis of our perplexity over the conciliar texts that are apparently incompatible with the traditional teachings of the Church.

Such a study would be submitted to the Holy See for its consideration and circulated strictly in milieus specializing in Theology (at most, an edition of some 200 copies, thought Dr. Plinio). This publication would serve as a shield to protect us from the open or veiled persecution that we suffer from members of the Hierarchy in various countries because of our attitude of passive resistance to the application of post-conciliar *aggiornamento*.

It seems that you did not understand the plan in the same way because, from the beginning, you began to give it a much larger extension. According to a testimony of Mr. Fernando Antunez, Dr. Plinio wanted a summarized analysis of the conciliar texts to provide a base for the expression of our perplexity.

Instead of this concise work, based substantially on the actual words of the conciliar documents – a difficult work because of the ambiguity of some of them – you chose to write a global critique of the contemporary theological currents that inspired the writers of those documents. From this resulted a collection of thousands of pages in 13 volumes.

Now then, already in the editing of the first volume at a Symposium held in Serra Negra in 1986, Prof. Plinio was not at all satisfied with the quality of the writing. Beginning with the title – *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* - which you intended to give it and which was the subject of a long expo-

sition of our Founder during the said Symposium, trying in vain to convince you to change it. On the contrary, according to your assistants, you preferred to add to your work a quotation that aimed exclusively at justifying the title you had imagined for the work and which you insisted on keeping.

What happened with the title occurred with many of the observations that Dr. Plinio made during this editing, whether in regard to some formulations, to interpretations of texts that seemed forced to him or to simple errors of Portuguese. After the Symposium, he told some close associates that it was entirely useless, since you defended each comma like a couple defending their only child.

Mr. Nelson Fragelli wrote the solemn declaration that I have enclosed, in which he relates such confidences. The veracity of the assessment contained in this declaration is confirmed by the testimony of those who, over the years, have collaborated in your work. Mr. Fernando Antúnez, as the private secretary of Prof. Plinio, and I, who spoke with him every day, are also witnesses to many of his comments in the sense that he judged your work insufficient, requiring a thorough review. All the more so since it was taking on a wingspan that went far beyond the initial plan. Mr. Fernando makes this clear in his declaration, which is included.

In view of these shortcomings, and realizing, on the other hand, that you did not have enough flexibility to accept the required corrections, Prof. Plinio chose to advise you to continue to write the work, thus deferring the editing of the same.

In this, Dr. Plinio did not show any duplicity, for he hoped and prayed that one day, through intellectual maturity inherent to the experience of life and by a special grace, you would be open to accept a serious review of your work, "*conditio sine qua non*" for its presentation to the Vatican and a select number of dignitaries and scholars. That day, unfortunately, has not yet arrived and was probably one of the many perplexities that Dr. Plinio offered to Our Lady at the hour of his death.

It is in the context of this charitable attitude of postponing the review to avoid a confrontation with you that one should understand the complimentary words he sent you upon receiving your communication that the work was completed. If you analyze them closely, you will see that, even as he praises your effort, Dr. Plinio avoided making value judgments about the content of the work. Nor could he do so, for he had read only a very small part of it, which, moreover, had already undergone changes.

I am aware of the very hard truth I am revealing to you that Dr. Plinio very paternally did not judge convenient to tell you. After the death of our Founder and facing the first manifestations of your intention to publish the work, the TFP directors maintained the same policy [of indefinitely postponing the review] in order not to have to tell you, out of charity, everything that is stated above. Thus, we tried to create favorable psychological conditions for an efficient review by well-oriented theologians because it seemed to us doubtful that you – who placed so many obstacles to the suggestions of Dr. Plinio himself – would accept corrections coming from other members of the TFP, certainly less qualified.

You could allege in your defense that, to the contrary, the text of your letter of February 27, 1997 demonstrates your readiness to respond to any objections, clarify any doubts, or even be corrected, as well as your willingness to submit to consultations with theologians.

We do not doubt the sincerity of your general intention. However, we had reason to fear that, in the actual correction of this or that paragraph, you would reject the observations submitted to you, as had happened in the past with all the reviewers, including Dr. Plinio himself. Feeding this fear was your desire, expressed in the same letter, that your work not be submitted to Dr. Paulo Brito on the grounds that his sense of objectivity left much to be desired and whose "scruples of conscience" would make the road of review quite bumpy.

Our fears that you judged your work completely satisfactory (and that, therefore, any review would be, in fact, very accidental) was confirmed by your decision to precipitate things by its publication. Acting thus, you freed yourself from this condition that you judged to be superfluous and now obliges us – moved by the supreme interest of our cause – to reveal to you the whole truth. The truth is that the publication of the *Murky Waters of Vatican II* does not correspond, for the reasons named above, to the desire of our late Founder nor to the conveniences of the TFP.

It does not correspond regarding the subject matter (he wanted an analysis of the documents of Vatican II; you made an analysis of the whole pre- and post-conciliar theology); it does not correspond to the aim of the study (he wanted a defensive study to be spread strictly in the higher spheres and you ended by making a study of an offensive nature, which you intend to circulate broadly, judging by the choice of the author of the Preface, precisely a writer for the masses and, moreover, one with a controversial reputation among more conservative Catholics in the United States); and it does not correspond regarding the scientific rigor of the work, which Dr. Plinio judged insufficient. In short, your initiative substantially disregards the mold of action that our Founder imprinted on the activities of our family of souls.

Therefore, and in a paradoxical way, to the ecclesiastical authorities and the public, who do not know these antecedents, "*The Murky Waters of Vatican II*" and the subsequent volumes of the announced series *Eli, Eli, Lamma Sabachtani?* can be seen as if they are being inspired by the TFPs.

This impression that, on the theological level, the TFPs would be opening fire against the Council could be favored by various circumstances: your status as a long time member of the Brazilian TFP; your residence in one of the principal houses of study in São Paulo; the two books you wrote in defense of the organization; the participation of a team of TFP members in the research that served as the base for your writing; your regular contacts with Dr. Plinio and, above all, the text of our Founder that you ordered placed in the Preface.

This unavoidable implication of the TFP in the conception, writing and publication of the book will be further reinforced, in the eyes of the public, by the fact that it is being promoted and directed by the American association Tradition in Action, founded and directed by Miss Marian Horvat, in collaboration with her brother Leo, a former Camaldolese from Jasna Gora, both siblings of Mr. John Horvat, an outstanding member of the American TFP.

The confusion that will thus be created is such as to profoundly transform the current "*status quo*" of the TFP before the Hierarchy and its sympathizers. Regarding this "*status quo*" left by Dr. Plinio, it is our duty to preserve it at any price, unless something substantially new happens.

To avoid such confusion, we see ourselves forced to officially manifest to you our total withdrawal from your initiative. We will make this withdrawal public if the circumstances demand it in order to preserve the work of Prof. Plinio.

Even more, we will eventually be forced to take practical measures to prove that this withdrawal is not a mere *flatus vocis* [empty words], but an actual reality. This would be analogous to what happened recently at the Gregorian University, whose directors and faculty felt required to ask a doctorate candidate (Fr. Gerald Murray) for a retraction of his thesis that the excommunication of Dom Marcel Lefebvre would have been invalid under penalty of seeing himself excluded from the academic board of said institution of studies. [This action was demanded] in order to avoid that the institution be judged as being in solidarity with the conclusions of the author.

You can possibly object that your book concerns a strictly religious matter that does not enter into the TFP's ambit of action, which is exclusively temporal.

The inspiration of our temporal action is fundamentally religious, and up to now there has been an almost unanimous consensus in the TFPs about the serious problems created by the post-conciliar crisis. An internal dissent among TFP members about this or that point of your analyses or, in any case, the convenience or inconvenience of launching your book, can open a very deep wound in this consensus. Such a disagreement would profoundly affect the harmonious development of our activities.

All the more so as the first condition for cohesion in an association is respect for authority. By going public in a matter of this gravity without the agreement of those who have the authority in our family of souls, you set a precedent that can be imitated in different areas by other members of the Group. This would thus establish a real internal chaos, which would destroy the work of almost 70 years of our Founder.

I am writing you to avoid having to take extreme actions to prevent this chaos. I am also giving you this last chance to step back and stop the printing and/or dissemination of the mentioned work.

Very dear Mr. Atila, because of your elevation of sights, your gifts of intelligence, your energy and, above all, the many graces that Our Lady has poured over you, you have a great role to carry out in the Counter-Revolution and in the TFP. But the union of all is fundamental, especially after the death of Dr. Plinio, so that we can continue, in fidelity to his legacy, the immense Crusade of the XX<sup>th</sup> Century to which Our Lady called us to undertake, under Her inspiration.

With the hope that this fraternal warning makes possible an understanding in terms that are acceptable to the TFP, I take leave with inalterable esteem.

In Iesu et Maria,

Luis Nazareno de Assumpção Filho  
President of the National Council

## FIRST DECLARATION

To whom it may concern:

I, Fernando Antúnez Aldunate, having been the private secretary of Professor Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira from the end of 1977 until his death, with regard to the studies he ordered Mr. Atila Sinke Guimarães (sic) to make regarding the Council, present the following recollections:

1. At the end of the '70s or in the beginning of the '80s, Dr. Plinio, always very concerned about the destiny of the Holy Church and Christian Civilization, asked Mr. Atila to undertake a study on the conciliar texts that left him perplexed.
2. Mr. Atila traveled to Europe, where he made interviews with various conciliar experts, which were extremely interesting and gave him good clues for the research and interpretation of the topic.
3. I have the idea that up to that moment what Dr. Plinio had requested of Mr. Atila was to make a work of simple research, with the aim of studying what could be known about the points that caused him, as I already said, tremendous perplexity.
4. At a certain moment, Dr. Plinio thought of doing something along the lines of the *Message* of the 15 TFPs against self-managing Socialism promoted by Mitterand. Just as in that *Message* he used abundant documentation accumulated by TFP researchers, he would use the documentation collected by Mr. Atila.
6. I believe that since 1986 – in view of the size that Mr. Atila's work was taking on – Dr. Plinio was fixed on the idea of presenting to the Vatican authorities the perplexities that the subject raised in him, along with the “monumental” work of Mr. Atila. In this plan, the study would be presented to some theologians. It is with this end in sight that the work began to be translated even before it was completed.
7. After the hypothesis of Mr. Atila making more than one research was delineated, Dr. Plinio always spoke about a review by several theologians. Mr. Atila raised all kinds of impediments and insisted that he should choose them and be present. He also made strong demands regarding the (internal) TFP reviewers, vetoing this one and indicating another, and did this repeatedly.
8. Until the end of his life, Dr. Plinio spoke of going to review Mr. Atila's work in some isolated place, and then present it to theologians and finally to the Vatican in opportune conditions.

It is to avoid any misunderstanding on this matter that I sign the present declaration.

Paris, November 18, 1997  
Fernando Antúnez Aldunate

## SECOND DECLARATION

For all useful ends, I declare before God the following:

In December 1985, having traveled to Brazil for the end of the year feasts, Dr. Plinio gave me instructions to not return to Germany, where my works were developing. He wanted me to review a work by Mr. Atila Guimarães, still in execution, on Vatican Council II.

To this amiable invitation, I smiled, telling Dr. Plinio I was not qualified to review a work on religious matters. On the other hand, I pointed out, there have always been in our ranks experienced reviewers, with conditions superior to mine.

Dr. Plinio replied that Mr. Atila had been placing insurmountable difficulties on the work of our reviewers and that he had repeatedly rejected, with irritation, proposals from the reviewers for the perfection of his text. Extremely jealous of everything he wrote, he would not admit suggestions, changes or corrections, be they doctrinal and sometimes even vernacular.

The opinion of a reviewer was absolutely necessary for Dr. Plinio. He always submitted all his works to qualified reviewers, as was the case of his last book on Nobility, examined by a team of TFP reviewers and a French historian. With the impossibility of convincing Mr. Atila that his work should necessarily pass through a good reviewer, Dr. Plinio accepted Mr. Atila's proposal for me to make the review. So I was brought in to examine it.

To calm the spirit of Mr. Atila was the explicit intention of Dr. Plinio. He praised not only the capacity of Mr. Atila in finding significant texts but also in knowing how to group them in accordance with the conciliar doctrines. The collection of texts were excellent.

I believe that a work of collecting data on the teachings of Vatican Council II was precisely what was initially asked of Mr. Atila. The writing of the work was made by him later. His other collaborators can clarify this point. I believe that the work, as Mr. Atila presents it, was never commissioned.

Thus, I started reading the volumes written to that date. We were four or five persons working as auxiliaries of Mr. Atila. All of us were in agreement about making something that was not entirely akin to the goals of the TFP. Mr. Atila was uncertain about the usefulness his work could have to TFP, as well as his real intentions.

The reading showed, in fact, that it was an admirable selection of texts. But Mr. Atila, when writing, made use of them in an imprecise way, unacceptable for the scientific rigor that our doctrinal combat demands. Each member of the TFP has before his eyes the polemical books and magisterial manifestos of Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira. We study them carefully. Oriented by the Author, we learn the proper way for TFP to analyze a text contrary to Catholic doctrine, the way to present the critical thinking, the proper use of vocabulary and composition of phrasing. These books and manifestos always reduced the adversary – as powerful as they might be – to silence. We know, therefore, in TFP what a polemical work of proved value is.

Now, the commentaries written by Mr. Atila presented neither the rigor of formulation, nor the prudence, nor the style proper to our school of thought. Since he would not admit changes and it

was not the case to irritate him even more, the "review" – made by an unqualified person – assumed the character of merely contenting the author. And thus was the one I made.

In February of 1986, having already worked on this review for about two months, Dr. Plinio called me on a Saturday night. He asked me what I thought of the work. I told him that it had an intellectual style that was sensibly different from ours and was a lamentable redaction with countless vulnerable points. On the whole, un-publishable without the review of a person knowledgeable on the subject.

As for the writing, it is a particular habit of Mr. Atila, known to those who deal with him, to attribute ideas to the texts of authors not expressed in them or reasonably deduced from them. This attribution of ideas without strict logical connection to the words of the texts examined would make his comments easily imputed as intellectually dishonest and, therefore, vulnerable to a refutation. This lack of intellectual rigor has never been accepted in the public documents of the TFP.

Dr. Plinio agreed with these observations. He asked me if I considered the work futile. My response was negative. I saw in the preparation of the work the qualities pointed out above. It was necessary for the author to allow a professional review to be made.

Would such a review mean that the work would be useful for the TFP? From all the comments made to me by Dr. Plinio, I understand that he had difficulty in imagining a use for the study, as Mr. Atila desired. He did not discern in the immediate future an opportunity for its launching and did not seem to show any hurry for its end. As in every launching made by the TFP, some occasion was necessary to justify it.

That same night, Dr. Plinio presented me with a possible solution that could satisfy Mr. Atila: If a future occasion were to appear allowing him to write a manifesto on the consequences of the Second Vatican Council, what would I think about the use of the documentation collected?

It would be a manifesto similar to the Message published in 1981-1982 fighting the self-managing Communism advocated by the newly elected French government. In that eventuality, Dr. Plinio thought that the work of Mr. Atila would be used only as powerful documentation to support the theses of this "message." This solution would avoid the vulnerability of the writing and would give the manifesto the prestige of being accompanied by vast and well-selected documentation.

The idea pleased me greatly. It was the most concrete thing that Dr. Plinio had said to me about a possible use of the work. It remained to be seen whether Mr. Atila would accept it...

Mr. Atila continually insisted that Dr. Plinio read his work, seeking an approval. A task virtually impossible to carry out: Dr. Plinio was too busy, and he would have to leave the direction of the TFP for a long time to devote himself to reading such a voluminous work.

Before the end of 1986, Dr. Plinio met with Mr. Atila and his assistants at a hotel in Serra Negra to learn about part of the work. I do not remember if we stayed there two or three days. I recall the difficulties Dr. Plinio encountered in making his remarks accepted. It regarded, I believe, the reading of the first volume.

Knowing how reluctantly Mr. Atila received every proposal for correction, Dr. Plinio formulated them carefully and delicately. His propositions were often accepted. But it was evident that he al-

most always referred to superficial discrepancies, as if not perceiving the more profound ones. Even so, Dr. Plinio's judicious proposals were discussed countless times, justified with warmth, and refused.

At the end of the first day, faced with the futility of that "revision" where fundamental questions could not be corrected, at around midnight Dr. Plinio expressed a desire to withdraw to rest. It was embarrassing to those present how Mr. Atila opposed this wish, saying that Dr. Plinio usually worked much later than this. He did not understand that in dealing with his work the day would close sooner. Dr. Plinio's haste was visible. It was also clear that other concerns, outside of this "editing," had priority in the considerations of Dr. Plinio.

Paris, November 17, 1997

Nelson Fragelli

## THE DEFENSE

### The Response of Atila Sinke Guimarães to the Aforementioned Accusations

São Paulo, March 25, 1998

Vice-President exercising the Presidency of the  
Brazilian National Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property  
Dr. Luis Nazareno de Assumpção Filho

Mr. President,

Salve Maria!

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated November 20, 1997, which, however, was only delivered to me by your secretary on the morning of the 27<sup>th</sup> of the same month.

I thank you for your equity in waiting for my response and not launching against me the drastic punishments promised in your letter without first allowing me to present my self-defense.

I praise the linguistic care found in your letter and some elegance of style that is always pleasant to note, even when it is transient, in a piece that is supposed to be destined for the annals of TFP.

My habit of analyzing texts inclines me to raise a hypothesis that this is a letter written by a person with some polemical background, but not secure enough as to exclude corrections from other hands, which introduced here and there arguments and proofs aimed at reinforcing the general line of the thesis. One could say that it was a letter written "collegially." The term is *ag-giornato*, but reflects the reality. If our amity were still that of the past, I would have perhaps proposed to you, in order to tease a little, the name of the author of this or that passage. You, however, wanted to confer a tragic note to the matter, with extremely violent consequences. I leave aside, therefore, the cordialities of the past.

Reinforcing the hypothesis of a "collegial" letter, you added interpretations of words I would have spoken to Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira, Director of the National Administrative and Financial Directorate – DAFN – and a member of the National Council, which supposes his collaboration. Further, you based some of your assertions upon two testimonies, respectively those of Mr. Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli and Mr. Fernando Antúnez Aldunate, both close assistants of Dr. Caio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira, Vice-Supervisor of the DAFN and a member of the National Council, in the collaboration that the three make for the French TFP. This, obviously, implies the latter's participation in the initiative.

When you mentioned a letter sent to me by Dr. Paulo Corrêa de Brito Filho, Secretary of the National Council (in your letter on p. 1, § 5), you used the first person plural – "We were obliged

to write to you ..."; and further on, "we have noted ..." – and not the third person singular, "he wrote," which would be normal. This is a small grammatical confusion that betrays the presence of the afore-mentioned director in the elaboration of this "collegial" letter. Such an impression is reinforced by the testimony of Dr. Paulo Brito regarding a conversation that he and I had without the presence of any third parties (see p. 2, §2).

Common friends, who sought out Dr. Eduardo de Barros Brotero, Vice-Supervisor of the DAFN and a member of the National Council, assured me of his complete knowledge and acquaintance with the contents of your letter. So, Mr. President, I assume the document sent to me to be an initiative of the principal directors of the National Council of the Brazilian TFP.

I ask, therefore, that my response be considered as addressed primarily to you, who signed the document and assumed responsibility for what is stated there, but also extended to the afore-mentioned directors of the Brazilian TFP. And if my assumption of a letter to which other persons have contributed is objective, please consider these collaborators included in my reply.

\*

You were accustomed to seeing our very dear Dr. Plinio obliged to write refutations. They could often be more extensive than the accusations. This is an imperative of one who defends himself. I hope you understand that this defense, which I start here, will not escape the rule.

\*

The decline of logic is certainly one of the main factors for the confusion that prevails in today's revolutionary world. And perhaps there is among us some penetration of this general tendency. For this reason, I am sure that you will not reproach me for trying to employ as much as possible a strict logic in order to try to remedy some of the misunderstandings that I note at the root of your position and flaws that appear in the course of the demonstration of your thesis.

The use of the apologetic method of Scholasticism, which we both admire, can have, however, the appearance of an inflexible sequence of cause and effect that may give the impression of a steamroller trying to humiliate the accuser. I want to make it clear from the outset that this is not my intention. You perhaps can note by the serenity with which I respond to you that I hold no grudge against your person. I only desire my position to be fully clear so that truth and, consequently, justice may prevail.

Permit me, then, Mr. President, to abandon to some extent the colloquial language employed until now and adopt the canons of apologetic language. I will have recourse to the former as much as possible when circumstances require, but also to make the exposition of my defense more amenable. Receive this effort as a manifestation of respect for your person and the position you hold.

\* \* \*

## PART I

### THE ACCUSATION

1. Regarding the two **parts of the accusation**, a careful analysis of your exposition led me to the conclusion that the most sensitive point of your argument supposes that the author of the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II* lacks respect for the authority of the current directors of the TFP and, only secondly, supposes his disrespect for the will of Dr. Plinio. I count on your permission to reverse that order. I will deal first with what concerns Dr. Plinio.

2. As for the **method adopted**, in the accusatory piece you signed, you assumed a liberty which, although not frequently used in expositions of great clarity and intellectual dexterity, is still legitimate. That is, between the deductive method of exposition – major premise, minor premise, conclusion – and the inductive method – description of antecedents, presentation of the consequent – you preferred to mix the two according to the needs of your exposition. To add further to this methodological variety, you chose to give your missive a certain tone of a historical chronicle, which supposes somewhat different rules of criticism. Without a doubt such variety is allowed. However, it somewhat encumbers the order to be adopted by the defense.

3. In view of this, I request your acquiescence for the **distribution of the matter** I present below. I tried with the best good will to classify the various arguments following the two usual methods. I arrived at something that seeks the objectivity of the accusation without rigorously obeying the dialectical canons. I divided your accusation into two parts, which I will designate as **theses**. For each one there are arguments, proofs, facts, opinions of various kinds that will fall under the general title of **arguments**. The thesis and arguments will be followed by the **conclusions, consequences** and **penalties**. This is the most coherent presentation I managed to compose in order to make the attack clear and, likewise, the defense.

4. Regarding the **confirmation of the arguments in your text**, I was uncertain whether to present a text for each argument immediately after the orderly presentation of the accusations or when my refutation of the arguments would begin. I opted for the second hypothesis, because it allows a closer proximity between the accusation and the refutation, not requiring a strong mnemonic effort on your part or a return to more distant pages.

5. Regarding the **presentation of the accusation**, your two theses depart from the basic fact of the publication of the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II* in the United States of America in my name.

#### **Thesis I: The launching of the work is against the will of Dr. Plinio**

##### **Arguments:**

**First: Dr. Plinio only wanted a concise document and not a book, much less an 11-volume work like the one made.**

**Second:** Dr. Plinio wanted the work to analyze only those conciliar texts that are seemingly incompatible with the traditional teaching of the Church.

**Third:** Dr. Plinio did not want the work on the Council to take a position of attack, but rather to be a simple defense to facilitate a position of passive resistance.

**Fourth:** Dr. Plinio wished to present the work, once completed, only to some Vatican organs, and not to spread it broadly.

**Fifth:** He considered the work insufficient from an intellectual point of view. That is, the author was not qualified to write it and the project presented lacked scientific rigor.

**Sixth:** Dr. Plinio wanted the work to be analyzed by internal reviewers; he wanted to review it personally and, then, have it reviewed by theologians, which was not done.

**Seventh:** The author rejected Dr. Plinio's revisions of Volume I.

**Eighth:** In view of Argument VII, and to avoid confrontation with the author, Dr. Plinio would have decided to indefinitely postpone the execution of the work and the revision.

**Ninth:** The stubbornness of the author in refusing a serious revision of his work was one of the reasons for Dr. Plinio's suffering on his deathbed.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, Dr. Plinio did not want the afore-mentioned publication, and the author acted abusively and fraudulently in attributing this intention to him.

**Thesis II:** To the lawfully established authorities in the Brazilian TFP fall the decisions on the writing, publication and dissemination of the works of its members. Now then, the author published his book without the knowledge and consent of those directors. Therefore, he acted against the rights of the authorities in the TFP

**Arguments:**

**First:** The current Directory was against the publication of this work since it had no guarantee that the writing was sound and the occasion opportune.

**Second:** This decision became firmer due to important flaws in the *Quinn Manifesto*, launched by the author in December of 1996.

**Third:** After a dialogue on the theological revision of the work was established, that dialogue was postponed. The author, however, cunningly continued negotiations for its publication. Now, he presents the *fait accompli*. This goes against the ideal of chivalrous obedience practiced in our family of souls.

**Consequences:**

**First:** For the ecclesiastical authority and the public, the work appears as inspired by the TFPs.

**Second:** Such confusion will change the *status quo* of the TFP.

**Third:** Further, it will lead to internal dissension among the members of the TFP regarding various positions in the work and the convenience of launching it.

**Fourth:** Since the condition for cohesion is respect for authority, the initiative of the author will set a precedent that could lead to internal chaos and the destruction of the work of Dr. Plinio.

**General Conclusion:**

The author is guilty of rebellion with regard to the will of Dr. Plinio, abuse of his name, deceit in affirming that he acted in accordance with him, rashness in the publication of his work. In addition, he is guilty of disobedience to the current Directory, deceit in concealing his attempts to publish it, and imprudence regarding the TFP political line; further, he is charged with stimulating internal dissension and chaos and being complicit in the eventual destruction of the work of Dr. Plinio.

**Penalties:**

**First:** The author is given an ultimatum to stop the publication and dissemination of his work.

**Second:** He will be asked to make a public apology for what he did.

**Third:** If he does not comply with these conditions, he will suffer drastic measures: expulsion.

**Aggravating factor of point three:**

The threat of drastic measures is made as an ultimatum, with no deadline established to take effect.

\* \* \*

|

## THE DEFENSE

For a good defense proceeding, I ask your permission to devote some words to analyze the premises, numbers 1 and 2, below. Only after examining the premises, as the sound laws of apologetics dictate, will I enter into the refutation of each thesis of your accusation.

### **1. First Premise: the ideological position of the author and the ideological character of the matter at point**

I ask you to consider, as preliminary to this defense, that in the current internal controversy that unfortunately has been undermining the idealism, elevation of sights, harmony and unity of the TFP, I have endeavored not to take sides with persons or groups, but rather situate myself in the realm of principles. This position obeys my natural inclination, confirmed by a counsel that Dr. Plinio specifically gave me. I try, within the limits of the information I have, to analyze the facts under the prism of Catholic Doctrine and counter-revolutionary principles, to the study of which I have dedicated the last 28 years of my life. And, even here, although I was asked at various times to refute this or that wrong position in writing, I did not do so because I judged that the foundations were not solid, the general climate [inside the TFP] unfavorable to objective reasoning and the information unsound, coming from indirect sources and often loaded with strong emotional passion.

Undoubtedly, from a doctrinal perspective, I have not feared to criticize orally, among the small circle of friends I have, certain actions or tendencies I noticed here and there; today some of them have been satisfactorily explained to me, others have not. In the meetings in which I participate, I have suggested as a norm that the attendees should not talk about persons and internal problems. Moreover, considering that the work Dr. Plinio requested of me was not part of the internal controversies, I devoted myself to updating the Collection on the Council, which left me little time for conversations.

Basically, in these two years and four months subsequent to the death of Dr. Plinio, I took the following doctrinal positions worthy of mention:

**A** – In December of 1996, in the bi-monthly newspaper *The Wanderer* (St. Paul, Minnesota) and in the daily newspaper *Diario las Americas* (Miami, Florida), I published, with the help of American friends, a manifesto against Archbishop John Quinn, in which I demonstrated that this Prelate wanted a radical change in the Church – especially in what concerns the Papacy – and toward this end he advocated the holding of a Vatican Council III.

**B** – I wrote a critical analysis of the *We Are Church* movement, an organization that has collected two and a half million signatures in multiple countries of the West to encourage even more radical aims than those of Archbishop Quinn. The signatures were presented to the Holy See on October 11, 1997. Because of time restraints, my American friends are only spreading *post factum* the text of this analysis in a booklet.

**C** – I sent Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira a note expressing my total disagreement, in both substance and form, with the text of a mailing, approved by the five directors of the Brazilian TFP and its advisors. That mailing-text dealt with John Paul II's visit to Brazil, proposed some prayers of a pentecostal nature to "attract graces" to the Country and supposed, in its hardly noble redaction, an acceptance of the person of John Paul II without any restrictive reference to the doctrinal positions he represents. An unprecedented action on the part of the TFP Directory, opposed in many ways to what Dr. Plinio taught us.

**D** – On last November 11, with the help of the same American friends, the first volume of my analysis of Vatican II was published.

I have done nothing else of relevance in this period, except, as I mentioned, the updating of the other volumes of the Collection.

Thus, you see that I have situated myself primarily in the realm of principles.

Also, the subject of my book is fundamentally ideological.

From this realm I will now turn to analyze your arguments and it is from this perspective that I ask to be judged.

## **2. Second Premise: Serious intellectual and moral flaws that compromise the seriousness of your accusation**

Allow me, with the respect due to the high office you hold, to point out certain criteriological defects in the document you signed, which can destroy or gravely harm the value of the evidence in your accusation. I divide them into these categories: haste, partialities, confusions, generalizations and omissions.

### **A. Suspicious haste**

a. Your letter, as we know, was dated November 20, 1997, but it was only delivered to me on the 27<sup>th</sup>. On the 25<sup>th</sup>, the judge of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Civil Court of the Central Forum of São Paulo issued a decision in favor of 52 TFP members who had made allegations of abuse of authority by the present day TFP Directory.<sup>1</sup> Your letter, given the content of its accusation and the singularly rigorous penalties it promises, could easily have been included in that same charge of abuse of authority, and the accused, without great effort, could have benefited from the same protection, at least during the time of the lawsuit.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time the President wrote this letter, a split had happened up in TFP and one party opened a lawsuit against the directors accusing them of abuse of authority. For several years thereafter, many other lawsuits were filed for different reasons, creating an internal ambience of factions and parties in which all kinds of intrigue ensued with allegations thrown against one another.

Did you stop to ponder whether you could possibly be whipping the air and providing arguments that would strengthen the position of those lawsuit plaintiffs?

b. Also, the date of your letter could testify against your probity. Since the letter was delivered *after* the court decision, a possible pre-dating could be interpreted as an attempt to circumvent the court order. In forensic language, if I am not mistaken, this is called fraud. You know that it is a criteriological defect that greatly weakens the accusation.

Why did you decide to take this risk? Would it not have been better, in order to punish more exemplarily a possible guilty member, to ensure your prestige by acting in less suspicious circumstances?

c. The almost invariable and first reaction of those with whom I have commented about your letter is to raise their hands to the head and ask: "But why did he decide to send it now?" In effect, the inopportunity of your action, Mr. President, could not be more obvious.

How can you explain your demands when, at that very moment, the limits of your authority and that of the other members of the current Directory – as well as the way of exercising your authority – are being contested by the majority of members and activists of the Brazilian TFP (the 52 initial dissenters today count 88, along with the 152 active members and 475 activists)? Further, your influence over the other TFPs was formally rejected by the presidents of 16 of the 26 TFPs.

How can you explain that you find yourself comfortable claiming this same authority as the main argument against a possible guilty person for publishing a work of a doctrinal nature, coming to light under his strict responsibility? If the exercise of an accepted authority in the governing body of an organization does not require its members to surrender their doctrinal obligations concerning Faith, Law, Institutional Identity and Metaphysics, as I shall prove below (see Item 2, letter E), then, what can be said when this authority is contested?

More clearly: Parallel to an intricate disciplinary dispute – involving delicate questions of legitimacy and subsidiarity – you opted unnecessarily to open another front of attack, not less important. To wit:

- A religious question – the right and duty that a Catholic has to defend his Faith, and a conflict of this right and this duty with the authority of the president of a civic association;
- A question of law – the right of free expression of a citizen, guaranteed by the current laws in Brazil and the United States, and its restriction by the authority of the civic entity;
- An institutional question with serious implications in law and morals – Does a society turned toward the fight against Progressivism not lose its identity when it stops doing so?
- A metaphysical-moral question – the right one has to maintain intact the first ideal vision he had of his archetype, without the interference of third parties, or, more clearly, the disciple's right to retain the ideal vision he formed of his master and model.

In other words, in face of a fire burning in the TFP, instead of trying to extinguish it, you decided to light four others, which by their nature, if not addressed with proportion, discernment, seren-

ity and a supernatural spirit, which I ask Our Lady to give me, can release even more virulent chained forces than those hitherto set in motion.

These are the fruits of great doctrinal and strategic importance that can be harvested from the document and actions that you certainly could have postponed.

To conclude this letter A, I would like to point out that these preliminary observations, which I amiably qualify simply as hastiness, can seriously compromise the value of your accusation.

## **B. Compromising partialities**

Your reasoning, however, suffers not only from hastiness. There are also compromising biases. Allow me to point out below three manifestations of a lack of the fairness one would not expect to find in the highest statutory authority of our entity.

a. You issued a judgment about the inopportunity of the document I authored – the *WAC Manifesto* – and a campaign that I suggested that the TFP make along the lines of our past campaigns against IDO-C and the "prophetic groups." These are your words: "You favored starting an international campaign against the *We Are Church* movement, which even included a judicial process for fraud against the promoters of this revolutionary initiative, as well as the dissemination of a manifesto of your making" (p. 2, § 6). Further on, you affirm: "The complete lack of success of the WAC recent delivery of its petition to the Vatican has only confirmed the accurateness of our proposal to abstain from the mentioned campaign" (p.2, § 6).

You argue on the basis of a draft of that manifesto that I sent to Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira on March 3, 1997. However, after that, the manifesto underwent considerable additions and changes that were not known to the TFP directors. While that first draft had five typed pages, today the manifesto exists in the form of a booklet (8.5" x 11") occupying 25 printed pages; therefore, it has more than five times the original content. In other words, the initial draft is not an appropriate basis for a criticism.

I communicated to Dr. Plinio Xavier (August 19, 1997) that the text had been significantly altered. He expressed a certain interest in reading the new text, but, because I was busy at that time, I ended by not delivering the new copy to him. He did not ask for it again and I forgot to send it. The booklet was made public in the United States in early November. Did you have the new *WAC Manifesto* in hand and read it before issuing your judgment? If you had it, why did you argue based on the draft? If you did not have it, why did you condemn it before reading it?

b. As for the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, something similar happened. In the development of your exposition, you consider yourself informed about the content of the book. For example:

- "It was not in the plans of Dr. Plinio to engage spear in hand in a public polemic about the problems of conscience that certain conciliar documents raise" (p. 4, § 1). You only could know that I "was engaging spear in hand" in such a polemic if you knew the content of the book.

- Further on, one can read: "You ended by making a study of an offensive nature" (p. 6, § 4). The emphatic statement presupposes that you had the final published text in your hands.

However, a cold check of dates shakes the column upon which such peremptory affirmations rest. Indeed, the first 1,000 copies of the work were published on November 11; Mr. Leo Horvat was only able to pick them up at the printing press in New Orleans, Louisiana, on the weekend of November 15-16, after which he sent me two copies. These two books, sent to me on the 18<sup>th</sup> at two different addresses by express courier, reached me on November 22<sup>nd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, after the official date of your letter.

Everything leads one to believe that you did not have a copy of the book before you condemned it. Did you base yourself only on suppositions to issue a condemnatory sentence against this work and threaten punishments of an unprecedented violence in the long history of the TFP? In this case, you would hardly escape the accusation of partiality.

For you to merit the attribute of impartiality, you would have to explain how you had access to the work before I did. Here, unfortunately, we would have to suppose hypotheses even less commendable. We would have to imagine, for example, that some zealous friend of yours had intercepted one of the copies intended for me and, in order to please you, had forgotten the right of inviolability enjoyed by all mail correspondence and made a photocopy of the book. If hypothetically this had happened, you would have had the published work in your hands for two days (from the 22<sup>nd</sup> to the 24<sup>th</sup>), let us say, and afterwards, the copy.

However, even using such a means – a hypothesis that, for the moment, I raise not to point to you as guilty or to affirm that it happened, but rather to demonstrate the embarrassing position you chose to adopt – the fact of having my book in your possession would not substantially improve your position.

In fact, how, for example, do you explain that – having the book in your hands – you had not noticed that, as early as it was feasible, on page 4, the reader is informed that the book "does not imply any official or unofficial position of the Brazilian or American TFP or any other TFP" and that "the author assumes full and exclusive responsibility for what he has written"? If you had read such affirmations, why did you condemn me for compromising the TFP? If you did not read it, why did you not wait to do so before opening such a drastic procedure?

*Rebus sic stantibus* [as things thus stand] regarding the book *In the Murky Waters*, it is difficult, Mr. President, not to have strong suspicions of a partial judgment and a prejudiced state of mind in relation to the work.

c. Regrettably, the biases do not end here. In effect, you made allegations about the will of Dr. Plinio regarding my work. You tried to show that the design of the Great Catholic Warrior did not include the publication of my work, as was done. You based your opinion on certain facts, on your own testimonies and those of two solicitous aides of Dr. Caio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira. With this as the base, you went on to make digressions, emit judgments and threaten punishments.

You have, however, forgotten something that I consider of capital importance for one who wants to play the role of a supreme judicial voice in an entity of the importance of the Brazilian TFP. You forgot to call the accused party in order to ask if he had any document expressing the wishes of Dr. Plinio. If you had done so, you would have easily known of the more than 500 typed pages – *verbatim ipsis* – of the words of Dr. Plinio on the subject, taken from tape recordings.

These included seven symposiums, various meetings and numerous dispatches of guidance on the work of analysis of the Second Vatican Council addressed to me separately or to me with my collaborators. This is not to count the 13 years of continuous and prioritized orientation I received in almost daily communication with him from the beginning of my work of analysis of the Council. If you wanted to argue impartially about the will of Dr. Plinio, why did you fail to make any effort to compare the few testimonies you gathered with this enormous quantity of other material?

Perhaps then, a harmonious conclusion could have been reached: "On this occasion he said this, on another occasion he said something else; let us see which opinion prevails." Perhaps some of the testimonies would need to be rectified – who can guarantee the accuracy of the memory on something that may have happened 10 years ago? Maybe some information was distorted – none of us are infallible ... But, none of this was done. Instead, you felt yourself authorized to ignore all this material and any testimony that the accused could have provided. I will deal with this matter again below (cf. Major Refutations of the Arguments of this Thesis). Here, I focus only on the serious lack of equity.

Having flagrantly omitted from knowing precisely what Dr. Plinio wanted to do in this matter and hearing any words from the accused, how could you pretend your judgment should not be regarded as partial?

### **C. Discreditable confusions**

It is also noticeable, Mr. President, in the document you sent me, another set of flaws that appear to me ill-suited for your position as the highest arbiter of TFP's fate. They are the following discreditable confusions:

a. The first confusion concerns the time – present, past or future – in which you want to situate yourself in relation to the publication of the book *In the Murky Waters*. In fact, sometimes you seem to speak as if the book were being published in the present; at other times you speak in the perspective of a future publication; yet other times you suppose the work to be already published.

\* In the present: "I was shocked at the news ... that a book under your authorship is being published in the United States" (p. 1, §1).

\* In the past: "It was not in the plans of Dr. Plinio to engage spear in hand in a public polemic about the problems of conscience that certain conciliar documents raise" (p. 4, §1). This is a judgment about a work that has already been published. Further, you confirm: "You ended by

making a study of an offensive nature" (p. 6, § 4). Your approach here is that the work had already been published.

\* In the future: "And now you surprise us with the imminent launching of the book" (p. 3, § 1). Further on, you use the future subjunctive mode: "A precipitous and large publication of this work, if it were to appear to be inspired by us, would substantially change the nuanced position of the TFPs" (p. 3, § 6). At the end of the letter, you further suppose a future publication: "I am giving you this last chance to step back and stop the printing ... of that work" (p. 6, § 2).

Hence it follows that the very object of your analysis is not clear. At times, picturing yourself well informed about a publication that has already been made, you deal with the merit of the work; at times you appear uninformed, supposing a future publication, and limit yourself to moral and political criticisms of my action. There is, therefore, a jumbled confusion about the very purpose of your letter which, for a missive of such gravity, should preferably not exist.

b. In the role you want to play, there is also a profusion of focuses. Curiously, at times you place yourself in the position of judge, at times as a prosecutor, yet other times as a witness, making it difficult for me to know how to clearly address you.

\* Role of judge: "The death of our Founder made it [the revision of the theologians] even more necessary than it was during his life, as well as an appraisal in the tactical-political field to be made by members of the TFP chosen by us, who are unquestionably qualified to issue an opinion" (p. 1, § 4).

\* Role of prosecutor: "The truth is that the publication of the *Murky Waters of Vatican II* does not correspond ... to the desire of our late Founder ... It does not correspond regarding the subject matter, ....; it does correspond regarding the aim of the study ... and it does not correspond regarding the scientific rigor of the work" (p. 6, §§ 3f). I consider such a sentence to be a mere accusation and not a verdict, both because of its indignant tone and because the "proofs" presented have not yet been discussed. Throughout my refutation, to the degree that the lack of foundation for your numerous "proofs" will become clear, the role of prosecutor you have assumed will be confirmed.

\* Role of witness: "Both Mr. Fernando Antúnez ... and I, who spoke with him [Dr. Plinio] every day, are also witnesses to many of his comments in the sense that he judged your work insufficient" (p. 5, § 1).

Thus, I do not know whether I should present my arguments to an impartial and serene judge who seeks truth and justice above all, if I must refute a ruthless prosecutor who sees in every shadow a proof to be leveled against me, or whether I should question a witness who presents himself at the preliminary stage of a process for the information of both parties.

Allow me to draw a consequence from your abandoning your position as judge. If you step down from the elevated position you occupy and situate yourself on the same level as a simple member like me and, in addition, with a ferocious accusation begin to dispute at this level the truth of a certain case, I ask this question: Who is taking the initiative to establish an egalitarian behavior? The inferior who defends himself or the superior who abandons *per viam facti* his authori-

ty? You can testify that I am not taking advantage of your initiative, but rather I treat you with the respect due the elevated position you have abandoned.

c. With regard to the value of the evidence of your thesis, there is also certain confusion in the way you present your arguments. It is rather difficult to evaluate all the proofs and data you use against me, since some of them are mixed with your personal opinions or the testimonies you solicited (a characteristic example can be found in the Refutation of Argument VII, 4. Confusion of facts and interpretations). To respond, I feel myself required to dissect various items and purify them of the personal opinions with which they are vested. In an invective so grave as yours, it would be much better for the accuser to present clear and crystalline evidence.

d. With regard to the implementation of the drastic measures that you threaten, there is also some confusion. At times the threat is very imminent, taking on the character of an ultimatum, at other times it seems that it may not be applied for some time, depending on the circumstances. Here are your texts.

- Drastic measures to be carried out shortly: "I am writing to you to avoid having to take extreme actions to prevent this chaos. I am still giving you this last chance to step back and stop the printing and/or dissemination of the mentioned work" (p 8, § 3).

This request, as you know perfectly, is impossible to fulfill:

*First*, because when I received your letter the book was already printed. You were already aware of this, as I have shown (cf. letter B.b). In addition, Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira asked Dr. Adolpho Lindenberg to seek me out and act as intermediary with this same request of the five directors: that I suspend its publication. On that occasion (November 13, 1997), I informed Dr. Adolpho Lindenberg that the book had already been published. It is certain that he communicated this fact to you. Therefore, you knew that your demand was not practicable. Why, then, did you make it? A demand whose realization is not executable sounds more like a provocation than something reasonable.

*Second*, because stopping the dissemination of a work like the book *In the Murky Waters* cannot be made by a simple individual decision; there are other factors that must be considered. The publication of the work and the plan to circulate it implied the collaboration of other honorable and respectable persons, outside of the TFP, whose actions were moved by the importance they considered the work has, hoping it would be a means to avoid the destruction of the Church. For this purpose, they made considerable sacrifices to have it published. How, in clear conscience, can you ask me to scandalize these good Catholics by telling them to stop the dissemination of a work that has religious importance for them? Giving them the impression that I am in solidarity with those who do not care about the crisis that assails the Mystical Spouse of Christ? And allowing the enemies of the Faith to boast their complete victory without anyone, no matter how small, making a serious attempt to reverse the situation?

*Third*, there are numerous practical circumstances regarding its dissemination that were already irreversible when your letter arrived in my hands. Namely, ads had been placed in four prestigious American newspapers and magazines offering the book; several intellectuals had already read it, approved it and promised reviews in various press organs; some conservative move-

ments are considering possible publicity campaigns; the publisher has already made an expensive mailing to its customers. You see, therefore, that stopping the spread of the published book is no less impossible for me than to stop its printing. Consequently, the conclusion is crystal clear: The execution of the "extreme actions" that you promised to be carried out shortly: "I am giving you this last opportunity"...

- Measures announced for the future: "To avoid such confusion, we see ourselves forced to officially manifest to you our total withdrawal from your initiative. We will make this withdrawal public if circumstances demand it in order to preserve the work of Prof. Plinio" (p. 7, § 4). In this statement you make the punishment less cogent – "if circumstances demand it."

How can you address a member of TFP who dedicated the 33 pivotal years of his life to the cause of the Counter-Revolution and, therefore, abandoned everything, and at the same time you communicate his coming expulsion from the TFP board, deny him the small consolation of clearly knowing the deadline for the execution of the announced penalty? Didn't you consider that I have to think of a means to live? How can I take any serious measures when you do not clarify even this elementary point? If you allow me a rude metaphor, but one not removed from the reality, you take the position of an executioner who does not tell the victim the date his head will be cut off. He indefinitely leaves the victim with his head on the plank, waiting for an execution that can be immediate or months away.

e. The type of obedience that you pretend to receive also oscillates. In one place you seem to suppose the statutory obedience to the president of a civic association, in another place you mention "the ideal of chivalric obedience practiced in our family of souls" (p. 3, §2), not clarifying what you understand by this.

Perhaps you recall that the various types of obedience existing in our family of souls were analyzed extensively by a member of the TFP in a work that won praise – *Servitudo ex Caritate* [authored by Atila]. Going to that book – and even adding to it other types of obedience it did not address – it was not easy for me to classify precisely what would be the "knightly obedience" to which you refer. Does it refer to that of a knight or a gentleman?

Let me look at the first. Would it be an obedience born of a feudal contract based on the protection-service bond proper to the medieval knight and governed by customary law? Would it be a vow of obedience of the kind that existed in the monastic orders of chivalry, deriving from the surrender of the will of the inferior to the superior, governed by ecclesiastical law or by a private contract of the parties? Would it be the enthusiastic obedience that the warrior gives to the nobleman who leads him in battle, faces the dangers, prostrates his enemies and wins the trophies? Undoubtedly, in this case, besides the norms of the various military laws proper to each epoch and country, there is something more: an enthusiasm for the ideal and the contagious force of heroism.

Or would the obedience to which you refer be a mere social convention, no longer of the knightly order but rather a gentlemen's agreement, where members of a gentlemen's club attend to the opinions of their older, more prestigious and more prominent members – relation-

ship that is "governed" by the vague, rich and subtle rules of social relations rather than by a cogent law?

The only assistance you provide to clarify the type of obedience to which you refer is that such obedience is "practiced in the TFP." You hide the verb tense, which, however, is important. If the verb is in the present – "the obedience that is practiced in the TFP" – it is one reality; if it is in the past – "that was practiced in the TFP" – the reality is different. Let me examine this further.

There is a significant detail that conditions the practice of obedience in the TFP. That is to say, until two years ago obedience was rendered to Dr. Plinio personally. And several of us enthusiastically gave him some of the kinds of obedience I mentioned and, perhaps others, more. In his absence, however, after the sorrowful day of October 3, 1995, one cannot properly speak of a newly established custom and, thus, the present tense of the verb to be – "is" – does not reflect the reality. The new situations that have been established in the last two years still seem to be temporary, and understandably so.

Therefore, Mr. President, so that there be no confusion in the censure that you made, you would need to define – with no possibility of doubt – the kind of obedience that TFP members owe to their President and members of their Directory.

You should have no difficulty in drawing the consequences of this confusion. That is, a considerable part of the "disobedience" that you impute to me is ineffectual until this important question is defined. If there is no established law, how can there be crime and punishment?

Do you understand that the action you took against me could also be interpreted as a grave injustice, disrespect for the natural rights of an individual and an offense against the legitimate freedom of speech?

#### **D. Groundless generalizations**

The foundational errors that I have noted in your letter, Mr. President, to my sadness, continue in another realm: the use of unfounded generalizations – here, however, with an aggravating factor. Among the arguments you use to expose the intellectual incompetence of the accused, you strongly emphasized, with the help of a witness, that I would have made generalizations in my work. It would be, therefore, normal for you to be especially cautious of this particular error that makes you so fearful of taking public actions.

a. In your letter is the statement: "According to the testimony **of the closest friends of our Founder**, as well as **those who helped you in the research**, Dr. Plinio intended that a study be made that would expose the basis of our perplexity [only] over the conciliar texts that are apparently incompatible with the traditional teaching of the Church" (p.4, §2). [Emphasis and brackets are added]. Independent of the merit of the question, I emphasize the impropriety of the two generalizations.

Considering the close friends of Dr. Plinio to be those few whom he received daily in his house, not for domestic services, but because of the communion of ideals and special bonds of friendship, I ask: Could it be that all the close friends of Dr. Plinio affirmed what you said here? The

one who is writing this defense counts his close friendship with Dr. Plinio as one of the highest honors of his life, and yet he never heard him say this.

Another close friend with whom I spoke – Mr. João Clá Dias – testifies the same. We are at least two in that very restricted group you mentioned. Why did you risk making a generalization whose weakness is so easy to discern? Could it perhaps be because you did not submit your document to the review of shrewder and more experienced apologists? In this case, you would be committing another fault of which you accuse me – not to submit works for revision...

A similar generalization appears with regard to those who worked with me. Perhaps one or another of those close to me will have forgotten the recommendations that Dr. Plinio gave us. I will try to revive their memories when I deal with this matter in greater detail later (see Argument IV, Major Refutation). However, I am certain that not all of them affirmed what you attributed to them.

Still in the same sentence, there is another imprecision, this time not about persons, but about their action when "they helped you in the research." Here you do not specify what this general action was. In principle, anyone who looked up a newspaper article and sent me the clipping would have helped me in the research. Anyone who went to a bookstore and found a book that might be useful to me would have helped me in the research. Anyone who sent me general information about what was going on in his country regarding the ecclesiastical crisis would have rendered me a similar service, and so on.

Now, if I were to count all those who, in this sense, helped me in the research, there would be no end to the list of names: friends in Brazil, Italy, France, Germany, Spain, the United States, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, etc. – to quote only those countries that randomly come to mind. According to you, all of them, with absolutely no exception, would have affirmed what you said in your letter. One can only wonder why you did not look for a word – in the vast and subtle vocabulary of the Portuguese language – that expressed less generally what you wanted to say.

Permit me, Mr. President, to investigate for a moment the solidity of your statement. You probably summoned several of my collaborators to testify against me, lest the suspicion of being untruthful should fall upon you. If you felt authorized to publish, for another purpose, the testimony of Mr. Nelson Fragelli, undoubtedly one of my close collaborators in the review of the first volumes of the Collection, why didn't you publish the other names? Certainly, because they asked you not to do so. Why would they have asked this if not because they were insecure about those testimonies? This is most probable. Not being able to publish their names but needing to give your accusation more credibility, you allude to anonymous witnesses. Such a tactic, in terms of apologetics, is very indicative of the weakness in which you found yourself. And in terms of the distribution of justice, it is quite unique...

b. In your letter another sentence is found: "But we had reason to fear that, in the actual correction of this or that paragraph, you would reject the observations submitted to you, **as had happened in the past with all the reviewers**" (p .6, §2) [emphasis added]. In summary: throughout the 15 years that I dedicated to the work *sub judice* [under judgment], I would have refused the observations (understood as all) of all the reviewers.

I beg leave to tell you, Mr. President, reading that sentence I have to make an effort not to laugh. The work I have done has 11 volumes (not 13, as you say: page 4, § 4), totaling approximately 5,000 typed pages. During this time I worked with a close team of four reviewers – on points of clarity, logic, the Portuguese language, fidelity to translations, formatting, etc.

Once, when Volume I was practically ready, I was curious to know how many times that work had gone back and forth for review. I counted 25 rounds of review, just with this team. When I thought that Volume I was ready to be presented for internal criticism, I asked Dr. Plinio to designate the most capable persons to review it – three more reviewers were chosen. Afterwards, these three also reviewed other volumes in the work. Afterwards, several persons asked me to read Volume I, perhaps 10 persons total. Frequently they made observations.

However, according to your definitive judgment, I would not have accepted the observation of anyone during all this time. If I had accepted at least a comma in language correction, your generalization would cease to be appropriate. However, as you can see below (Argument VI, specific rebuttal. 1), I am able to prove that I accepted much more than this.

What perplexes me, Mr. President, is how you and your eventual collaborators could justify unleashing an ideological punishment unprecedented in the life of the TFP, based on an accusation whose rigidity of logic and precision of language has the value we are verifying together. I believe, however, that we have still more shortcomings to patiently verify.

I hope you understand what I said above (cf. Introductory Words) about the apparent inflexibility of the apologetic method. The conclusions I reach are a straightforward application of this method, not a manifestation of personal feelings. I am only establishing the presuppositions of my legitimate defense. I take of this pause to reiterate my absence of emotion and my respect for your person and the position you hold.

## **E. Incomprehensible omissions**

There are four questions dealt with *per summa capita* [superficially] or hidden in your letter, which I will now address: the religious question, the juridical question, the institutional question and the delicate metaphysical-moral question.

### **a. Religious question**

Since the bone of contention in your letter is the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, allow me to quote what is published in it about the right and duty the Catholic has to defend His Faith. I stress that the defense of the Faith in question is against the legitimately constituted ecclesiastical authorities. In other words, it is the right to resist the authorities of the Church, even the Sovereign Pontiff, when they teach or command something that is directly or indirectly against the doctrine of the Church. In the book, in fact, it is written:

"Natural Law entitles a Catholic to speak about his Faith as long as he is moved by love of the Church and does so according to the dogmatic and moral precepts taught by her, with due respect for the members of the Hierarchy and, above all, the Sovereign Pontiff. However, when one takes into account that Pope Paul VI characterized the present situation in the Church as a

process of 'auto-demolition,' (\*) and that such a process cannot take place without the participation of many Prelates, that which for a Catholic was only a right becomes a duty.

"This duty is not only to talk about points of the Faith, but also to question those responsible for deviations regarding those points of the Faith. (\*) This duty is all the more cogent since failure to fulfill it would amount to a sin known as *peccatum taciturnitatis*. (\*) For these reasons, the Author believes he has the right and duty to analyze the Council. His first credential is, therefore, the fact that he is a Catholic." (Metairie, Louisiana: MAETA, 1997, pp. 15-21) [The asterisks refer to four pages of footnotes with abundant documentation].

Now then, if the Catholic has the right and the duty to resist the highest ecclesiastical authority to defend his Faith, he should also have them in relation to the civil authority of a lay association.

It is very strange that in your letter you ignored the fact that the Catholic Faith is in very grave danger before the progressivist attack, as well as the right and duty that the members of the TFP, as Catholics, have to defend it. It is truly paradoxical that in the entity founded by Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, the Paladin of the Church in this century, less than two and a half years after his death it must be argued with the President-in-office that TFP members have the right to fight for the Church...

Since it has reached this point, perhaps it is not superfluous to remind you that the "drastic measures" you promise to take against me for having launched a work in defense of the Holy Catholic Church could be characterized as religious persecution.

#### **b. Legal question**

In your letter, you seem unaware of the right of every Brazilian to express his thinking. However, on numerous occasions, I formally declared to Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira that, in publishing the work in question, I hoped, without compromising the Directory, to make use of this right (see Thesis II, Refutation of Argument II, 6.H.1).

As the date of publication approached and before signing a contract with the publisher, I consulted a competent lawyer in the city of São Paulo specializing in copyrights about the legal questions of publishing a work under my responsibility (September 4, 1997). Below is a summary of the question I posed and his answer:

*Status quaestionis:* I am a member of TFP and the author of an 11-volume collection about Vatican Council II, which the then President of the entity, the late Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira asked me to write. I have all the necessary evidence that this work was written by me and assigned to me by the mentioned Professor. The present day Directory of the TFP is against its publication and I do not find it open to negotiations. I have decided to publish the work in the United States under my exclusive responsibility without compromising the present day Directory. I plan to make it clear that the work was assigned to me by Dr. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira and to maintain in it the eulogies of the TFP that he himself wrote or reviewed.

Question: Do I have the legal right to do this?

Answer: Absolutely. If you were not a member of the TFP, you would have the right to publish your work. Being a member, you have still more right. And, making eulogies of the TFP in it, you have even more right. I do not see the slightest problem from the point of view of Brazilian or American law. Both countries are signatories of the same treaty that governs copyrights. I do not see this compromising the present day Directory. If there should be statutory sanctions, you can call on me.

I communicated this consultation – except for the last sentence – to Dr. Plinio Xavier da Silveira in the two meetings we had in September and October of 1997. In the first meeting, at Bolinha restaurant, I briefly gave this report. In the second, at Panela de Barro restaurant, I went into the subject in detail, with approximately the same words I have just reproduced. I say this to manifest my good will to preserve the rights of the current TFP Directory and principally to demonstrate that I communicated this consultation to the person I habitually contacted in such matters. Therefore, it seems to me incomprehensible that he, who, as I suppose, participated in the writing of the letter that you signed, did not communicate to you the answer of this lawyer.

Why, then, did you forget to consider the civil right that I have to publish my work? You know perfectly well that, in copyright matters, there are well-defined limits between what is due the writer and the society to which he belongs. Why, then, this omission?

Such omission is all the more incomprehensible since, for 12 years, Prof. Plinio collaborated weekly with articles for the newspaper "*Folha de S. Paulo*" as a private individual, without this compromising the TFP – even though he was President of the National Council of the entity. Dr. Arnaldo Vidigal Xavier da Silveira, in his private name, published first in Brazil (1970-1971) and then in France (1975) a book on extremely polemical topics – the reform of the *Ordo Missae* and the possibility of a Pope becoming a heretic. He was a member of the National Council of the TFP and a collaborator of the magazine *Catolicismo* and did not even bother to assert that he took sole responsibility for what he defended in those works (see *Messe de Paul VI: Qu'em Penser?* [Mass of Paul VII: What Should One Think?] Chiré-en-Montreuil: Diffusion de la Pensée Française, 1975, p. 7).

At that time, the TFP – so lucidly directed by Prof. Plinio – did not consider itself compromised. To my knowledge, the author only received praise from the internal circles of the TFP for this initiative. Mr. Armando Alexandre dos Santos published several works defending the restoration of the monarchy – also a polemical position. The same was done by Dr. Leôncio Cerqueira under a pseudonym. The TFP did not consider itself compromised by the position of these two longstanding members.

If I were to consider not just writings, but public actions of TFP members, I could say much more. I cite just one example of one of its most august personages that can stand as the rule. Among the most illustrious members of the TFP are the presumptive heir of the Brazilian Throne, Prince Dom Luiz of Orleans and Bragança, and his *de jure* successor, Prince Dom Bertrand of Orleans and Bragança. When the possibility of a return of the monarchist regime to Brazil, a hotly debated topic, was presented, the two Princes initiated an open campaign favoring restoration: They traveled through Brazil from end to end, giving speeches and media interviews and making alliances they deemed opportune for the success of their cause, founding small groups of parti-

sans wherever they could. None of this was considered as compromising for the TFP. Why? Because when Prof. Plinio directed the TFP, the limits between the rights of the individual and the rights of the entity were perfectly clear.

This conclusion is confirmed by another incident. Prince Dom Luiz was invited to give a conference commemorating the 204<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the hospital Holy House of Mercy in the city of Campos (RJ). Included in the program was the celebration of a *Novus Ordo Mass*. Dom Luiz attended the event. This raised accusations by traditionalist sectors of the city that considered this as proof that the TFP was adhering to Progressivism. The TFP press service released a clarification (October 24, 1990) under the title "Invitation of the TFP to Msgr. L. Rangel," in which these words can be read:

"The invitation was made to His Highness as the Head of the Brazilian Imperial House, and not as a member of the TFP. ... Thus, His Highness did not in any way represent the TFP, which had nothing to say in the matter. ... The TFP has already stated on more than one occasion that, in keeping with the provisions of its statutes, it does not take an official attitude in matters that are essentially and exclusively theological, even though its respective members, under their own names, may do so. ... In any case, it is important to make clear that TFP does not answer for the actions made by the respected and amiable Head of the Imperial House as such. Likewise, reciprocally, the Prince does not answer for the actions of the TFP."

*Tempora mutantur...* [the times have changed] Today, Mr. President, if these intellectual warriors were to present themselves before your presidency in order to publish the aforementioned works and, indeed, did so, they would run a serious risk of being expelled from the entity, or, to avoid such an extreme, they would be obliged to withdraw from circulation the editions of their books and make a public apology. Why? Because of the omission one can note in your criteria and that of the current directors of the TFP regarding the distinction between the rights of the individual and their commitments to the entity.

Do you understand that the action you have taken toward me could be interpreted as a grave injustice, disrespect for the natural rights of the individual and harmful to legitimate freedom of speech?

### **c. Institutional question or identity crisis**

Certainly the TFP is a civic society which, by its statutes, does not enter into theological matters. But, it would deny reality to say that our entity, for this reason, does not fight against Progressivism or does so only in its temporal developments.

In *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, Prof. Plinio affirms without subterfuge: "Progressivism, installed almost everywhere, is converting the formerly verdant forest of the Catholic Church into wood that can easily be set afire by Communism. In a word, the extent of this change is such that we do not hesitate to affirm that the center – the most sensitive and truly decisive point in the fight between the Revolution and the Counter-Revolution – has shifted from the temporal to the spiritual society. The Holy Church is now this center. In her, progressivists, crypto-communists and pro-communists confront anti-progressivists and anti-communists." (Part III, Chapter II.4.B)

This said, a question of law and a question of fact surface.

*De jure*, the TFP, a civic society, is limited to activity in the temporal sphere, either by combating the destructive action of Communism and Socialism or the temporal developments of progressivist initiatives – whether made by members of the Hierarchy or not.

*De facto*, the members of the TFP, as a group of Catholics, are called to develop the new fight inside the Catholic Church, described by Prof. Plinio in the paragraph above. Will these persons form another association? Will it be the same one? Will they act only as a group of Catholics? These are matters to which Our Lady will certainly give a future orientation. Prof. Plinio did not want to precipitate the organic development of this growth. One thing, however, is indisputable: It will not be the obstacles of a juridical nature, either civil or ecclesiastical, that will prevent us from continuing the fight indicated above.

Incidentally, not a few examples – the first of which was the publication of the book *In Defense of Catholic Action* – could be named as precursors of this colossal confrontation.

In a letter addressed to his mother Dona Lucilia (October 1962), Prof. Plinio gives the reasons that led him to travel to Rome to closely follow the work of the First Session of the Second Ecumenical Vatican Council. I extract some passages:

"This trip is the fruit of long deliberation. I do not take it as an amusement. On the contrary, in my present state of fatigue, I would rather stay here, without burdening myself with all the concerns and worries that I shall have in Rome. But, if I did not go to Rome now, my conscience would be more sullied than that of a soldier who deserted the field. And, putting duty above all else – especially the duty to the Holy Church – I have decided to go. ....

"On the one hand, the siege of the external enemies of the Church has never been so strong and the action of its internal enemies has never been so general, articulate and audacious. On the other hand, I am well aware that I can provide very useful services to help sustain the edifice of Christendom. You well understand ... that I could never, under any circumstances, renounce rendering to the Church, to which I dedicated my life, this service in an historical hour almost as sad as the death of Our Lord" (João S. Clá Dias, *Dona Lucilia*, São Paulo: Artpress, 1995, vol. III, p. 117).

This was written in 1962, and on April 17, 1995, he dictated some considerations to Mr. Paulo Campos about the Good Friday ceremony of that year, held a few days earlier by John Paul II at the Coliseum. In that ceremony, important ecumenical acts took place, as described in this news report: "For the first time, the faithful of other religions were invited to share with the Pope the task of carrying a wooden cross through the streets of Rome. ... The objective of the change was to highlight the ecumenical character of the Holy Week ceremonies. A religious woman who heads a Swiss Protestant church and a priest of the Russian orthodox patriarchate were present among those invited to participate in the *Via Crucis*" (*Folha de S. Paulo*, April 15, 1995).

On this subject, Dr. Plinio dictated the following words on the 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>, and ordered me to introduce them into the work on the Council. I transcribe excerpts from his words on the 17<sup>th</sup>:

"This group of united religions [which results from ecumenism] is a conjunct of legal juridical persons. Now, a conjunct of legal juridical persons necessarily results ... in that they are federative juridical persons, a federation, that is, a juridical person of a federal character. Insofar as the previous juridical persons are juridical persons of an individual character, they have a collective individuality that takes juridical form and constitutes a juridical entity. ...

"This raises the question: Is the Church a juridical federative person united to a greater, more important one, which ... encompasses her? Or does the Church constitute a distinct juridical entity different from the other churches with which she forms the federated church?

"This question unfolds into another: Can the Catholic Church form a juridical person with entities that spread a creed different from hers? For the Catholic Church is distinguished essentially from the others by differences of dogma and morality.

"Now, if they spread similar dogmas and also opposed principles, can one ... only look at the points in which they are united and not at those in which they are separated? Obviously, this hypothesis is absurd. And to the measure that these churches disagree and spread their points of disagreement at the same time they spread their points of agreement, it is clear that they have assumed a militant attitude and not just a cooperative one.

"However, this militancy in the [Catholic] Church is not of a fleeting character, occasioned historically by a more or less long-standing quarrel, in brief, a militancy born in time and then dead after a time. Rather, it is the very essence of the Church to be combative, to be militant. She cannot avoid being so.

"But, if she is militant, can she join together with the other churches that fight against her? Can two nations be at war with each other and be at peace from a certain point of view ...? Is it conceivable to take this position to the point of forming a federation? Who cannot see that this is impossible, that there is a contradiction in this hypothesis?

"Now then, it is precisely toward this end that this kind of relations – that of the Good Friday procession in the Coliseum – is leading. The [Catholic] Church manifests herself as a sister to that group of associations that on Good Friday killed the One for Whom she weeps. How can such a thing be permitted? If this is so, can it not be said that the Church has denied herself? If not, then how can it be explained that she did not?

"Then, you should push the knife to its handle: you should take all the consequences of this question; this is to push the knife to its handle. It seems to me that the answer is clear: One must admit that a large part of the Church – which accepts this federalization in the ecumenical sense – left the Church before constituting such a federation. Because before forming a federation, this party had to renounce her militant character as something bad and accept only the pacifist character as something good. In such a case, it is not the Church who will have renounced herself, for she will have remained in the ranks and actions of the group of people who remained faithful to the principle of militancy."

Who does not remember the meetings where Prof. Plinio unabashedly preached that we could not allow certain boundaries to be passed in the general apostasy to which Progressivism, with

ever greater amplitude, is leading the Holy Church? If we were to permit it, we would be accomplices. This recalls a brilliant and poignant metaphor, that of the "Dethroned Queen," who asked those who contemplated her to come and help her, to come and save her from the usurpers. Now, who is this Queen except the Holy Church? Who are the assassins and henchmen who abuse her, mistreat her and try to assassinate her except the progressivists? If it were necessary, book after book could be published with Dr. Plinio's words confirming this thesis.

If we turn to the prophetic predictions of St. Louis Maria Grignion de Montfort in his Fire Prayer, we find a description of the current panorama. "Fire! Fire! Fire in the House of God!" Who are the men who will come to rescue her? Were they not we? Was this not one of the noblest hopes that inflamed the expectations of the best among us in the finest hours of our vocation? Didn't Dr. Plinio believe that the Congregation of the Apostles of the Latter Times [predicted by St. Louis] was founded on May 18, 1967 [when our consecration of slaves of Our Lady was made]?

So, now, why the fear? Why the calculations of a primordially human prudence? Why, in the name of such calculations, do we stand by and indifferently witness the consummation of the crucifixion of the Mystical Body of Christ?

"Yes, but Dr. Plinio is no longer with us... We can do nothing without making a mistake." This seems to be the voice of the *lapsi* [early Christians who denied the Faith under the threat of martyrdom], the Mozarabs [Spanish Catholic Visigoths who conformed to the Moorish rule], the collaborationists and the ecumenists.

This excuse is not applicable. *First*, because Dr. Plinio having promised that he would not abandon us, he did not abandon us. *Second*, because he said, "If I die, look for where I will be manifesting myself, and I will guide you there." This means that we should look for where he is. Obeying him, I looked for him. Others will have found him in various places. I found him in the fight; this is where I noted his manifestation and, perhaps, as I believe, others will also find him there. "The Lord will come with fire, his chariot will be like a whirlwind to render His anger with fury" (Is 66:15f.). I owe to him, in these days of affliction that you decided to launch against me, the consolation of finding the luminous text that I reproduce below:

"I became a Crusader. That is, a man different from all men. Because Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the perfection of all things and Who is the fulfillment of the most perfect things, Our Lord Jesus Christ will now be avenged by me. I will perform the beauty of the revenge, of the fight for the fight, of the revenge for the revenge of Christ Our Lord for Christ Our Lord."

Thus, by his unmistakable writings, by his glorious precedents, by his innumerable words, by the prophetic predictions of St. Louis Grignion de Montfort, by the longings of our souls, or by the possible symptoms of his presence in the fight, the members of the TFP as Catholics have the imperative obligation to enter the arena and defend the Church. For, if we do not, it would be the denial of our identity, of what is most serious and elevated in our vocation.

Now, having before our eyes this panorama, when we consider your letter, punishing a Catholic, a member of the TFP, who did not fear to face difficulties to publish the work that Dr. Plinio told him to write, we see a flagrant contrast. Because it is very difficult to conceive that, punishing

him for having launched an analytical work of Vatican Council II, you said not a word about the appalling crisis that strikes the Holy Church.

And even if you were to condemn him from the point of view of inopportunity, it would be normal for you, a beloved son of the Church, to make some observations about the situation of the Mystical Spouse of Christ, who is now experiencing an incomparable Passion. However, this did not occur. The more prodigal you were in prudently evaluating risks – present or future, actual or possible, internal or external – that the book might bring for the current Directory of Directors of TFP, the more parsimonious you were in assessing the agony of the Church.

Unfortunately, however, this attitude seems to be a reflection of the line of conduct that you and the current Directory have imprinted on the TFP regarding the anti-progressivist fight. In fact, after the absence of Dr. Plinio, the standards of the TFP were withdrawn from the battle. Exceptions must be made for an address to the CNBB on the agrarian question (*Folha de S. Paulo*, December 4, 1996), and two statements of self-defense against attacks by the Bishop of Maringá over the visit of the Statue of Our Lady of Fatima conducted by TFP members in that Diocese (August 29, 1996) and against attacks by some other Prelates about the mailing on the trip of John Paul II, to which I have already referred (see Item 1. C). There were also undoubtedly combats against Agrarian Reform and, in the civic-moral sphere, against pernicious laws – abortion, homosexuality – as well as in the religious sphere against blasphemies on television and in the movies, all certainly meritorious and necessary undertakings. But no longer the anti-progressivist combats proper to the TFP

This mischaracterization of the TFP has become so common that it is often heard that it has disappeared from the national and international scene where the truly important bouts are taking place.

Many of us are harboring hopes that the recent publication of the American TFP's critique on John Paul II's visit to Cuba, praiseworthy from various points of view, may be the beginning of a long series of measures that, marked by ardor and courage, may erase the impression caused by two years of silence in the anti-progressivist struggle. I ask Our Lady that this publication not be just a solitary anti-progressivism initiative motivated by internal squabbles – to prevent this or that member from making another serious manifesto that would make someone look bad. Rather, my hope is that it may be the beginning of a great emulation of the many TFPs against Progressivism and its universal initiatives.

You should stop the growth of the Pentecostal movement, which, like the Cursillos of Christianity, is invading the whole Church. You should make an effort to criticize – tactfully but without servile fear – the youth meetings promoted by John Paul II that have taken on permissivist characteristics from the moral point of view and semi-anarchical ones from the institutional vantage point, to such an extent that even the favorable organs of the media describe them as "Catholic Woodstocks." Doesn't this mean that the Church is taking on the promotion of the Fourth Revolution?

Further, you should make a thorough and severe analysis of John Paul II's approval of rock 'n' roll in Bologna just some days before his trip to Brazil. You should make a mailing denouncing the

launching of a "Catholic rock" record by the Italian Episcopal Conference. Once again, are we not facing the promotion of the Fourth Revolution? You should address all the requests for forgiveness of this Pope regarding points of honor in the History of the Church. Principally, the recent request for a general pardon to the Jews, which recriminates the religious struggle the Holy Church carried out against the false Israelite creed. Isn't a grave question of fidelity to orthodoxy involved here? Can't it be seen that these various requests for forgiveness seek to destroy the militant character of the Church?

And why haven't you said anything yet about the beatification of Frederic Ozanam – known for his pre-modernist positions – solemnly made in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris? What will you do against the ongoing reversals of the condemnations of Giordano Bruno and Savonarola, both heretics? And against the proposals for processes of “beatification” of heretics ranging from Luther and John Hus to Abbot Rosmini? What serious offensive are you preparing to prevent the ecumenical celebrations of the year 2000, which probably will take large steps toward establishing a pan-religion? And if there is a Vatican III, what do the TFP members intend to do? I can assure you that Dr. Plinio gave me special instructions regarding the last hypothesis. These points are only a summary of the extensive agenda of battles that the manifesto on John Paul II's trip to Cuba was, we hope, but a small auspicious step.

Until then, dedicated almost exclusively to the dissemination of pamphlets on Our Lady of Fatima, it is not surprising that many have begun to consider the TFP as a new version of the Blue Army. Having abandoned the public campaigns where our standard flew above the eyes of all Brazil, why should we be surprised that oblivion falls on the TFP? Why should we be surprised that our distinctive lapel pin, once a symbol of the Marian Congregations and invariably recognized as the TFP emblem, today creates confusion and causes more and more people to ask us if we are priests?

If the anti-progressivist fight of the TFPs does not take off, it would be the case to ask you this crucial question: Isn't the orientation that the current Directory is conferring on the Brazilian TFP the extinction of the anti-progressivist combat of our entity? Would this not signify rolling down our banners, deserting the battlefield and handing over the arena to the enemy? Wouldn't it be an abandonment of TFP's very identity? It would seem that, being so busy finding means for subsistence and seeking a unity that, sadly, is visibly breaking into pieces, the TFP would be on the way to losing its reason to exist. *Propter vitam vivendi perdere causas* [In order to live his own life, he lost the reasons for living].

And, yet, does achieving unity not depend on raising the standards atop the masts and sounding the alert against the enemies? "Upon the dark mountain [of Babylon] raise up a standard, exalt the voice, lift up the hand, and let the rulers enter through your gates. I have commanded my sanctified ones, and have called my mighty ones into my wrath, they rejoice in my glory" (Is 13: 2-3).

Lamentably, however, the loss of the notion of the fight has gone so far that you, by threatening to expel me and publicly disassociate yourself from the anti-Council book, have neglected to realize that any person with common sense will consider such actions as support for Progressivism. In fact, this is what is already happening in certain conservative ambiances in the United

States, where, unfortunately, the American TFP has been working against the dissemination of my book.

Thus, Mr. President, if in fact you execute the penalties threatened against me, the identity crisis will probably have reached its most acute expression: In addition to abandoning the fight, the TFP will combat those who want to fight against its enemy... of yesterday.

It would be the case to cry out with the Prophet: "Arise, arise, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; Awake, as in the days of old, in the ancient generations. Was it not thee who has struck the proud one, and wounded the dragon?" (Is 51: 9).

#### **d. Metaphysical-moral question**

However, Mr. President, the point that struck me regarding your omissions, which I found especially bitter to note, was the oblivion I noted in your letter of my right to keep in its entirety the noble vision of Dr. Plinio that Our Lady gave me.

During the many years I had the pleasure of being close to you, I always admired your nobility of spirit and capacity to appreciate the qualities of others – human qualities, of course, but principally the supernatural gifts that called this or that person more particularly to the Counter-Revolution. I also admired your real admiration for the person of Dr. Plinio. There I encountered in you the principal point of affinity that linked us.

Now, however, I am saddened to verify that you have lost what I admired in you.

In effect, you decided to bring into a dispute over your authority and that of the other directors of the TFP the question of my personal relationship with Dr. Plinio, a point that was unnecessary to your accusation.

I ask you to see in the considerations below not a manifestation of disrespect, but an attempt of the former friend to make you see the narrow route you have chosen to take.

In the 51 years that I have roamed on this earth, I did not know a better image of God than my relationship with Dr. Plinio. Neither my admiration for Medieval Civilization, nor my enthusiasm for Chivalry or the magnificent architecture of the cathedrals, nor the elevated analysis of the organic regimes of yesteryear, nor my reverential respect for Charlemagne, nor the devotion I have to certain Saints – Michael the Archangel, Elias, Gregory VII, John the Evangelist, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and especially Louis Grignion de Montfort, nor my complete affinity with the Holy Inquisition and the silent veneration that I pay to the mystery of the Liturgy gave me anything comparable. Even the contemplation of God's plans in History, of which I am an aficionado admirer, did not bring me the broadness of panoramas and the sense of the divine that my relationship with Dr. Plinio provided.

Not that such a relationship was perfect on my part – far be it from me to hold such pretensions – but on his part it was. And since there are certain supernatural realities that are expressed only in a relationship, the fact that they were perfect on his part and that I did not oppose great resistance to him on my part, they could flow normally, reflecting what God wanted them to reflect for me and, perhaps, also for Dr. Plinio. It was through such a relationship that I learned the true love for the Catholic Church, which he taught me to venerate with all my soul.

It was through this means that I came to know Wisdom, reflected in him, but in so translucent a way that in him I could glimpse the Eternal Wisdom, the Subsistent Truth, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. It was through this means that I understood Grandeur – a man who assumes everything good that existed in History and, by declaring himself in the state of counter-attack, causes the good of the past to be reborn and opens the doors of the future.

It was through my relationship with him that I understood Magnanimity, this new name for the love of God by which the bountifulness of the superior naturally leads to the detachment and joy of the inferior. A virtue that makes it easy to understand what was and what is the disinterest of the Good Shepherd who gives His life for His sheep. It was in my relationship with him that I discovered Holy Wrath against the enemies of the Catholic name, a wrath proper to those truly innocent men, true lovers of the Holy City. Here also I understood what Courage is, a lofty, elevated and disdainful fearlessness in face of the bad, the revolutionary, the conspirators who plot the destruction of Christendom. It was in him that I learned what certainty of victory is and, in a word, the unshakeable certainty of the full realization of his vocation and, permit me to say, of mine as well.

This relationship, with which Our Lady and he wanted to reward me, is sacred to me. The great Moses with his burning bush on the top of Sinai does not make me jealous. For if he were there with God for 40 days, I have been with Dr. Plinio for 33 years. And in this relationship I see, perhaps, more of the divine presence than he before the sacred bush. And I guard the hope that I still may win the dispute with this Prophet when I shall pass from this exile to the Fatherland.

There are, however, certain conditions for such a relationship to take place: "Remove your sandals, for the place where you stand is holy ground" (Ex 3: 5; Acts 7:33), God said to Moses. Certainly, it was not because He required sinlessness, for Moses was as sinful as we are. It was something different He demanded: not to bring the "dust of the sandals" inside – that is, human criteria, small interests, personal quarrels – but to preserve a position of soul before the vocation that attracts the grandeur and communicability of God. This position that Moses had before his burning bush, I asked and sincerely sought to acquire also in mine. I do not know if I succeeded, but I know that, trying to achieve it, I had the good fortune of having this relationship. For me this suffices; it is my reward exceedingly great (cf. Gen 15: 1).

Therefore, for me, the relationship with Dr. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira is what most expresses God. It is the castle of my honor, the tabernacle of my inner sanctuary.

If this is so, I believe I have the right not to receive the interference of third parties in such a relationship. Especially when it comes from those who seek to destroy the ideal image that I have formed of the one whom Our Lady gave me as a model.

Now, the most painful lacuna to be noted in the letter you sent me is precisely your abandonment of the sense of what I have just described. I say abandonment, because I am sure that you had it. That is why, when I first took up the pen to respond to you, it consoled me to consider that you did not read the letter you signed. Others, who never had such an understanding, would have written it and you would simply have signed it. Truly, such a hypothesis comforts me. But, since I am not given to digressions, and am responding to an accusatory libel that

threatens me with expulsion from the TFP, I am obliged to assume the formal realities as true. You, in fact, wanted what is written there.

What is the picture that is depicted, in view of what I have just set out?

You, barricaded behind some unknown article of the statutes of civic associations, judging your authority contested by me and brandishing threats, employing a document whose intellectual value we are weighing, can think of nothing better to do than to call into question my personal relationship with Prof. Plinio. Attempting to fortify a thesis difficult to defend, you launch against me alleged judgments of Prof. Plinio about me. Doing this, you try to put me against him and denigrate the sterling memory of him that I preserve.

Be assured, Mr. President, that I hold no bitterness against you for the defects that you point out in me. What is objective in your statements, I find almost puerile compared to other more serious defects that I know in myself. I know them, by the way, because Dr. Plinio, who discerned them, showed them to me. And this in no way altered the incomparable relationship I have with him. If he knew my serious defects, why should he not address my minor defects with this or that person? He could, he had the right to do so, and, if he did so, it was well done. For, I never noticed anything in him that was not just. My faults, to my joy, will be announced to everyone at the Last Judgment, to glorify Our Lady, who called me in spite of them, and Prof. Plinio, who, knowing them, did not despise me but maintained the relationship I spoke of. So, it is not with hurt that I address you for having brought up my defects. Do it as much as you like, you will find me indifferent.

What saddens me, in the *first place*, is to note in your accusation the desire to throw sulfuric acid into the innocent view that a person maintains of his archetype. Even an oath in the name of God was taken to try to dull the image of God in a soul... *Second*, I am amazed at the abuse of confidence that you and your witnesses, who received the confidences to which you allude as things that should be kept in reserve, just as I also have received confidences about other persons. By revealing them, the trust that Prof. Plinio placed in his interlocutors is betrayed.

I do not know if Catholic Morals permits, in a situation of self-defense, certain moral exceptions to be made in view of Natural Law and give to the accused the right to make use of opinions that were transmitted to him in a confidential way. Perhaps it is so. At any rate, this is not the case regarding your accusatory piece. Therefore, Mr. President, this particular point directly betrays the trust that Prof. Plinio placed in you and your witnesses.

In passing, I assure you that I will reveal nothing of possible personal judgments [about you] that Prof. Plinio may have made that I may have heard from his lips. You, your collaborators and your witnesses can rest easy in this regard.

\*

It is, therefore, with a bitter taste in my mouth that I close the part of my defense that has analyzed, in this Item 2, various intellectual and moral vices that seriously compromise, if not destroy, the foundation of your accusation. Summarizing, the following were analyzed: suspicious

haste, compromising partialities, discreditable confusions, groundless generalizations and incomprehensible omissions.

\*

I go now to the refutation of the two theses.

\* \* \*

### PART III

#### THESIS 1

#### THE LAUNCHING OF THE WORK GOES AGAINST THE WILL OF DR. PLINIO

As I said above, after stating each thesis or argument, I will give the proof in the text of your letter. Afterwards I will refute it.

##### **Proof of the accusation in the text:**

\* "The truth is that the publication of *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* does not correspond ... to the desire of our late Founder." (p. 6, § 3)

##### **Refutation of Thesis I**

##### **Argument I**

#### **DR. PLINIO WANTED ONLY A CONCISE DOCUMENT AND NOT A BOOK, MUCH LESS THE 11 VOLUME WORK THAT WAS MADE**

##### **Proof of the accusation in the text:**

\* "According to the testimony of Mr. Fernando Antunez, Dr. Plinio wanted a summarized analysis of the conciliar texts to provide a base for the expression of our perplexity. Instead of this concise work, based substantially on the actual words of the conciliar documents ... you chose to write a global critique of the contemporary theological currents that inspired the writers of those documents. From this resulted a collection of thousands of pages in 13 volumes" (p. 4, § 4)

\* "We are witnesses to many of his comments [Dr. Plinio's] in the sense that he judged your work insufficient, requiring a thorough review. All the more so since it was taking on a wingspan that went far beyond the initial plan. Mr. Fernando makes this clear in his declaration, which is included" (p. 5, § 1).

\* "At a certain moment, Dr. Plinio thought of doing something along the lines of the *Message* of the 15 TFPs against self-managing Socialism promoted by Mitterand. Just as in that *Message* he used abundant documentation accumulated by TFP researchers, he would use the documentation collected by Mr. Atila" (Statement by Mr. Fernando Antúnez, n. 4).

\* "Thus, I started reading the volumes written to that date ....

"In February of 1986, having already worked on this review for about two months, Dr. Plinio called me on a Saturday night. He asked me what I thought of the work. I told him that it had an intellectual style that was sensibly different from ours and was a lamentable redaction with countless vulnerable points. On the whole, un-publishable without the review of a person knowledgeable on the subject ... That same night [February of 1986], Dr. Plinio presented me with a

possible solution [of utilizing the work on the Council] that could satisfy Mr. Atila: If a future occasion were to appear allowing him to write a manifesto on the consequences of the Second Vatican Council, what would I think about the use of the documentation collected?

"It would be a manifesto similar to the Message published in 1981-1982 fighting the self-managing Communism advocated by the newly elected French government. In that eventuality, Dr. Plinio thought the work of Mr. Atila would be used only as powerful documentation to support the theses of this 'message.' ...

"The idea pleased me greatly. It was the most concrete thing that Dr. Plinio had said to me about a possible use of the work. It remained to be seen whether Mr. Atila would accept it ... " (Statement by Mr. Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli, p. 1, § 7, p. 2, § 1, §§ 5ff.).

### **Refutation to Argument I**

For my refutation, I will *first* set out the texts of Dr. Plinio that speak in the opposite sense of the argument in question and, *second*, make a specific rebuttal.

#### **Major refutation: The words of Dr. Plinio contrary to the accusation**

The following exposition follows the chronological order in which the comments were made and provides context data for a full understanding of the cited passages. The subtitles, in Arabic numerals, aim to focus on the points of the accusation that the texts deny.

Let me note here that parts of the texts will be repeated in other arguments to prove different topics that the texts also address. In order to distinguish the particular point I want to prove, you can follow the bold marks, which give emphasis to what I deem necessary.

#### **1. The exposition of the doctrine underlying the Council, an important factor**

The accusation affirms that Dr. Plinio did not want a critique of the theological currents and that this would have been an "option" of the author: "You chose to write a global critique of the contemporary theological currents that inspired the writers of those documents." I will now set out what Dr. Plinio said about the need to refute these theological currents.

In one of the two symposiums I had with Dr. Plinio in Serra Negra (1982) for the preparation of the trip to Europe that he asked me to make, he had already conceived the general lines that the work on the Council should follow.

The typed transcriptions are his words, taken from tapes; the page numbers refer to the mentioned typed texts.

His own words speak in the opposite sense of Argument I, especially the words in bold:

**A – Dr. Plinio: "It [the theme of the project] must be an exposition of their doctrine that makes one shudder reading the Council. For this, the difficulty is not the exposition. It is to know their doctrine with enough subtlety so as to be able to define it with all authenticity.** Because

this idea proceeds from the presupposition that knowing the overarching tone of their thinking makes it easier to show its similarity with the Council.

Mr. Atila: "And, I believe, they did not follow only one philosopher. They followed an ensemble of a thousand things, which makes it difficult to find the documentation.

Dr. Plinio: "It is a real and serious difficulty. But, I have the idea that, if we were to visit the top personages ... we could get the books – these books should not be hidden, I think they are sold. I have the impression that we would get many things from them. Because I think that the decisive books repeat themselves, more than the common books. It is a hypothesis" (Serra Negra, April 29, 1982, p. 11).

**B – Dr. Plinio: "Here are two things to do: one is to look at the theologians with extra-conciliar books and the other is to look at the conciliar debates. To attack the Council, the conciliar debate is more interesting. Because then you could say: "So-and-so said this, another one said that, and yet another maintained this and that, etc., etc. ....**

Mr. Atila: "The Montaigne vs Gironde system."<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Plinio: "Exactly. You should put a thing like this, **to say that this [current of thought] is what is represented in the Council.** Will the others be represented as well? **It is probably a study of exegesis, but, in any case, [to show that] this current [of thought] is present at the Council suffices to demoralize it"** (*ibid.*, p. 12).

**C – Dr. Plinio: "I believe that in the end all this [the characterization of the current of thought] is urgent and more important, as preparation for your travel, than to see the errors that it [the Council] has *in concreto*.** Although, if a work denouncing the errors *in concreto* falls into your hands, purchase it" (*ibid.*, p. 13).

One can see, therefore, that Dr. Plinio gave me instructions for the analysis to be made about both the currents of thought and the conciliar texts.

## **2. To explain the obscure language of the Council, it is indispensable to know the thinking of the current that inspired it**

This can be confirmed in the following guidelines that Dr. Plinio gave me.

**A – Dr. Plinio: "Let's make the *mise au point* in the following way ... I want you to make this trip to polish the hypothesis [you made about the Council's thinking] or to acquire the means to polish it so that the hypothesis reaches that point. ... You should look for a documentation that gives you the possibility to formulate your hypothesis or, at least, the possibility of documenting**

---

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to the tactic used to prepare the victory of the French Revolution. To do this, two parties were established in the French National Assembly: the Gironde – the conservative revolutionaries – and the Montaigne – the radical revolutionaries. They fought each other in a way that led to the victory of the radicals and the death of the conservatives.

that this hypothesis has some foundation in the Council. The hypothesis ... **should say in clear language what is said there [in the conciliar texts] in obscure language. In a way that it proves that the obscure language wanted to say what the clear language is saying. That's it"** (Serra Negra, December 1, 1982, 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, p. 1).

**B – Dr. Plinio: "So, our first thesis would be: the Council expresses itself in a hidden language. Within its apparent language, there is a hidden language. This [language] is here. Now, a question that the 'ploc-plocs' [narrow-minded intellectuals] will immediately put to the test is this: It is true that one can say this, but in order to affirm that the Council had this intention, you must prove that they used this language with the books of the principal authors" (*ibid.*, 2).**

**C – Dr. Plinio: "After writing it, it is necessary to have the foundation, the documentation that there is a theological current expressed in 'Councilese' [the language used in the Council]. Perhaps the chapter could even be titled 'speaking Councilese.' And then show the thing. Now, the third chapter would be: the errors of the Council – the palpable errors, and how these errors are nothing but the offshoots [of a doctrine]. That is, the moment when the conciliar writers resolved not to speak Councilese. Which is one more proof. All the errors they have are explained by these doctrines here, they are consistent with this doctrine. Were they unintentional or intentional? It is another question. But here they are" (*ibid.*).**

**D – Dr. Plinio: "With the critique of the Council, we will have to fish to see if material appears ... to prove or to lead to proof that what we have is a current embedded in the Church, already prior [to the Council]. One remotely affiliated with the Modernism that St. Pius X crushed, but by which, in another sense, he was crushed, and which re-emerged in this [current] that is [now] demolishing the Church" (*ibid.*, p. 3).**

It is clear, therefore, that Dr. Plinio wanted to deal with the theological currents that prepared the way for the Council and not just the texts of the official documents.

### **3. The idea is born for a book of interviews, confirmed by documents**

The accusation states that it is the author's wish, not Dr. Plinio's, to publish a work that is larger than a *message*. The following excerpts show that, from the beginning, he was already thinking of a book.

After returning from Europe, I had two symposiums with Dr. Plinio to evaluate the results obtained, to prepare the execution of the original plan and its possible adaptation.

On the trip, I made 22 interviews with important names of progressivist conciliar theology and recorded them. The contents of the tapes were typed and I summarized the most important points. Dr. Plinio intended to publish those interviews in the form of a book to raise the hypothesis of a doctrine hidden in the Council and to question those responsible in the Church, asking whether or not such doctrine corresponded to the underlying thinking in the conciliar texts. It is from this perspective that some of the following passages below should be understood. The first symposium (June 15-19, 1983) was held in Serra Negra, with one day spent in Águas de Lindóia.

A – Mr. Atila: "[After reading an excerpt from a book]. I just wanted to show you – based on Küng and this other author I read here – that the written material is pure dynamite."

Dr. Plinio: "**Which raises a problem** for the purpose of the publication that we were thinking about ... **If there isn't a risk that a publication with only these interviews will be too meager compared to what they have declared**" (Serra Negra, June 16, 1983, 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, p. 1).

B – Dr. Plinio: "You brought back material that, on the whole, accomplishes everything that I had hoped for and even more in some points. Therefore, **I am obliged to ask myself whether, with this material, I should not modify and expand the plan that was made with poorer material. The original plan, as far as I remember, was to publish something that was an interpretation of the Council, in view of what these men said there.** But it had a certain exegetical sense. That is to say, the Council says this and that; this is ambiguous and so on, but the interpreters of the Council understand it in this way.

Mr. Atila: "You thought [to accuse them] of the flavor of heresy. What we have here explodes the flavor of heresy [accusation].

Dr. Plinio "This explodes it, explodes it!" (Águas de Lindóia, June 17, 1983, 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, p. 1).

These initial thoughts are confirmed by the document transcribed in Item 4.

#### 4. The opinions of the progressivist theologians, the bomb-part of the book

Dr. Plinio: "But the point is that, especially earlier in the garden and now this evening, the true method is beginning to appear. ... **In the material you have collected there are two things to distinguish. One is what they say about the Council, but the other is a doctrine that one sees is the doctrine of the Council, but which they present more as personal opinion ... rather than an opinion supported by the Council.** Now, what I think is most explosive is their personal opinions and, on the other hand, these [opinions] **are what would give the most violent blow to the Council and would create the clearest canonical case of a heretical Council; thus, based on their personal opinions, we could say something appropriate as an introduction. It would be their personal opinion unfolding in a creed.** Afterwards, [we should present] them and the Council. That is to say, it would be the interviews.

"It is necessary to have a very skillful graphic part, very well done, very beautiful, where the most important things are duly stressed, the others with less emphasis and, afterwards, a small conclusion. **But, the bomb would be the first part, which would be the doctrine that they profess in common. Now, it seems to me that this doctrine could be presented – this depends now on the execution – tout court as follows: First, it should be a very synthesized [presentation] and should clearly say ... the following: We are not going to present the whole doctrine. You have not even had time to read all the books, but you present indisputable texts proving that the doctrine is this. And that, hypothetically, it can be completed this or that way.**"

Mr. Atila: "Why does it depend on the execution?"

Dr. Plinio: "Because I think the nucleus of the difficulty lies in knowing how much evidence from the books [of the progressivist theologians] we have to present, beyond what is in the conversations.

Mr. Atila: "You think it is better to present the interviews because they are more acceptable to the public or because they do more damage?"

Dr. Plinio: "No, no. **I have the impression that ... the interviews should be the bulk of the book. The initial hypothesis should be a kind of bomb, but a bomb that is not the bulk of the book**" (*ibid.*, 1).

It is clear, therefore, that Dr. Plinio wanted a book and that it should be about the thinking of the theological currents. These two points frontally contradict the accusation.

### 5. The idea of a three-volume work is born

However, Dr. Plinio went further than the plan for just one book. Below, one can follow the birth in his mind of a work of three volumes.

After this symposium, I began to read many books, together with Mr. Gonzalo Larrain and Mr. Rodrigo Guerreiro Dantas, who helped me for some months. Later, Mr. Wilson Gabriel da Silva and, afterwards, Mr. Renato Vasconcelos and Mr. José Coutinho, joined this effort. We read and made note cards. Below, Dr. Plinio referred to the significant sample of these note cards, whose general notions I exposed to him. His initial idea of publishing a book evolved into the publication of several volumes. The following excerpts make it clear that it was his initiative that there should be more volumes, just as they confirm his original idea of denouncing a current of thought behind the conciliar documents.

A - Dr. Plinio: "The work aims to show that the Council was a revolution.

"Now, **the method of the work is to give an interpretation of the Council or, at least, of certain parts of the Council, first showing that the thinkers who made the Council and the leaders of the theological movement in the post-conciliar era have a certain doctrine. This doctrine has some internal variants ... but also has common points that constitute the actual doctrine. So, regardless of the internal variants, the common points are these. And so, this is what constitutes the conciliar current. ... They [those in this current] did such and such things before the Council in their preparation; during the Council they held these positions; after the Council they did this or that, wrote such and such a work, etc., etc., etc.** The works they wrote before the Council can also be mentioned.

"And so, **they constitute a current because in certain fundamental points – we can say that these points are this, this and that – generally speaking they share the same thought. And if it is true that ... examining the differences we see that they are considerable ... when we leave the circuit of their thought and analyze their thinking compared to traditional doctrine, we see that it constitutes a counter block in the face of traditional doctrine. And [we see] that in their denial of traditional doctrine they are homogeneous. So, this is a current of thought.**

"Now, **we are going to define this current of thought** as follows: We will present it **as wanting to make a revolution. This revolution is such and such.** It may or may not include a reference to R-CR. **This carries out in the religious field what, according to R-CR, took place in the temporal field in such and such a way. This is what they accomplished, we give the evidence: Here are the texts.**

"[We will tell the reader:] Don't be surprised to see this. We understand that this affirmation is of such great scope, of such a magnitude that a person can be astonished because even though it is demonstrated, broadly speaking, it seems implausible. That these men, using such supports in these situations, have said such things and are thinking and doing this seems implausible. Don't be dismayed, because this implausibility is the road upon which they are in fact walking. Look at such and such other points, which do not enter directly into the field of revolutionary analysis as we are looking at here, although a very suggestive correlation can be made. Here we show them as in a sketch of a play; in another place we show what they affirm so that we see who they are as a whole. Don't be surprised, therefore, if it is affirmed that they are the ones pushing this revolution forward. **This would be the first volume, the first part of the work. These note cards would be used for that**" (São Bento, November 21, 1983, pp. 1f.).

B – Dr. Plinio: "So this would all be in the first. In the first it would already come. ...

Mr. Atila: "**The R-CR analysis would be in the first?**"

Dr. Plinio: "**In the *first [part of the work]* ... an analysis of *Pascendi* would also enter at some point, as [an explanation] for the methodology, showing that they [Modernism's and Progressivism's methods] are the same. They indisputably make one think of the Modernism at the time of St. Pius X.**

Mr. Atila: "*Immortale Dei* also?"

Dr. Plinio: "Less of it. Maybe some phrases. **I want to show there is a tactic and that, behind the tactic, according to the denunciation in *Pascendi*, a conspiracy.** Here also, a clear conspiracy exists that has been made in such a way that I will say more: it is a society. **Because, without the stable collaboration of persons who know one another, think in the same way, aim for the same end and are led by the same heads, this would not have gone forward.**

"I can say still more: It is not a secret society. Anyone who says it is a secret society would slander these people, because the concept of a secret society is one that the authority does not know about. Now, **here** we have the opposite, **the authority directs the work. It not only knows about it, but promotes the work. It pushes the works ahead.** It is not a secret society. It is a society that the public is unaware of, but something different from a secret society.

"**So the first work [volume] is done.**

"**Now, in the *second work*, the following should come: We show what these people want to overturn, we show what they want to implant. We see by this, in a general way, what they hate and what they love. Now, behind this hatred and love, there is a counter-creed or a creed that goes against the present one. What is this new faith? We affirm that this faith is such and**

such. Then, for this demonstration we utilize clear excerpts once again, but at one point in the waters, we also use obscure excerpts. No, not obscure, but ambiguous" (*ibid.*, p. 3f).

C – Dr. Plinio: "Now, the final element, which would constitute a *third part*, much smaller, which would be the conclusion of the first two. It would be the Council read after this reading. So, the Council read after this reading is only the exposition of what the Council says. Below would come a small footnote relating to this or that point, showing how this is what is behind the Council.

Mr. Atila: "Church, people of God, collegiality, sacraments, other things that are completely loose terms, would make sense when explained like this.

Dr. Plinio: "Then, we should say the following: **The feeling one has when he has this presupposition on reading the Council is that every article of the Council is a lampshade that is dark. When you press [the button] – the interpretation comes. It is like turning the light on in the lampshade. Then, the drawings on the lampshade become clear. Then, this point, that point, another one – become easy to understand. [With this] the Council is unmasked. This would be the work"** (*ibid.*, 4f.).

Thus, it could not be clearer that Dr. Plinio desired a vast work, which should address as one of its central themes the theological currents that made the Council. That is to say, the accusation is unfounded.

## 6. The germination of an even larger work begins

However, with the course of time, Dr. Plinio would further extend his plan. This is what one sees in the text below:

Mr. Atila: "**How many volumes are you thinking of for this [the work on the Council]?"**

Dr. Plinio: "**I haven't thought about it. It doesn't matter to me."**

Mr. Atila: "[Cardinal] Journet's work is half of this [in size] and there are objections [to its size]."

Dr. Plinio: "It doesn't matter! It doesn't matter! **Things have to have the volume needed to say what they have to say. Like it or not.** This was an objection to the *Message*, it was an objection..."

Mr. Atila: "No, no. **I am saying that no one can [pretend to] wear a sword that he cannot lift later."**

Dr. Plinio: "**Let's do what is necessary; afterwards we will resolve this problem."**

Mr. Atila: "I believe that by February I can finish the readings and begin the writing."

Dr. Plinio: "Magnificent!" (*ibid.*, p. 7).

## 7. A Collection of many volumes

After organizing a card registry of more than 4,500 note cards and making a general plan of how they could be used, I asked for a new symposium with Dr. Plinio so that he could set out what he concretely wanted, since the writing would begin shortly (November 18, 1985). This symposium was held in Amparo (October 28-November 1, 1985); also present were Mr. Wilson Gabriel da Silva and Mr. Renato Vasconcelos. The excerpts from this symposium reproduced below confirm the previous ones and frontally contradict Argument I.

**A – Mr. Atila: "Only a list of the subjects contained on the note cards give a volume that corresponds to the five *Towers* (The *Towers* were three books defending the TFP). Now, if you use the note cards, you get something around 10 [volumes]. If you make a comment [on each card], you get around 15 [volumes]. So, we decided to stop: No one can digest a work of 20 volumes. A boundary mark was placed because it was getting too big. There's no use for it."**

Dr. Plinio: **"I agree with you, especially because of the following: It seems that there would not be enough time to write it and still have the time to intervene in a timely way in the events that are unfolding. A tactical question arises ... as the work is imagined now, what can be its possible uses?"** (Amparo, October 30, 1985, p. 29).

**B – Dr. Plinio: "I think the following: Whatever happens, we should try to write as much as we can."**

Mr. Atila: **"Write as much as we can?"**

Dr. Plinio: **"Yes. Write as much as we can. For this reason..."**

Mr. Atila: **"To be kept there by Dr. Borelli, until the moths eat it..."**

Dr. Plinio: **"No, no, that is not it. This is all being done in the hope of the *Bagarre* [internal jargon for the coming divine chastisement] and the Reign of Mary. Obviously. Like the MNF [specialized meetings to study and denounce the Revolution]. The MNF is made with the hope of the *Bagarre* and the Reign of Mary, outside of this, there is no MNF. What is the meaning of this MNF material?"**

**"Now, beyond writing this, we must see what use it – the work – can have before the *Bagarre* and the Reign of Mary. That is to say, the question is: Is there a point where the work can be considered as – I do not say complete – but in a stage like a building where the stories are constructed, but there is still no coating, plaster and all the rest. Well, what would this stage be? And what usefulness – depending on the focus – would the publication of the work in this stage have for us? Because it would have one, depending on the focus? So then, let us see what could be available from now to, let us say, about a year from now. *Second*, if we have to enter the fight before a year from now, what should we do?"** (*ibid.*, pp. 29f).

The clear conclusion is that Dr. Plinio's orientation for the work was precisely the opposite of what the accusation claims.

## 8. The constant importance given to the current of thought

His intention to analyze the current of thought of which the Council is an expression never ceased to be present in his plans. He attached importance to this analysis to such a point that, as seen in the first excerpt below, Dr. Plinio even forgot about the study of the conciliar texts...

**A – Dr. Plinio: "Now, we should say [to the Pope]: 'Why are we speaking about Rahner and not about the Council itself? [Because] we feel ourselves so abandoned that, if we speak of the Council, if we make an analysis of the Council, we fear that you will strike us down.'"**

Mr. Atila: "But it will be an analysis of the Council."

Dr. Plinio: "But, **much less about the texts of the Council ...**"

Mr. Atila: ... "I was thinking of putting in the text ... because they all do this when interpreting the Council. And, then, it is very easy to get it..."

Dr. Plinio: "Oh, yes! I agree. **[So, we will say:] 'This is how they analyze the Council. We went and studied how those responsible for the Council see the Council'**" (Amparo, April 31, 1984, morning, pp. 10f).

**B – Dr. Plinio: "We will say the following: 'We are going to speak about the Council through the voice of those who are the closest inside it. ... We are going to see how they interpreted it. And their interpretation seems the true one to us. And so, we ask you: Is this not the real Council and are they wrong? ... Or is this the Council and are we wrong? If you say we are wrong, permit us to say: We see a contradiction [between the Council] with the teaching of the past. Are we wrong in this? You tell us!' (ibid., p. 11).**

Again, the complete lack of foundation of the accusation appears.

## 9. The idea of a shorter document, like the *Message*, is born

Perhaps it is not superfluous to note what appears in the text below, in which it is clear that the original idea of launching a *Message*, of the kind that Dr. Plinio wrote against self-managing Socialism, came from one of his interlocutors, not from himself. This is very different from – perhaps the opposite of – what Mr. Fernando Antúnez' statement affirms (number 4) and what one of the paragraphs in Mr. Nelson Fragelli's statement clearly states.

**A – Mr. Atila: "You could make a kind of a *Message*, which would be a first part of the book; afterwards we could make another, as many as you want. Because in this *Message* you can refer to the other books. Then, we release the *Message* over the whole world."**

Dr. Plinio: "No. I do not think the *Message* should be separate from the book. In any case, this is premature for us to think about. **The *Message* would come out. If it were to come out as something separate from the book or just distinct from it, that is another thing. I have the impression that the book should not contain the *Message* except as an appendix, a prologue or some such thing."**

Mr. Atila: **"This has to be done for the glorification of the fight that you started with *In Defense of Catholic Action*. It even occurred to me to give it the title *In Defense of the Catholic Church* to be symmetrical with your first work.**

Dr. Plinio: "Strictly speaking, the book and the *Message* could have different titles" (*ibid.*, p. 12).

The truth of this conclusion is not without a certain irony. In effect, the accusation states: "Dr. Plinio did not want books, but only a *Message*; it was the author who imposed the large work." Here the opposite is proved: Dr. Plinio wanted the large work and had not thought about a *Message*. It was the author who proposed the latter. Dr. Plinio agreed, with the condition that it should come out with the work...

### **10. The work plan: One *Message*, two summary volumes, ten support volumes**

At the same symposium in Amparo, as can be seen in the texts below, Dr. Plinio came up with a quite complete work plan. It was in trying to fulfill this plan that my collaborators and I dedicated ourselves to the work of writing and reviewing.

**A – Dr. Plinio: "I have come to believe that we cannot think of this material we have here as above all a weapon for a battle, but rather as a repository of weapons for a war. It is a weapons depot for a war. And so, it must be written, ordered, listed and arranged. I don't know if it will be for publication, but at the least it must be available for use at any time and for publication of the totality at any moment, if it be the case. Because in this way, anywhere we go, anything we need to do, we have it available and we can go there. A kind of [Cornelius] a Lapide. We go there and we take what we want and attack. It seems to me that ... this is the backdrop of the picture. I'm not talking about the feasibility; I'm talking about the advantage.**

Mr. Atila: "It is not that it is infeasible. It is done."

Dr. Plinio: "No, it is not written yet, is it? You need to write it, right?"

Mr. Atila: "If it is just the documentation, it is here [in this ensemble of note cards]."

Dr. Plinio: "Or is it written? A book or a treatise?"

Mr. Atila: "What we have is the documentation."

Dr. Plinio: **"And what about the whole context of argumentation?"**

Mr. Atila: **"You have not given it yet. I don't know what it should be – if it is to write a book or write an encyclopedia."**

Dr. Plinio: **"Let us say it is a book of encyclopedic proportions. A treatise of encyclopedic proportions. This is what I am thinking of, what I think would be ideal.** Let us see what is doable. It hasn't been done yet. You have the note cards. Now, you have here your verbal exposition. But, the treatise of encyclopedic proportions is not done. Now, **I think we should go ahead immediately with the treatise. In an overview of the treatise ... we should say: 'We are done, we finished the whole thing [the work]. However, we can still expand on this or that topic.'** ...

"It would be a summary, but largely based on this [encyclopedic] book in the rearguard, which could be mentioned to the people. To this book ... of action, I would like to give the title *Eli, Eli, lamma sabacthani?* [My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?]." With a letter-preface from me to you explaining the usefulness of a book like this and so on ... I imagine the forthcoming publication would be this book, but I would like this publication to be supported by something that could be published at any time and would be the great work. I don't know if it's clear.

"I believe that, during the battle, this or that chapter, this or that part, can be launched separately as a booklet or something like that, to address some aspect of the polemic. But, I do not know to what extent this will be. It depends on the unexpected. **My idea is that this encyclopedic collection of support should also be an arsenal. But, not just a storage arsenal.** It can respond immediately to a call ... [All kinds of threats] are boiling around us coming from every side. Very well, we jump into the field before we are attacked or at the dawn of the attack – depending on the timing – or at the height of the attack, and we place our question: we present the case. And, then, we go to the end! I do not know if the whole picture is clear?"

Mr. Atila: "This set of books would be a support for the spear, because the spear itself would be the *Manifesto* [the Message made by Dr. Plinio]."

Dr. Plinio: "But wait. Now, the other side comes. This is for the spreading of this set of 10 books ... I am thinking aloud here, I think we should collect donations to support this whole project; we would need to collect them in the U.S., Germany, for a large campaign, including publishing in newspapers. This cannot be a mere book. The thing [the attack] against us will come out in the papers, and either we have newspapers to counter-shoot or it will not go forward. **I would like to show, therefore, copies of the collection, perhaps in a Tower-like edition** – how to show it is an operational part that I haven't formed an idea about yet – perhaps you have ideas. We can think about it later. Now is not the time to think about this. But, **something that is as cheap as possible that still has a very dignified appearance that we can bring into the polemic**" (Amparo, January 1, 1985, afternoon, 4ff.).

B – Mr. Atila: "If you want to release this [smaller] volume as a sample, it can be done in two or three months. It depends on the strategy that you want to adopt."

Dr. Plinio: "**You could write ... [for this summary], at most two volumes of, let us say, 300 pages each, therefore something quite large**" (*ibid.*, 8).

Therefore, the general plan would be to write

- *In the first place*, a grand work – 10 volumes, to be a point of reference;
- *Second*, a two-volume summary;
- *Third*, Dr. Plinio would write a *Message*, which may or may not be separate from the two-volume summary.

Throughout the writing of the various volumes, the plan of the two summaries changed a little in my frequent consultations with Dr. Plinio. The reason for this change is not difficult to under-

stand. In order to demonstrate what Dr. Plinio wanted for the collection, it was necessary to adopt the inductive method. That is, since we would present ourselves as laymen without ecclesiastical titles that give us credentials to speak *ex autoritate proper* [by our own authority], we would have to make the texts speak for themselves as much as possible. The method would be all the stronger if more irrefutable documents were presented.

This advantage for the exposition in 10 volumes, however, had a serious drawback for the two-volume summary. In effect, as we synthesized the material, we realized we would necessarily have to dispense with a large number of documents that would inductively prove the general thesis. That is to say, the summary works would abandon the inductive method. Then, we would fall into the disadvantage of lacking credentials. Or, maintaining the method, we would have the drawback of the summary works being much less cogent than the volumes of the Collection, since the number of texts would necessarily be smaller.

In order to resolve this impasse, Dr. Plinio decided to dispense with the writing of the two summary volumes and to publish Volume I on a wide range of subjects, which would serve as the summary. If Volume I were well accepted, he gave me precise criteria for continuing the divulgation. I see no convenience or need to expose them here, since the responsibility for the work today is exclusively mine.

Once again the accusation is baseless, because, in the above passages, it is evident that Dr. Plinio desired 10 volumes of the Collection.

### **11. The aim to denounce the current of thought remained the same**

During the Carnival of 1987, with the writing of the collection already in progress, Dr. Plinio asked me to make a general presentation in his presence for the participants of the Sunday evening meetings [*Eremo do Vínculo Profético*] and the Saturday night meeting. Those present were: Dom Bertrand de Orleans and Bragança, Dr. Adolpho Lindenberg, Dr. Paulo Corrêa de Brito, Dr. Eduardo de Barros Brotero, Col. Carlos Antonio Poli, Mr. Gonzalo Larrain, Mr. Paulo Henrique Chaves, Mr. Fernando Antúnez.

**A – Dr. Adolpho: "Shouldn't non-conciliar authors be attacked as well?"**

Dr. Plinio: **"Those authors? Yes, massively!"**

Dr. Adolpho: **"Does this mean that the question [of presenting our perplexity] is only about the Council and the Popes?"**

Dr. Plinio: **"Correct. Otherwise it is impossible to write the book ..."** (Symposium for EVP, March 2, 1987, morning, p. 2).

**B – Dr. Plinio:** "I don't know if you have noticed: 'We tend to separate from ourselves those who isolate themselves,' but this is said as in a whole string of wrong positions. To separate from ourselves those who isolate themselves is wrong. It is not Atila's goal here. He is not aiming to show that they are wrong. He has the goal of showing that they are injuring the Church. So, my commentary goes farther than his. **For Dom Bertrand and the others [attending this symposium]**

sium] in order to evaluate this work, it is very useful to take into account how many thorny points the work makes evident, which paralyzes them [the progressivists] and leaves them terrified. They never imagined that ultramontane eyes would stir all these points. They understand that, from this point on, every kind of misery can fall upon them."

Dr. Adolpho: "Even more when seen in perspective..."

Dr. Plinio: "That's it ... Never!" (*ibid.*, pp. 10f).

C – Dr. Plinio: "Here is something I've been thinking while Atila was talking. ... I am afraid that at some point some will say: 'Mr. Atila did the following – imagine that someone takes five boxes of pebbles destined to make a mosaic. These five boxes came from mosaics [in walls] that were destroyed. Here they are all mixed up. He takes these stones and arbitrarily makes ... another design. Can you say that this new design is the same as the first one? No. The same for these authors: He draws from here and there, without demonstrating that these authors constitute a whole [current of thought], that they are all links of the same chain ... He throws this over an entity called a certain current that he invented."

Mr. Atila: "I have the answer to this: the comparison of a besieged castle – there may be divisions among the attackers, but the offensive is one."

Dr. Plinio: "The argument is very good, but you could add something more: By the fact that they are simultaneously destroying the same city, they have a single intention to which a thinking must correspond. Because this is what is happening in the field of doctrine."

Mr. Atila: "There's no doubt about that..."

Dr. Plinio: "There is, therefore, an intentional *unum* among them. It has to be in the order of thought. Therefore, my effort to look for links in their thinking is legitimate. If I find them, what more do you want?!" (Symposium for EVP, March 2, 1987, afternoon, pp. 10f.)"

As demonstrated, he always had the intention of denouncing the current of thought.

## 12. A plan that did not undergo substantial changes

The idea of the publication of the collection continued to be strongly present in the mind of Dr. Plinio up to the last acts of the counter-revolutionary fight of his life.

A – Indeed, who can deny that he made mention of the work of analysis of the Council when, at the conclusion of the Nobility book, he wrote the following words about the crisis in the Church?

"At the moment that this work reaches its end, grave unknown factors surround Humanity on all sides. The world situation described by Pius XII was altered principally by the fact that the economic problems of the West attenuated, to a considerable extent by the effect of the mentioned 'miracles.' But, at the same time, thenceforward two great crises have been steadily increasing. One is the internal crisis in what was once the empire beyond the Iron Curtain, and the other, the crisis – also internal – in the Catholic Church. A painful crisis, the latter, which is related to the very essence of the problems dealt with here, but which we refrained from analyzing, be-

cause the gravity and breadth of it would require a separate work. Most likely one of many volumes..." (*Nobreza e elites tradicionais análogas nas alocações de Pio XII ao patriciado e à nobreza romana*, Porto: Livraria Ed. Civilização, 1993, p. 153).

**B** – I transcribe below excerpts from a letter I wrote against Dom Estêvão Bettencourt (July 27, 1995) addressing his slanderous accusations made against Dr. Plinio's honor. The letter was reviewed by Dr. Plinio several times. The phrase concerning the publication of the work on the Council, which was originally more vague, was replaced by the current one, which he dictated to his secretary. I kept copies of the handwritten corrections made by his secretary. The letter, the penultimate document in which he dealt with the subject, was published in the September issue in the magazine quoted below, which circulated after the death of Dr. Plinio. Excerpts:

"As a member of the Brazilian Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property, author of a book – *Servitudo ex Caritate* – and of a collaboration – *Three Letters* – in the work *Refutation of the TFP to a Failed Attack*, both dealing with malicious accusations against the entity to which I belong, I ask Your Reverence's permission to make some considerations about the article "A Burning Topic: Tradition, Family and Property" printed in *Pergunte e Responderemos* [Ask and We Will Answer] magazine, (July 1995, pp. 316-326) published under your responsibility.

"In your presentation of the topic, I notice two bases for your argumentation, which I distinguish for the sake of clarity: The first basis is mentioned in passing when Your Reverence affirms that the TFP has restrictions about the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar Church' (p. 316). ... **With regard to the first and major basis of your argument, namely, that the TFP has restrictions about Vatican II and the post-conciliar Church, I can assure you that, in order to respond to this gratuitous statement, the TFP has in preparation a very hefty study elucidating the subject, which will be made available to the public as soon as the final touches are completed.**"

**C** – What follows are some extracts from the letter that the four Priests of the Diocese of Campos, who give religious assistance to the TFP, sent to Cardinal Antonio Innocenti – in charge of the *Ecclesia Dei Commission* in Rome – in August of 1995, defending themselves against the attempt of the local Bishop to declare them schismatics. Such a letter, at the request of the four priests, was written by a member of the TFP who advised them and was based on the report of Fr. Olavo Pires Trindade. The choice of the letter writer was approved by Dr. Plinio. At the request of the same priests, the letter was reviewed and meticulously corrected several times by him, especially with regard to the work on the Council. It can, therefore, be considered as the last document in which Dr. Plinio expressed his will regarding the publication of the Collection on the Council. The parts that refer to this are transcribed below:

"Third, we have to say that during the time that elapsed between our first dialogue with His Excellency D. Corso (June 25, 1991) and the first of his violent letters declaring us schismatic (May 30, 1995), we did not stop studying the points of Vatican II '*qua difficulter conciliari possunt cum declarationibus Magisterii praecedentis*' [which can hardly be reconciled with previous declarations of the Magisterium].

"This was when **we learned about the work of a Brazilian writer, a lay Catholic, a member of the TFP who since mid-1982 has been preparing a detailed analysis of Vatican II. We entered**

**into contact with him and were shown a work of many volumes already in the process of being published – lacking only the necessary retouching, revisions, indexes, etc., which may require some more time. We verify it to be an extremely serious study that assists our needs. And we are certain that when it becomes public, it will be seen that the magnitude of the work fully justifies the delay in its preparation.**

"Incidentally, we had already mentioned this in the letter to His Excellency Dom Corso (November 22, 1993), who, in the course of our dialogue, assumed the work to be non-existent. At our suggestion, the author [Atila] agreed to enter into dialogue with the *Ecclesia Dei Commission*, another Roman dicastery or even with His Excellency D. Corso to document some points of the Council and the post-Council period that, in our view, are difficult to harmonize with the prior Magisterium. **The author, however, reserves the right to publish his work when he deems convenient, and we cannot demand from him a commitment to be silent on this subject matter. Above the assistance he is giving to us is his author's copyright.**

"Summing up the three reservations, we see that ... regarding the study on our points of perplexity related to the Council and the post-Council period, we have made it [the collection], but it is still not sufficiently prepared to show it to the *Ecclesia Dei Commission*. **We await the publication of this work we trust in.** Notwithstanding, to demonstrate our goodwill in the dialogue, we asked the author to advance to us some themes, to which he acquiesced kindly, establishing understandable conditions."

These two letters are the last documents in which Dr. Plinio, in life, expressed his will about the collection on the Council.

### **Major Conclusion regarding the texts of Dr. Plinio**

You have to agree that a simple reading of the above texts, considered in the chronological order in which they were transcribed, lead to these conclusions:

1. They make it clear that, from the beginning to the end in the orientation he gave to my work, Dr. Plinio was thinking of a work of considerable proportions.
2. From the context of the conversations, you can note that I never pressured him to make the work have larger proportions. On the contrary, it is clear that several times I have tried to show the inconvenience of a huge work – difficult to do, difficult to review, difficult to disseminate, etc. – but it was he who insisted on the size of the work and always assumed that the writing would be done by me.
3. The idea of writing a document like the *Message*, to be made by Dr. Plinio, was suggested by me and accepted by him at the very symposium in which he decided that there should be the "encyclopedic work." That is to say, the two initiatives were born together in perfect harmony, and not in antagonism, as you suppose in your argument, based on the statements of Mr. Fernando Antúnez and Mr. Nelson Fragelli.
4. Thus, your Argument I shows itself without base in reality. Which, in apologetic terms, is synonymous with saying it is null and void. And, in moral terms, the following appear:

- Partiality – you did not want to make yourself aware of the above texts before launching your judgment and the corresponding punishment;
- Injustice – because, as regards Argument I, your sentence punishes me for obeying what Dr. Plinio had decided to do.

### Specific refutation

Allow me, Mr. President, besides the Major Conclusion that I have just drawn, to pause for a moment to make a specific analysis of the internal logic of your argument.

1. You based part of your argument on the testimony of Mr. Fernando Antúnez. In that document he simply states, "Just as in that *Message*, he [Dr. Plinio] used abundant documentation accumulated by TFP researchers, he would use the documentation collected by Mr. Atila" (n. 4). I found nothing more in it that could strengthen your position regarding Argument I.

2. However, in your interpretation, you go beyond the testimony.

- In fact, you assert that Mr. Fernando Antúnez would have stated that "Dr. Plinio wanted a summarized analysis of the conciliar texts" (p. 4, § 4). Although I have carefully examined the testimony at issue, I have not found in his document the expression "summary analysis" to which you refer or anything synonymous to it.
- You state: "Instead of this concise work, based substantially on the actual words of the conciliar documents – a difficult work because of the ambiguity of some of them – you chose to write a global critique of the contemporary theological currents" (*ibid.*). Analogous to my previous observation, I did not find the expression "concise work" or any term synonymous to it.
- You further state: "[The work] was taking on a scale that went far beyond the initial plan. Mr. Fernando makes this clear in his enclosed statement" (p. 5, § 1). Again, Mr. President, such a sentence does not appear in the testimony to which you refer, that is, what you desire is not clear.

3. Certainly there is a vague insinuation in the cited passage of Mr. Fernando Antúnez' document that I would have made an undue extension of the initial plan. But insinuations are not evidence upon which serious charges are based.

4. If, in a statement that seeks to be decisive in accusing me of deviating from the wishes of Dr. Plinio, the witness is elusive enough not to clearly commit himself to the statements you attribute to him, is it not because he was insecure? But, if he was insecure, why would he have made the statement, except to please Dr. Caio Xavier, whose zealous secretary he has been since 1991 and also you, whose dedicated friend he is?

5. In the document of Mr. Fernando Antúnez, one notes a jump from number 4 to number 6. Perhaps the part that provided evidence for your affirmations was in number 5 and was removed later. I raise the hypothesis only to facilitate an exit for you... Nevertheless, you have to

agree that the parts withdrawn from a document cannot be valid data in a serious accusatory statement.

6. The part of the statement by Mr. Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli, which would apparently support Argument I – that from the beginning Dr. Plinio only wanted a *Message* and not a work of several volumes – in fact discredits Argument I. Because he clearly affirms that Dr. Plinio wanted a larger work, but gave up the idea moved by the witness' opinion about the author's incompetence to make a work of that nature. Therefore, this testimony serves to weaken Argument I rather than support it. For that reason, I will deal with it when refuting Argument V, about the author's incompetence.

### **Specific minor conclusion**

Thus, one concludes that two accusations you make against me turn against you: namely: making generalizations with no basis in reality and rashness.

- If the actions you accuse me of were true, I would deserve to be considered ambitious for trying to do something much greater than what Dr. Plinio wanted, and hasty for launching myself against such an enemy so great. I have just proved that the accusations of generalization and rashness of which you accuse me in reality apply to you.
- If justice is blind, could you not be accused of moral defects symmetrical to those imputed to me for the actions I have just described? In other words, could you not be considered as the one who wants to immensely diminish the amplitude that Dr. Plinio wanted to give to the work of analysis of the Council? To what moral defect does this correspond?
- And could you not be considered obstinate for not wanting to confront the enemy so clearly described by him? Once again the question: To what moral defect does this correspond?

\*

## ARGUMENT II

### DR. PLINIO WANTED THE WORK ONLY TO ANALYZE CONCILIAR TEXTS THAT ARE APPARENTLY INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE TRADITIONAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH

#### **Proof of the accusation in the text:**

\* "According to the testimony of the closest friends of our Founder, as well as those who helped you [Atila] in the research, Dr. Plinio intended that a study be made that would expose the basis of our perplexity over the conciliar texts that are apparently incompatible with the traditional teaching of the Church" (p. 4, §2).

\* "Instead of this concise work, based substantially on the actual words of the conciliar documents – a difficult work because of the ambiguity of some of them – you chose to write a global critique of the contemporary theological currents that inspired the writers of those documents" (p. 4, § 4).

\* "[Your work] does not correspond [to the desire of Dr. Plinio] regarding the subject matter - he wanted an analysis of the documents of Vatican II - you made an analysis of all of pre- and post-conciliar theology" (p. 6, § 4).

\* The somewhat vague affirmation of one of the witnesses was probably meant to reinforce Argument II: "I believe that a work of collecting data on the teachings of Vatican Council II was precisely what was initially asked of Mr. Atila. ... I believe that the work, as Mr. Atila presents it, was never commissioned " (Statement by Mr. Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli, p. 1, § 6).

#### **Refutation of Argument II**

Argument II would only have value if Argument I had been proved. Since it was demonstrated that Argument I was baseless, then consequently Argument II is vacuous. Nevertheless, it is worthy of some considerations.

#### **Major Refutation: Dr. Plinio's words against the accusation**

To prove, in the refutation of Argument I, what Dr. Plinio wanted regarding the size that the work on the Council should assume, it was indispensable to address his constant concern to denounce a current of thought present in Vatican II. This current is responsible for introducing ambiguous words that mask an underlying doctrine. The presentation of this doctrine would have in itself the effect of clarifying the ambiguous points of the conciliar documents. The metaphor he used of the lampshade whose drawings become clear and defined when the light bulb is turned on is expressive.

The texts presented in the refutation of Argument I, which express the need for a work descriptive of that current, could serve to refute Argument II, according to which Dr. Plinio would have desired only an analysis of the conciliar texts (cf. Items 1. B; 2.B, C, D; 3.A, B; 4.A; 5.A, B, C; 8.A, B; 11.A, C).

I cite only one more text, still unmentioned, as an *aide-mémoire* [memory aid] to the subject treated:

**Mr. Fernando Antúnez: "I lost my footing on the subject. I am not seeing the connection of all this theology with Vatican Council II. Where is the proof that this philosophy-theology influenced the Second Vatican Council?"**

**Dr. Plinio "The way to interpret the Second Vatican Council is to interpret the thinking of men who were considered its authors. This is an exposition of their thinking in a number of points. And at a certain moment it will demonstrate how this is included in Vatican Council II" (Symposium for EVP, March 3, 1987, afternoon, p. 9).**

Without a doubt, the analysis of the conciliar texts would be made later or parallel to the presentation of the current of thought. Only this would be consistent with the plan he established. In addition, I do not recall any time in the 13 years of continuous guidance he gave me on writing the work on the Council that Dr. Plinio even once expressed a desire for the exclusive approach to the analysis mentioned in the accusation. To the contrary, as can be seen from the text of Item 8.A in the refutation of Argument I, he makes reference there to making a work exclusively on the current of thought, leaving aside the interpretation of the conciliar documents. You may note that I interfered, reminding him of the initial plan to do both things together.

### **Major Conclusion regarding the texts of Dr. Plinio**

The major conclusion, which comes from the reading of the texts presented, is that:

- Neither at the beginning, middle nor end of the preparatory period of the work did Dr. Plinio decide that the analysis of the Council should be turned exclusively toward the conciliar documents. Thus, unless there is evidence to the contrary – that is to say, a number of texts analogously significant to what I have presented – Argument II reveals itself to be groundless.
- The other consequences of the conclusion of Argument II are similar to those of Argument I, repeating and reinforcing them: The argument is void; it reveals partiality for not having tried to know the written guidelines that Dr. Plinio gave me; it reveals injustice, for condemning me for carrying out what Dr. Plinio ordered me to do.

### **Specific refutation**

In view of the major conclusion, the three following excerpts from your letter...

\* "Dr. Plinio intended that a study be made that would expose the basis of our perplexity over the conciliar texts that are seemingly incompatible with the traditional teaching of the Church" (p. 4, §2).

\* "Instead of this concise work, based substantially on the actual words of the conciliar documents, you chose to write a global critique of the contemporary theological currents that inspired the writers of those documents."

\* "It [your work] does not correspond [to the desire of Dr. Plinio] regarding the subject matter - he wanted an analysis of the documents of Vatican II - you made an analysis of the whole pre- and post-conciliar theology."

... all fade away in the air like the sound of three rocket booms, a loud din as if to precede some battle, but soon recognized as nothing but fireworks that cause no major damage.

The curious profession of faith of the witness, Mr. Nelson Fragelli – "I believe ... I believe ..." – perhaps valuable for someone interested in reading his biography – presents less interest from the apologetic point of view because of its highly insecure and opinionative character, especially when it is used in an accusation of the gravity that you direct against me.

\*

### ARGUMENT III

#### DR. PLINIO DID NOT WANT TO GIVE THE WORK ON THE COUNCIL AN AIR OF ATTACK, BUT A SIMPLE DEFENSE TO FACILITATE A POSITION OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE

##### Proof of the accusation in the text:

- \* "It was not in the plans of Dr. Plinio to embark spear in hand on a public polemic about the problems of conscience that certain conciliar documents raise" (p. 4, §1).
- \* "This publication [of the work on the Council, 'according to the testimony of the closest friends of our Founder'] would serve as a shield to protect us from the open or veiled persecution that we suffer from members of the Hierarchy in various countries because of our attitude of passive resistance to the application of post-conciliar *aggiornamento*" (*ibid.*, § 3).
- \* "The truth is that the publication of *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* does not correspond ... to the desire of our late Founder .... It does not correspond to the aim of the study (he wanted a defensive study to be spread strictly in the higher spheres and you ended by making a study of an offensive nature, which you intend to circulate broadly)" (p. 6, §§ 3s.).

##### Refutation of Argument III

The refutation of this argument will follow the same order used in the refutation of Argument I. That is, the texts of Dr. Plinio that contradict the accusation will be presented first and, after this, a specific refutation will be made.

##### Major Refutation: Dr. Plinio's words that oppose the accusation

In the exposition of the texts of Dr. Plinio below, subtitles (Arabic numbers) are placed to facilitate the reading. The subject matter will be divided following the order of the topics, no longer obeying the chronological sequence, already clear in the exposition of the refutation of Argument I.

To facilitate the understanding of the thinking of Dr. Plinio, I clarify the scrambled concepts that can be noted in the accusation. An alternative is established there that does not correspond to what Dr. Plinio thought with regard to strategy. In effect, the accusation considers an exposition of our perplexity over the Council as something that should neither cause harm to the adversary nor be polemical. Rather, it should simply facilitate maintaining our position of "passive resistance." Any "study with an offensive character" would signify "running the risk of embarking, spear in hand, in a public polemic," which would be contrary to Dr. Plinio's desire.

However, the strategic plan that Dr. Plinio conceived for the work involves a presentation that adopts both an expository method of inquiry and an attitude of perplexity simultaneously. In this

sense, it would be a defensive study – along with a note of attack. Failure to recognize such a nuance will be fatal to the accusation in this Argument II. The excerpts transcribed below show what the wish of Dr. Plinio actually was. The parts more particularly opposed to the accusation are in bold.

### 1. The final objective of the study is a clear attack against the Council

Contrary to the idea in the accusation that Dr. Plinio only wanted to guarantee our action of "passive resistance," I emphasize his words setting out the tone of attack he wanted to imprint on the work.

**A** – Dr. Plinio: "Then, **for the attack on the Council, the conciliar debate is more interesting.** Because we could say: this one said this, another said that, so-and-so held the following, etc., etc." (Serra Negra, November 29, 1982, p. 12).

**B** – Dr. Plinio: "The third chapter would be: the errors of the Council, the palpable errors and how these errors are nothing but the offshoots [of a doctrine]. That is, the moment when the conciliar theologians resolved not to speak '*Conciliese*.' Which is one proof more. **All the errors they have are explained by these doctrines here, they are consistent with this doctrine. Were they unintentional or intentional? It is another question. But here they are. From here, what comes? It is an attack [accusing them] of heresy, it is an attack of suspicion of heresy. It's the greatest attack we can make.**"

Mr. Atila: "An attack on their denial of God."

Dr. Plinio: "Yes, but is it a suspicion of the denial of God or is it a resounding denial of God? This is a crime that lies in the language they use, it is a clearly criminal act or a suspicion that they think like that. ... **There is a moderate, majority, influential current that I want to reduce to silence. To reduce it to silence, I need to have this [the work]. That is to say, the answer we have to give is: 'I repute it as probable, but you who do not consider it probable cannot fail to consider this as suspicious. I will not tolerate that you not find it suspicious [the matter I am pointing out] ... If you do not judge it suspicious, you are suspicious! And I will bring you down! What is suspicion of heresy? It is in the *Code*, it says this and that. And I will take you down!'**" (Serra Negra, December 1, 1982, 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, pp. 2f.).

**C** – Dr. Plinio: "But, **the bomb would be the first part, which would be the doctrine that they profess in common.** Now, it seems to me that this doctrine could be presented – this depends now on the execution – *tout court* as follows: First, it should be a very synthesized [presentation] and should clearly say ... the following: We are not going to present the whole doctrine. You have not even had time to read all of the books, but you present indisputable texts that this is the doctrine. And that, hypothetically, it can be completed this or that way."

Mr. Atila: "Why does it depend on the execution?"

Dr. Plinio: "Because I think that the nucleus of the difficulty lies in knowing how much evidence from the books [of the progressivist theologians] we have to present, beyond what is in the interviews."

Mr. Atila: "You think it is better to present the interviews in order to be more acceptable by the public or because they do more damage?"

Dr. Plinio: "No, no. I have the impression that ... the interviews should be the bulk of the book. **The initial hypothesis should be a kind of bomb, but a bomb that is not the bulk of the book**" (Águas de Lindóia, June 17, 1983, 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, pp. 1f.).

**D** – Mr. Atila: "A first question: John XXIII says terrible things along the line of breaking the Church. 'The Church must throw out this dust of Constantine.' Anything concerning nobility, he calls it the dust of Constantine. So, these Popes said outrageous things. What [John Paul II] has said about the human body, the theology of sex, once we give the key [to interpret it], is something absurd ... Paul VI has things like that also. **So I ask: should the Popes be in this accusation?**"

Dr. Plinio: "**It would be a magnificent thing if you could place this question: Is it only the Council or do the Pontiffs of the conciliar era follow this line?**"

Mr. Atila: "But, this does not mean that I want to cover the whole world."

Dr. Plinio: "No, no. Your desire is to close the fortress, to close the circuit of the walls" (São Bento, November 21, 1983, p. 5).

**E** – Dr. Plinio: "**Perhaps this plan of the destruction of the Church would be worth publishing in the first impact with what you just read**" (Amparo, December 29, 1985, morning, p. 3).

**F** – Dr. Plinio: "**We will say the following: 'We are going to speak about the Council according to the voice of those who are the closest inside it. ... We went to see how they [the progressivists] interpreted it. And their interpretation seemed the true one to us. And so we ask you: Is this not the real Council and are they wrong? ... Or is this the Council and are we wrong? If you say we are wrong, permit us to say: We see a contradiction [between the Council] with the teaching of the past. Are we wrong about this? You tell us!'**"

Mr. Wilson: "If they [the progressivist theologians] are wrong, why didn't they [the Popes] condemn them [the progressivists]?"

Dr. Plinio: "Yes, if [the progressivists] are wrong, why didn't they condemn them? At least condemn them now! Do not forsake us, for we will be shipwrecked if you do not condemn them [the theologians]. **We will be shipwrecked or will be forced to say that you are not Peter. This would be the theme. A terribly aggressive theme, but our adversary's attack is leading us to this. Then, we will face them on this basis, God willing**" (Amparo, October 31, 1985, morning, p. 11).

**G** – Dr. Plinio: "I would like you to record what I said earlier today – do you remember? – about that interpellation. It is necessary to add the following: **These lacunas and the omission of admonitory measures were noticed ... precisely in relation to those errors ... against which the Church had always been vigilant until that moment. ... Ecumenism was the embrace with those against whom the Church had always taken precautions. Embracing is one thing. To embrace renouncing all cautions, all the stipulations in the *Index*, which the pastoral of the past**

centuries had judged indispensable, that is a different thing. And that is what has been done. This increases our state of confusion" (Amparo, October 31, 1985, p. 1).

H – Dr. Plinio: "I think that ... what you have presented unveils a panorama with colossal strategic possibilities. In this sense, we knew that this is what they were. Now, there is a way to tell them that they are this – here is the question. And in this question a [new] possibility opens. In such a way **that I find myself more or less in the position of a general or a head of state or minister of war who receives the news that the formula for the atomic bomb is ready. At the first moment he receives this news, he still does not have the whole plan made to take advantage of the weapon.** He can say at that moment what occurs to him that he might do, but then there are adaptations, etc. Thus, you need to prepare yourselves for the idea that the plans of this afternoon may have many changes and adaptations because the span of the thing is immense" (Amparo, November 1, 1985, morning, 7f.).

I – Dr. Plinio: "Now, the plan comes. ... The judgment I make of this material is that it is useful for countless of our needs. It is most vast and excellent and the plans to take advantage of it must not be plans for immediate execution, but **there should be a plan for taking full advantage of it for all the possible eventualities in the psy-war in which we are engaged.** Having done this, we can see where we should begin, which is a different thing; but the first thing is to see what can be the total advantage. **I go on, then, to say how it can be used ... in a total war. The adversaries are initiating a total war against us"** (Amparo, November 1, 1985, afternoon, pp. 1f.).

J – Dr. Plinio: "I have come to believe that **we cannot think of this material we have here as above all a weapon for a battle, but rather as a repository of weapons for a war. It is a weapons depot for a war.** And so, it must be written, ordered, listed and arranged. I don't know if it will be for publication, but, at the least, it must be available for use at any time and for publication, and for publication of the totality at any moment, if it be the case. Because in this way, anywhere we go, anything we need to do, we have it here and we can go there. A kind of [Cornelius] a Lapide. **We go there, take what we want and attack.** It seems to me that ... this is the backdrop of the picture" (*ibid.*, p. 4).

Total war, atomic bomb, *psy-war*, attack, interpellation, accusation of the suspicion of heresy, etc. – this is not a language that corresponds to the perspective of the "passive resistance" presented by the accusation. On the contrary, it flatly denies it.

## 2. The background of the work is an accusation

Next, Dr. Plinio considers more particularly the work as a denunciation, as an accusation.

A – Dr. Plinio: "**It [the theme of the project] must be an exposition of their doctrine that makes one shudder reading the Council.** For this, the difficulty is not the exposition. It is to know their doctrine with enough subtlety so as to be able to define it with all authenticity" (Serra Negra, November 29, 1982, p. 11).

B – Dr. Plinio: "**The point is that we must include in this accusation, not just this, that or the other point, but their whole. We must prepare ourselves to sustain that this schema of the**

**whole: Either it is under suspicion of heresy or it is heretical"** (Serra Negra, December 1, 1982, 1st meeting, p. 3).

**C – Dr. Plinio: "To say the following: The Council at the least is presumed to be heretical. It is not only suspect of heresy, but is presumed to be heretical. If I want to be moderate, [I should say], they are suspect of heresy."**

Mr. Atila: **"We have to accuse them otherwise we become ourselves suspects."**

Dr. Plinio: **"Otherwise we become suspect. We would lose the state of grace if we stopped working on this. I think that we would lose the state of grace."**

Prof. Martini: "A grave sin. It is a right and a natural duty to do what you are doing. They can now destroy the *Code of Canon Law*. Only by Natural Law, they [incur a crime that] has no escape. ... But with this, the Council can be condemned."

Dr. Plinio: **"We do not have the right to not bring this work to its end or we will lose the state of grace. A very grave sin. ... And then, what an opportunity! With the Council it is very flagrant! It unleashed all this and is not suspected of having connivance with what it unleashed?!"** (Serra Negra, December 5, 1982, 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, p. 5).

**D – Mr. Atila: "But [the accusation] now remains in terms a bit..."**

Dr. Plinio: "Vague. But this is what reaps more. This is **our accusation, the *J'accuse***. If they ask us, 'But do you have proof of this [that the Council is inspired by progressivist thinking?]' We say: 'It [what we have] is a Herculean work. We are still studying. That's it. For this reason, we ask for time. That's it. We have the right to have time'" (MNF, June 22, 1983, p. 1).

**E – Dr. Plinio: "[This is] the idea that I think would be useful for our Cause. Let's approach the matter from its very depths. Why is this useful for our Cause? The aim of this work is to show that the Council was a revolution"** (São Bento, December 21, 1983, p. 1).

**F – Dr. Plinio: "In the first [part of the work] ... the analysis of *Pascendi* should also enter at some point as an explanation for the methodology, showing that they [Modernism's and Progressivism's methods] are the same. They indisputably make one think of the Modernism at the time of St. Pius X."**

Mr. Atila: *Immortale Dei*, also?"

Dr. Plinio: "Less of it. Perhaps phrases. **I want to remind you, Atila, that there is a tactic, and that behind the tactic, there exists, according to *Pascendi's* denunciation, a conspiracy"** (*ibid.*, p. 3).

**G – Mr. Atila: "We are departing from the idea that the Council is ambiguous, the texts are ambiguous. There are a lot of people who say that."**

Dr. Plinio: "That is to say, the thesis itself is both ambiguous and wrong, is not it? ... **This has polemical advantages that would be superfluous to name here, but they are enormous.** This is the point: When one recognizes that an act of the Magisterium or a whole group of acts of the Magisterium, such as the Council, is in fact ambiguous, then the opinion of the faithful who think

they did not understand it deserves respect. They cannot be treated directly as bandits. How can it be? ... 'There is no mandate from Our Lord Jesus Christ for you to do this [teach with ambiguity] ... **You have a mandate to give clear teaching, but not to be believed in the ambiguous formula that you made with a content we do not know.'** They never expected us to depart from this point" (Amparo, October 28, 1985, night, pp. 3f.).

H – Dr. Plinio: "But what concerns us the most at the moment is this work, how we need to construct together the whole plan in this or another symposium: **The exigencies of the accusation, the parts, how it should be done, what it presupposes, what I already know the Roman theologians will say, what the Roman jurists will say. Because we must fight a battle, but to gain what? To get as many people as possible [to know about the denunciation] ...**

"Therefore, it is not by any means a work to convince the other side – this doesn't even enter into consideration. It is not a work to silence the other side. It is not to convince them or to silence them. We are not going to silence them, but **it is such a work that ... those who have any trace of rectitude will realize that we denounced the situation as it is**" (Amparo, October 30, 1985, afternoon, p. 31).

I – Dr. Plinio: "**Our work is a confrontation that departs from a position that has nothing of personal irritation, but of interrogative fidelity in face of what is happening.** We present this interrogative position in this way: 'We found such and such contrasts, we found these and those other differences. We find that the Council thought ... it should adapt itself to everyone. But [the current ecclesiastical leaders] have no concern about safeguarding, enlightening, approaching or pleasing us. They do not think about us. Our first cry is: Why have you forsaken us? Why is it that we, who are an elect part of your flock, suddenly find ourselves set aside and completely abandoned? We turn to you for an answer.'

"'Once the doctrine of a heretical Pope is established along with the doctrine of the continuity of the Popes, of the possible contact, etc., etc., we verify – with astonishment and amazement – that it was possible for [the Pope] to have erred. In the rigor of logic it was possible. Are we wrong? You tell us. But, tell us in terms that will clarify our doubt, because **our doubt is: It can be that you no longer have the authority to tell us that we are wrong. And that your voice can be as much the voice of Belial as it is that of Christ. We do not hide [this extreme consequence]. Tell us who you are. But above all, do not abandon us.'**

"Well, ... **we should say the same to the Scholastic [conservative] priests, asking them about their great silence during the Council. ... 'Why have you been quiet all this time? You also abandoned us! Because you did not see our affliction, you did not make any broad systematic work to refute those who abused the Council ... And, with this, your silence was an invaluable collaboration, because if we ask ourselves how far this evil goes, when we find it even in you who speak and write as being faithful to the good ... What did you do, for example, for the cause of St. Thomas? Did you not see that Thomism, which is the protective wall for you and for ours, did you not see this wall thrown to the ground, torn apart, dissolved for the purpose of [pleasing] public opinion? Why do you not say a word to refute, to clarify, to make us understand? Thus, we ask you also, why did you abandon us?'** It would be a *Message* to them.

**Then, there should be a letter to the traditionalists. And that word would be: 'Why do you attack us?'"** (Amparo, October 31, 1985, morning, pp. 8ff.).

It is clear, therefore, that the foundation of the work should be a denunciation, an accusation and an interpellation. And that it should not be a "passive" position, as Argument III claims.

### **3. As for the exposure method, it should be cold, presenting questions as one perplexed and avoiding the *J'accuse***

Having clarified that the work is a denunciation, Dr. Plinio goes on to explain the most efficient method to present it.

**A:** Dr. Plinio: "**And it does not necessarily need to take on the tone ... of a *J'accuse*, a libel: 'Then, let me tell you that...' No ... It suffices to affirm with an almost laconic placidity that the bomb has been dropped. It seems to me that this is the way, the tone, the mode. Of course they are going to be silent, and we are going to sell it in the streets"** (Serra Negra, June 16, 1983, lunch, p. 2).

**B –** Dr. Plinio: "Well, and **without having the air of *J'accuse*, it is a phenomenal *J'accuse*"** (*ibid.*, p. 3).

**C –** Dr. Plinio: "Now, the logical value of argumentation comes. **Some words, some expressions ... like religious freedom, cannot be interpreted in the first reading except in the opposite way [of their traditional meaning]. As for others, they are, at the least in their first reading suspicious or gravely suspect of being wrong. This suspicion is not just coming from us. This suspicion comes from those who love the Council, who praise it, who, according to historians and the public voice, have concurred in its writing and interpret it the same way.** It is not, therefore, an interpretation of enemies, but the interpretation of its authors and friends, of the panegyrists.

"And this, therefore, gives us an even greater right to deduce that this is the meaning contained in the Council. Therefore, we affirm it. Then, the interviews should come in. And I believe that these interviews should be reinforced by quotes from books. Then, after the interview of each conciliar priest or of each Bishop you spoke with, at the foot of the page there should be a small note relating the comments to such and such a book, a text, etc. **And, afterwards, a general *riassunto*, proving that in fact the whole conjunct falls under the initial accusation.**"

Mr. Atila: "Two days ago, you made another presentation from the point of view of sexology. How do the two fit together?"

Dr. Plinio: "That's right. **When we state ... that in the Council the errors suspected are ordered in this or that way, we should include what we agreed about sexology.**"

Mr. Atila: "**So, it would not be an accusation? It would be a defense.**"

Dr. Plinio: "**There would be an accusation in our defense.** What do you think of this way of taking advantage of the material? Does it draw from the material as much as you can see, every-

thing it can give? Because this is the historical reality. But, it can be that, depending on the possibilities of the material, the plan may evolve as the study progresses, to retouch it."

Mr. Atila: "The reality is that there is an initial imposture: They say that the Church [as we understand it] is a heresy, which is the worst of the heresies. The accusation of Modernism is not enough – it doesn't say everything. [The ideal for our attack would be] to reveal the heresy without stating it as such. This is a heretical imposture, from top to bottom. But, **if we only defend ourselves, they will say: 'Okay, no one is going to attack you. You defended yourself well. That's good. It is a defense. But, we do not discuss these matters on a universal level.'**"

Dr. Plinio: **We discuss, yes! Because this that I am formulating as a defense could be formulated [as an attack] if the material is ... sufficient. It is just a question of changing it a little bit. Instead of saying that we are defending ourselves, we say: 'The very source from which our thinking flows has been attacked. And we are going to defend this source.'** It is just a question of changing it a little bit" (Serra Negra, June 19, 1983, p. 3).

D – Dr. Plinio: I feel as if a very strong accusation is thundering around us. **And I feel that we will have the advantage of being able to present these accusations in the form of a defense, where our means of action are much freer ... Once we are accused, we have the legitimate right to fight back in our defense, describing who the accuser is. This gives us a much freer forensic position ... than the simple notion of accusation"** (Amparo, October 30, 1985, afternoon, p. 31f).

E – Dr. Plinio: "John Paul II. **We will take these various things, including what we have about the continuity of papal documents, about what constitutes infallibility, the part on the heretical Pope, and ask: 'Is this true or not?' If it is true, we publish [everything] without any pause. I will allude to our manifesto of *Resistance*. I will ask: 'Is what I wrote right or not right? We are in this *Resistance*. Is there a lack of communion with the Church by doing this? How? We are the accused. We asked: In what [are we wrong]? Come and tell us!' Then, I will go further. I will ask, 'If it is slandering the Council to interpret your text like this, why doesn't the same apply to the texts of this or that author? In these terms, we are not so much making an accusation as raising a dialogue in the presence of God, and so we present you with the fruit of our reflections. You should not laugh at this dialogue, since it is the Shepherd's duty not to laugh at the ignorance of the sheep that come to you to ask for clarification. Explain it to us!' It seems to me that **the *J'accuse* of the Zola type would be completely wrong from the strategic point of view. This is how I would like to do it! ....**"**

Mr. Wilson: "Ah, there is no comparison!"

Dr. Plinio: "There is no comparison! Now, **they are going to ask us: 'You accuse us of having said this, that and the other. But, what does it mean altogether?' My response as a lawyer would be: 'You are the ones who have the onus to respond. What is *sub judice* [under judgment] is whether you said it or did not say it. And if there is or is not an error in what you said. Now, what is the error that you all embrace? If you want, we can publish our impressions. Do not think it is a vacuous work. We have our thoughts on the matter and consider them valuable from the intellectual point of view, they are worth what they are worth. So then, we will pub-**

lish them, stimulated by you. But, do not look at this as a formal accusation. It is a response to a question.' And, from there, the essay fits perfectly. This would be the legal perspective of the matter" (*ibid.*, 35ff.).

F – Mr. Atila: "Should I take, then, the tone of going through an inner tragedy?"

Dr. Plinio: "No. It is a cold exposition ... It is the cold exposition of a reflection" (Amparo, November 1, 1985, p. 11).

G – Dr. Plinio: "Because the advantage of this [presenting the accusation as a defense] seems to me the following: *First*, because it expresses us very well. *Second*, instead of creating the illusion that we are making a campaign against them, that we are hostile to them, we present the thing as it is: It is a step *toward* them, in which we ask them, using our right as disciples, to respond to the perplexity of their students. If they will not dialogue with people like us, then the Council is a chimera" (*ibid.*, p 12f).

H – Dr. Plinio: "You must have been surprised that I gave a defensive label to an eminently offensive operation. But do not forget my thinking that the role of the one who defends himself always has the best position" (Serra Negra, June 19, 1983, p. 6).

I – Dr. Plinio: "I want you to remember that the work will raise these disturbing matters for them, but that the work is not properly a denunciation of errors. It is an indication of a number of extremely disturbing things from which we can draw this thesis. We ask: 'Is it so or not?' It is a query. Therefore, our position is much more secure than if it were a mere denunciation of errors" (Symposium for EVP, March 2, 1987, morning, pp. 14f.).

J – Dr. Plinio: "Dom Bertrand and you should particularly take into account that this exposition is not an invective, but a query: 'To us it seems this way ... now, you respond!' It's not a thesis: 'You erred in this, that and so on.' It is the following: 'Reading this, we cannot escape the impression that you erred. Please, respond!'... There are small artifices that can help with this. For example, to place in a footnote: 'It does not seem possible to us that this phrase can be interpreted in any other way. Is this correct?'" (*ibid.*, pp. 1f).

K – Dr. Plinio: "This summary makes even more ostensive the size of the hole that this work opens in the [enemy's] wall. Now, the question is: Can one write this work without ostensibly showing what it is? .... Let us go to our case. The letter would read as follows: '**We are analyzing this because we were perplexed. Here is our analysis. Throughout it we became even more perplexed because it seems to us that everything we said here is right; on the other hand, we do not want to affirm this categorically because we are afraid it might not be in concordance with the Magisterium. So, we ask you to clarify whether this is right or not, etc. etc. For this study has led us to certain conclusions. We are asking for you to teach us.**'

"This request is going to bother them and not us, because we are not bothered at all. It is a way of speaking. It seems to me that this is how we should open our play – the well-handled introductory letter – a stupendous way of opening our play. I think it would be much better than to have a prologue, a letter from the President of the TFP introducing the work."

Mr. Atila: "The conclusions spring forth from the texts. How can we say that we are perplexed?"

Dr. Plinio: "Yes. And **the response that can be made is this: 'You are not perplexed. You are sure of what you are saying and you are just using an artifice. Because it is not possible that you, having reached these conclusions, could still be perplexed' ... Then, we ask: 'What is your verdict? Are we wrong about this? Where are we in error? Have the goodness to tell us.'** My concern is to safeguard the political side as much as it is necessary. But, on the other hand, **only in what it is necessary and not a bit more**" (Serra Negra, May 28, 1987, night, pp. 46f).

L – Dr. Plinio: "In final analysis, my general idea [about their position] was that they had not compromised themselves [that much], that they said all these things, but had used the customary velvet wrapping. Therefore, we would have to make the fight also using the velvet. **But now, I am seeing this is not possible because they threw out the velvet wrapping. In such a way that I think they went so far beyond Taprobana that there is no return.** This last final blow – I need to read it again to see how they are playing to gauge our tone proportionately. **Because the first plan [to present the work with velvet wrapping] I see that it is not possible**" (Serra Negra, May 29, 1987, morning, p. 48).

One can see, therefore, that Dr. Plinio conceived the presentation of the tone of the work as one of perplexity because:

1. It corresponds to our position as laymen who do not know theological issues as specialists, that is, as members of the learning Church.
2. It allows us to present the denunciation on the level of a question, which prevents us - and not them - from being judged.
3. It makes it possible to present the contrast of the conciliar doctrine with the traditional doctrine with a tone of perplexity rather than as a direct accusation.
4. Moreover, if by chance there should be some error in our argument, it is explained by our position of humility.

Therefore, there are only advantages to adopting such a strategy. But, this does not mean that Dr. Plinio wanted to abandon the background of attack, which is the essence of the work.

All the more so since, in the last excerpt quoted (letter L), Dr. Plinio raised the serious possibility of no longer adopting the "velvet-wrapping" method – that is, the way of presentation considered in this Item 3 – because of the radicalism he verified to exist in the highest representatives of Progressivism in his reading of Volume I.

#### **4. To enter the present fight to defend the Church is the very heart of our vocation**

It seems opportune to transcribe here a comment of Dr. Plinio on the importance of the fight in defense of the Holy Church that appears on the horizon for the TFP to take up.

Dr. Plinio: "To make the Revolution inside the Church is strategically the heart of the Revolution, because the Church is the place of the Counter-Revolution. To expel them from inside the Church and define her as what she has always been is the heart of the Counter-Revolution. Be-

cause if we do not make the Counter-Revolution inside the Church, there is no use doing it outside her.

"Hence a conclusion: There is no one to make this Counter-Revolution in the world. No one! Unless Our Lady arouses the Basils, Athanasiuses, Augustines, etc., there will be no one. And she asks the following of us: to raise the standard, which is ready here [with the work on the Council], because this is raising our standard against them. ...

"Historically, before the Council, they were hiding and did not dare to raise their standard. But also, because in a panorama where their standard was absent, we [the TFP] also were inexplicable to all. Well, now they are raising theirs [the standard of the Revolution], and our standard explains itself and, by explaining itself, the R-CR fight is explained before the eyes of all. It is the great dilemma at the center of the modern world. If you like, I can try to express myself better. I consider it very important [to deal with this] in parallel. Atila's work was not written to demonstrate this, but these are things that are demonstrated in the flanks of his work. I think it is very important to make this clear" (Symposium for EVP, March 2, 1987, morning, pp. 15f).

## 5. A polemic that can bring punishment as a consequence

The possibility of the punishments that we could suffer from the ecclesiastical authorities did not make Dr. Plinio turn back in his intention to launch the work.

A – Dr. Plinio: "Then, we are going to state what we do not accept and why we do not accept it. Now then, what will be the conclusions of this for those reading the book? **The conclusion is: On the part of the ecclesiastical authority, to punish us. We do not know clearly how it will do this, because it is this very authority that established itself as a non-punishing authority – and made impunity the cornerstone of its edifice. Such and such documents will follow. Another possibility is that the authority could isolate us. But, it did this a long time ago.** What the faithful who will read this work can do – if they are convinced of the validity of our arguments – is to follow us. And, that is it" (Serra Negra, June 19, 1983, p. 2).

B – Dr. Plinio: "One can see that **they [the pro-Council conservatives] are all prepared in case an attack like this comes to say the following: 'This is the interpretation of that clique.** There is no doubt that it is very well made' ... What I think is that ... if we take an action against the Council, these [conservative] people are going to come out barking [against the work]. ... These are persons of the good wing. It is the perfect play [for Progressivism]! **Then, since I see that you have your castle built – before this, it was not the case to say it – I need to point to you from where the troops are coming to attack. I just want you to keep this in mind, because that is what will come**" (Alagoas - 1<sup>st</sup> floor, June 22, 1984, pp. 4ff).

C– "Mr. Atila: If you think it is dispersive, it is better we take precautions to make it as focused as possible."

Dr. Plinio: "No, I think something else. **Since here you are defending the truth, you will be criticized for any position you take. So, it is not worthwhile for us to waste time on this. Because criticism will come!**" (Serra Negra, May 27, 1987, night, p. 33).

**D – Dr. Plinio: "Now, I ask myself what they are going to do in response. Their response will say the following: 'You are pretending to be overwhelmed with perplexity, but we see that you are not perplexed. You are making a cavalry charge!' Our answer is, 'Very well. You are ignoring a thing called courtesy, according to which saying 'It is a pleasure to know you, it is a pleasure to see you', etc., all these things are not lies according to the moralists. Obviously, this can be seen on a larger scale. I employed a courtesy. If you lament that I did so, I say without courtesy: It is true [it is a cavalry charge]'"(Serra Negra, May 29, 1987, morning, p. 48).**

There is no reason, therefore, for panic. The attacks can come. There is nothing more normal for those who fight for the Church. One gives a blow here, one receives a blow there. This is what is apparent from the calmness with which Dr. Plinio approached the subject.

## **6. With or without punishment, we shall make a battle cry in the presence of God**

However, regardless of human calculations, Dr. Plinio was determined to publish the work in the presence of Our Lady and God.

**A – Dom Bertrand: "What would you think about the publication [of the work] in Europe?"**

Dr. Plinio: "[They will say:] 'A nebulous sect that publishes interminable books! How pretentious!' If we say: 'But we have these arguments' ... They answer: "Oh! Let us not talk about it. Let us not talk about it. Have you read the little book by so-and-so about this topic? You have to read it! It is much hotter, etc.' This will be their exit: a curtain [of silence] around it.

"Either way, it will produce a profound effect, as the *Message* did. For the movement of self-management of that time stopped!"

Mr. Atila: "The *Resistance* was the spark that set off a whole series of reactions of the silent majority worldwide."

Dr. Plinio: "Without a doubt! But they will try to make us submit with the following objection: 'You are shooting ghosts in the dark. Ghosts don't die from your shots!'"

Mr. Atila: "They will say that we are whipping the sea, like the king of Persia [Xerxes who had the sea whipped as punishment for destroying his ships in a storm]." ...

Dr. Plinio: "Exactly. Afterwards, they will ignore the arguments, refuse to read the analysis, and, it's finished!" ...

Dr. Adolpho: "This is the last breath of the Constantinian Church"...

Dr. Plinio: "The last breath of the Middle Ages! They can try to do this, with the world as overtaken by the devil as it is, this can happen. **Now, at a certain moment, someone will say: 'They will make an ecclesiastical sanction against you and, then, you can defend yourselves. But in what ecclesiastical court?' ...**

**"Well then, what choice do we have? I think it is a libel made before God, and just as Nimrod was a great hunter before the Most High, we will be the great hunters in the presence of the Most High! We, in the presence of the Most High, make the proclamation. This is one of these**

moments ... [in which we say] to Our Lady: 'What you wanted from us, we did. Now, you do the rest!'"

Mr. Atila: "Afterwards, the joy to have helped the Church in something ..."

Dr. Plinio: "**And helped a lot! Because it remains for all ages**" (Symposium for EVP, March 3, 1987, morning, pp. 12f.).

**B – Dr. Plinio:** "From the doctrinal point of view, I have no objections; from the political point of view – ... tomorrow I would like to review this because this is an enormous bomb. ... **And we must ask ourselves: If the nature of the work is this, is there any other alternative for us but to say it? Because when we go through their books and read them, they established such conditions that we see that this is what they said. Now, should we make a foolish commentary in which what they said doesn't appear? Why? ...**

**"At this point of my reading ... it seems to me ... that this is a bomb, in the sense that it makes it obvious – this summary makes it even much clearer than it already was – the size of the hole that this work opens in their wall [is immense]. Now, the question is: Can we write this work without clearly showing that this is what it is?"**(Serra Negra, May 28, 1987, evening, pp 45f).

It is quite difficult for the accusation to continue to maintain that Dr. Plinio wanted a "passive resistance"...

## **7. Could it be pleaded that the Council is null?**

Mr. Atila: "There is no Council that has stopped halfway..."

Dr. Plinio: "But there is more. It is not only halfway because they thought it imprudent to announce the whole road, but rather it is because they were not cognizant of where that whole road was leading. Hence this invitation to study [Vatican II], made even to the lay people, to establish the facts about what was the end of the road they were defining. Now, this is a flawed way of teaching. Because either you know the final end of where you are going or you do not teach. And, **in fact, this declared position of the Council would be a factor to plead its nullity.** I don't know whether what I said is clear or not" (Serra Negra, June 26, 1987, night, p. 20).

To plead the nullity of the Council is an action quite different from the line of "passive resistance" sustained by the accusation.

## **Major Conclusion regarding the texts of Dr. Plinio**

From the texts cited above, one can see that:

- The accusation seriously erred in maintaining that an interpellation written in the form of defense cannot contain an attack;
- It erred blatantly in attributing to Dr. Plinio an attitude of "passive resistance" in relation to the current crisis of the Church, since the texts show the combative spirit of Dr. Plinio and

his constant desire – by means of an interpellation, an eminently active initiative – to end such a crisis;

- It revealed total ignorance about his intentions and plans concerning the work of analysis of the Second Vatican Council. That is to say, Argument III shows no consistency, which in apologetic terms, is synonymous with being null and void.

From a moral point of view, the argument indicates that:

- There was a blameworthy oblivion regarding the teachings of Dr. Plinio – some of those who gave information for the writing of this letter were present at the [*Eremo do Vínculo Profético*] symposium made on the subject in which Dr. Plinio indicated his will, which was contrary to the accusation (cf. Items 4, 6.A);
- The accusation showed itself to be partial in not informing itself about the impressive number of statements made by Dr. Plinio contrary to the accusation;
- There was a strong suspicion of pusillanimity in defending the position of "passive resistance" as being the ideal for the TFP;
- There was also suspicion of complicity with the enemies of the Church in trying to prevent the publication and dissemination of the work on the Council;
- And finally, there was manifest injustice in condemning the author for doing something that is combative and obeying the instructions given by Dr. Plinio.

### **Specific refutation**

When writing the part of your letter that gave form to this Argument III, you forgot to add any proof that in the book *In the Murky Waters* the author "entered spear in hand" and gave his "study an offensive character." For the accusation to be honest, it would be necessary to provide the proper evidence. Your two assertions, therefore, are void.

In substantiating the charge of Argument III, you based yourself on "the testimony of the closest friends of our Founder, as well as those who help you in the research." From this you concluded that the principal objective of the work of analysis of Vatican II would be "to act as a shield to protect us from the open or veiled persecution we suffer from members of the Hierarchy." Now then, you did not mention the names of these close friends and researchers whose testimonies would substantiate your statement. Mr. Fernando Antúnez, a close friend of Dr. Plinio, said nothing about this in his statement. Mr. Nelson Fragelli, reviewer of my work, who could be included under the generic epigraph of those who helped me in the research, also did not address the matter in his.

How, then, do you expect to be taken seriously in an accusation that hides the names of those who buttress it? Are these, perchance, testimonies that you are shrewdly reserving for a future polemic that your accusation would awaken? In this case, you would be incurring the censure you made of me for making a trap for Msgr. Quinn... (cf. 1, § 5). In addition, being so astute with

regard to the future, you would, however, have forgotten to give evidence for the present accusation.

**Minor specific conclusion**

From what was proven in the Specific Refutation, you can see that hardly anyone can take seriously the reasoning that constitutes this Argument III.

\*

## ARGUMENT IV

### DR. PLINIO WANTED TO SUBMIT THE WORK AFTER ITS COMPLETION ONLY TO SOME VATICAN SPECIALISTS, AND NOT CIRCULATE IT WIDELY

#### Proof in the text of the accusation

\* "Such a study would be submitted to the Holy See for its consideration and circulated strictly in milieus specializing in Theology (at most, an edition of some 200 copies, Dr. Plinio thought)" (p. 4, § 3).

"He [Dr. Plinio] hoped and prayed that one day ... you would be open to accept a serious review of your work, *conditio sine qua non* for its presentation to the Vatican and a select number of dignitaries and scholars" (p. 5, § 3).

\* "He [Dr. Plinio] wanted a defensive study to be spread strictly in the higher spheres and you ended by making a study ... which you intend to circulate broadly, judging by the choice of the author of the Preface, precisely a writer for the masses" (p. 6, § 4).

\* "I believe that since 1986 – in view of the size that Mr. Atila's work was taking on – Dr. Plinio was fixed on the idea of presenting to the Vatican authorities the perplexities that the subject raised in him, along with the 'monumental' work of Mr. Atila. In this plan the study would be presented to some theologians. It is with this end in sight that the work began to be translated even before it was completed" (Statement by Mr. Fernando Antúnez, n. 6).

\* "Until the end of his life, Dr. Plinio spoke of going to review Mr. Atila's work in some isolated place, and then present it to theologians and finally present it to the Vatican in the opportune conditions" (*ibid.*, n. 8).

#### Refutation of Argument IV

The order to be followed in replying to this argument is the same as in the previous one: *First*, the texts of Dr. Plinio will be presented that oppose the accusation and, then, a specific refutation will be made.

For a good understanding of the texts below, it seems opportune to point out another simplification in the accusation. Indeed, in this Argument IV, you consider that a possible presentation of the work on the Council to the Holy See would mean that Dr. Plinio did not intend to give the work more publicity. These two actions do not have a necessary link because in several public campaigns the TFP directed itself simultaneously to the Vatican and the public, as, for example, in the *Reverent and Filial Message to Paul VI*, in which we collected more than two million signatures asking the Pope to stop the communist infiltration in the Church. Thus, the core of this Argument IV lies in the exclusive character that Dr. Plinio would have wanted regarding the

presentation of the work to the Vatican. Once it is shown that such a character does not exist, the argument dies on its own.

\* I note that everything that has already been exposed manifesting Dr. Plinio's desire to publish the work testifies against this Argument IV, because no one with common sense speaks about a publication whose purpose is to show only a few persons. If this were the objective, one would speak about a typewritten text with copies or, at most, of a mimeographed text.

\* Furthermore, the texts already presented attest to Dr. Plinio's desire to use the work on the Council to make an interpellation or a denunciation. Indeed, what would be the fruit of an interpellation except to crystallize a part of the faithful? What would be the purpose of a denunciation if not to open the eyes of many to the errors exposed? How can one suppose, without revealing ignorance about the spirit of Dr. Plinio, that an interpellation or a denunciation would be made exclusively for the Holy See? Would it be a denunciation in which the accused is also the judge? Such a denunciation would have no other fruit except to augment the hatred against us that is already present in high ecclesiastical levels contaminated by Progressivism.

The following excerpts of Dr. Plinio show his desire to reach a considerable audience of ecclesiastics, intellectuals, educated men, men of action and lay people. They blatantly contradict Argument IV.

**A – Dr. Plinio: "There is a moderate, majority, influential current that I want to reduce to silence. To reduce to silence, I need to have this [the work]"** (Serra Negra, December 1, 1982, 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, p. 3).

Now, I ask: How could Dr. Plinio reduce the moderate majority to silence if not with a public denunciation?

**B – Dr. Plinio: "We have no right to not bring this work to its end or we will lose the state of grace. [It is] a very grave sin. .... And then, what an opportunity! With the Council it is very flagrant! It unleashed all this and is not suspected of connivance with what it unleashed?!"**(Serra Negra, December 5, 1982, 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, p. 5).

Now then, I ask, an opportunity for what, except a public denunciation?

**C – Dr. Plinio: "But the work [on the Council] is a book directed, thus ostensibly ... to educated men who are not intellectuals specialized in these scholarly fields. The bomb has to be this. Further, the men who interpret [the Council] ... occupy the highest places and enjoy the best reputations and, therefore, it cannot be considered defamatory to think like them. We are, therefore, taking what they [the progressivists] have said and we are bringing it to the public because what they wrote is in terms that the educated – but not specialized – audience cannot follow. One could even call this non-specialized public the part that forms a kind of link between culture and life. They hold the levers for what happens in their hands and are aware of the [more important] ideas around them. And, therefore, they are the point on the horizon where the sky and the sea seem to meet. It is for these people that I write"** (Serra Negra, June 16, 1983, lunch, pp. 1f).

**D** – Dr. Plinio: "That is to say, it suffices to affirm with an almost laconic placidity that the bomb has been dropped. It seems to me that this is the way, the tone, the mode. **Of course they are going to be silent, and we are going to sell it [the work] in the streets**" (*ibid.*, p. 2).

**E** – Dr. Plinio: "We know that this is the position of many [conservative] theologians inside the Catholic Church who show or do not show themselves, but whose names the Holy See can easily know, either by the more or less declared positions of some or by the silence of others, who clearly are not singing in the Council choir; they represent the silent part of the Church. This silent part of the Church is placed in conditions in which it believes it should not speak. **We, who can speak, ... we cannot fail to express ourselves, by the principle of subsidiarity – from the bottom up and not from the top down**" (Serra Negra, June 19, 1983, p. 1).

**F** – Dr. Plinio: "What has our study persuaded us of? *First point*, that this Council has errors. *Second point*, these errors together follow a logic... better expressed: It is easy to structure all these errors inside one philosophical-theological hypothesis. *Third*, this theological hypothesis corresponds to such and such concrete data. ... *Fourth*, these errors in fact exist in this point and that, etc. Well then, what is to be deduced from this about the reach of the Council? Whatever one wants, but not that it compels a Catholic in the name of the Faith to accept the totality of its doctrinal theses. This is the case not only regarding its pastoral guidelines, in the traditional sense of the word, but the totality of its doctrinal theses; the Catholic is not obliged to accept it, because it cannot be in contradiction with the past teaching, and so on. *Fifth*, also those pastoral guidelines, in the traditional sense of the word, that are the result of these erroneous theses ... cannot be accepted. **We, then, are going to declare that we do not accept them and why we do not accept them.**

"Now then, what is the conclusion of this for anyone reading the book? The conclusion is: On the part of the ecclesiastical authority, to punish us. We do not know clearly how it will do this, because it is this very authority that established itself as a non-punishing authority – and made impunity the cornerstone of its edifice. Such and such documents should follow. Another possibility is that the authority could isolate us. But it did this a long time ago. **What the faithful who read this work can do – if they are convinced of the validity of our arguments – is to follow us. And, that is it**" (*ibid.*, pp. 1f).

**G** – Dr. Plinio: "**It seems to me that the part of the exposition – entirely objective – of what this theology professes will be in itself a refutation for many cultural milieus, which, reading scattered works, do not understand it in its ensemble.** And that, therefore, the work of refutation would be necessary, but should be shorter than the exposition" (*ibid.*, p. 10).

**H** – Dr. Plinio: "I think the method you are suggesting is very good – to show, above all, the adversary who they are trying to destroy. But, **you will be addressing a public that has a very vague idea of the *unum* of this adversary.** Because this adversary who they [the progressivists] want to destroy inside the Church is the Church as they found her, let us say, on the eve of the Council or at the beginning of Pius XII's reform, wherever you want to situate it. It is what was living inside of the Church then, plus many vestiges of other historical ecclesiastical epochs inside the Church" (Amparo, October 28, 1985, afternoon, p. 10).

I – Dr. Plinio: "But what concerns us the most at the moment is this work, how we need to construct together the whole plan in this or another symposium: The exigencies of the accusation, the parts, how it should be done, what it presupposes, what I already know the Roman theologians will say, what the Roman jurists will say. **Because we must fight a battle, but to gain what? To get as many people as possible [to know about the denunciation] ... It is not, therefore, by any means a work to convince the other side – this doesn't even enter into consideration. It is not a work to silence the other side. It is not to convince them or to silence them. We are not going to silence them, but it is such a work that ... those who have any trace of rectitude will realize that we denounced the situation as it is**" (Amparo, October 30, 1985, afternoon, p. 31).

J – Dr. Plinio: "**It might be worthwhile – because I am slowly conceiving the book as it should come out, and it can be as thick as it needs to be. I imagine it should have several pages in the front that set out ... one thought or aspect of the topic with quotes that do not take the whole page.** ... One thing, for example: that the Church always spoke to men who seek God and she responded to the questions they asked about God. It had a broader amplitude of [giving the] message in the sense that she also spoke to the men who did not seek God, causing them to seek Him. Thus, the most immediate message of the Church, her teaching, was for those who already believed, to prevent them from erring and dispersing, to harmonize the development of their thinking, enriching them with new thoughts. This was the faithful part, the son who did not flee the house and whom the father lovingly nourished, who was the beloved son throughout the time of the diaspora of the prodigal son. Now, you Prelates did something else. In the Council you imagined a man who is not seeking God. In the doctrine of man you have described, we have no part. You addressed only the man who has his back turned from God, or from the Church of God at least, rejecting her. You made all your teaching only for him, as if only he existed. And the result is that, in your teaching, we do not feel ourselves to be in the father's house."

Mr. Atila: "It is the father who left the paternal house."

Dr. Plinio: "Then, one could say that the father left the paternal house and the household was dispersed. Indeed, it would almost be the case to say: *pater prodigus* [prodigal father]. And when they [the fathers] wanted to return to their house, did they find the road back or not? It's something like that.

"Thus, [we should place] **some clarifying bombs that would only take four or five lines of a page, to make the reader reflect a bit on this before turning the page.** In fact, one could tell them here that the priest turned toward the tabernacle, which is in the center of the altar, or turned toward the crucifix, which is in the center of the altar, represented the Church turned to God. Today, the priest turned toward the people represents that the people take the place of God. And that the priest now is a servant of the people. Before he used to be a minister of God; today he is a minister of the people. That is to say, **we should place flashes like this throughout the work**" (Amparo, October 31, 1985, afternoon, pp. 6f).

I ask: Who was Dr. Plinio trying to impress with these introductory pages: the common reader or the "high Vatican figures"?

K –Mr. Atila: "No, no, I don't think the work can be published like this - we are heading to 15 volumes!"

Dr. Plinio: "You are right, this does not work. The point is this: We have to prepare ourselves for the expense that this represents. Because writing is one thing, publishing is another. **We have to have a very large publication or we will waste time writing.** And so, this is another question that we need to pray for ... And also for other things that come tomorrow, or maybe not, because we have to think a lot ... **There should be the publication of a popular edition of these things. We cannot just think about reaching a cultured middle class – we have to go much further.**

"My thinking is the following: How the publication of these things in South America first would produce a very lively detonation [from the point of view of small internal religious disputes] and even disconcertment. But, **it is necessary to publish it first in Europe and perhaps first in Germany, where reading habits are better established ... and, then, publish it in Latin countries and, afterwards, South America. An 'after' that would not take too long. Let us say three months, three months and three months. But, in a way that doesn't touch Brazil except by ricochet.** ... Because if ... our aim were to resolve our little fight in Brazil, it would not be worthwhile. The work is more than that..."

Mr. Atila: "To write this for the Reign of Mary ..."

Dr. Plinio: "No, **I think we should do this to resolve the situation in the Church. This is what we have to do.** They would like to reduce our case to the proportions of a Brazilian matter" (*ibid.*, 10).

L – "Mr. Atila: "Now I would like to know what things you want me to deal with first, before the others."

Dr. Plinio: "I think the writing style should be very conditioned ... to everything that I am saying, which should be the point of view where you situate yourself. Now, the order should be somewhat conventional, the order to which they are accustomed."

Mr. Atila: "They being who?"

Dr. Plinio: "**The ecclesiastical authorities who will read this.** Setting out the thing as they do when they deal with these matters."

Mr. Atila: "This is the order that I used."

Dr. Plinio: "I had this impression. So then, keep this order. **You shouldn't forget that this work should come out in Europe before Brazil. Or, if it be the case, in the United States and not in Europe. But do not make South America the first plane. This will determine the question of translation**" (Amparo, November 1, 1985, afternoon, pp. 13f).

I comment: In this passage, it is clear that Dr. Plinio was thinking about a widespread publication that would reach the ecclesiastical authorities of the whole world.

M – Dr. Plinio: "**In the [initial] message there should also be an appeal to all the specialists to make a statement on the topic because we in the TFP cannot understand, you cannot under-**

stand, I do not see how it is that something like this [work] can be published without a response from them and they can save face" (Traipu, July 12, 1986, p. 1).

**N** – Dr. Plinio: "I think you could mention [other works of my own] because that will have an international repercussion. And there is such a strong tendency to underestimate all that is Latin American in terms of intellectual work that I think we should barricade against this, for the sake of the work. Just so they would not be surprised at a reference to the Agrarian Reform, you could put in a footnote saying: 'These are expressive works based on Catholic doctrine to combat agrarian socialism, etc ...' without omitting Carlos del Campo in the works where he is a co-author" (Serra Negra, May 25, 1987, night, p. 2).

**O** – Dr. Plinio: "He [the quoted author] speaks of ambiguity as clearly as Fr. Laurentin. Even more so. I was not aware of that. It is splendid! Really splendid! This gives them a loophole and gives us a status. Because they can say to your objections: 'These are ambiguities that should be studied after the Council. We have already said that the Council has nothing unchangeable, and so on' ...

"And we will say: 'Ah, good! So, you affirm that everything here can be reduced to ambiguity and has no real, direct, proper, normal meaning or that there is no normal sense to this? What is it that the Council defined? Is this Council a set of provisional positions of an evolving thought? And, what is that thinking? Because you present this Council as having authority and, then, yet it declares itself incapable of finding the proper terminology to express itself.' **So then, this has to be told to the faithful.**

"**They [the progressivists] will not want to acknowledge this! ... They can give any excuse they want, but they will feel extremely uncomfortable about it, while we are in the euphoria of feeling good.** ... It is stupendous! When I saw the ambiguity so evident in these texts, I lost my initial concern [to counsel caution in this regard]. It is a magnificent torrent [of texts]!" (Serra Negra, May 26, 1987, night, pp. 17f).

**P** – Dr. Plinio: "I put this question to you. It seems impossible, but it is real – the fear you have [of being too clear, appearing like a man in the cinema with a flashlight who shows the place where everyone should sit] is a fear more ponderable for Germanic readers than Latino readers. I understand that you fear this more than I do. In my books, I act as a man with a flashlight. I grab the guy by the neck and say, 'Look, this is the place you must sit and you have to walk this way to get there.'" One might think that the Latino is more anarchical and would revolt more against this. But, he feels himself so incapable of putting together the great schemas that he accepts it well. While the Germanic mind has more capacity for ordering schemas. Therefore, he can feel that your explanation is unnecessary, you are supplying too much. Hence, you fear it more than I do. Now, **since the book is made for a broad translation, and the Germans and Anglo-Saxons read more than the Latins, en tout état de question, I think it is fine. Continue to do it the way you did – it is well done**" (Serra Negra, May 27, 1987, night, p. 33).

Therefore, all types of public audiences were considered by Dr. Plinio as targets to be reached by the work on the Council.

### Major Conclusion concerning the texts of Dr. Plinio

From the numerous excerpts from meetings that were transcribed, one sees that:

- Argument IV is baseless. That is to say, it is not accurate to say that Dr. Plinio wanted the work on the Council to have a circulation restricted to the "Vatican higher spheres." Certainly, the work, having been conceived as a question to be addressed to the Pope and the leaders of the Holy See, could be sent to them. And, in this sense, Dr. Plinio dictated a letter to John Paul II so that it might eventually be placed at the beginning of the first volume. But this does not mean that he had conceived a plan to send the work exclusively to the Pontiff, the Cardinals of the Curia and a few theologians. From this, one sees that the accusation was utterly mistaken in attributing to Dr. Plinio the character of exclusivity. Therefore, your Argument IV is unsubstantiated, which, from the apologetic point of view, is synonymous with null.

And, from the moral point of view:

- In what you were ignorant of, you and your collaborators are culprits of a blameworthy lack of information, not having sought to know the abundant material that exists which clearly shows the contrary of what your Argument IV claims;
- As a necessary consequence, the accusation once again incurs the moral vice of partiality, a prejudiced attitude towards the work I wrote and myself;
- And a grave injustice in condemning me for having obeyed the wishes of Dr. Plinio.

### Minor specific refutation

1. In Argument I, exposed above, you incriminated me for having made a work of many volumes when Dr. Plinio would have wanted only a brief document in the style of the *Message against Self-managing Socialism* in France. To try to prove this, you made syllogisms, you brought forth data from your memory and testimonies from witnesses. Now, in this Argument IV, you endeavored to demonstrate that the same work should reach only the "higher spheres" of the Holy See. How do you reconcile the two accusations? Wouldn't a *Message* call for a broad divulgation? Wouldn't it signify a public interpellation to the Vatican of the kind that was made to Mitterand and his socialist government? How, then, do you go on to suppose it should have a "restricted divulgation"? It would be very opportune if you could explain how your Argument I does not contradict this Argument IV.

2. In the statement he made supporting the accusations contained in your letter, Mr. Fernando Antúnez affirms: "I believe that since 1986 ... Dr. Plinio was fixed on the idea of presenting to the Vatican authorities the perplexities that the subject raised in him. ... In this plan, the study would be presented to some theologians [to study it]. **It was with this end in sight that the work began to be translated even before it was completed**" (n. 6). [Emphasis added]

Earlier in your statement, specifying to whom the work on the Council was destined, you affirmed: "This study would be submitted to the Holy See for its consideration and circulated strictly in milieus specializing in Theology" (p. 4, §3).

Permit me a moment of analysis of the last sentence of the witness to see whether it agrees with your assertion.

Anyone accustomed to dealing with the Vatican, Dr. Plinio included, knows that when one directs himself to the Holy See, he does not need to translate his requests, letters, books, etc. The Church, because it is Catholic, that is, Universal, is solicitous of all peoples and receives them maternally. And, in addressing the Vatican, even today, no one needs to worry about translating what he wants to say. When one wishes to show delicacy toward the Holy See, he writes in Latin, the official language of the Church, in French, the diplomatic language of the Church, or in Italian, an unavoidable language for those who serve the Church in Rome.

Now then, Dr. Plinio decided that the work I wrote should be translated into English. For this, he personally asked Mr. Aloisio Schelini to dedicate years of his life to this great and meritorious effort. How does the witness reconcile his affirmation that Dr. Plinio's decision to ask for the translation of the work on the Council to show it to the Holy See and a limited number of theologians with the fact that this translation should be in English?

If his objective were to show it exclusively to the Holy See, could he not spare the translator this enormous work and present it simply in Portuguese? If his intention was to show courtesy to the highest Vatican authorities, why not translate the work into French or Italian? Again, something is wrong in the affirmation – *il y a du toc* [it sounds fake]. It gives the impression of something arranged to evade a proof contrary to Argument IV. In other words, the English translation of the Collection speaks strongly in favor of Dr. Plinio's intention to give the work international dissemination.

In fact, I can guarantee with certainty that when Dr. Plinio decided to make the translation into English in a dispatch to me in July of 1987, he had pondered at length the possibility, presented by me, of translating the work into French or Italian. In view of practical matters, however, on an entirely personal initiative, he determined that the work should be translated into English rather than another language. The reason given is not difficult to understand. Since the first objective of the work was to reach the educated men of the West who are not specialized in theology, as he told me several times, the best language for this is English, the language most read today in this milieu.

### **Minor specific conclusion**

One sees that, among the foundations that you chose for your Argument IV:

- At least one of them does not harmonize with the fundamentals of your Argument I; that is to say, both are contradictory.

- And one of the statements of one of your witnesses – Mr. Fernando Antúnez – clashes with the praxes of the Church and is not in accord with the customs of Dr. Plinio in dealing with the Vatican.
- It is suspect of trying to circumvent reality,
- And, moreover, it is untrue.

\*

## ARGUMENT V

**DR. PLINIO CONSIDERED THE WORK INSUFFICIENT FROM THE INTELLECTUAL POINT OF VIEW.  
THAT IS, THE AUTHOR WAS NOT CAPABLE OF WRITING IT AND THE WORK HE PRESENTED  
LACKED SCIENTIFIC RIGOR**

### Proof of the accusation in the text

\* "Mr. Fernando Antúnez, as the private secretary of Dr. Plinio, and I, who spoke with him every day, are witnesses to many of his comments in the sense that he judged your work insufficient, requiring a thorough review" (p. 5, § 1).

\* "The truth is that the publication of *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* does not correspond ... to the desire of our late Founder ... It does not correspond regarding the scientific rigor of the work, which Dr. Plinio judged insufficient" (p. 6, §§ p. 3f).

\* "In February of 1986, having already worked on this review [of the study of the Council] for about two months, Dr. Plinio called me on a Saturday night. He asked me what I thought of the work. I told him that it had an intellectual style that was sensibly different from ours and was a lamentable redaction with countless vulnerable points. On the whole, un-publishable without the review of a person knowledgeable on the subject.

"As for the writing, it is a particular habit of Mr. Atila, known to those who deal with him, to attribute ideas to the texts of authors in the texts not expressed in them or reasonably deduced from them. This attribution of ideas without strict logical connection to the words of the texts examined would make his comments easily imputed as intellectually dishonest and, therefore, vulnerable to a response. This lack of intellectual rigor has never been accepted in the public documents of the TFP.

"Dr. Plinio agreed with these observations. He asked me if I considered the work futile. My response was negative" (Statement by Mr. Nelson Fragelli, p. 2, §§ 1ff).

### Refutation of Argument V

Before beginning to refute this argument, I would like to point out that it has two aspects that need to be distinguished. That is, the accusation has a *major sense* – the work is insufficient and without scientific rigor and, therefore, cannot be published; and a *minor sense* – the work, although essentially sufficient and publishable, could receive further improvements and, in this sense, would be accidentally insufficient. It is not my intention to deny the *minor sense*, for there are few writers – and I am not among them – who regard their work as perfect. Thus, until the moment of going to press, Volume I has been updated and improved. In this sense, Dr. Plinio could also find, and certainly found, that the work would have many points to be perfected. Therefore, I will refute only the *major sense* of the accusation.

You place me in the very embarrassing situation of obliging me to defend the intellectual competence of my work. I do not flinch before it, as I did not flinch before the previous accusations. I only ask you not to accuse me of boasting if I bring into my defense the eulogies and praises of Dr. Plinio and others of my work and me. Or, if I include details about my way of intellectually working. You oblige me to do this.

Before, however, allow me an initial distinction of the methodological order in this Argument V.

There are two types of testimonials that are present here. *First*, those of ear witnesses – you and Mr. Fernando Antúnez – who do not know the work and affirm what they would have heard from Dr. Plinio. *Second*, the eye witness of Mr. Nelson Fragelli who read the work and, furthermore, would have heard comments from Dr. Plinio.

To respond to the statements of the ear witnesses, I need do nothing more than to expose the texts in which Dr. Plinio says otherwise. I will do this below.

To respond to an eye witness, I find it necessary to descend to the specific analysis of the facts, reversing the order I have followed so far in refuting the previous arguments.

### **1<sup>st</sup> specific refutation: The witness who read the work**

**1. Omission of the method adopted.** Volume I of the Collection was written in haste from November 18 to December 6, 1985. Then, the others volumes came, written in analogous speed until the fifth, which I finished on November 15, 1986. Only then did I pause to rest. After that, I returned to perfect minutely what I had already written. Why such haste? For the simple reason that I did not know if I would be able to make a work as vast as Dr. Plinio had asked of me, and having to choose a method, I decided to follow this one.

To use a metaphor, it would be like an engineer who had been commissioned to make a long road into the virgin forest. He could choose one of the two methods. One method: open a path that takes you immediately to the other side of the woods; after that, mark out the road, make the path wider, so as to allow access to work vehicles, then start the fundamentals of paving it, finishing it properly, making it passable for all types of vehicles and, finally, think about the final presentation of the road, signal lights, landscaping, adding logistic assistance to users and potential tourist sites, etc. Another method: for each kilometer of the open forest, construct the road as completely finished with all the points I described above.

In the execution of the Collection commissioned by Dr. Plinio, I opted for the first method regarding the first five volumes. I wrote them in one shot, because I also considered that they could, after revisions and improvements, meet the polemical needs of the Counter-Revolution, perhaps at our doorstep, as Dr. Plinio described it in the texts quoted above. Only then did I rest, only then did I return to make my road accessible to the work vehicles, that is, to the second phase of the job.

Now, the essence of Mr. Nelson Fragelli's objuration proceeds from his forgetting which of the two methods I adopted or, perhaps remembering it, he did not want to state it. A method, however, that was quite clear to Dr. Plinio, whom I consulted specifically about the choice, to those

who helped me and to me. To such a degree that the very metaphor I used here was used frequently in our conversations. Therefore, in itself, the observation of Mr. Nelson Fragelli is objective: Volume I, in February 1986, was unpublishable. What is not objective is his strong insinuation that I judged my work to be ready.

**1<sup>st</sup> specific conclusion:** In order for the criticism of the witness to be pertinent, he should read my work today, 12 years after the initial hasty first draft.

**2. Omission of duty on the part of the reviewer.** What I do not understand is why the witness, during the period of 1985-1987, when he had every liberty to present the criticisms he wanted, made so little use of his reviewer's prerogative and said nothing then about the weaknesses he today declaims before God. If he discerned them in 1986, why didn't he tell me those defects? Was it not his duty, assumed before Dr. Plinio? Why did he make a masquerade, pretending to me and my other collaborators that he found the work extraordinary – see the excerpt below – when in fact he considered it to be without any value? And, if it was impossible to correct me – because of the delirious attachment to my work that he attributes to me – why did he not ask Dr. Plinio to exonerate him from his role as reviewer, since he did not agree with the way the work was being written and argued? He would thus exempt himself from passive complicity with the errors that would be expressed in the work.

It is difficult not to see duplicity in the intervention of Mr. Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli that I will cite in Item 5. In the text below he praises the work that he was reviewing, which now he sharply criticizes. He made this eulogy at a meeting with my close collaborators and me with Dr. Plinio at the *Eremo of Mount Carmel*. At that meeting, the witness said: "The research on the work of the Council by Mr. Atila opens innumerable attractive horizons, very attractive panoramas. Many themes are related to the topics you address in the MNF and other commissions. However, some of us are afraid we are not making these studies as you would want them to be done. How do we avoid the tendency to be ploc-ploc [abstract scholar living outside of reality]?" (Traipu, December 12, 1986, p. 10).

**2<sup>nd</sup> specific conclusion:** Therefore, his omission to present criticism on that occasion makes him suspect of recidivism, of dissimulation, and, if the attachment to my own opinions he attributes to me is true, his omission is also suspect of pusillanimity. Moreover, if he was silent on that occasion, why does he speak now, when he no longer knows the content of the work? In short, the witness erred then, when he remained silent, and he errs now, when he speaks.

**3. Omission regarding our previous collaboration.** There is another point that the witness leaves out. It is that in March of 1985 I published a work in defense of the TFP against certain defamations and calumnies – *Servitudo ex Caritate*. Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli was the principal reviewer of this work. Now, if the reviewer accuses me of making generalizations that are inconceivable in works of the TFP, why, in order to make his accusation more credible, did he not make an exception regarding the other work he reviewed, which later received private and public praise from various sources?

In fact, in his testimony he states: "It is a particular habit of Mr. Atila, known to those who deal with him, to attribute ideas to the texts of authors not expressed in them or reasonably deduced from them. This attribution of ideas without strict logical connection to the words of the texts examined would make his comments easily imputed as intellectually dishonest and, therefore, vulnerable to a response. This lack of intellectual rigor has never been accepted in the public documents of the TFP."

Now, in the book *Servitudo ex Caritate*, there are comments on many passages of authors. Would such comments merit the severe restrictions that the witness accuses me of? In such case, how does he explain the eulogies of it, including his own, which I reproduce below (Item 5)? If they did not deserve them, why the silence about at least one work I wrote where such mistakes did not appear?

**3<sup>rd</sup> specific conclusion:** The omission reveals that the witness fell precisely into the error of excessive generalizations of which he accuses me. Moreover, his omission leads to the suspicion of bad faith, since the omitted fact contradicts what he wishes to demonstrate.

**4. Denial of truth.** Still on the subject of *Servitudo ex Caritate*, I would like to ask one more question. The witness accuses me, as I have just shown, of having the vice of making generic comments, which would disqualify me intellectually. He also affirms that I do not accept the observations of reviewers. Now then, when the aforementioned book was made public, it was a source of controversy and to this day no unsubstantiated generalization was pointed out in it. On the contrary, as I said, it received numerous eulogies. Since the witness was the reviewer of the work, he will certainly attribute the absence of generalizations to his accurate corrections. How, then, does he explain his accusation that I do not accept the observations of the reviewers? On the other hand, if I did not accept his corrections, how can he explain that there are no generalizations in that work?

**4<sup>th</sup> specific conclusion:** The witness, by making two contradictory accusations, reveals that, at least in one of them, he did not speak the truth. Notwithstanding, the witness makes a sworn declaration before God. So then, the questions arise: From the juridical stand point, if one were to consider your accusatory piece as part of a process, would we not be facing here the crime of perjury? From the moral point of view, would we not be facing a sin against the 2<sup>nd</sup> Commandment?

**5. Omission of the cordial atmosphere in the work.** Permit me to reproduce the words that the witness addressed to me on the subject of the aforementioned work *Servitudo ex Caritate*:

"Frankfurt, 23.IV.1985. Dearest Mr. Atila, Salve Maria! I arrived here exactly a week ago. ... At the moment of leaving ... I saw for the first time ... a volume of the glorious *Tower III* [*Servitudo ex Caritate*]. My contentment was immense, and my emotion great. Having given you some help ... in its revision, I am particularly close to the book. ... Now, on returning from a meeting,

here I see a volume of the work, which you were kind enough to send me. I am most grateful for this kindness.

"Until now, our Frankfurt brothers had not seen the book. Their interest in it is enormous. They all send you congratulations. And they are asking me for details about its composition. And I, speaking as if I were an expert, am giving details of the history of the preparation of the book that in so many ways can be considered as the book that was impossible. 'Then, amid the growing calumnies of apostates, after crossing the dark valley [of the meeting] of the National Council at the Hall of the Reign of Mary on freezing cold days to the *Eremo de Elias*, the fibers of this narrative were woven, a work which one day, perhaps not so far off, will be in the tapestries of the apostolic palaces and princely castles' ...

"Do not think that I have embellished the truth in telling the story to our friends here. It was so splendid, so filled with incredible nuances that I only narrate it, as it happened, for the admiration of our friends. So, Mr. Atila, thank you very much for the place you gave me in this *Epopée*. Thank you very much for the volume that has just arrived, whose dedication honors me very greatly. May Our Lady abundantly bless your other works. ... A strong embrace, Nelson. "

Now, I ask, *en passant*: Is it not normal to invite a friend who had worked so well in the first joint book we made to review the greater work that I was writing?

**5<sup>th</sup> specific conclusion:** Why does the witness omit the cordial atmosphere that existed between us in 1985? Is it not because the confirmation of this cordiality would cast a strong suspicion of bias and exaggeration on his present declaration? In this case, did the witness act with loyalty?

**6. Unbelievable statement:** Today, however, the witness presents my choice of his name for a reviewer in another way: "In December 1985 ... he [Dr. Plinio] wanted me to review a work by Mr. Atila Guimarães, still in execution, on Vatican Council II. To this amiable invitation, I smiled, telling Dr. Plinio I was not qualified to review a work on religious matters. On the other hand, I pointed out, there have always been in our ranks experienced reviewers, with conditions superior to mine. Dr. Plinio replied that Mr. Atila had been placing insurmountable difficulties on the work of our reviewers and that he had repeatedly rejected, with irritation, proposals from the reviewers for the perfection of his text. Extremely jealous of everything he wrote, he would not admit suggestions, changes or corrections, be they doctrinal or even vernacular. The opinion of a reviewer was absolutely necessary for Dr. Plinio. ... With the impossibility of convincing Mr. Atila that his work should necessarily pass through a good reviewer, Dr. Plinio accepted Mr. Atila's proposal for me to make the review. So I was brought in to examine it" (Statement by Mr. Nelson Fragelli, p. 1, §§ 1-4).

Permit me to analyze the objectivity of what is stated. The Symposium of Amparo, held from October 28 to November 1, 1985 – from which I reproduced numerous passages above – ended days before I began to write the first volume. Mr. Nelson Fragelli reports his conversation with Dr. Plinio, which took place in December 1985, shortly after I finished writing the same volume. In December Mr. Wilson Gabriel da Silva and Mr. Renato Murta Vasconcelos were most probably giving the first touches of revision to this volume, shortly after it was typed. I was busy writing

the following volumes, as I explained. So, I had not yet returned to the text for a thorough analysis.

Given these facts, I ask: From what facts could Dr. Plinio have deduced that I "repeatedly rejected, with irritation, proposals of the reviewers for the improvement of his text. Extremely jealous of everything he wrote, he would not admit suggestions, changes or corrections, be they doctrinal and sometimes even vernacular." I do not believe that the two reviewers mentioned above could have reached such general and peremptory conclusions in such a short time.

**6<sup>th</sup> specific conclusion:** This being the case, the affirmation of the witness that Dr. Plinio had declared that I "had been placing insurmountable difficulties on the work of the reviewers" seems highly unlikely. This amounts to saying that there is a suspicion of exaggeration in attributing the said statements to Dr. Plinio.

**7. Intentional memory failure or omission?** To try to explain what really happened, to know what Dr. Plinio really said, one can raise two hypotheses:

*First hypothesis:* The witness would have presented Dr. Plinio with his observations on the previous review of the book *Servitudo ex Caritate*, in which such defects of mine would have appeared. And so use of the term "the reviewers" would be a mere majestic plural we or a rather modest plural we, in order to veil his personal criticism.

It is difficult, however, to reconcile the time when such "reviewers" would have acted. For it is claimed Dr. Plinio would have said that in the period before December 1985, I "repeatedly rejected the propositions of the reviewers" and "did not admit suggestions for corrections." Now, the revisions of the witness for the book *Servitudo ex Caritate* were made in 1984. How can these dates be reconciled?

In addition, if the witness were referring to my attitudes regarding the revision of this book, he would be revealing a very weak memory. Because I remember well – even without consulting the originals of the work in the archive – that he dealt directly with Dr. Plinio on that revision, and I accepted practically everything. Since the review was in good hands, my main concern was the research that still had to be made.

**Conclusion of the 1<sup>st</sup> hypothesis:** Given what has just been explained, one sees that the witness was not objective if he attributed to me the refusal of his revisions for the cited work.

**Second hypothesis:** Dr. Plinio would be mentioning an agreement that I established with him to choose my reviewers. Let us see if the words that the witness put into the mouth of Dr. Plinio about the reviewers are objective. To do so, I must address my previous experience with reviewers.

**Probable omission.** I believe I have commented with the witness, as I did with those who collaborated with me, on a curious fact that occurred in another work I wrote. In 1983, when I returned from the interviews and research made in Europe and after a bout of severe hepatitis, I wrote a long letter to Dr. Plinio refuting most of the accusations that a former member of the

TFP were making against him and Dona Lucilia Corrêa de Oliveira. This letter, delivered to the addressee on July 25 of that year, was considered useful to face that slanderous assault.

Dr. Plinio had chosen a certain person – who I greatly respect and whom I only speak about here for the need of my defense – to review my letter and correct it. This person found it opportune to put in my text a series of data that I had not placed there. He invited a number of people to help him in the research that I had not included in it. He moved and stirred my work at will, without bothering to give me any satisfaction. It was the right of the reviewer, for I had asked for nothing and he had been assigned directly by Dr. Plinio. When the same person judged that my work was in a position to prevent the slanderous assault, my letter was sent to the Rev. Fr. Victorino Rodríguez y Rodríguez, OP, for his opinion. The credentialed Spanish theologian and canonist gave a favorable opinion to the letter. I reproduce it below:

"I have carefully reviewed the writing of Mr. Atila Sinke Guimarães in response to three letters from Mr. Orlando Fedeli to Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, in which he intended to blame the Tradition, Family and Property Association (TFP) for certain deviations of a religious order. The response, in my judgment, fully serves its purpose: It responds adequately to the presumed accusations with transparent and effective argumentation, based on well-established theological-canonical presuppositions and on the reconstruction of subjective and objective circumstances that served as a pretext for the denunciations. I noticed only minor errors in transcription, incorrect Spanish vocabulary and spelling. I have suggested only two or three slight details which, I believe, will improve the phrasing. Everything goes on separate sheets" (Father Victorino Rodríguez, Madrid, May 12, 1984).

Now then, even after such a prestigious opinion, my esteemed reviewer – always without bothering to give me satisfaction – decided to modify the first two chapters of the book that he considered insufficient from this or that point of view. Dr. Plinio called me and asked me if I would accept these changes. The disadvantage was obvious, since it delayed the counter-attack and ran the risk of not receiving the same high approval from Fr. Victorino Rodríguez. Dr. Plinio explained to me certain reasons for it that I keep in reserve.

Therefore, I agreed to the suggestion to change the first two chapters. I did not even ask to read them. Finally, the reviewer was satisfied. The book should no longer be published in my name, but by a commission. I accepted the decision, which was made by someone unknown to me. Mr. João Clá diligently obtained a new approval from Fr. Victorino Rodríguez and the work came to light. I was told that the priest himself was surprised at the introduction of the first two modified chapters and the delay of the counter-attack. I only read the corrections that had been made in my original work when I received a copy of the book, already printed.

After a while, Dr. Plinio asked me what I thought of the revision. I remember responding to him that I had been very pleased that the work had defeated the enemy, but that the system of revision did not coincide with what I had imagined should be an ideal intellectual exchange between an author and a reviewer. It could perhaps work well for other psychologies, but not for mine. It was then that he – or I – I no longer remember – proposed that in my next work I should choose the reviewer or reviewers. This decision was made in full harmony between Dr. Plinio and me, in

a general atmosphere of contentment for the way the work came out and the defeat of the enemy.

This agreement went into effect in choosing the reviewer of *Servitudo ex Caritate* and in selecting the collaborators for the work on the Council. I believe that nothing is more normal, given the antecedent I described and the agreement that I had established with Dr. Plinio.

**Conclusion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hypothesis:** In a conversation with the witness, one can easily imagine that Dr. Plinio made some reference to such an agreement. One might even suppose that Dr. Plinio had forgotten about the agreement and had made some criticism of me. What is more difficult to imagine is that Dr. Plinio made the criticism in the atmosphere of dramatic concern that the witness presents.

**7<sup>th</sup> specific conclusion:** As far as the witness is concerned, one sees that he omitted mention of the previous experience, which he probably knew, when I accepted all the revisions that were made to me, without reading them. He also omitted mention of the agreement, which he probably knew, established between Dr. Plinio and I, allowing me to choose my reviewers in future works. If voluntary, such omissions would reveal the witness' bad faith, since he takes on dramatic airs, both about the possibility of the author not accepting the corrections of the reviewers and of choosing his own collaborators. In addition, he attributed to Dr. Plinio criticisms made of the author that are not credible and, with this, incurs the suspicion of exaggeration.

**8. Two probable exaggerations:** In order to properly assess the possibility of exaggerations used in the statement of the witness, I will address other aspects.

In the sequence in which the witness presents the facts, Dr. Plinio would have first invited him to review my work, and, in face of his modest refusal, Dr. Plinio would have criticized me severely for not accepting other reviewers more capable than the witness. Let us analyze here these two statements regarding the actions attributed to Dr. Plinio.

**A – Exaggeration regarding the reviewer:** Whoever has been a close friend of Dr. Plinio knows the incomparable tact with which he treated persons and goals of the Counter-Revolution. Anyone who has had this privilege knows that it is highly unlikely that he, who wanted the collaboration of Mr. Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli in my work, would have agreed with the insufficiency which the witness – immersed in smiles of modesty – attributed to himself.

The witness curiously does not perceive the weak point of his statement. In order for it to be objective in the dramatic climate he presents, it would be necessary for Dr. Plinio to agree with his incapacity to revise my work and, departing from that presupposition, he would have rebuked me for not allowing a more competent reviewer than the witness. Now, this would be to attribute to Dr. Plinio a lack of courtesy which those who were close to him know that he would not have. Only if he had agreed with the intellectual insufficiency of the witness would Dr. Plinio have expressed – and then not in the manner described – his displeasure with my obstinacy in not wanting my reviewer to be someone more competent than the witness.

Besides the lack of courtesy, there is another fact against the witness: what Dr. Plinio objectively thought of his capacities. More than once Dr. Plinio told me that he had placed at my disposal the best team of TFP auxiliaries, as, for example, in the section below (cf. Major Refutation, 2.L). Now, this team included the witness. Therefore, Dr. Plinio, in making this eulogy, confirmed my choice. Thus, I am led to conjecture that the modesty of the witness and his ignorance of the invariable courtesy with which Dr. Plinio treated people led him to exaggerate and describe some words Dr. Plinio said as a supposed afflicted and dramatic displeasure in order to incline the witness to accept the suggestion I made of his name.

**B – Exaggeration regarding the writer:** The climate of my relationship with the witness at that time is objectively reflected in his letter of 1985, which I transcribed above (Item 5). It was this atmosphere of mutual trust that led me to choose him for a reviewer. Therefore, the possibility existed that a long-time collaboration could be starting. Those who knew Dr. Plinio know well that he has always strengthened and fostered good relationships among TFP members, especially those who would have to work together to render services to the Counter-Revolution. Generally, only a last case scenario and at the insistence of one of the parties complaining about the other would he acquiesce and make a comment on some defect of the other party.

Now then, Dr. Plinio had agreed without problems to my suggestion of the name of the witness to help me in the work. The goal of the conversation with the witness, therefore, was to make the witness accept my suggestion. The normal attitude of Dr. Plinio in similar situations would be to promote harmony. However, the witness claims that when Dr. Plinio invited him to work with me as a reviewer, Dr. Plinio decided, on his own initiative, to rebuke my defects, especially my supposed refusal to receive any correction from the reviewers. Independent of the writer, the scene that the witness portrays differs from everything we have been accustomed to admire in Dr. Plinio. It is easier to think that this is one more exaggeration of the witness.

**8<sup>th</sup> specific conclusion:** In the two examples analyzed in this item, one notices that the witness probably exaggerated the statements that he attributes to Dr. Plinio.

**Conclusion on the value of the statement of the eyewitness who read the work:** From what is said in the above 8 items, it is easy to conclude that:

- The witness's criticism that the work was unpublishable in February of 1986 is objective. However, there is nothing to be drawn from his assertions about the author's incapacity and the lack of scientific rigor of his work since at that time the author also considered it unprintable. For the criticism to be pertinent, the witness would need to read the work as it is today.
- The witness revealed himself to be remiss in not presenting the criticisms he supposedly had of the work when he first acted as reviewer. And, today, he is eager to speak about what he no longer knows.

- In omitting in his statement that the witness was a reviewer of my previous work in which he found no generalizations, he incurs in making excessive generalizations, the same indiscriminate accusation he makes against me.
- In his statement the witness accuses me both of making excessive generalizations and not accepting the corrections of the reviewers. Both charges are indiscriminate. However, the witness was a reviewer of a previous work of mine, and in that work there were no generalizations. Therefore, either I accepted the corrections of the reviewers or I did not make generalizations. Hence, in one of the two assertions the witness has not told the truth. Now then, as he took God as witness of his statement, the crime of perjury and the sin against the 2<sup>nd</sup> Commandment seem to be present here.
- The witness omits the climate of cordiality that existed at the beginning of the work. Hence he falls under suspicion of bias, because such a climate testifies against the statement of the witness, who presents me as hostile toward my reviewers.
- The witness attributes to Dr. Plinio the statement that I did not accept the corrections made by the reviewers or by anyone else. Now then, on the date when Dr. Plinio would have said this, there had not been sufficient time for even a first revision of the work, which was fresh from the first typing. Therefore, there is a strong suspicion that the witness is exaggerating the words he attributes to Dr. Plinio.
- The witness omits my previous experience, which he probably knew about, where I accepted all the revisions made to my work without even reading them. He also omits the agreement, which he also probably knew about, that had been established between Dr. Plinio and I for me to choose my reviewers in future works. If voluntary, these omissions would reveal the witness's bad faith, since he puts on dramatic airs, regarding both the possibility that I do not accept the corrections of the reviewers and that I alone can choose my collaborators. In addition, he attributes to Dr. Plinio criticisms of me that are not credible and, thus, he seriously incurs the suspicion of exaggeration.
- The witness reveals himself to be, once again, under serious suspicion of exaggerating the words he attributes to Dr. Plinio because they contradict the latter's normal habits of courtesy, both in dealing with the reviewer and in dealing with me.

Given these conclusions, one sees that the declaration of the eyewitness is not a valid document to justify the lack of capacity of the author and the lack of scientific rigor in his work.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> specific refutation: the ear witnesses**

Permit me now to analyze for a moment the other reasons that you claim to consider my work insufficient intellectually and without scientific rigor.

In the two passages I reproduced at the beginning of the discussion of this argument, you allege that you heard Dr. Plinio say many times that he considered my work insufficient. In principle, I do not deny that possibility. But, it is strange that you have exempted yourself from providing

any evidence of what he said. Do you remember the aphorism: *Quod gratis asseritur, gratis negatur?* [What is freely asserted is freely denied].

How can you expect a statement without evidence to be taken seriously, even though it comes from your pen? Certainly in presenting yourself as a witness, you, in principle, merit some credibility. But it would be necessary for you to offer some concrete evidence of what you heard, to reproduce his actual words, indicating the date you heard them, the subject you were treating with Dr. Plinio, the general atmosphere at the time, so that your words would enjoy the attribute of the probability of being true.

However, you only state: "Mr. Fernando Antúnez ... and I, who spoke with him every day, are witnesses of innumerable comments he made in the sense that he judged your work insufficient." No matter how much good will one might have to believe you, the actual words of your testimony would not allow it, given their extremely vague character. All the more so in an accusatory piece as grave as this one that you decided to make against me, which today is in the heavenly tribunal before Dr. Plinio and God. Therefore, Mr. President, if you would like your testimony to be taken seriously, please provide proof of what you say and I will be happy to respond with the same attention I am giving to the other details of your letter.

You added the ear testimony of Mr. Fernando Antúnez. I went to the statement he made to support what you wrote and I found nothing there that attributed to Dr. Plinio the claim that my work would be insufficient from the intellectual point of view. I pass over this imprecision in your accusation. To Mr. Fernando Antúnez, I make the same invitation that I addressed to you: Present the evidence, at least reproduce the words Dr. Plinio would have said and the date he said it. Without this minimal contribution, my defense is quite difficult...

I request your attention for yet one more curiosity of your accusation. On the same page where you draw on your ear memory to try to show that my work is insufficient, you affirm further on: "It is in the context of this charitable attitude of postponing the revision to avoid confrontation with you that one should understand the complimentary words he [Dr. Plinio] sent you upon receiving your communication that the work was completed. If you analyze them closely, you will see that, even as he praises your effort, Dr. Plinio avoided making value judgments about the content of the work. Nor could he do so, for he had read only a very small part of it, which, moreover, had already undergone changes" (p. 5, § 4).

For the sake of clarity, I reproduce the compliments in question with which Dr. Plinio wanted to honor me:

"On October 17, 1991, my very dear Atila gave me the good news of having completed the monumental work that he had undertaken initially on May 31, 1984.

"The enormous effort of intelligence and will that he has made has thus enabled him to bring this work to completion for the glory of Our Lady, the Holy Church and Christian Civilization. When it is published, I am certain that it will be an irreparable blow to the forces of the Revolution that have infiltrated the Holy Church in this phase of auto-demolition and expansion of the smoke of Satan.

"And, for this reason, I ask the sublime Patroness of the Counter-Revolution and of the author of the work for her blessings, all her help, all her affection and protection for them: She whose Heart is *sicut acies ordianata* [like an army in battle array].

São Paulo, 21.X.1991  
Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira"

Now then, if, with the aim of praising me, Dr. Plinio could not make a precise judgment of my work because he did not know it all, how could he, under the same conditions, judge it insufficient? According to you, when Dr. Plinio wanted to eulogize my work, his praise would not be valid because he did not know the whole work. But when, under the same conditions, Dr. Plinio would have asserted that my work would be insufficient, such a judgment should be taken into account and even generalized.

Do you realize that you use one criterion when you want to underestimate the content of a document written by Dr. Plinio himself and, then, you adopt another criterion when you want to overestimate supposed words of him for which you offer no evidence? From the apologetic point of view, your statements are contradictory, which is to say that one annuls the other. From the point of view of justice, the adoption of two weights and two measures says enough...

Independent of this conclusion, I will go a bit further in my analysis.

You affirm that Dr. Plinio exempts himself from making "value judgments about the content of the work." However, in the aforementioned eulogy, he writes that the work "will constitute when it is published – of this I am certain – an irreparable blow to the forces of the Revolution that have infiltrated the Holy Church." Now then, if Dr. Plinio declares that the work will constitute an irreparable blow to the Revolution, isn't he affirming that it is good for this purpose? Doesn't such an assertion imply a value judgment? In my view, either words have lost their meaning or this is an appraisal of the entire work. And a judgment to which he wanted to impart a strange note of security – "I am certain of this." It might even be said that here he wished to bring into play his prophetic inerrancy.

Therefore, Mr. President, one can see that your affirmation that Dr. Plinio did not make a value judgment on my work is completely wrong. And, if this affirmation reflects something, it would express bad faith, for it denies the evidence.

### **Conclusion on the value of the testimonies of the ear witnesses:**

It is not difficult to conclude regarding the value of your assertions, corroborated by the possible acquiescence of Mr. Fernando Antúnez, that my work would be insufficient.

- From the apologetic point of view, your testimony is insufficient – it would be the case to say: *Medice, cure te ipsum!* [Doctor, cure yourself!] That is to say, since the accusation comes unaccompanied by evidence, it has no value, it is void. Further, it contradicts what you had previously affirmed.

- From the point of view of justice, your testimony is partial.
- Moreover, as for your affirmation that the praise of Dr. Plinio does not imply a value judgment in relation to the work of the author, one sees that this is not correct and is suspect of bad faith.

Having analyzed what value the statements of both the eye witness and the ear witnesses have, I close the specific rebuttal of Argument V.

### **Major Refutation: Dr. Plinio's words against the accusation**

Since the intellectual capacity of the author and the scientific rigor of the work is in judgment, it seemed appropriate to me that, after the presentation of quotes of Dr. Plinio (Items 1, 2, 3 below), to dedicate some space to transcribe opinions of persons who read Volume I, both inside the TFP and outside of it.

#### **1. According to Dr. Plinio, the author would be proportional to the work requested of him**

**A** – In this first text Dr. Plinio considers that Our Lady, after inviting the author to work on the Council, is giving him just "the appetizer to I don't know how many other works."

Dr. Plinio: "Would it bother you if I tell Dom Bertrand some personal things about you?"

Mr. Atila: "No, no"

Dr. Plinio: "I think it is good that Dom Bertrand hears it, there is no problem. You received a grace in this trip [to Europe] that was a consolation, a drop of water for the problem of patience you have. **You felt that, after everything, your hour had begun to sound.** ... I do not know if you were aware of it, but it was something half subconscious . ... But, my son – let me add a little more – if you had not suffered all that you suffered ... " [tape ends]

Mr. Atila: "A merited suffering. I do not want to play the victim."

Dr. Plinio: "It was. A merited suffering, but it was a curious thing. God, when He punishes and the punishment is accepted, in His goodness, He gives it the character of an ennobling trial. And it is as if one leaves the scourging with a title of nobility in hand. It is His mercy. One enters as a culprit, in the condition of a slave and leaves the pillory with a title of nobility in his hand, as if he were His son. For example, I have an admiration for the penitential psalms of David, something beyond words. But what is it? The soul feels itself passing from the condition of a culprit amidst the moans and sobbing tears of the penitential psalm.

"But, in those trials, there was something that was preparing you precisely for a hundred types of detachment, a hundred types including patience... let me even say, above all patience. They were the senseless, brutal trials denying the best of what you were trying to do. You found the muddiest and saltiest deception inside the chalice where you had the right to find the best [wine]. And [it went] on, and on, and on. I see this perfectly. But, with all of this together, **Our Lady thus prepared for you a first moment [the beginning of work], which is just the appetizer**

**to I don't know how many other works.** But the point is that, in the *fratempo* [intermediary time], yet other things can come" (Serra Negra, June 16, 1983, 1st meeting, p. 9).

**B** – In this second excerpt, Dr. Plinio considers that the work on the Council "is one of the things that he expected" from the author, and adds that it is an effort "that is proportional" to the author.

Mr. Atila: "One thing I always wanted to do before I died was something for the Church. That is what I am doing here."

Dr. Plinio: "**I was asking myself what I would say to you without fluffy amiabilities but in a real way, for you ... to see how much I am liking this [the beginning of the work on the Council]. Then, I say it this way: As soon as I met you, I realized the *thau* [counter-revolutionary vocation] you had and realized what things Our Lady was calling you to do. Not by visions or revelation or anything like that – you know me well – by through the discernment of spirits. This [the work on the Council] corresponds entirely to ... one of the things I expected of you. I do not need to say anything else!"**

Mr. Atila: "The prospect of helping you in something in defense of the Church is what I always had in my soul. And you stimulate this. Now, curiously, there are times when I perceive the enemy's carotid artery within my reach. And, curiously, I am feeling it now."

Dr. Plinio: "Yes, I think so too."

Mr. Atila: "And a man in those hours multiplies his strength a hundredfold."

Dr. Plinio: "There also, my son, the supernatural enters, the vocation, all the rest enters. That is to say, your strength can be multiplied for this ... And I perceive well ... that **to a large extent the trials through which you have passed are because you did not see where you would go nor the occasion when you could render such services, which are proportional to you. It is not a question of megalomania. Some would say that it is megalomania, but it is not. Rather, it is the desire to use your whole *leistung* [potentiality].** I would be very disappointed, for example, if I were contracted to be a teacher of sewing at a Catholic establishment. Not because of megalomania, but because I have the impression that I could do something more effective for the cause of the Church. And here you have the prize of the wait."

Mr. Atila: "I believe there is still more wait to come."

Dr. Plinio: "A distressful wait, ... but **you have here one of these moments when you have the awaited thing in your hand, like I am holding this [an object]. Because you are not unlike Columbus leaving Barcelona, you are like Columbus when the first vegetation appeared in the ocean, from which he deduced that land was nearby.**"

Mr. Atila: "To be able to destroy the other side... [the Revolution in the Church]"

Dr. Plinio: "Yes, that's it. We are called to this destruction" (São Bento, November 21, 1983, p. 8).

**C.** At a Saturday lunch, dedicated to giving orientation to the writing of volume VIII, Dr. Plinio said in passing that the author was called to make a denunciation of that which lies at the bottom of the progressivist doctrine.

Dr. Plinio: "If some day a vagrant were to write my biography, he could put in a chapter called: *Forty years later*. Because **then [40 years ago] I had to wrestle with these problems when I was trying to do what, in fact, you would be called to do, which would be a *J'accuse* [accusatory statement] against these people [the progressivists]. But a *J'accuse* that would bring the fight to its end.** But it should be a prudent *J'accuse* because it is necessary – in order to totally destroy the other side – not to draw the sword and cut what is still part of the living flesh in that which I want to eliminate" (Alagoas - 1<sup>st</sup> floor, December 19, 1992, p. 6).

## 2. Eulogies of the work and the author in its various phases

To respond to the accusation that the work would be insufficient, nothing seems more appropriate than to quote Dr. Plinio's own words to the contrary.

**A – Dr. Plinio: "So then, this [establishing the ambiguity in the Council] has such polemical advantages that it is almost superfluous to say it here, but they are enormous.** It is simply this: 'When it is recognized that an act of the Magisterium or a conjunct of acts of the Magisterium, as at the Council, is in fact ambiguous, this gives credibility to the opinion of the faithful who think they do not understand it. They [the faithful] cannot be treated by you directly as bandits. How can it be?'" (Amparo, December 28, 1985, night, p. 4).

**B – Dr. Plinio: "I am very content with this study. Next, the presupposition is very well conceived, very well presented, above all the conclusion addressing ambiguity ... The moderate-arditi game also falls under suspicion ...** Further, in the order you exposed it, you first have the moderate-arditi game, afterwards the ambiguity, generated in some way by the moderate-arditi game" (*ibid.*, p. 5).

**C – Mr. Atila: "Now, Dr. Plinio, I can go faster from here on."**

Dr. Plinio: "No. No. Especially since ... considering that today is Wednesday, we still have Thursday and Friday. I think that our time is paying off well. **I am very satisfied! Further, I should say that I am fully aware of the extent of the work, the magnitude. I see it all. And I also see that you are presenting me with a draft of a work where there is still ... – as you consider necessary – much to think, read, do and see. It is not a finished work, but a work that is going forward, regarding which you would like ... for us to check whether our watches show the same time [whether we have the same criteria] before proceeding.** This is what we're doing" (Amparo, October 30, 1985, afternoon, pp. 28f).

**D – Dr. Plinio: "The plan. .... The judgment that I make of this material is that it gives us ammunition for this and many other fights. It is most vast and excellent!** And that the plans to take advantage of it should not be all of immediate execution, but we should have a plan for its full use in all possible eventualities in the *psy-war* in which we are engaged. Once this is done, we can see where we will begin, which is something different. But the first thing is to see the total advantage we can take from it. Let me say, then, how it is ... the full exploitation [of our arsenal] in a total war. Our adversaries are starting a total war against us" (Amparo, November 1, 1985, afternoon, pp. 1f).

**E – Dr. Plinio: "For you to have an idea of the whole [of my opinion] of the work. It [the general schema] is doctrinally very well ordered, and where you should most focus your attention is precisely on [the quality of] the note cards, because everything is very well ordered, it is perfect" (Amparo, December 29, 1985, morning, p. 2).**

**F – Dr. Plinio: "For Dom Bertrand and the others [attending this symposium] in order to evaluate this work, it is very useful to take into account how many thorny points [for the progressivists] the work makes evident, which paralyzes them and leaves them terrified. They never imagined that ultramontane eyes would stir up all these points. They understand that, from this point on, every kind of misery can fall upon them."**

Dr. Adolpho: "Even more when the ensemble is seen in perspective..."

Dr. Plinio: "That is it... Never [seen before]!" (Symposium for EVP, March 2, 1987, morning, p. 11).

**G – Dr. Plinio: "To make the Revolution inside the Church is strategically the heart of the Revolution, because the Church is the place of the Counter-Revolution. To expel them [the progressivists] from inside the Church and to define her as what she has always been is the heart of the Counter-Revolution. Because if we do not make the Counter-Revolution inside the Church, there is no use doing it outside her.**

"Hence a conclusion: There is no one to make this Counter-Revolution in the world. No one! Unless Our Lady arouses the Basils, Athanasiuses, Augustines, etc., there will be no one. And she asks the following of us: To raise the standard, which is **ready here [with the work on the Council], because this is raising of our standard against them. ...**

**"Historically, before the Council they were hiding in their burrow and did not dare to raise their standard. But also, because in a panorama where their banner was absent, we [the TFP] were inexplicable to everyone. Well, now they are raising theirs [the standard of the Revolution], and our standard explains itself and explaining itself, the R-CR fight is explained before the eyes of all. It is the great dilemma at the center of the modern world.** If you like, I can try to express myself better. I consider it very important [to deal with this] on the sidelines. Atila's work was not written to demonstrate this, but these are things that are demonstrated in the flanks of his work. I think it is very important to make this clear" (*ibid.*, 15).

**H – Dr. Adolpho: "This [the subject matter of the first five volumes] surpasses all that we imagined!"**

Dr. Plinio: "It is unimaginable..."

Dom Bertrand: "But it also gives us a certain relief..."

Dr. Plinio: "Undoubtedly. It is the end of times. But also something else: This work is something that gives us, so to speak, the real certainty of what we already knew, including our self-identity. For the trials we are going to face, this is very valuable. For example: this room is dark. When I entered I did not see anything in it; I groped my way through and I sat here. Well then, I might have known from reasoning that there is a recording microphone here. It is a secure reasoning. But if suddenly my hand reaches up here and I realize that actually there is a microphone

here, my hand solidifies what my reasoning told me and it becomes a fact. This is the difference that goes from the knowledge of what is true to certainty. It was true, then it became evident. Because this is the way we have to be certain of something. In this way also, **here [in view of what the work exposes] our role appears with a fascinating evidence.**"

"Dr. Adolpho: "Incredible that there were no reactions..."

Dr. Plinio: "Incredible, incredible!"

Dr. Adolpho: "Dom Mayer, Dom Sigaud..."

Dr. Plinio: "So far, Adolpho, they are doing nothing!"

Dr. Adolpho: "Dom Lefebvre goes no further than the Mass.:"

Dr. Plinio: "They make the Mass almost an alibi. Do you think that, in the face of this torrent [that was exposed to us in this work], a person can only pretend to *sauver la Messe* [save the Mass]? Did he order any priest to read this quantity of things that Atila read?" (*ibid.*, night, pp. 15).

I – Dr. Plinio: **"If you had refused the invitation of '67 [to your consecration to Our Lady], you would not be doing this [the work on the Council]."**

Mr. Atila: "Never..."

Dr. Plinio: "You know that very well. You would have taken another turn. At this point it is clear" (*ibid.*, p. 18).

J – Dr. Plinio: **"João has a catechism, Fernando Antúnez must have heard about this catechism, but it is completely authentic. It emphasizes a special sin for those who do not duly praise the things that deserve praise. So that you, finding a work that merits all praise, you have an obligation to give it the praise it deserves. Silence is an injustice. In view of this [the work on the Council], we must say: The atomic bomb of our combat is this! There is no question about it! That is, in our fight there are two steps: the *first step* is everything up to this; *the second* is everything after it. There is no discussion about it, that's the way it is. You have to take it like that, because that is the way it is!"**

Mr. Atila: "Your prophetism is proclaimed with this ..."

Dr. Plinio: "More than... what was foreseen is impossible! The reality [however] exceeds the prophecy."

Mr. Atila: "There is a new front whereby we take the enemy directly in its weak point. I consider this an R-CR grace."

Dr. Plinio: "I agree entirely" (*ibid.*, p. 17).

K – Dr. Plinio: "If there is an attack against us, as I think there will be, this [the work] makes it much easier for us ... **An attack is inexplicable if they do not deal with it, because it is our response! I think it is magnificent! Most superb! Most superb!**" (Symposium for EVP, March 3, 1987, morning, p. 15).

**L – Dr. Plinio:** "They will feel [the counter-attack] in their very bones. **I think that this [the first five volumes] as a work is simply stupendous! Providential, magnificent, stupendous! It must have cost an enormous effort! It is still costing. If you consider what it was on Atila's first trip to Europe and how it is now, you are seeing something extraordinary. There aren't words for it!"**

**Mr. Atila:** "It must be said that **Mr. Renato Vasconcelos and Mr. Wilson Gabriel da Silva helped me a lot. And in the part of the review [of the writing], Mr. Nelson Fragelli and Mr. Paulo Roberto Rosa."**

**Dr. Plinio:** "That is true. **You have at your disposal for this work the best of what the Group can offer... [for this purpose]. This is beyond doubt. All together the weight [of the labor] is enormous!** I will say more. If it were not for the Camaldolese institution and for Atila living in an Eremo, etc., this would not have been done. ... Everything that we have here would have seemed infeasible when we first thought about the work. If you take into consideration how this was born, the idea of Atila to make interviews with the leaders of Progressivism, to record them and transcribe them from the tape recorder for us to make a blow ... How much greater this is than that! There is no comparison! But since it was a preparation, it served a hundred purposes" (Symposium for EVP, March 4, 1987, evening, p. 7).

**M – Dr. Plinio:** "I think that a language of almost scientific coldness should be used. **The thinking is very well expressed.** I have the impression that in the form there are lots of small things that are not worth looking at right now. **The thought, the general line, the logic are splendid"** (Serra Negra, June 26, 1987, morning, p.1).

**N – Dr. Plinio:** "He [the quoted author] speaks of ambiguity as clearly as Father Laurentin. Even more so. I was not aware of that. **It is splendid! Really splendid! This gives them a loophole and gives us a status.** Because they can say to your objections: 'These are ambiguities that should be studied after the Council. We have already said that the Council has nothing unchangeable, and so on.'

"And we will say: 'Ah, good! So you affirm that everything here can be reduced to ambiguity and has no true, direct, proper, normal meaning, or that it has no normal sense to it? What is it that the Council defined? Was this Council a set of provisional positions of an evolving thought? And what is that thinking? Because you present this Council as having authority and yet it declares itself incapable of finding the terminology necessary to express itself. So then, this has to be said to the faithful.'

"They [the progressivists] will not want to acknowledge this! ... **They can give any excuse they want, but they will feel extremely uncomfortable about this, while we are in the euphoria of feeling good. ... It is stupendous!** When I saw the ambiguity so evident in these texts, I lost my initial fear [of showing prudence in this regard]. **It is a magnificent torrent [of texts]!"** (Serra Negra, June 26, 1987, night, pp. 17f).

**O – Dr. Plinio:** "It is so clearly demonstrated that there is ambiguity in the Council, so clearly demonstrated, that, on the one hand, it is indispensable [to expose it] because they are who

**they are** ... but on the other hand, it could almost be criticized [for doing it too much]" (Serra Negra, May 28, 1987, p. 43).

**P** – Dr. Plinio: "**You did very well in mentioning TFP's books and me throughout the work; in blending them and, thus, presenting them in ... a kind of same level of importance ... to their things. It works very well!**"

Mr. Atila: "To allow them to be compared to us is still to give them too much" (Serra Negra, May 29, 1987, morning, p. 49).

**Q** – Dr. Plinio: "Now, at any rate, it is clear that the step they took is much larger than I had imagined. That is to say, that they had all these things [thoughts] behind them. That is to say, it is 'evident,' certain for us. **But I never imagined that all these things would come out with this degree of clarity! In fact, it came out because of the work you did, because an ordinary reader does not find this in their things**" (*ibid.*, afternoon, p. 53).

**R** – Dr. Plinio: "**The reference to the Condemned One on the Cross is stupendous!** But, to emphasize it, I could say the following: 'It is impossible to avoid that the conservatives thus condemned – but persuaded that they were right – would not feel themselves included in the Eighth Beatitude: 'Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 5: 10). And that they would recall the Condemned One on the Cross, asking themselves: 'And did He not attract the world to himself?' From there, the text would continue. **It is stupendous!**" (Serra Negra, May 29, 1987, afternoon, p. 56).

\*

Finally, in order to show that Dr. Plinio considered the work essentially publishable (the passage transcribed in letter L above is quite expressive for this purpose), I will transcribe below his words on three occasions.

Before that, I would like to remind you that the concept of essentially publishable (cf. Refutation of Argument V, beginning) does not mean that the work should not be improved. On the contrary, it implies that such improvements be made. So also, Dr. Plinio's intention to publish the work does not mean, evidently, that he had read it in its last version. Therefore, the passages quoted below are proof only that Dr. Plinio assumed that the work as it was then offered the minimum conditions for publication.

\* In 1985, when he was presented only with the documentation following the general plan, he raised the hypothesis that the material, after a year of retouching, would be essentially publishable. In effect, he affirmed: "**Now then, beyond the writing of this, we must see what use it – the work – can have before the Bagarre [the Chastisement] and the Reign of Mary.** That is to say, the question is: **Is there a point where the work can be considered as – I do not say complete – but in such a stage that it is like a building where the floors are constructed, but without coating, plaster and all of the rest? Well, what would this stage be? And what usefulness – depending on the focus – would the publication of the work in this stage have for us? Because it would have one, depending on the focus.** So then, let us see what could be available from

now to, let us say, about a year from now. *Second*, if we have to enter the fight before a year from now, what should we do?" (Amparo, April 30, 1985, p. 30).

\* In 1987, the general lines of the first five volumes, already drafted, were presented. Faced with the perspective of publishing them, being isolated and persecuted, he asked: **"Well, then, what choice do we have? I think it is a libel made before God, and just as Nimrod was a great hunter before the Most High, we will be the great hunters in the presence of the Most High! We, in the presence of the Most High, make the proclamation. This is one of these moments ... [in which we say] to Our Lady: 'What you wanted from us, we did. Now, you do the rest!'"**

Mr. Atila: **"Afterwards, the joy to have helped the Church in something ..."**

Dr. Plinio: **"And helped her a lot! Because it remains for all ages"** (Symposium for EVP, March 3, 1987, morning, p. 13).

If such thinking occupied his mind, it was because he regarded the work as essentially publishable.

\* Months later, also in 1987, during the reading and revision of Volume I, he commented: "From the doctrinal point of view I have no objections; from the political point of view ... tomorrow I would like to review this because it is an enormous and amazing bomb ... **And we ask ourselves: if the nature of the work is this, is there any other alternative for us but to say it? Because when we go through their books and read them, they established such conditions that we see that this is what they said. Now, should we make a foolish commentary in which what they said doesn't appear? Why? ...**

**"At this point of my reading ... it seems to me ... that this is a bomb, in the sense that it makes it obvious – this summary makes it even much clearer than it already was – the size of the hole that this work opens in the [enemy's] wall. Now, the question is: Can we write this work without clearly showing that this is what it is?"** (Serra Negra, June 28, 1987, evening, pp 45f).

Who can deny that, on the road he was taking in these deliberations, Dr. Plinio was thinking that the work would be essentially publishable?

The conjunct of these eulogies – some global, others partial – greatly honors the author of the work and seems to demolish the major, general and more important aspects of the accusation of its insufficiency. For it is clear that Dr. Plinio, in what was presented to him, found it essentially sufficient.

### **3. A method that leaves us shielded against possible attacks of theological insufficiency**

Even if Dr. Plinio had not previously stated (cf. Item 1) that the work was proportional to the author's capacities and had not made the numerous eulogies of the work (cf. Item 2), simple obedience to the orientation he left me would obviate the problem of capability. For he recommends adopting an approach in the writing that prevents the adversary from advancing against us using the arguments of incapacity, lack of preparation or even the allegation that some topics would be presented in an incomplete form.

Once the prophetic guidance was given, the position to take is simple:

- \* We are laymen, therefore, we do not have the ecclesiastical preparation of professional theologians; we speak as learned men, nothing more. If we make errors, correct us and we will accept this with joy. We ask you not to despise us in our ignorance, for such is the obligation of Pastors and theologians.
- \* We only speak because we do not find voices more credible than ours to express our affliction in the face of the crisis of the Church.
- \* We present our questions on the level of the question, and we do not declare that we pretend to resolve them, but we ask the ecclesiastical authority to resolve them and to put an end to the deviations and errors. Therefore, we do not leave our position in the learning Church and we take an attitude of humility.
- \* Having said this, we propose a series of comparisons between the Conciliar Church and the Catholic Church as she has always existed – her clear language, hierarchical institution, traditional teaching, venerable sacrality, etc. – and our perplexity in face of the apparent contradictions.

Thus, I point out to you: Whoever wants to evaluate the strategic position of the author of the work sees it is shielded against criticisms of ignorance or insufficiency – which does not mean that it will not arouse a polemic. In the opposite sense, it is possible for him to question the authorities – even the highest ones – as to whether or not they are in contradiction with the traditional Catholic concepts. Therefore, Dr. Plinio placed us in a very advantageous position to present the questions and situate the polemic that can possibly take place.

The passages transcribed below provide a sufficient idea of the points cited above, about which Dr. Plinio spoke in detail to me on other occasions.

**A** – Mr. Atila: "What I want to do is something that, if it succeeds, explodes the other side, and if it has errors, does not endanger you."

Dr. Plinio: "**Yes, but it cannot go wrong. Calculated like this, it cannot go wrong. ... It can be that we will become alone. This doesn't matter. To evaluate whether it was right or wrong is of no importance**" (Amparo, October 31, 1985, morning, p. 12).

**B** – Dr. Plinio: "This is what I would like to make you see ... **This is not a common book. It is a book in which a layman speaks, as a researcher and an intellectual, who says that he has no title and who serves as a spokesman for other laymen. And who gives this experience, so to speak, of the view of a learned man, even a well-learned man but one who is in the learning Church, of the darkness he is living inside the Church. ... Well, if we abandon this point of departure, the whole pitch becomes unrealizable**" (Amparo, November 1, 1985, p. 9).

**C** – Dr. Plinio: "I would like you to keep in mind that the work raises up these disturbing things to them, but that **the work is not properly speaking a denunciation of errors. It points out a whole series of supremely disturbing things, from which it seems we can draw some theses. Then, we ask: 'Can we or not?' It is a query. Therefore, our position is much more secure than if it were a mere denunciation of errors**" (Symposium for EVP, March 2, 1987, morning, pp. 14f).

D – Dr. Plinio: "The method of exposition to analyze: I have the impression that **you should say flatly that you do not intend to give the full proof of everything, but rather a demonstration of some essential points and the others will only be sketched.** And, in order to do this, you adopt the best method to make the thinking understood." (Alagoas - 1<sup>st</sup> floor, February 13, 1985, p. 3).

E – Dr. Plinio: "They are going to ask us: '**You accuse us of having said this, that and the other. But what does it mean altogether?**' My response as a lawyer would be: '**You are the ones who have the onus to respond. What is *sub judice* [under judgment] is whether you said it or did not say it. And whether there is or is not an error in what we said.**

"**Now, what is the error that you all embrace?** If you want, we can publish our impressions. Do not think it is a vacuous work. **We have our thoughts on the matter and consider them valuable from the intellectual point of view, they are worth what they are worth. So then, we will publish them, stimulated by you. But, do not look at this as a formal accusation. It is a response to a question.'** And, from there, the essay fits perfectly. This would be the legal perspective of the matter" (Amparo, October 30, 1985, p. 37).

F – Dr. Plinio: "If they [the traditionalists] ask us: '**But do you have proof of this [that the Council is inspired by progressivist thinking]?**' We say: '**It [what we have] is a Herculean work, we are studying, it is finished. For this reason, we ask for time.'** That is it. We have the right to have time" (MNF, June 22, 1983, p.1).

G – Dr. Plinio: "**And what if, for example, you would make this exposition as one who describes a historical process, in its general lines, but without being concerned about saying that at a certain moment the boundaries of error were crossed or that this already took place beyond the boundaries of error, without considering error or truth, as a historical work? This would be the following: What is the evolutionary method of thought inside the theological currents that support Vatican Council II?** [The thinking of those] who made and support the Council and those who put it into practice? Then, in this grand work of the huge conciliar revolution, as conceived on the theological realm and as realized on the practical realm, what is the inner evolutionary system of this revolution...?"

Mr. Atila: "Based more on doctrine than on practice, or on both?"

Dr. Plinio: "Both. **But, without worrying about truth and error. I do not think anyone would object. The work would make them uncomfortable – because no one should say things like that – they would be silent, but no one would object**" (Alagoas - 1<sup>st</sup> floor, February 13, 1985, p. 2).

It can be seen, therefore, that the accusation reaps here the fruits of its partiality. For if you had gone to the author to learn about Dr. Plinio's guidelines, you would note that the position he recommended for the writing of the work, rigorously followed in Volume I, would obviate any eventual problem of the author's intellectual inadequacy and the alleged lack of scientific rigor of his work.

### Major Conclusion concerning the texts of Dr. Plinio

Having attentively analyzed the above mentioned excerpts of Dr. Plinio, transcribed in the refutation of this Argument V, one can easily see that:

- He considered the author not only proportional to and capable of writing the Collection on the Council satisfactorily, but he stated that that Collection was "one of the things he was expecting of the author."
- Furthermore, he did not spare partial or global praises for the work in numerous analyzes, several of them with the text of the work [*In the Murky Waters*] before his eyes. In addition, on various occasions, he expressed his intent to publish the work, even incomplete. This speaks strongly to the contrary of considering it "insufficient" and "without scientific rigor," as your accusation claims.
- Moreover, regardless of its intellectual merit, Dr. Plinio conceived for the work a strategy to be taken in the writing that, strictly speaking, would allow the author to present himself as insufficient, thereby not harming the strategic purpose of the fight.

Therefore, one sees that the accusations of insufficiency and lack of scientific rigor of the work are baseless. However, even if they were sound, the accusations would not impede the publication of the work.

### Repercussions of other persons who read Volume I

Given that what is at stake is difficult to sustain for the defense since the author must defend himself, may it be permitted to him, as an exceptional case, to present here the testimonies of other persons who have read Volume I and whose opinions speak contrary to the accusation.

#### 1. Persons in the circles of the TFP

As a clarification, I would like to draw attention to the fact that TFP readers are being mentioned here only to prove that the author and the work cannot *a priori* be described as "insufficient" and "without scientific rigor," as the accusation says. My friends who read Volume I did not intend to prove this, but rather their aim was to correct and perfect the work. Thus, some of their observations, which I transcribe here, precede or conclude a series of criticisms that I requested of them and that I took into great consideration. This fruit of my response to the Accusation is, therefore, only reaped in passing.

**A** – Dr. Murillo Maranhão Galliez, undated: "These are some observations presented as collaboration for a work worthy of the highest praise, of high intellectual relevance and of paramount importance to the interests of the counter-revolutionary cause. They are made by a reader who knows only up to Volume V."

**B** – Mr. Gonzalo Larrain, August 8, 1989: "After having carefully read volumes I, II, and III, I have to say that, since the beginning, a gong of alert sounds and grows increasingly stronger, reveal-

ing very clearly the character of a conspiracy made by the progressivists. Not only this, but it reveals a summit of evil and un-heard-of daring of this conspiracy, both literally unimaginable. That is to say, anyone who has not read this [work] could not imagine that it could have reached this point.

"Further, you have succeeded ... in making it clear, from the eloquence of the facts, that this evil is explicitly desired, calculated and executed. This impression comes from the excellent concatenation of the subjects, as well as from their importance and magnitude. And this is obvious to the reader's eyes without need for many commentaries."

**C** – Mr. Leo Daniele, October 8, 1989: "The first volume of the work you are writing enthused me and surpassed all my expectations! ... The main, most fundamental and most admirable thing was the fact that, with this first volume, you have transformed the stinky gelatin of the Vatican Council II, through the analysis of its ambiguity, into a kind of unobjectionable rock mountain over which an edifice can be constructed. Just as the bite of the serpent is cured with the venom of the same serpent, the deadly poison of ambiguity becomes the start of the remedy to quell so many disasters! Our Lady should be greatly thanked for the fact that you found such an appropriate way of approaching the subject. The quotations are stupendous, they are a veritable steam roller; the language is clear, elevated and even quite lively, although it deals with a densely doctrinal matter."

**D** – Mr. Gonzalo Guimaraens, January 13, 1992: "As I have had occasion to tell you personally ... the *cappo lavoro* [masterpiece] is magnificent! I can sincerely tell you it exceeds my expectations. In retrospect, I see now that I started reading having one question somewhat subconsciously in mind: that is, to verify if the documentation really matched the 'myth' ... Almost simultaneously, with the first 'tests' of the documentation (very positive, of course), I began to see in the successive pages the vast, serious and at the same time tragic – as tragic as possible – overall vision of the work. ... Placing myself psychologically in the skin of the adversary, I could not avoid a shudder and a gasp for air ...

"Two thoughts already began to take shape in my mind, chronologically: the *minor* but extremely important one, the quality of the documentation; and the *major* one, the vision of the ensemble. But already in the second half of the volume, a *third thought* was taking form: the ordering and concatenation of the various parts and chapters, very Plinian, very R-CR. For brevity's sake, this was the order in which I perceived the existence of these three levels, which constitute three successive frameworks of the work, which are certainly closely interwoven. Above the chronological order, the hierarchical order is, in my view, *first* the overall vision, *second*, the ordering and division of matter and *third*, the documentation."

**E** – Mr. Mauricio Vargas, February 21, 1992: "This is a supremely serious and profound work, one of the few I have seen in the Group, which unveils the tragic panorama of the Holy Church with impressive documentation and argumentation. It clarified for me personally a number of ideas and strengthened my convictions in the fight in which we have the honor to follow the *Man of the Right Hand of Our Lady* since the tragic days of the Council. This tragedy becomes clearer with the perspective of time."

## 2. Persons outside the circles of the TFP

A – One of the things that disagreeably draw attention in your attitude regarding my book is that you do not attribute importance to the Preface by Rev. Fr. Malachi Martin, SJ. The only reference to that prestigious document is the following: "You ended by making a study ... which you intend to circulate broadly – judging by the choice of the author of the Preface, precisely a writer for the masses and, moreover, with a controversial reputation among the more conservative Catholics in the United States" (p. 6, § 4).

Thus, according to you, one of the points that would discredit Fr. Martin would be that he is "a writer for the masses." Now then, what better accreditation can a writer have than his works becoming best sellers? Wasn't this always one of the goals for the books of the TFP? Don't you remember the publicity that was made when the book *Agrarian Reform – a Question of Conscience* was acclaimed for several weeks as one of the bestselling books in Brazil? Don't you remember the publicity advantage we took from the success of *Frei, the Chilean Kerensky* when it sold well to the public? What was the purpose of the dissemination of the booklet of Fatima, authored by Dr. Antonio Augusto Borelli Machado, but that it should reach the masses? Didn't the prestige that Dr. Plinio achieved for editing *The Freedom of the Church in the Communist State* come from the wide circulation of the work? So, why do you now speak with horror about a writer whose "crime" would be to write *best sellers*? In this antipathy, isn't there a bias, a prejudice?

But you throw out another apollade against this priest: He would have a controversial reputation among "the most conservative Catholics in the United States." *First*, you made no effort to specify the terms of this accusation. Who exactly are "the most conservative Catholics"? Would they be the ones above whom there are none more conservative? How many are they? What organizations do they belong to? You are quite vague.

*Second*, what happened to Fr. Martin [that caused this controversy], however, is worthy of admiration. A very capable Jesuit priest, he was chosen by Fr. Augustin Bea, later Cardinal, to be his secretary. After going back and forth, he recognized his erroneous path and became a writer, one of the exponents of the American conservative current. Do you consider it objectionable that he changed his pathway? Is it not characteristic of the true Catholic to rejoice when he sees someone return to the good path? Would this have caused consternation among "the most conservative Catholics in the United States"? Why?

I can assure you that Dr. Plinio did not share your *a priori* horror regarding Fr. Malachi Martin. I was present at a meeting where Dr. Plinio ordered Mr. Mario Navarro da Costa to look him up and try to get his support for some of our projects, which ones I no longer remember. He asked me to read and summarize the book *The Final Conclave* so that Mr. Mario Navarro could have some material to talk about with him in the visit.

But there is more. In your diatribe you do not spare me an irony. According to your figuration, I, sitting in my chair in the *Eremo de Elias* at the far end of Itaquera, would have decided which of the great intellectuals of the United States would serve to write the Preface for my book. Suppo-

sedly I would have had the list of such intellectuals drawn up and, after some hesitation, I would have chosen the "mass writer" so that I could give the impression that my book was destined for "widespread dissemination."

In fact, you jest. Do you not remember the enormous difficulties we have had in our struggles to get support? Even counting close to 2,000 members, when has the TFP had the luxury of choosing its *Preface* writers? If the TFP cannot do it, how could I – without means, grassroots and power – manage this with the ease you imagine?

No. I can guarantee you that Fr. Martin's support was not due to any personal decision of mine. Certainly, offered the opportunity, I gladly accepted it. But this was due to a series of initiatives in which it is not difficult for me to distinguish traces of a supernatural action from Someone who wanted the book to come out against all the winds and tides... But, then, we enter into the hypothesis that Providence is helping with my work. And since I know that this is not admissible for you and the current Directory of the TFP, I ask simply that you understand why I consider the possibility of you having taken the path of sarcasm...

To the point, one thing no one can deny to Fr. Malachi Martin is his intellectual capacity to make an objective critique. And it is under this title that I transcribe his words about my work, to testify in an opposite sense to what you and one of your witnesses asserted in your accusation. Indeed, he declares to anyone who wishes to read:

"This first volume of the Collection: *Eli, Eli, Lamma Sabacthani?* establishes the author Atila Sinke Guimarães as one of the best informed latter-day students of that epochal event, the Second Vatican Council. Up to this moment, the most encyclopedic and detailed informed examination of the Council was provided by Professor Amerio in his *Iota Unum*. Guimarães' Collection bids fair to replace *Iota Unum* as the best all-purpose source-book about the Council; and it is not hazardous or rash to predict that this work of Guimarães will be a standard reference work on the subject and well into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

"The title of this first volume, *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, tells exactly what the contents are. All of us who lived through the years of Vatican Two (1962-1965) and have had to deal with the consequences can recognize immediately the pinpoint accuracy of this first volume: the ambiguity, cultivated and, as it were, perfected in the composition of the 16 main documents of the Council, is now seen as the most skillful means devised to undo the essential Roman-ness and Catholicism of the Roman Catholic Church, and to deliver that entire one-billion member institutional organization into the ready and eager hands of those for whom the existence of the traditional papacy and hierarchical organization has long been anathema. One reads in this volume with a certain sickening feeling the unified way in which the Church's own theologians and prelates conspired willingly to bring about the present trend to the de-Romanization and de-Catholicizing of the once monolithic institution."

**B** – Fr. Brian Harrison, OS, is undoubtedly one of the most respected Anglo-Saxon conservative theologians. It was he, as you may recall, who gave support to Dr. Plinio and the American TFP in the defense against a defamatory campaign instigated several years ago by certain traditionalist groups in the United States. Recently, in a letter to Dr. Marian Horvat, he commented that *In the*

*Murky Waters of Vatican II* is a "fearless and timely contribution to the contemporary self-reflection of the Church." He said that the book adopts a respectful and objective position on a matter that has often been treated indelicately.

In a recent review, Fr. Harrison made this summary:

"Atila Sinke Guimarães' book is, therefore, a welcome challenge to the prevailing complacency about Vatican Council II. He puts his finger squarely on the central sore point in the contemporary Mystical Body of Christ, which most other Catholic commentators – apart from extreme traditionalists who by their exaggerations destroy their own credibility – have cautiously avoided or skirted around. ...

"Guimarães bluntly answers the question I have formulated above: Why has it been easy for liberal dissidents to claim the support of the Council for their views? Simply because the conciliar documents themselves are frequently ambiguous. The buck, Guimarães asserts, stops there."

You can see, therefore, that another well-known theologian saw more positive elements in the book than those who naturally ought to support it.

**C** – Another contribution to clarify the intellectual level of the book in question is the Foreword written by the dynamic and valorous Dr. Marian Horvat, Ph.D., President of Tradition in Action. She, together with our very dear Mr. Leo Horvat and the very Catholic Dr. Remi Amelunxen, Ph.D., played key roles in the review and publication of the work and, now, its dissemination. To her – who took as her mentor Dr. Plinio – the Catholic Cause already owes much for her disinterested dedication in the same hour when many warriors are laying down their arms. I present her Forward here only to prove that my work cannot be considered *a priori* a study "without scientific rigor" and "insufficient." Below are the elevated words with which she honored me:

"To shed light where before there was obscurity, to bring order to mayhem is a great charity that can be done by one man for another, not only in the realm of things, but also in that of events and ideas. For the last three decades, a controversy regarding Vatican Council II has engaged 'conservatives' and 'liberals' inside the Catholic Church, with the former group performing every form of intellectual gymnastics in order to comprehensively fit the 'spirit' and the 'letter' of the Council into the traditional Magisterium of the Church. At the same time, the progressivists and neo-modernists have pushed increasingly radical reforms based on this 'spirit' and 'letter' of the Council. The debate has been further confused by certain ecclesiastics, who show amazing tolerance toward heresies, yet lose their ecumenical spirit of tolerance when dealing with those who stand for Tradition.

"It is a great intellectual *tour de force* of Atila Sinke Guimarães to have prepared the eleven-volume Collection with unprecedented documentation entitled *Eli, Eli, Lamma Sabacthani?* in order to clarify and analyze with a scholarly and objective study the letter, spirit, thinking and fruits of the Second Vatican Council. Doing so, he provides us with a most important tool for the defense of the Holy Catholic Church against progressivist currents, such as the *We Are Church* movement, which is now calling for the Third Vatican Council 'to finish the work begun at Vatican Council II.' For years, faithful Catholics have struggled with the avowed ambiguities present

in the conciliar documents. Using an inductive method, Atila S. Guimarães has delimited and documented these ambiguities, their historical roots and their consequences in the impressive analysis *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*.

"The polemics over the letter and spirit of Vatican Council II have been at the center of the Church life for three decades and raise great passion on all sides of the religious/ideological spectrum. It takes great care, as well as rare courage, to stand up and speak frankly about what the Council mentors intended when hitherto there have been veiled allusions or undocumented accusations. As we reach the threshold of the new millennium with all the events and promises it portends in the ecclesiastical sphere, the work of Atila Sinke Guimarães takes on new importance and urgency.

"These last 30 years the Church has been afflicted by a particularly strange phenomenon – the fear of any comprehensive, objective critique of a controversial Council. Fear of being labeled 'integrist', 'narrow-minded,' 'close-minded' or out of synch with the Vatican has set unwritten, but predetermined, boundaries for this debate. This one-sided fear – for there is no fear on the side of the progressivists to draw ever more radical consequences from Conciliar ambiguities – has only proven its protagonists to have a profound lack of objectivity.

"And refrain not to speak in the time of salvation.' (Eccles 4: 28). Failure to define, clarify and, then, arrest doctrinal and spiritual ambiguity ultimately has been the vehicle used by the progressivists to neutralize opponents and to give free reign to dissent and heterodoxy – with all the multiform evils that this represents for Church and, consequently, temporal society. Silence and subservience in the name of respect for authority and obedience does not take into account that every disciplinary authority and every obedience presuppose the clear and unequivocal doctrinal teaching of the Holy Church.

"It is significant that the spirit of the author of *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II* is not that of a dissident, hostile to the Papacy or authority, but one of humility, love, obedience and fidelity to the Holy Catholic Church, to the Successor of Peter and to the ordinary and extraordinary teachings of the Magisterium, in whose defense he undertook this great effort. For this reason, the present work deserves the careful reading and reflection of Bishops, priests, scholars, historians and the faithful."

"Atila S. Guimarães undertook this endeavor at the request of Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, a great Catholic thinker and man of action who commissioned, directed the study, desired its publication and never feared public opinion more than God. Prof. Plinio viewed the Council not as an isolated event that ignited a great crisis, but placed it within its historical perspective. Already in 1943, Prof. Corrêa de Oliveira perceived the re-emergence of the Modernist errors in his prophetic work *In Defense of Catholic Action* and denounced those currents that would contend for control of the Second Vatican Council.

"Time has only confirmed such early perceptions, making more opportune than ever this important analysis by Atila S. Guimarães. Already in 1991, Prof. Corrêa de Oliveira sent these words of encouragement to the author: 'An enormous effort of both intelligence and will enabled the author to achieve this work for the glory of Our Lady, the Holy Church and Christian Civilization.

When published, it will constitute an irreparable blow to the forces of the Revolution that have infiltrated the Holy Church in this phase of self-demolition and the internal expansion of the smoke of Satan.'

"Thus, it seems an opportune moment for *Tradition in Action* to bring this unique study before the American public. It is in tribute to Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira and his spirit of obedience and love for the Holy Catholic Church that *Tradition in Action* publishes this work."

**D** – Dr. Remi Amelunxen, Ph.D., professor at the University of Kansas Medical Center, is a Catholic speaker and scholar who carefully follows the crisis in the Holy Church. I asked him to review Volume I from the point of view of orthodoxy, logic and clarity of exposition. On March 24, 1997, he wrote me the following words: "I received Volume I of your work a few days ago, I am on page 130. I fully approve of your approach, your writing and your analysis of this continuous disaster called the Vatican Council II. ... I was impressed by the massive research involved only in Volume I and by the clarity of its presentation. I have learned a great deal from this first reading."

**E** – The same Prof. Amelunxen wrote on April 26, 1997: "Having finished my first reading of Volume I and now well into the second, I can say unequivocally that it is unquestionably unique in the literature of Vatican II, and is the only formidable exposé of the apostasy inherent in Vatican II. Your approach to the design of Volume I is very similar to that employed by scientists in writing manuscripts or books. You outline the question to be addressed, give your procedures, present the data and draw conclusions based on the data. The consequence is a book of incredible documentation and clarity and your conclusions are constructive and totally logical. Many times in a book such as this, the author becomes vindictive and the message is partially lost; in the case of Vatican II, it is difficult not to become very angry and vindictive, and I commend your restraint. ... I think it is imperative that Volume I be published before Vatican III."

**F** – Again, from Dr. Amelunxen, on May 10, 1997: "I completed my second reading of Volume I ... What I said to you in my previous letters, I reiterate and emphasize! The drive to get the manuscript in final form is vital and must be emphasized to everyone involved. In my humble opinion, no more revisions except one, which I will cover below are necessary: Time is of the essence!"

I followed his suggestion that I introduce a part in one chapter about the *Novus Ordo Missae's* changes and had him and another professor review it.

**G** – One of the intellectuals linked to the Catholic conservative press who was given a proof of the book to read made a review for various organs. On October 8, 1997, Dr. B.O.P. wrote: "Help! Couldn't they give me a hidden hint? I just hit page 130 in *Murky*, shortly after Mr. Atila seems to make a good case that the documents were promulgated almost infallibly by Paul VI. If they are infallible, either Paul VI was not Pope or the 262 Popes before him are suspect. How will Mr. Atila clarify this point? What is becoming clear from *Murky* is the unsustainable position of conservatives who defend the Council. Conservatives treat Rahner, Congar and others with disdain, but they uphold the Council, which the same [theologians] and others made. And this Council is admitted as an attempt to hold the middle path from where the modernists wanted to go. How strange to say that Rahner, Küng, Congar, Chenu, etc. are all taboo, but that the Council is above

suspicion! The Holy Spirit used these modernists to implode the true Faith! It's the only possible conclusion for these conservatives."

**H** – A well-known Catholic intellectual, linked to the conservative press in the United States, Dr. M.M. of San Antonio, Texas, sent this comment on the book to the publisher on December 2, 1997: "I look forward to finishing the book, especially to discover 'the dangerous doctrine behind the ambiguity' of Vatican II. Any doctrine that is dangerous can only be heretical. And I have to agree with you and your author that only after Vatican II has been put in its place can we expect a 'widespread return to tradition and orthodoxy.'"

**I** – On December 26, Dr. G.D.R., an academic friend of Prof. Amelunxen, wrote to him: "What a pleasant surprise your gift was! I had read a couple of ads about the book and also the critical study on WAC, and was thinking of ordering them after the holidays. You were in some way able to step into my thoughts, for which I thank you sincerely. I started reading the book and I am already completely convinced of its merits. After having read *Iota Unum* by Amerio, I thought I would not find a comparable work for many years. This book (and the whole Collection) will surpass *Iota Unum*. It is surely needed and the timing seems perfect. I believe Catholic people are beginning to shake off the slumber – better yet, the hypnotic trance – that has prevented them from exercising their faith. This work will be a tremendous aid in restoring the people to their faith.

"I am very grateful to you for sending me this great work. I am including a personal check ... My congratulations to you, Dr. Horvat and to other Americans involved in this effort. Profound gratitude to the author and all those who helped him to make this revelation possible. Once again, thanks to you, Doctor, for your generosity and concern. May Our Lord and Our Lady bless you fully ... Let us pray that this monumental work by Atila Guimarães will help move the restoration of the Catholic Faith into high gear."

**J** – The Superior of a Congregation of brothers in New England asked that his subordinate respond to the letter in which he was offered the book in question. The response, dated December 30, 1997, included these excerpts: "Brother F.B. [Superior] received your recent letter with the enclosures and the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*. Thank you very much for sending them. Brother Superior asked me to answer the letter ... After receiving the book, Brother F.B. made a review for him and was very favorably impressed. He also assigned me to read it and see if there is something in it that we could promote. In the partial reading that I did, I was impressed by its spirit – loyalty and criticism are very well balanced – and by its academic character. M.A.B."

**K** – The same religious wrote on January 7: "I am presently on page 125 of the book ... I am very impressed. Mr. Guimarães is truly a *scholar*. His dispassionate and respectful massacre of certain sacred cows is more efficient than all the sulfuric acid found in certain traditionalist environments. We have never been favorable to those sulfuric attacks and find the position of gentleman proper to truly Catholic studies. "

**L** – Prof. W.R., of Niagara University, wrote on January 3: "I am marching slowly forward in his book and am astonished at what he reveals. I think the grave duty of being aware of its content weighs on us."

**M** – From Cincinnati, Ohio, journalist Mr. R.S.M. writes on January 5: "A couple of weeks ago I asked for a copy of *In the Murky Waters*, but I cannot remember if I sent my mailing address. In case you do not have it, now you do. I intend to make a book review and promote it! Thank you."

**N** – Another professor, Dr. H.D. of Washburn University wrote on January 9: "Atila Sinke Guimarães wrote the first volume of one of the most exhaustive studies on Vatican Council II that is available to the public. Although his analysis is penetrating and insightful, the real strength of this volume lies in the citations and references that the author so skillfully presents and makes accessible to the reader. This volume and those to come will be invaluable aids for scholars and non-scholars who wish to know what happened in the Church in the 1960s and beyond."

**O.** Intellectual and journalist Mr. J.V., on January 13 sent a letter from which I selected excerpts: "I finally finished reading *Murky Waters* (MW) and will make a favorable review in the February issue of CFN. ... I think MW will be a reference book for years to come. ... The author lets the quotations work for him, and also makes clear the position he takes, that is, of a traditional Catholic. He buries once and for all the great lie that Vatican II was perfectly orthodox, which perverse liberals later misrepresented. ... I think the work gives a magnificent sequel to books like *Pope John's Council* by Davies, *Open Letter to Confused Catholics* by Lefebvre, *Iota Unum* by Amerio etc. In fact, MW is one of the best weapons in the arsenal. Guimarães rendered a great service documenting the bad will of those who had the greatest influence on the Council. I think the book will be a superb reference book for years to come. I find it invaluable. ...

"The appendix on homosexuality is as superbly documented as the subject is horrifying. Guimarães brought together a real gold mine of quotations that prove his thesis. My favorite section is chapter IX, especially section 2, about the concessions to the modern world ... I plan to spend a lot of time studying this section as well as the rest of the book. I have sent you a list of people who will be interested in MW and who are in positions that allow them to make the book well known."

**P** – Under the title "Out of the Murk," journalist Solange Hertz published a review in *The Remnant* newspaper of January 15, 1998, with these excerpted paragraphs: "When Our Lady told Sr. Lucy of Fatima that the dogma of faith would always be preserved in Portugal, we can't help thinking her prediction included that nation's former colonies as well. Portuguese-speaking Brazil, which in the wake of the Council raised up Archbishop Castro Mayer and Dr. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira as outstanding defenders the Faith, 30 years later seems to have raised up another in Atila Sinke Guimarães. Appearing just now on the horizon is his monumental 11-volume work, *Eli, Eli, lamma sabacthani?* which applies to the Church in her present dereliction the lament uttered by her divine Master from the Cross. ...

"Undertaken at the behest of the late Dr. Plinio, founder of the Brazilian Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property, the Collection is the result of 15 years of painstaking analysis

of the letter, spirit and fruits of the Second Vatican Council. The documentation alone should earn it a permanent place on reference shelves.

"So far only the first volume has been published in English. Its title, *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, was not one coined with pejorative intent by the author. The metaphor was first employed by Council Fathers Msgr. Suenens and Msgr. Delhaye to denote the confusion generated by the constant clash of Progressivism and Conservatism which "made the waters murky" throughout the proceedings. Volume I, therefore, deals specifically with ambiguity, which was not merely "an indisputable reality," but a purposely developed strategy...

"A wealth of quotations is adduced to demonstrate how ambiguity was used to promote the progressive agenda, making it possible to convert pronouncements deemed 'pastoral' during the Council into 'dogmatic' assertions after its close ... The 60-page Appendix, an overview of 'The Catholic Church and Homosexuality,' is alone worth the price of the book."

**Q** – Fr. Charles Fiore, in a review (January 28, 1998) entitled "My God, my God, What Did the Council Do?" states: "The first thing one must understand about this stunning book by Guimarães is that it is not a screed against Vatican II, nor a polemic penned by an admitted traditionalist to discredit the Council. It is something far different, far more important and, on balance, far more valuable for sincere Roman Catholics still trying to make sense of the remains of the pre-Conciliar Church some 35 years after Vatican II than a simple analysis or critique might provide.

"What the author, a Brazilian and member of the late Professor Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira's *Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property* (TFP), has done is exhaustively to compile 11 (!) volumes of documentation – titled with the words of Jesus' lament to the Father from the Cross, 'My God, my God, why have You forsaken Me?' (Mt. 27: 47) – citing not only the conciliar documents themselves, but the writings and speeches of various fathers of the Council, its *periti* or experts, its *pre-* and *post-factum* analysts who, in their own words, explain what the Council set out to do and how.

"Guimarães' 'point of view,' if he can be said to have one, is simply to allow the Council documents and the personages who prepared and wrote them, and those who added their 'authoritative' interpretations once it had ended, to speak for themselves! *Res et periti loquuntur* – the facts and the experts speak for themselves. This is a monumental work of research and an inspired, positive stroke of genius!

"But it is not a happy picture. And it casts grave doubt on the *bona fide* of many of the members and some of the major conclusions of the Council. In a word, the authors of the major conciliar documents began by calling the Council's work 'pastoral' – i.e., not a revision of the dogmatic teachings of the Church – but once the Council had ended, they openly called its results 'dogmatic.' Then, they quite boldly affirmed that a systematic undoing of the Church's magisterial teachings not only had been their original intent, but was, in fact, Vatican II's accomplishment! ...

"And how did the Council 'subvert,' and instigate the 'auto-demolition' of the Church's Magisterium that seems to have taken Paul VI – who was present for all of it as Cardinal and Pope – by

surprise? That is the centerpiece of *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, the essential, conclusive distillate of Guimarães' work.

"In a word, the 'fathers' of the Council and their collaborators deliberately chose to conceal the lack of conformity of key Council documents with the Magisterium by means of their *ambiguity*: i.e., by use of language that is philosophically inexact, by appeals to the 'findings of modern and contemporary social sciences' and to synchronicity with 'the modern world,' that provided camouflage for attempts 'to achieve (surface) unanimity'... but positively to 'prepare the future' of the Church. ...

"The remaining chapters constitute some of the finest analysis of Vatican II's *ethos*, its rationales and theological consequences I have seen – far surpassing in scope and clarity countless articles in the journals and popular press that never address the obvious 'forest' amid the trees: the radical departure of the Second Vatican Council from the tradition that preceded and, indeed, should have anchored it. ...

"Obviously, I admire this book – both for the strength of its scholarship and its conclusions, which are the best explanation I have yet seen of what the Council did. ...

"This book is a shaft of light in the gathering storm, eminently worth the effort and should serve as a standard reference on Vatican II for years to come.

**R** – Prof. Toby Westerman, editor of the *European Addendum*, wrote a review titled "Vatican II Reexamined" in the January issue of *Catholic Family News*, from which I offer these excerpts:

"Tradition in Action, a group specializing in Catholic apologetics, has recently released the English edition of a new and valuable book, *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, by Atila Sinke Guimarães. It is the first of 11 volumes on the Second Vatican Council and its effect upon the Church. ... Mr. Guimarães' analysis is a rare combination of thorough scholarship and readability employing careful documentation while avoiding destructive polemic. ... *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II* is generously footnoted and contains an impressive bibliography; thus, the reader is given the opportunity to examine areas of particular interest with greater ease and certainty.

"The forces of chaos are never idle. Mr. Guimarães' efforts will be of particular importance as the Church enters into a period of even greater confusion and Satanic attack. The book is available at ... "

**S** – The St. Benedict Center in New Hampshire, one of the most traditional institutions in the United States, sent to its supporters in mid-February a recommendation of the book, posted on their site on the Internet. It reads: "A recently published book with the provocative title, *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, came to our notice. We would like to make our readers familiar with it and, at the same time, comment on it.

"The author is a Brazilian named Atila Sinke Guimarães and the book is published by MAETA ... Guimarães is a disciple of Professor Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, the founder of the Brazilian Society for the Preservation of Tradition, Family and Property. Prof. Plinio was among those few people who saw the writing on the wall [reference to Daniel's prophecy] even before Vatican II. His classic work *Revolution and Counter-Revolution* made a profound impact on Catholic traditionalists

fighting for the Faith in the world's most Catholic country, Brazil. Plinio's stand against the novelities of the Conciliar progressivists affected millions of Catholics, especially in Latin America.

"In the beginning of the book, Guimarães spells out his thesis, which he develops with great precision in the remaining pages. 'Ambiguity (in the Council texts) leads to a spirit of tolerance towards the world and to false religions.' He points out the obvious fact that the texts are indeed ambiguous. This he proves from the texts themselves, with corroborating evidence from the Council Fathers and *periti*. Men who run the gamut from 'conservatives' to outright radical modernists all agree that the texts are ambiguous. While some might accuse the author of rashly judging intentions, he supports his assertions with the words of the very authors of the texts and the Bishops who voted for them. The results of these ambiguities are concessions to false religions and the world – both of which were perennially understood as enemies of the Church. ...

"The book does not pretend to settle the issue of the Council. The author makes it clear that the Magisterium of the Church must make the final judgment, but he provides a wonderful resource for the work of some future Pope to infallibly separate the wheat from the chaff in the Council texts.

"One section of the book is a historical outline of the dynamics of the Council. With the science of a historian, Guimarães gives an outline that sheds considerable light on this epic tragedy in the history of the Church. The sketch follows a rigid outline, each point of which is developed in detail in the book. ... The sketch we have just cited may well serve as a history book model for years to come."

With such a significant number of letters of voluntary support, which I hope are the beginning of an even more expressive interest, **two consequences** can be drawn:

**First**, a really impressive supernatural support, when one considers that there are only approximately four persons working on the project – including the one who writes to you – who lack both a large organization to back them and the financial means to expand their action. Clearly said, whoever does not want to deny reality should admit a palpable action of Dr. Plinio – favoring the contacts, creating opportunities, giving the indispensable minimum resources.

**Second**, given the considerable number of intellectuals who have spoken about the value of the book, perhaps this adds some weight to counter your opinion and that of your two witnesses, who affirm that the book is "insufficient" intellectually speaking and "lacks scientific rigor."...

### **Conclusion on the testimonies of those who read Volume I**

One sees that the documents cited above oppose what the accusation claims – the work is insufficient from the intellectual point of view and without scientific rigor. Such opposition has its degrees.

- Everyone considered the work to have a good intellectual level.

- Those who read it in the preparatory stages naturally suggested improvements. And in this sense, they perfected its scientific rigor.
- Those who read it in the final phase were unanimous in considering that it met good intellectual standards and had scientific rigor.

#### **Conclusion of the refutation to Argument V**

- Given the Specific Refutation to the eye and ear witnesses, the Major Refutation with the texts of Dr. Plinio and the refutation based on the testimonies of those who read Volume I after the eye witness, it is seen that the charge of this Argument V does not stand. That is, the argument has no dialectical value, which is synonymous with being null and void.

#### **Consequence**

- The author, however, does not want to draw as a necessary consequence that his work is "wholly satisfactory," as you fear (cf. p. 6, §3). Any correction deemed appropriate that you, any member of the Directory or those who have probably helped with the writing of your missive find in it will be included in the next edition.

\*

## ARGUMENT VI

### DR. PLINIO WANTED THE WORK TO BE ANALYZED BY INTERNAL REVISORS, THEN TO REVIEW IT HIMSELF, AND AFTERWARDS TO SEND IT TO THEOLOGIANs, WHICH WAS NOT DONE

#### Proof in the text of the Accusation

\* "In these conversations he [Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira] insisted especially on the fact that our late and dear Founder did not desire the work to be published before he himself reviewed it in its entirety" (p. 1, § 2).

\* "A review to be made by high caliber theologians, after Prof. Plinio himself had made one, was already desired by him still in life [sic!]" (p. 1, § 4).

\* "Wouldn't these words [Dr. Plinio's praise of my work on the Council inserted in the book I published]... imply the disregarding of a personal editing of Dr. Plinio that he still hoped to make in France In 1993? Wouldn't it also imply disregarding the editing by qualified theologians that he also desired?" (p. 2, § 3).

\* "You could allege in your defense that ... the text of your letter of February 27, 1997 demonstrates your readiness to respond to any objections, clarify any doubts, or even be corrected, as well as your willingness to submit to consultations to theologians."

"We do not doubt the sincerity of your general intention. However, we had reason to fear that, in the actual correction of this or that paragraph, you would reject the observations submitted to you, as had happened in the past with all the reviewers. ... Feeding this fear was your desire ... that your work not be submitted to Dr. Paulo Brito on the grounds that his sense of objectivity left much to be desired and whose 'scruples of conscience' would make the road of review quite bumpy" (p. 6, § 2).

\* "I, Fernando Antúnez Aldunate, having been the private secretary of Professor Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira from the end of 1977 until his death, present the following recollections:

"After the hypothesis of Mr. Atila making more than one research was delineated, Dr. Plinio always spoke about a review by several theologians. Mr. Atila raised all kinds of impediments and insisted that he should choose them and be present. He also made strong demands regarding the (internal) TFP reviewers, vetoing this one and indicating another, and did this repeatedly.

"Until the end of his life Dr. Plinio spoke of going to review Mr. Atila's work in some isolated place, and then present it to theologians and finally to the Vatican in opportune conditions" (Statement by Mr. Fernando Antúnez, header and nn.7,8).

\* "Mr. Atila continually insisted that Dr. Plinio read his work, seeking an approval. A task virtually impossible to carry out. Dr. Plinio was too busy, and he would have to leave the direction of the TFP for a long time to devote himself to reading such a voluminous work" (Statement by Mr. Nelson Fragelli, p. 2, § 8).

## Order of the accusation

You see that the accusation you made, even after selecting the main paragraphs in which it appears, is somewhat scrambled. I will try to order it and, then, respond to you clearly. Allow me not to repeat the source for each Item. To confirm it you need only make the effort to check the texts above. I will simply give the initials of each witness to facilitate the search. I suggest to you the following order:

### 1. Regarding the review of other members of the TFP:

\* The author made "strong demands regarding the (internal) TFP reviewers, vetoing this one and indicating another, and did this repeatedly." (FA).

\* You and the other Directory members "had reason to fear that, in the actual correction of this or that paragraph, the author would reject the observations submitted to him, as had happened in the past with all the reviewers."

And, further, "feeding this fear was your [the author's] desire ... that your work not be submitted to Dr. Paulo Brito on the grounds that his sense of objectivity left much to be desired and whose 'scruples of conscience' would make the road of review quite bumpy." (LN).

### 2. Regarding the review of theologians:

\* Dr. Plinio wanted "a review to be made by high caliber theologians" (LN).

"After the hypothesis of Mr. Atila making more than one research was delineated, Dr. Plinio always spoke about a review by several theologians. Mr. Atila raised all kinds of impediments and insisted that he should choose them and be present" (FA).

\* You ask whether the words of praise that Dr. Plinio addressed to me would "imply disregarding the editing by qualified theologians that he also desired?" (LN).

\* And you acknowledge that the author "could allege in his defense that ... the text of his letter of February 27, 1997 demonstrates ... his willingness to consult theologians" (LN).

### 3. Regarding the review by Dr. Plinio:

\* You attest that Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira "insisted especially on the fact that our late and dear Founder did not desire the work to be published before he himself reviewed it in its entirety" (LN).

\* You ask whether Dr. Plinio's words of praise for the work would "imply the disregarding of a personal editing of Dr. Plinio that he still hoped to make in France in 1993." (LN).

\* "Until the end of his life, Dr. Plinio spoke of going to review Mr. Atila's work in some isolated place" (FA).

\* "Mr. Atila continually insisted that Dr. Plinio read his work, seeking an approval. A task virtually impossible to carry out: Dr. Plinio was too busy, and he would have had to leave the direction of the TFP for a long time to devote himself to reading such a voluminous work" (NF).

4. *The conclusion of the Accusation* would be: Since the author did not permit anyone from the TFP to review his work, did not allow it to be sent to theologians, and it was not reviewed by Dr. Plinio, the work could not be published.

### **Refutation of Argument VI**

The nature of this Argument VI is somewhat different from the previous ones. I do not deny that Dr. Plinio wanted the work to be reviewed by internal analysts and by professional theologians, as well as that he wanted to review it himself. Thus, a presentation of texts would be meaningless. Therefore, in refutation of this argument I will only make a specific refutation, responding to the charges in the order I suggested above.

### **Specific refutation**

#### **1. Regarding the internal (TFP) reviewers**

**A** - At various points in the refutation of the previous arguments, I made it clear that I agreed to accept the revision of several members of the TFP. I will not return to those points. You or one of your auxiliaries can easily find them.

**B** - To deal once and for all with the question of whether I accept reviewers, permit me to say that I have established as a norm between those who helped me and myself to not deal orally with suggestions for revision. Thus, I have with me most of the written observations of Wilson Gabriel da Silva, Renato Murta Vasconcelos, Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli and Paulo Roberto Rosa, who constituted the closest team that reviewed the initial volumes. Several volumes with corrections have been burned, since, on Volume I alone, we worked with around 15 typewritten copies. Even so, what I kept in my archive is sufficient to demonstrate what I affirm.

After the review of the first team, another was selected – with the full approval of Dr. Plinio – to review my work; its members were Dr. Murillo Maranhão Galliez, Mr. Juan Gonzalo Larrain Campbell and Mr. Miguel Beccar Varela. I retain the originals of all the observations of these reviewers, as well as the indication of the ones I accepted. In addition, the following persons read various volumes of the work – I indicate in parenthesis the number of volumes: Mr. Leo Daniele (5), Mr. Severiano Antônio de Oliveira (5), Mr. Enrique Loaiza (5), Mr. Maurício Vargas Leon (3), Mr. Leo Anthony Horvat (1), Mr. Orlando Lira (1), Mr. Ronaldo Baccelli (1), Mr. Carlos Eduardo Schaffer (1) and Mr. Luis Fernando Stamm de Barros (1).

I asked each one to put his observations in writing, but only the first four did. I accepted as many as possible. I regret that I was unable to read Mr. Mauricio Vargas's comments because of a lack of time. After this, I further asked Mr. Gonzalo Guimaraens to criticize the first volumes (4). He did so and left his observations in writing. I attended to all that I considered pertinent, which constituted the greater part of them.

Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira also read Volume I and made several observations of his own, which I also kept, most of which I accepted. About those that were not clear, I asked him to

meet with me to discuss them, preferably outside of São Paulo, so that I could understand what he wanted. I invited him three times without receiving a response. Below, I reproduce the last written invitation I sent him. It is an excerpt from the letter of February 27, 1997, that you mention in reference to another topic:

"You [Dr. Plinio Xavier] will certainly remember that after the meeting on my work that we had – with you Dr. Eduardo, Dr. Caio and me (July 25, 1996) – I proposed to the three of you that you read the work and make corrections. Dr. Eduardo and Dr. Caio could not read it, although I left the first volume on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor [where they lived] for about three months for this purpose. You, thanks be to God, honored me with a reading and your suggestions. Several of them have already been incorporated into the text, enriching it. Others, which you posed as questions, await the opportunity of a conversation between us so that I can understand your thinking better. I have suggested two or three times that we go outside São Paulo to accomplish this task with greater profit. I renew my proposal here" (p. 1, § 5).

Permit me, in passing, to manifest my surprise that you did not take into account this paragraph, which makes it clear that I attended to the recommendations of at least one of the reviewers, precisely the one you use against me in the letter, which affirms that I would not accept *any* reviewer: "As had happened in the past with all the reviewers."

Of the mentioned reviewers, except for the closest team, the only one who, after the initial revisions, returned the text of Volume I to check the contexts of the citations was Dr. Murillo Galliez. After he did this, he told me that his suggestions for the first review had been incorporated into the book and that he had no more observations.

In addition to the Portuguese language reviewers, there were others in English. In fact, José Aloisio Schelini, a translator from Portuguese into English, always freely made comments on improving the original wording. The three intellectuals external to the TFP boards to whom I submitted my text in English – Dr. Remi Amelunxen, Ph.D., Dr. Marian Horvat, Ph.D. and Dr. William Mitchell, MD – had full liberty to make any suggestions they wanted.

What is more, Dr. Amelunxen – in addition to numerous written observations, most of which I accepted and whose originals I have with me – proposed that I introduce a commentary on the reform of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, to which I gladly agreed. Today this addition to the text is titled Letter A, Item 1 of Chapter IX, consisting of 23 pages. Dr. Mitchell passed on his remarks to Mr. Schelini, who introduced them with my full acquiescence. Dr. Horvat made a thorough linguistic review and suggested changes. I was in almost daily contact with her until the final proof was ready. I accepted most of her corrections and observations. Besides the precious contribution of these intellectuals, the work was presented to Fr. Malachi Martin for review. He stated that, from this point of view, he had nothing to correct.

This is a general picture of the revisions through which Volume I of my work has passed.

If you or your consultants would have contacted me, I would have shown them an imposing archive in which they would find – written in their own hands – a large part of the observations made by said reviewers that today are included in the published text.

It is firmly demonstrated, therefore, that the accusation that I do not accept the corrections of reviewers does not correspond to the truth. And anyone who launches it against me would seem culpable of the vice of denying the elementary evidence of the facts and, thus, be considered guilty of bad faith. The bad faith, which seems patent in this argument, projects suspicion over the other allegations.

**C.** The objurgation of Mr. Fernando Antúnez that the author wanted to choose the reviewers himself is set out with infantile and untruthful connotations: "He also made strong demands regarding the (internal) TFP reviewers, vetoing this one and indicating another, and did this repeatedly."

*First*, there is nothing unusual about an author choosing the reviser that better suits him. *Second*, I have already described an agreement made between Dr. Plinio and myself establishing that my reviewers be chosen by me, so there is nothing surprising in this (see Argument V, 1<sup>st</sup> specific refutation. n. 7, *Probable Omission*). *Third*, it is not true that I chose and vetoed my reviewers "repeatedly." For it is well known that I worked with only one team throughout the writing. The only substitution made was that of Mr. Nelson Fragelli by Mr. Paulo Roberto Rosa, at the request of the former.

**D** - You draw Dr. Paulo Corrêa de Brito from the placid comfort in which he usually situates himself to bring him to the accusatory arena. I want to state that the initiative in this attack was not mine and that I am only dealing with it here for the benefit of my defense.

You act shocked at my request that he not be a reviewer of the work, considering this request as one of the reasons for rejecting my suggestion of other reviewers chosen by the current Directory. Permit me, then, to justify my request.

I have two unfortunate precedents involving revisions with Dr. Paulo Corrêa de Brito that I will relate.

**a.** In 1981-1982, Dr. Plinio asked me to research the Popes who fell into heresy or serious delicts, whether canonical or liturgical, and to prepare articles to publish in *Catolicismo* magazine. It was not difficult for me to find 18 cases up to the 12<sup>th</sup> century, since Church History was a subject I had been studying to corroborate certain theses in the MNF. Dr. Plinio's objective in asking for this series of articles was to clearly present antecedents that would justify a possible position of his or the TFP.

I wrote three or four articles. At that time Dom Antonio de Castro Mayer was with us. After the review of Dr. Plinio, he re-read the articles and, then, Dr. Paulo Brito [who was the director of *Catolicismo*] published them without problems.

After the first articles, however, Dom Mayer distanced himself. Dr. Plinio reviewed and approved the next one to be published: the dispute between St. Augustine and St. Aurelius on the one side, and Pope St. Zosimus on the other. The latter favored Pelagius and was fighting with the African Bishops. Dr. Paulo Brito did not feel secure with the corrections of Dr. Plinio. He asked for the review of another person, whose name I see no need to bring in here. That person vetoed the Collection of Church History on which I based myself, the famous work [*Histoire de*

*l'Église* – 24 volumes] coordinated by Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin. He affirmed that they were superficial authors. Dr. Paulo Brito closed the question: The article could not be published.

Dr. Plinio reviewed the article twice more. But this was not enough to satisfy Dr. Paulo Brito. At the time, Mr. Paulo Henrique Chaves, in charge of the Bureau of the TFPs in Rome, sought out, at my request, one of the greatest historians of the Vatican and asked him for his opinion on the aforementioned Collection. The Prelate assured him that the *History of the Church* in question was a prestigious and reliable work. Dr. Paulo Brito remained unmoved.

The Vatican historian made a written statement saying that the work was sound. Nothing changed the position of the Director of *Catolicismo*. I spoke with Dr. Plinio and he declared himself unable to dissuade Dr. Paulo Brito. What was the reason alleged by Dr. Paulo Brito? A "problem of conscience" that no one could overcome: He did not feel safe in publishing, under his responsibility and without an episcopal guarantee, an article that related the precedent of a Pope who supported a heretic.

Now then, what writer would want to have such a reviewer again for his works? Wasn't it normal for me to ask that Dr. Paulo Brito no longer be my reviewer?

**b.** Another case involved my article against Msgr. John Quinn, published in December 1996. Dr. Plinio Xavier asked me if I would accept a review by Dr. Paulo Brito. After some reluctance, I agreed. On the day and place chosen – November 14 of that year, in my office, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor – we were both present. As soon as he sat down, Dr. Paulo Brito said these words to me: "I would like you to know that my review will be based on a problem of conscience: Your article can not entail – in the near or distant future – any obligation for the TFP to issue an opinion on Vatican II."

I said nothing. The review began and I accepted the suggestions he made – all of them, if I remember correctly. After about an hour of his observations, with me following and introducing them in the text, Dr. Paulo Brito declared to me another problem of conscience: Since Msgr. Quinn favored the doctrine of collegiality expressed in *Lumen gentium* – a 80-page conciliar document – Dr. Paulo Brito did not feel secure about accepting my criticism of the Prelate without studying *Lumen gentium* in detail. The perspective was worrisome: If he had raised the difficulties mentioned above in *letter a* just to review a newspaper article denouncing flagrant errors, what would the analysis of a long and sensitive document such as *Lumen gentium* entail?

I offered Dr. Paulo Brito a solid argument that could quiet his conscience: I told him that the doctrine of collegiality had been the subject of a Preliminary Note in *Lumen gentium* itself, assuring that it should be understood in the traditional sense. This did not change his position. In order to avoid an eventual lack of objectivity and prevent Dr. Paulo Brito from imagining that this American prelate was an academic scholar concerned about subtle sophistic problems, I pointed out that Msgr. Quinn was a kind of American Dom Helder Camara, turned far more toward action than study. Further, his actions were suspicious because he supported the most radical progressivist movements. In addition, he had been relieved of his duties as Archbishop of San Francisco because of two lawsuits accusing him of complicity in acts of homosexuality and misappropriation of funds.

I also showed him several articles from the American press that substantiated the very same error I attributed to him. Dr. Paulo Brito remained indifferent.

Finally – a weighty argument – I reminded him that the point of doctrine that made him insecure had been formally defined by Vatican I, that is: The Pope has the plenitude of the power of jurisdiction without the need for the Bishops. Nothing moved him. Such are the facts.

Permit me a moment of analysis. If a reviewer of the importance of Dr. Paulo Brito starts out by stating that, because of a problem of conscience, he cannot, in the near or distant future, do anything that might cause the TFP to take a position on Vatican II, what does this signify? That the Directory had decided to no longer combat Vatican II? That the TFP would no longer attack Progressivism? The position of Dr. Paulo Brito leaves one much to think about... Especially for a person who was entrusted by Dr. Plinio to write a work against Vatican II.

These are the two antecedents that led me to request in polite terms that Dr. Paulo Brito not be on the list of my reviewers. These are the words I addressed to Dr. Plinio Xavier, reminding him of what we had agreed upon:

"You asked me, then, if I would agree that it [the work] be read by members of the *Vínculo Profético*, and also by the Colonel, Mr. Fernando and Mr. Ureta. You will recall that I accepted without any obstacle. I raised only one small difficulty with regard to our dear Dr. Paulo Brito, who is so rich in virtues but whose sense of objectivity, in my judgment, could be improved and whose scruples of conscience make the road of revision quite bumpy." (November 27, 1997, p. 1, § 2)

I could not find more polite terms to recall the two precedents I had reported to Dr. Plinio Xavier.

Now then, in your quoted words, you discovered a new proof that I would not accept any revision: "In addition to this fear, your desire ... that your work not be submitted to Dr. Paulo Brito." In the same letter in which I, to show good will, submitted my work to eight new reviewers, who were clearly less competent than the previous ones, and asked only to be spared the revision of one, how can one find evidence that I would not accept the revisions? Doesn't your conclusion seem a little exaggerated? Had Dr. Plinio Xavier forgotten to recount the two precedents I described to him about Dr. Paulo Brito? Or did he transmit them, but you also consider it a problem of conscience to take a public stand on Vatican II? This is a fundamental question of importance to be clarified. So important that it even commands your whole position in relation to my book.

## **2. Regarding the review of theologians**

**A** - Undoubtedly Dr. Plinio wanted my work to be submitted to the opinion of theologians. We have already dealt with this several times. Some specifications, however, commanded the question of revision:

**a.** Given the universal influence of Progressivism in the Church and given that even conservative theologians suffer serious restrictions against fully expressing their convictions, it would be diffi-

cult for us to find some theologian of fame who would endorse the whole of the work as it is conceived. He feared sanctions would inevitably fall on it.

**b.** This situation required us, therefore, to avoid presenting the whole work for revision. We would only present the specific points that caused us doubts.

**c.** The presentation of these points would be a simple matter since the work only deals with more delicate doctrinal questions from Volume VI on. Until then the consultations should require fairly quick responses.

\* The consultations should be preceded by the author speaking to the theologian to avoid the latter taking as presupposition data that possibly come from a school of thought different from his. At previous consultations, there had been unpleasant precedents of clash of opinions of schools, which prejudiced valuable theological contacts. After the preliminary conversation, the author would compose a written consultation and present it.

**d.** The author of the work would be present at the time of the consultation to give any necessary clarifications on details not included in the text of the consultation. Further, his presence would enable him to speak again to the specialist some days later, after he had discussed with Dr. Plinio whether there were other points to be clarified.

These were the specifications that Dr. Plinio established.

The topic of the consultations, I should present to him.

**B** - Several times I approached Dr. Plinio and volunteered to make the necessary theological consultations. At the beginning Dr. Plinio had been very concerned about having the work reviewed from this point of view; however, after the detailed reminder I gave of the approach he had directed me to take in the first five volumes, as well as the subject matter that was actually dealt with, he was quite relieved.

Indeed, anyone who pages through Volume I or the other first four volumes will not find many delicate theological issues in the writing. And, in the points that appear, the work adopts a traditional position of the Catholic Magisterium, a position clearly expressed in Encyclicals, glossed by sound manuals and often even taught in the Catechism. For example, Volume I addresses the issue of homosexuality as a symptom of the crisis of customs that is raging in the Church. The part of Catholic Doctrine regarding homosexuality used in the work is usually expressed in the Catechism. Is it necessary to consult a theologian about this? Obviously, the answer is: no.

**C** - What are the doctrinal points that Volume I addresses? As reference I quote the English edition.

**a.** There is an exposition on the *sensus fidelium* (cf. General Introduction, note 1). This matter is what in Catholic teaching is called a *quaestio disputata*, that is, a problematic question that is still in the phase of theological elaboration, open to discussion among the various schools. The official Magisterium of the Church has not yet officially pronounced on it. This matter, therefore, enjoys a relative liberty. In the text, the author's position is sufficiently documented in the schools and doctors. In principle, it is not necessary to consult theologians on this matter.

**b.** There is an explanation about the right and duty of the Catholic to resist the orders of ecclesiastical authority that are dangerous to the Faith and objectively wrong (cf. *ibid.*, note 3). This matter was drawn from the part dealing with a heretical Pope in the book by Dr. Arnaldo Vidigal Xavier da Silveira. Only two or three passages were added that were not there. This doctrine is proven practically by the transcription of passages that speak for themselves, without the need for discursive exposition. Therefore, it is matter that dispenses with the need for consultation with a theologian. In addition, the aforementioned book was published some 30 years ago, was freely circulated in the theological milieu, and received no significant refutation.

**c.** There is a mention of *peccatum taciturnitatis*, that is, the sin committed by those who should speak but remain silent in certain situations, such as the current crisis of the Church (cf. *ibid.*, note 4). It is a simple transcription of two passages of Vincent de Beauvais. It does not seem to bear need for consultation.

**d.** There are transcriptions of excerpts of John Paul II, Vatican II documents and conciliar theologians on the new doctrine that would apply to us, on the role to be played by the laity in the Church (cf. *ibid.*, §§ 7-10, notes 5-9). They are pronouncements that fall under the responsibility of the authors who made them. The topic does not seem to warrant consultation.

**e.** There is a transcription of pontifical texts proving that the Catholic Church is identified with the Church of Christ (cf. Chapter I, note 1). This does not seem to warrant consultation.

**f.** There is a list of the teachings of the Popes against the principles of the French Revolution, against Liberalism, Naturalism and Religious Indifferentism, and against Socialism and Communism (cf. *ibid.*, note 14). This does not seem to warrant consultation.

**g.** There is an exposition on the concept of the Church by St. Robert Bellarmine, later adopted by the Council of Trent and by the whole Magisterium (cf. Chapter VI, §§ 3f). This does not seem to warrant consultation.

**h.** There is an exposition on the concessions to Protestantism represented by the reform of the *Novus Ordo Missae* (cf. Chapter IX, §§ 21-46). This matter was summarized or transcribed *ipsis verbis* from the book on the Mass of Dr. Arnaldo Xavier. If it warranted consult with theologians, he had already done so.

**i.** There is, as I said, an exposition of the Church's teaching on homosexuality (see Appendix, §§ 6-26). It does not seem to warrant consulting theologians.

Excepting a more accurate analysis, there is nothing else that could be a topic for consultations. There are, without a doubt, a conjunct of hermeneutical, strategic, institutional, sociological, historical and other focuses that aim to give the reader a general picture of the progressivist current and to demonstrate – based on credible authors – the willful ambiguity that Vatican II assumed in the texts of its official documents and in its post-conciliar applications. However, they are not directly doctrinal subjects and, therefore, do not need consultations. There are also expositions of progressivist theses duly based on the authors themselves, which obviously cannot be the subject of consultation with conservative theologians, since they do not compromise the orthodoxy of our position.

It is understandable, therefore, that Dr. Plinio, seeing that there was not much need for consultations in the first five volumes, was relieved and, after my exposition, rarely returned to the subject. I remember that in 1993, I suggested that I should go to Europe for such consultations. He preferred to wait.

**D** - Permit me a moment of reflection here. Given these facts - principally the lack of material for revision in the subject matter of Volume I - can you not see the emptiness of the ruckus you raised over the theological reviews? Why such a commotion? Wouldn't it have been better, to safeguard your prestige, to go directly to the written text and see objectively whether there was material that needed to be reviewed rather than to seek out ear witnesses to attest that Dr. Plinio always wanted theological reviewers?

Since you did not do this, where is the common sense, the sense of fairness and justice that a TFP member has the right to expect to find in his President? Do you see that your attitude, impugning me for rejecting an unnecessary revision and threatening me with violent measures, is completely removed from the reality, hovering in the air for anyone to see, dripping with partiality and prejudice?

**E** - Instead of a serious and objective concern for justice, we find you engaged in releasing solemn declarations against me. I turn my eyes to two testimonies that are attached to your mis-sive, in the part that addresses the issue of theological revision.

In the *first declaration*, one reads: "I, Fernando Antúnez Aldunate, having been the private secretary of Professor Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira from the end of 1977 until his death ... present the following recollections:

"After the hypothesis of Mr. Atila making more than one research was delineated, Dr. Plinio always spoke about a review by several theologians. Mr. Atila raised all kinds of impediments and insisted that he should choose them and be present. He also made strong demands regarding the (internal) TFP reviewers, vetoing this one and indicating another, and did this repeatedly. Until the end of his life Dr. Plinio spoke of going to review Mr. Atila's work in some isolated place, and then present it to theologians and finally to the Vatican in opportune conditions" (Statement by Mr. Fernando Antúnez, header and nn. 7,8).

There is a serious inaccuracy here, which borders on untruth. Since 1991 Mr. Fernando Antúnez has been in France and is the secretary of Dr. Caio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira. He came to Brazil every six months and spent between 20 days and a month here. That is, in fact he was no longer the secretary of Dr. Plinio. The latter maintained him in a position of honor, agreeing that when he was here he would carry out some of his old services, especially those relating to France. Such a situation, which we all viewed with benevolence, becomes suspicious when it is alleged as a guarantee that he would know everything that Dr. Plinio desired. This is the case of his testimony on the theological review.

Why this nervous and underscored affirmation that Dr. Plinio would have always said what is convenient for Mr. Antunez? Could it be that, in the other 10 months of the year, Dr. Plinio might have told me several things that Mr. Antunez did not know about? Or even, when he was here, did he scrutinize the life of Dr. Plinio so closely that he could guarantee that nothing es-

caped his vigilance? One sees, therefore, that the *status* alleged by Mr. Antunez and the way his "information" is leaked make him suspicious of bad faith.

*The second declaration*, which will also be analyzed in the item below, reads: "Mr. Atila continually insisted that Dr. Plinio read his work, seeking an approval. A task virtually impossible to carry out: Dr. Plinio was too busy, and he would have had to leave the direction of the TFP for a long time to devote himself to reading such a voluminous work" (NF).

Of itself, it is a banal statement that merits no attention. However, when compared with the previous one, it reveals a curious disparity. *In the first*, one notes the indirect statement that I would be fleeing the reviews – "Mr. Atila raised all kinds of impediments" – Dr. Plinio's review would also seem to be included in this "flight." *In the second*, there is the indirect assertion that I became annoying to Dr. Plinio with my constant insistence that he review my work. Considered objectively, the comparison shows that one of the two indirect accusations is false. From the point of view of justice, one could appropriately say that I am being accused of having a dog and not having a dog...

**F** - Since Dr. Plinio is no longer among us, I addressed myself, through Dr. Plinio Xavier, to the Directors of the TFP to assure them that I was still willing to consult with the theologians and placed myself at their disposal for such. My letter is dated February 27, 1997. Until your letter, which was delivered to me on November 27, 1997, I had had no news about what the Directory had decided on these consultations. Although I was in regular contact with Dr. Plinio Xavier, nine months passed without the least response – for a matter I could have resolved in about 20 days. That is, in these 20 days I could have consulted with them on all the necessary points for the whole work.

If the Directory and you were seriously concerned about the publication of my work and, therefore, its orthodoxy, would it not have been more coherent to attend to my suggestion to make a trip to carry out the review [the consultations with theologians]? If you were silent for nine months in face of this respectful suggestion to make the consultations, I ask you the favor to answer this question: Why do you claim now to be surprised and present me as insubordinate?

### **3. Regarding the review of Dr. Plinio**

I will leave the question of Dr. Plinio's revision of Volume I for Argument VII. Here I will address only the last instructions he left me, days before traveling to the *Eremo do Amparo de Nossa Senhora* and, afterwards, being admitted to the Hospital.

**A** - I do not deny that Dr. Plinio has always talked about reviewing the work. If it were not for the law suit that was made in 1993 in Rio Grande do Sul, we would have gone to France then for that purpose. Of this fact all the TFP members are witnesses. During the course of the process, we had often talked about the review. However, today I note that from mid-1994 onward he had no longer touched on the subject.

**B** - I have already mentioned the last two written documents, reviewed by Dr. Plinio, in which he suggested mentioning the coming publication of my work (cf. Major refutation of Argument I,

12). These mentions are in a letter of my own to Dom Estêvão Bettencourt and a letter the four priests in the northern part of the State of Rio de Janeiro directed to Cardinal Antonio Innocenti. The first one is dated July 27, 1995, the second August 8, 1995.

In the letter to Dom Bettencourt, Dr. Plinio ordered the following words be introduced regarding the publication of the work: "With regard to the first and major base of your argument, namely, that the TFP has restrictions about Vatican II and the post-conciliar Church, I can assure you that, in order to respond to this gratuitous statement, **the TFP has in preparation a very hefty study elucidating the subject, which will be made available to the public as soon as the final preparations are completed.**"

In the letter to Cardinal Innocenti, he suggested the following final words on the same subject: "We have to say that during the time that elapsed between our first dialogue with His Excellency D. Corso (June 25, 1991) and the first of his violent letters declaring us schismatic (May 30, 1995), we did not stop studying the points of Vatican II *'qua difficulter conciliari possunt cum declarationibus Magisterii praecedentis'* [which can hardly be reconciled with the previous declarations of the Magisterium].

"This was when we learned about the work of a Brazilian writer, a lay Catholic, a member of the TFP who since mid-1982 has been preparing a detailed analysis of Vatican II. **We entered into contact with him and were shown a work of many volumes already in the process of being published – lacking only the necessary retouching, revisions, indexes, etc., which may require some more time.** We verify it to be an extremely serious study that attends to our needs. And we are certain that when it becomes public, it will be seen that the size of the work fully justifies the delay in its preparation."

**C** - With regard to the corrections introduced by Dr. Plinio into this last letter at the end of July and the beginning of August 1995 concerning the parts that dealt with the work of the Council, which were initially more vague but later made more forceful and pointed towards an approaching publication, I asked him this question (words reproduced from memory, after the fact):

Mr. Atila: "Why do you mention publishing the Collection soon?"

Dr. Plinio: "Because I am determined to do it, as soon as it is ready."

Mr. Atila: "But it is ready..."

Dr. Plinio: "In this case, it will come out soon."

Mr. Atila: "As an estimate, as a reference point for the practical measures I should take, when would you imagine the publication [will be]?"

Dr. Plinio: "I would like it to be done in about five or six months, by the end of the year."

Mr. Atila: "But what about the review? You said you would like to review the various volumes."

Dr. Plinio: "You will be amazed at the review I am going to make. Because I have paid close attention to everything you have done and exposed to me about the Council – you see I have been asking many questions lately – and I note that things are pretty well done. You know me and you

know that with these data I calculate the standard of a work. I am sure that I will have few things to touch up."

In fact, Dr. Plinio had requested that I give two presentations [for the whole TFP] in the auditorium on ecclesiastical rebellion; one presentation for him on the Encyclical *Ut unum sint* and another on the Apostolic Letter *Tertio millennium adveniente*; a four-day symposium for priest friends of TFP with morning, afternoon and evening meetings; a series of four presentations on homosexuality in Catholic milieus in the auditorium [for the whole TFP], a letter to Dom Bettencourt and the advice to priests in the letter to Cardinal Innocenti. This was in addition to numerous conversations about the work, in which he questioned me about the various themes of the work and the way of approaching them.

The words that I quoted constitute the testament he bequeathed to me regarding the work.

Since he had decided that the Collection should go to press soon and said that he would only make small adjustments, I decided to carry out his will. And having found no one to support me, I undertook the project under my own responsibility.

Is there some statutory prohibition of the present day Directory stating that I could not exercise this right?

Whether I did it with or without the knowledge of the Directory will be dealt with in the Refutation of Thesis II.

This was what he said at the end of July/beginning of August 1995.

**D** - Allow me to put to test one of the proofs you employed in your missive as a basis for your accusation. The part with Mr. Nelson Fragelli's statement that addresses the issue of Dr. Plinio's review has already been tested in Item 2.E.

You state with grandeur: "In these conversations he [Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira] insisted especially on the fact that our late and dear Founder did not desire this work to be published before he himself reviewed it in its entirety." It would not be necessary to cite such a qualified witness to prove what everyone knew. You verified that I do not deny that this was a desire of Prof. Plinio.

There is only one flaw in your proof. It is that Dr. Plinio Xavier did not affirm this. To please you, I say that the possibility of your statement being objective is no more than one in a thousand. The demonstration is not arduous.

*First*, because Dr. Plinio Xavier, in dealing with me, rarely referred to Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, and I would remember this exception, as I remember the few practical references to Prof. Plinio he made and one theoretical one. In the former, he and Mr. Martim Afonso Xavier da Silveira discussed with pleasure in my presence how *the mailing* would fully realize the counter-revolutionary ideals of Prof. Plinio. This exception occurred at a luncheon on Saturday, December 28, 1996, at *Bolinha* restaurant. I do not recall any other.

*Second*, on the contrary, I recall that I repeated innumerable times to Dr. Plinio Xavier the words of Prof. Plinio about his decision to publish the work by the end of 1995 after a summary review, reproduced above, and that Dr. Plinio Xavier invariably skirted away from the subject.

*Third*, at other times, when I spoke of Prof. Plinio, for the simple pleasure of remembering him, my comments were received with a vacuum and silence.

*Fourth*, because I keep a written record of my contacts with Dr. Plinio Xavier and there I would have recorded the singular fact of him saying something about Prof. Plinio.

Thus, your assertion is not objective. Dr. Plinio Xavier never insisted with me that Prof. Plinio did not want the publication; he simply did not address the case.

Judging by this fact, one can see that you were not very rigorous in the examination of your sources. And you appear to accept them as truthful for the simple fact that they come from your friends and testify against the one you want to incriminate.

### **Conclusion of Refutation of Argument VI**

I conclude the refutation of this Argument VI saying that:

- There is no basis for the charge that I did not accept the observations of the internal reviewers, because it denies the evidence of the facts.
- The charge that I rejected the revision of theologians is senseless, since there is no material in Volume I that required such a review.
- Furthermore, it was demonstrated that I was prepared to go forward with the reviews that could be done and that they were not carried out because the Directory did not want them.
- Prof. Plinio's last words on the work speak of a very light revision, contrary to what he had previously said; therefore, the idea that he still wanted to review it thoroughly is not objective.

\*

## ARGUMENT VII

### THE AUTHOR REFUSED THE REVIEW OF DR. PLINIO FOR VOLUME I

#### **Proof in the text of the Accusation**

\* "Already in the editing of the first volume at a Symposium held in Serra Negra in 1986, Dr. Plinio was not at all satisfied with the quality of the writing. Beginning with the title - *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* - which you intended to give it and which was the subject of a long exposition of our Founder during the said Symposium, trying in vain to convince you to change it. On the contrary, according to your assistants, you preferred to add to your work a quotation that aimed exclusively at justifying the title you had imagined for the work and which you insisted on keeping.

"What happened with the title occurred with many of the observations that Dr. Plinio made during this editing, whether in regard to some formulations, to interpretations of texts that seemed forced to him, or to simple errors of Portuguese. After the Symposium, he told some close associates that it was entirely useless, since you defended each comma like a couple defending their only child.

"Mr. Nelson Fragelli wrote the solemn declaration that I have enclosed, in which he relates such confidences. The veracity of the assessment contained in this declaration is confirmed by the testimony of those who, over the years, have collaborated in your work" (p. 4, §§ 5, § 5, § 1).

\* "We had reason to fear that, in the actual correction of this or that paragraph, you would reject the observations submitted to you, as had happened in the past with all the reviewers, including Dr. Plinio himself" (p. 6, § 2).

\* "Before the end of 1986, Dr. Plinio met with Mr. Atila and his assistants at a hotel in Serra Negra to learn about part of the work. I do not remember if we stayed there two or three days. I recall the difficulties Dr. Plinio encountered in making his remarks accepted. It regarded, I believe, the reading of the first volume.

"Knowing how reluctantly Mr. Atila received every proposal for correction, Dr. Plinio formulated them carefully and delicately. His propositions were often accepted. But it was evident that he almost always referred to superficial discrepancies, as if not perceiving the more profound ones. Even so, Dr. Plinio's judicious proposals were discussed countless times, justified with warmth, and refused.

"At the end of the first day, faced with the futility of that 'revision' where fundamental questions could not be corrected, at around midnight Dr. Plinio expressed a desire to withdraw to rest. It was embarrassing to those present how Mr. Atila opposed this wish, saying that Dr. Plinio usually worked much later than this. He did not understand that in dealing with his work the day would close sooner. Dr. Plinio's haste was visible. It was also clear that other concerns, outside

of this 'editing,' had priority in the considerations of Dr. Plinio" (Statement by Mr. Nelson Fragelli, p. 2, § 9, p. 3, § 1).

### **Refutation of Argument VII**

In the refutation of this argument, I will not follow the order of the first five. I prefer to deal with the Major Refutation, based on the texts of Dr. Plinio, and the Specific Refutation simultaneously.

For the sake of clarity, I would like you to know that the symposium at Serra Negra made for the revision of Volume I was transcribed from the tape to paper by Mr. Wilson Gabriel da Silva and Mr. Renato Vasconcelos. The typists copied what they thought was important. In the case of typists of this caliber, I gave no specific norms, but I believe that neither would have omitted anything relevant that took place. The source upon which I base myself, therefore, is as reliable as possible.

**1. A cascade of generalizations.** The analysis of your accusation reveals that the paragraphs that provide the base for this argument are not exempt from the same criteriological vice already found in your previous arguments. To wit:

In the first paragraph you use this formula: "according to your assistants." However, my close assistants until 1987 were Wilson Gabriel da Silva, Renato Murta de Vasconcelos, Nelson Ribeiro Fragelli and Paulo Hideo Moriyama. As of that date, the one who accuses me today left and was replaced by Mr. Paulo Roberto Cariello Rosa. To these assistants, I would like to add Mr. José Coutinho, who helped me in the research from the preliminary phase to the writing stage, as well as in its later phase [after it was concluded]. If you have any of my assistants who agree with the witness, why don't you name him? If you don't have any, why did you use the generic formula ["according to your assistants."]? Since we know that this ploy has no juridical basis, I ask: Why do you persist in using it? Would it perhaps be because you planned to circulate your letter internally and would like to impress the unwary?

In the second paragraph you employ the formula: "he told some close associates that it [this symposium] was entirely useless." It is always the same method of cowardly and imprecise generalizations.

In the third paragraph you use the formula: "The veracity of the assessment contained in this declaration is confirmed by the testimony of those who, over the years, have collaborated in your work." Again, the same error aggravated by recalcitrance, which I qualified as a vice.

The other passage you cite is not exempt from the same vice: "as it happened in the past with all the reviewers," which I have already dealt with above.

Thus, for practical purposes, despite any good will I might have to believe your accusations regarding "my assistants," "some close associates" of Prof. Plinio, "those who over the years have collaborated in my work" and "all the reviewers," since you refrain from giving the names of this

large cohort of persons, I am obliged to consider that the only source for your accusations is Mr. Fragelli, which is what I will do.

**2. Memory weakness.** I have already had the opportunity to show above (cf. Refutation of Argument V, 1st specific refutation, 7) that the witness does not count on a privileged memory in his favor. Here the same observation is repeated. In effect, he affirms that the symposium was held in late 1986, when in truth it was in May 1987. He does not recall whether the symposium lasted two or three days, when in fact it lasted four full days, totaling 11 meetings. He remarks that Dr. Plinio corrected nothing important, when in fact we have 60 typed pages recording the most relevant of his editings. It is curious that the witness is not even sure about the work being reviewed. "It regarded, I believe, the reading of the first volume," he nonchalantly states.

Now, what confidence can we have in a testimony whose probative value lies in the mnemonic capacity of the witness, when right from the beginning we are faced with several equivocations of memory capable of disqualifying him?

**3. Remiss participation.** However, it is not only this memory defect that testifies against the objectivity of the witness' statements. His participation at the symposium was very aloof. While Dr. Plinio and the other participants gathered in a circle with six chairs to facilitate the communication and follow the review, the witness sat separate from the group at a far table, situated perhaps some 10 feet from the closest chair. The photographs taken to record the meetings confirm the scene. While we were all following the reading of Dr. Plinio and responding to his questions, the witness read novels... Hence the joking remark that Dr. Plinio made to him, delicate but rich in lessons...

Dr. Plinio: "Ah! My Nelson, you're reading Chateaubriand, eh? If Atila has marked [for you] the passages he read to me, you have ... an excellent selection! Now, the man writes quite well, does he not? He is extraordinary!" (Serra Negra, May 26, 1987, night, p. 16).

There are only two interventions of the witness at the meetings. *The first:* When Dr. Plinio addressed himself to Mr. Renato Vasconcelos to clarify a grammatical question in German, he made a gentle metaphor placing himself in the position of disciple. For this purpose, he recalled a past incident between a physician from Rio de Janeiro, Dr. Miguel Couto, and one of his disciples. When Dr. Plinio remarked on this small fact, the witness rushed in and asked:

Mr. Nelson Fragelli: "It was said that this Miguel Couto was very tight. Did you hear anything about this?"

Dr. Plinio: "No, I never analyzed him from this angle. But, what I saw in him conforms perfectly to it" (Serra Negra, June 26, 1987, night, p. 23).

*The second participation,* at the last meeting of the symposium, occurred when Dr. Plinio was discussing the destructive work of the Council.

Dr. Plinio: "Many times we see ruins of monuments ... with such a grandeur in those ruins that ... we ask if the monument in its normal state would give that impression. Well, here we see in a new light how colossal that which was constructed was. Colossal! Something of a size and scope that has no measurements! ..."

Mr. Nelson Fragelli: "Those monuments of Rome are exactly like that. What is the deeper significance of this?"

Dr. Plinio: "I think that they were constructed as a kind of trans-spherical idea, which they managed to express there, but in the contact of normal life this idea becomes much less clear" (Serra Negra, May 29, 1987, afternoon, pp. 53-54).

This last question, legitimate undoubtedly, was still a deviation from the main theme that Dr. Plinio was considering: the destruction of the Church. No other participation of the witness was recorded or transcribed by the typists.

Thus, the participation of the witness in the 11 extremely serious meetings with Dr. Plinio was restricted to the reading of novels, a commentary on the supposed avarice of Dr. Miguel Couto and a question about the monuments of Rome.

In view of this, a question necessarily arises: Can a person who displays such a lack of interest in a given topic have a competent opinion on this matter? If, at the time the events occurred, he paid such little attention to what was going on, what can be said when, after more than 10 years have passed, this person displays such a lamentable memory?

**4. Entanglement of facts and interpretations.** It is curious that Mr. Fragelli, who accuses me of a lack of scientific rigor, when he places himself before God to give his solemn declaration, is not overly concerned about the scientific rigor of his own words. In fact, it would be normal for him to clearly present the facts that occurred and, then, for the proper understanding of each fact, to present his interpretation. Unfortunately, this is not the case here. On the contrary, he constructs elaborate niches of interpretations and arranges the facts to fit into the mounting he had prepared.

Thus, for example, in the phrase: "Knowing how reluctantly Mr. Atila received every proposal for correction, Dr. Plinio formulated them carefully and delicately." What is the purpose of the first interpretation the witness makes here: 'Knowing how reluctantly, etc.'? Did Dr. Plinio reveal to him that he had that intention? Or did the deponent conclude this himself? In that case, if I had not been reluctant to receive corrections, would Dr. Plinio have acted without care and with brutality in dealing with me? It is a curious nonsensical remark that makes one laugh. So, I ask: If Dr. Plinio did not reveal to the witness that he acted with the intention that the latter attributed to him, wouldn't the phrasing of the sentence reveal that the witness wants to cause the reader to have an unfavorable impression of the author? This is what I called the niches he constructs.

In the following sentences one notes a similar confusion between the fact and the interpretations: "His (Dr. Plinio's) propositions were often accepted. But it was evident that he almost always referred to superficial discrepancies, as if not perceiving the more profound ones."

Again the question arises: Did Dr. Plinio confide to the witness that he was using dissimulation, pretending that he did not perceive the deep discrepancies he saw? On what basis does the witness attribute to Dr. Plinio such action? However, he is emphatic: "It was evident..." What is evident is generally admitted without demonstration. Here, however, this is not the case, for, as I will show below (see letter B), the evidence for anyone who reads the passages Dr. Plinio corrected speaks in the opposite sense. Thus, the only fact in this phrase is that innumerable propositions were accepted. Everything else is a montage that tries to condition the judgment of the reader.

In the next paragraph, the same trick is repeated: "At the end of the first day, faced with the futility of that 'revision' where fundamental questions could not be corrected, at around midnight Dr. Plinio expressed a desire to withdraw to rest." The only fact presented is that Dr. Plinio expressed the desire to retire to rest. The rest of the sentence is a montage to influence the reader.

From these three examples taken from the basis of this Argument VII, one can see that the witness undoubtedly has the gifts of a playwright, perhaps influenced by the novels he reads during the symposiums, but as a piece of judicial literature that expresses clearly and without emotion what happened, the cited excerpts leave much to be desired. However, this declaration is the fundamental evidence that you offer to "prove" that I did not accept any of Dr. Plinio's revisions.

**5. Refutation properly speaking.** I summarize the accusations in Mr. Fragelli's statement in order to refute them:

- \* The author posed difficulties for Dr. Plinio's review of Volume I. Such difficulties came from his reluctance to receive any proposal of correction.
- \* In view of this, Dr. Plinio only made superficial revisions of the work.
- \* The author rejected countless proposals of Dr. Plinio after heatedly justifying them, which would render the review "entirely futile."
- \* The author complained to Dr. Plinio because he cut short one of the meetings, which was embarrassing to those present.

From this it could be concluded that, since the author did not attend to anything important that Dr. Plinio desired, the revision would have no value and, as you affirm, the symposium would have been "entirely futile."

The accusation as a whole is quite weak, for it is not based on objective facts, but relies entirely on viscous subjective intentions and impressions. Except for what I summarized above, I found nothing else in the statement that could support the accusation in this Argument VII.

Given the insufficiency of the accusation, I could simply ask the witness to present objective proofs for what he affirmed. With this, my defense would have already reduced him to silence. But to demonstrate my good will, I will try to respond with clarity to his confused accusations.

**A - Reluctance to receive corrections.** Contrary to what the witness says, I will transcribe the words of Dr. Plinio to me at the end of the first day of work, precisely at that meeting where the witness imagined a dramatic scene of disrespect:

Dr. Plinio: "[It should be explained] why, after you have read this enormous quantity of books ... why is it that you do not go directly to the theme of the Council to determine its spirit, but rather go through that tortuous labor of seeking the spirit in those who made the Council? Why isn't the study of the letter of the Council present? Why did you choose this process? Do you recall that this was central in our idea?"

Mr. Atila: "You are quite right. This explanation is missing."

Dr. Plinio: "**You are receiving my comments in the most polite way possible. But I have the sense that I'm mangling you! Such a torture session! I heard the other day that the cataract surgery is done while the patient is awake. The physician takes the patient, grabs the tweezers and pulls the crystalline [the transparent part of the eye] out of his eye with the patient awake. I was horrified! It is an atrocious operation. This [what I'm doing to you] is a bit of a cataract surgery.** I do not consider myself a good reviewer, far from that. But, in the end, I will do what I can" (Serra Negra, May 25, 1987, night, p. 5).

Further, the facts demonstrate that the corrections made in Serra Negra reached the end of chapter X, the last one of the volume. They constitute, as I said, 60 typed pages. Dr. Plinio made the rest of the review of the last chapter with me at his residence after the symposium in the frequent contacts I had the honor of having with him.

The system of review adopted by Dr. Plinio at the symposium consisted of reading Volume I, indicating the points that needed improvement and, if necessary, asking something of me or my collaborators, or even proposing a topic for discussion. Therefore, the major part of the time at the meetings were devoted to reading and passed in silence, in a completely peaceful climate – not the one of anguish imagined by the witness.

The corrections Dr. Plinio made were noted by Mr. Renato Vasconcelos, who marked them to be introduced in the appropriate place of the text; they were simultaneously recorded on cassettes. After the symposium, the corrections from the tapes were scrupulously incorporated into the text. In addition, the notations of Mr. Renato Vasconcelos assured the accurate entry of each correction.

I recall having passed out the typed texts six different times to make sure that nothing had been left out from what Dr. Plinio had decided. The acceptance of the corrections made by Dr. Plinio can be verified by comparing what is the material from the tapes with the final published text. Of course, one or another theme raised by Dr. Plinio as a question and recorded on the tapes may not have been incorporated. In this case, the response to his question would have led him to the conclusion that the correction was not necessary. Such a procedure is normal in revisions (cf. letter C, 3rd point).

Besides these corrections placed directly into the text, Dr. Plinio sometimes questioned larger parts of the work. It was thus that he, after a discussion on the reasons that had guided the au-

thor in his writing of the General Introduction, thought it better to redo it. In fact, the author had adopted a certain tactic to pitch Volume I and, then, the whole work, which took advantage of a certain fogginess in the exposition of the matter. Dr. Plinio did not agree with this and ordered him to adopt the tactic of full clarity. A simple comparison of the Introduction of that time to the one that was published shows that his order was followed and this was a correction of the greatest importance, as will be seen in the refutation of the item below.

Another very important part was the one concerning the theological qualification of the Council. The author had previously chosen to avoid the embarrassing question. After an exchange of ideas, Dr. Plinio ordered this part should be reworked, analyzed with complete clarity and objectivity. Once again, I emphasize that a simple comparison of the text of that time with what was published testifies that his order was obeyed.

**Conclusion to the 1st accusation of Argument VII.** There is not the slightest difficulty in verifying, by the exposition of the facts, that the author was not recalcitrant in receiving the corrections of Dr. Plinio. Further, Dr. Plinio himself explicitly recognized this. Thus, it is proved that the accusation is baseless.

**B - Dr. Plinio made only superficial observations about the work.** The witness must have been extremely absorbed in the reading of his novels to make an affirmation of this sort. What happened was diametrically opposed to what he pretends.

As to the essential parts of Volume I, I indicated above (see letter A) that he ordered two fundamental parts of the work to be changed: *the first*, the general focus of the whole collection, its General Introduction; *the second*, one of its most delicate questions.

Regarding the importance of the topics analyzed, you could judge this for yourself if you had bothered to look at the dense material from that symposium. There Dr. Plinio dealt with themes of major relevance to the cause of the Counter-Revolution. I will mention a few:

a. Dr. Plinio: **"You know that I think – something that I only had a vague impression of before, but it became more defined from the reading of your work – that they [the progressivists] achieved the greatest demolishing work in all of History. Never, neither Titus with the Temple of Jerusalem, nor anything or anyone else, has managed to destroy what they destroyed. I will add more: Danton, Marat, Robespierre, Lenin and so on, did not succeed in destroying what they [the progressivists] have destroyed. Even more: Between the demolishing action of the Sorbonne and theirs, theirs is more serious, much more serious! What is a flea like Cohn-Bendit compared to what we see here? Nothing!"** (Serra Negra, May 27, 1987, night, p. 30).

b. Dr. Plinio: **"On the question of the French Revolution, do you also mention the speech of John Paul II on the topic of *liberté, égalité, fraternité* when he visited France? I think it would fit in well and that a reference to this – at least a very light one – would be obligatory here. Because it is something extremely bad"** (Serra Negra, May 26, 1987, night, p. 14).

c. Dr. Plinio: **"He [the quoted author] speaks of ambiguity as clearly as Fr. Laurentin. Even more so. I was not aware of that. It is splendid! Really splendid! This gives them a loophole and**

gives us a status. Because, to your objections they can say: 'These are ambiguities that must be studied after the Council. We've already said that the Council has nothing unchangeable, and so on.'

"And we will say: 'Ah, good! So you affirm that everything here can be reduced to ambiguity and has no real, direct, proper, normal meaning or that there is no normal sense to this? What is it that the Council defined? Is this Council a set of provisional positions of an evolving thought? And what is that thinking? Because you present this Council as having authority and yet it declares itself incapable of finding the proper terminology to express itself. So then, this has to be told to the faithful.'

"They [the progressivists] will not want to acknowledge this! .... They can give any excuse they want, but they will feel extremely uncomfortable about it, while we are in the euphoria of feeling good. ... It is stupendous! When I saw the ambiguity so evident in these texts, I lost my initial concern [to counsel caution in this regard]. It is a magnificent torrent [of texts]!" (Serra Negra, June 26, 1987, night, pp. 17f).

d. Dr. Plinio: "Thus, it is so clearly demonstrated that there is ambiguity in the Council, this is so clearly demonstrated that, on the one hand, it is indispensable [to do it] to reveal who they are ... but, on the other hand, it could almost be *reproché* [reproachable]."

e. Mr. Atila: "There is no Council that has stopped halfway ..."

Dr. Plinio: "But there is more. It is not only halfway because they thought it imprudent to announce the whole road, but rather it is because they were not cognizant of where that whole road was leading. Hence this invitation to study [Vatican II], made even to the lay people, to establish the facts about what was the end of the road they were defining. Now, this is a flawed way of teaching. Because either you know the final end of where you are going or you do not teach. And, **in fact, this declared position of the Council would be a factor to plead its nullity. I don't know if what I said is clear or not**" (Serra Negra, May 26, 1987, night, p. 20).

f. Dr. Plinio: "At this point in the reading ... it seems to me that ... that this is **a bomb, in the sense that it makes obvious – this summary makes it even much clearer than it already was – the size of the hole that this work opens in the [enemy's] wall. Now, the question is: Can we write this work without clearly showing that this is what it is? ... My concern is to safeguard the political side as much as it is necessary. But, on the other hand, only in what is necessary and not a bit more**" (Serra Negra, May 28, 1987, night, pp. 46f).

g. Dr. Plinio: "In final analysis, **my general idea [about their position] was that they had not compromised themselves [that much], that they said all these things, but that they had used the customary velvet wrapping. Therefore, we would fight to make the fight also with the velvet. But, now, I am seeing this is not possible because they threw out the velvet wrapping. In such a way that I think they went so far beyond Taprobana that there is no return**" (Serra Negra, May 29, 1987, morning, p. 48).

h. Dr. Plinio: "Now, at any rate, **it is clear that the step they took is much larger than I had imagined. That is to say, that they had all these things [thoughts] behind them. That is to say, it is**

**'evident,' certain for us. But I never imagined that all these things would come out with this degree of clarity! In fact, it came out because of the work you did, because an ordinary reader does not find this in their things.** In any case, the scope, perhaps the very nature of the coup, may change somewhat in view of this. This is what it is." (Serra Negra, May 29, 1987, p. 53).

This provides a good sampling of the level of profundity of the analyses and decisions Dr. Plinio made in the review of Volume I.

**Conclusion to the 2<sup>nd</sup> accusation of Argument VII.** It can be seen, therefore, that there is not the least basis for affirming that in the symposium of Serra Negra for the revision of Volume I, Dr. Plinio restricted himself to dealing with superficial subjects. In other words, the accusation is false.

**C - The author rejected countless proposals of Dr. Plinio, after discussing and heatedly justifying them.** There are three aspects to this accusation that should be distinguished: discussion, heated justifications, and refusal. I go on to analyze them.

*First point:* Dr. Plinio never made it a secret to anyone that he considered the author a good interlocutor. Perhaps for this reason, in 1973, before the writing of this collection, Dr. Plinio invited him to assist at the principal study meetings he conducted in the TFP, the meetings of the MNF. He then asked him to attend various other meetings in order to, as he so kindly said, "help him make the themes livelier."

Now, one of the characteristics of these interlocutions was discussion. Amenable in the grand majority of cases, but heated discussions in other cases. With cordiality on his part? Yes, Dr. Plinio was inseparable from cordiality. And what was the presupposition of the author in such discussions? That Dr. Plinio was a giant from the human standpoint, a lion from the vantage point of confronting evil and a man who possessed wisdom. Could the author, then, a "lion cub," as Sacred Scripture picturesquely says (Is 31:4), spar with his master on the solidity of truth? Could it not help him to explain, in the hard practice of fencing arguments, problems that Dr. Plinio himself sometimes implicitly had? There is nothing more normal, I believe.

There are more delicate spirits who do not understand this way and could view it as a violent match that a barbarian spirit forced a very civilized man like Dr. Plinio to engage in. At times he and I laughed loudly – barbarously perhaps on my part – at a reaction of horror that we both noted in this or that person. Certainly not a laughter of despisal; rather, that of those who note the picturesque aspect of having persons with many different make-ups. This way – which was ours – is difficult to comprehend for the abovementioned spirits.

Certainly not all of the author's participations in discussions were moved only by love of truth. There were times when his revolutionary tendencies prevailed – and invariably rejected by Dr. Plinio. At such times the meetings became more strained, certainly insupportable for those more delicate spirits. But, in general, when this occurred, the sun would not go down without the author asking the pardon of Dr. Plinio, who invariably told him, "My son, I want you to know

that before you asked for pardon, I had already forgiven you." And he would add, "Don't think about it anymore."

Therefore, I respond thus to the witness about these discussions: Dr. Plinio and the author found them normal, healthy, proper to manly spirits. This is not to deny the legitimacy of other ways, nor to accuse them of being devoid of virility. Thus, if some of the discussions in the symposium of Serra Negra – incidentally, not frequent – shocked him, the author asks that the witness should also try to understand that there are different ways of being. If he noted something revolutionary in the author, forgive him; for this is certain, Dr. Plinio has already done so.

Moreover, if the witness wants to take a side against the author about the release of his book, do so. Do not be afraid to destroy him if he can. The author will be waiting for him *le sourire aux lèvres* [smiling]. But, accuse him forthrightly following the customary norms of a manly challenge. Do not invent imaginary scenes that do not resist a critique because, then, the combat is on uneven grounds...

*The second point* of this accusation is that it would be reprehensible for the author to justify his opinions and do so with warmth. Essentially this difficulty is answered in the above response. With a small addendum: If Dr. Plinio condescended to present to the author his critiques as questions, what is more normal for him than to answer with an attempt to justify what he wrote? What did the witness want? For the author to say that everything he wrote was wrong? Doing so, wouldn't he be undeserving of the trust of Dr. Plinio who chose him to write this work? The question of justifying oneself warmly or coldly depends on one's preferences, temperament and psychology. I do not think it is a matter worthy of discussion. *De gustibus et coloribus non est disputandum*. [There is no disputing about tastes and colors]

*The third point* of this accusation is that the author would have rejected numerous criticisms, which would make the review completely futile. It has already been pointed out above (see letter A) that the author incorporated the corrections made by Dr. Plinio into the text. This, however, does not mean that, before deciding to make the correction, one or another criticism was not discussed. For, it would seem that in a revision process of a book, after the presentation of the criticism and the defense of the interested party, there is nothing more normal than some criticisms would be accepted and others rejected. This only reveals that the review was conscientiously made on both sides.

To see in this fact a lack of respect or revolt would be to mix the moral ambit with the intellectual, thus obliging one of the parties to accept everything the other said; that is to say, it would misinterpret the very notion of a review. If the witness thinks that "countless" criticisms were rejected unjustly, he should indicate which ones he is referring to. For, here also, as I said above, the burden of proof lies with the accuser.

**Conclusion to the 3<sup>rd</sup> accusation of Argument VII.** In the objective order of the facts, what took place – the discussions, the defense of points of view and the eventual rejection of some criticisms made by Dr. Plinio – follows the usual procedure of a review. This does not mean that the corrections were futile. For, as stated above (see letter A), the author incorporated into the text the corrections that Dr. Plinio decided to make and which are recorded on the tapes. To prove

this point, the author offered the texts of the meetings to be compared with the text of the published Volume I.

In addition, the author pointed out two important general corrections made by Dr. Plinio, which are not recorded on the tapes. Here also, he offered the earlier text to be compared with what was published. Therefore, unless there is evidence to the contrary, there is exaggeration in insinuating bad faith in the author based on the alleged facts. And, above all, the accusation that the revision was entirely futile is false.

If there was a lack of respect on the part of the author in other points, this is a moral problem that does not affect the intellectual merit of the review. However, if there were anything of this nature, the author makes his apology to Dr. Plinio and the other participants of the symposium.

**D - The author complained to Dr. Plinio about cutting short one of the meetings, which was embarrassing.** *First*, it should be pointed out that the subject matter of this accusation is not relevant for demonstrating Argument VII, which states that the author refused Dr. Plinio's review of Volume I. It is a matter that could be considered more appropriate for a manual of good manners than a focus point for this argument. *Second*, in this chronicle, at the end of the aforementioned meeting there was no lack of courtesy on the part of the author. *Third*, if there were, the author asks the pardon of Dr. Plinio and apologizes to the other participants of the symposium, including to the witness, for the shock caused to his refined sensibilities.

**Conclusion to the 4<sup>th</sup> accusation of Argument VII.** This accusation is out of place, it does not pertain to the case or demonstrate the argument at hand.

### **Conclusion to the refutation of Argument VII**

From what was exposed and discussed in this Argument VII, it is proved that:

- \* In the exposition of the facts, manifestations of recalcitrance on the part of the author in receiving the criticisms of Dr. Plinio do not appear in the notes *ipsis verbis* of the symposium. On the contrary, Dr. Plinio himself acknowledges in the author an exemplary attitude of accepting his criticisms.
- \* The many excerpts presented show that during the symposium Dr. Plinio often dealt with profound themes of great importance, contrary to what the accusation claims.
- \* For an author to discuss and defend what he has written and at times not follow the criticisms made characterizes a habitual procedure in any review process, contrary to what the accusation pretends.
- \* A possible *gaffe* in courtesy on the part of the author is beside the point in assessing his acceptance of the criticisms of Volume I.

Therefore, I close the discussion of this argument saying that it is baseless in regard to the charge that the author was recalcitrant in receiving corrections. Also baseless is the claim that only superficial subjects were addressed at the symposium.

In what concerns the discussion and acceptance of criticism, it is necessary to distinguish several points. There were normal discussions during the reviews and, after such discussions, Dr. Plinio would order the corrections to be made. The author offered proof that he accepted them. The accusation did not present any evidence to the contrary. Further, regarding certain general corrections of importance, the author also offered evidence of his acceptance of them. The accusation did not present any proofs.

Therefore, regarding the third accusation of Argument VII, insofar as no evidence is presented, the argument is groundless. From what has been concluded so far, it is seen that the affirmation that the Serra Negra symposium was "entirely futile" is not objective.

Regarding a possible lack of courtesy of the author toward Dr. Plinio, the author asks his pardon and apologizes to the other participants. The matter, however, does not concern Argument VII.

***Argumentandi gratiae [for the sake of arguing].*** In the texts where you made the accusations of this argument, you state at the end that: "Mr. Nelson Fragelli wrote the solemn declaration that I have enclosed, in which he relates such confidences." However, none of confidences that you mentioned are in the document of Mr. Fragelli. Why is this? Did he write his solemn testimony too hastily? In that case, would he have forgotten to reproduce the data that he told you personally? Or did you hear these things from other anonymous witnesses, who preferred to accuse and hide? It is you, not I, who know the answers.

On my part, since, simply to demonstrate good will, I have already refuted Argument VII which was presented without proofs, I could easily dispense myself from further examining your mis- sive to see if I could find further dregs of argumentation to answer. But, I will do so to show that, even in the residuals, the accusatory libel that you decided to launch against me is unsubstan- tiated.

In order not to tiresomely repeat your words, this time I will summarize them for my response:

- \* The author would have imposed on Dr. Plinio, against his will, the title of the first volume: *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*.
- \* Dr. Plinio would have said that the author defended each comma like parents defending their only child.

I go on to refute these accusations:

**A - The title: *In the Murky Waters...*** Let us see what is recorded on the tape. The typed tran- scription – without any omissions on my part – reads as follows:

Mr. Atila: "Yesterday you changed the title of the work to *In the obscure light of Vatican II.*"

"Dr. Plinio: "And how did you have it?" *In the murky waters of Vatican II*. No, because these waters are not really turbid. They are boiling waters, clashing. Turbid water is a very liquid sludge. Do you have another designation?"

Mr. Renato: "In the revolted waters."

Dr. Plinio: "Revolted waters... This, for example, would be very good" (Serra Negra, May 27, 1987, p. 26).

Contrary to what the accusation claims about the author's obstinacy, the transcript shows that he had already accepted the change. Faced with the title *In the murky waters...* Dr. Plinio chose not to use it, in view of not making an injury against the Council. But such things are susceptible to reformulations, which is understandable. In the text quoted, it is seen that Dr. Plinio opted for another formulation.

What the typed text does not reveal is another short discussion that took place. In it, the author asked Dr. Plinio if he could keep the title if he found a note card that he knew he had where Msgr. Phillippe Delhaye clearly states that the mixture of currents at Vatican II constituted "murky waters." Dr. Plinio asked to see the file. The author began to look for it but did not find it. In the meantime, Mr. Renato found another passage from Msgr. Suenens cited in the work that mentions revolted waters. As the text of the meeting records, Dr. Plinio agreed to change the title to this.

As for the document of Msgr. Delhaye, the author did find it and showed it to Dr. Plinio later at his residence, sometime after the end of the symposium. Dr. Plinio thought that the passage was excellent, and agreed to change the title from revolted waters, as it had been, to murky waters, since we could no longer be accused of any injury. You can check for yourself to see that I have been careful to warn the reader that I do not intend to offend Vatican II by employing such an expression (cf. English edition, Clarification, pp. 49f).

In addition, there were two antecedents that led the author to insist on maintaining the water image in the title. *First*, the great admiration that Dr. Plinio expressed to the author in 1982, before his trip to Europe, for the title of the book of Fr. Ralph Wiltgen, SVD, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*. Dr. Plinio even directed the author to interview the aforementioned priest – which was done in Rome – to congratulate him on the title and ask him some details. *Second*, while interviewing Fr. Raymond Schwager, SJ, in Innsbruck, the author received an explanation related to Dr. Plinio in the following terms:

Mr. Atila: "A priest there [in Innsbruck] with whom I spoke, not [very] initiated, but informed, said something quite interesting as coming from someone highly initiated. I said I was having difficulties [understanding the ambiguity of Vatican II], etc., etc.,] and he replied: 'Of course, because Vatican Council II was made by mixing the waters of Vatican I with those of Vatican III.' This metaphor can explain what you were saying."

Dr. Plinio: "Magnificent! ... Truly marvelous! Providential!" (São Bento, November 21, 1983, p. 3).

One can see, therefore, that Dr. Plinio emphatically liked the metaphor.

Therefore, knowing these precedents and based on the excerpt of Msgr. Delhaye that suggested the title to the author, and in the face of the new possibility that Dr. Plinio had opened, I insisted on maintaining the image of waters and of murky waters.

This took place naturally, without the tragedy and affliction envisioned by your anonymous witness.

**B - The comma, defended as an only child...** I have not the least difficulty in supposing that Dr. Plinio used this picturesque metaphor. What I question is whether he would have done so to objectively refer to the review, or to be free of a swarm of criticisms against me that might have been made in his presence.

It must be said that, given your letter, which has so little foundation in reality and, further, is loaded with criticisms as well as such an intense desire to denigrate me, along with such violent threats of punishment against me, the hypothesis I raise cannot be considered theoretical. All the more so since Dr. Plinio warned me several times that there were many rumors against me and my work. One time he even cautioned me that it was going around that my work was un-publishable, but he advised me not to take it seriously because in Serra Negra he had found it to be "a masterpiece." And, as an example of similar injustices, he pointed to the fact that Dom Geraldo Sigaud, after he had read the blueprint of Dr. Plinio's book titled *In Defense of Catholic Action*, told him that it was un-publishable.

On other occasions, which I estimate to be about 10, Dr. Plinio warned me (approximate words): "They – the members of Martim and their associates – would expel you from the TFP if I were not always supporting you." And he justified this action: "You represent one aspect of my vocation that I had to veil in order to be tolerated, but since you cannot veil it, they cannot bear you."

You understand, therefore, that if "they" were able to denounce me and my work in front of Dr. Plinio, perhaps the latter had to cede to something lesser in order to save the greater... Hence, from a situation like this to the picturesque metaphor, the road is not long.

With this final sweep, which I have dealt with for the pleasure of seeking to assert the truth, I close the discussion of Argument VII.

\*

## ARGUMENT VIII

### IN VIEW OF ARGUMENT VII, AND TO AVOID A CONFRONTATION WITH THE AUTHOR, DR. PLINIO HAD DECIDED TO INDEFINITELY PROLONG THE EXECUTION OF THE WORK AND THE REVIEW

#### Proof in the text of the accusation

\* "In view of these shortcomings, and realizing, on the other hand, that you did not have enough flexibility to accept the required corrections, Prof. Plinio chose to advise you to continue to write the work, thus deferring the revision of the same.

"In this, Dr. Plinio did not show any duplicity, for he hoped and prayed that one day, through intellectual maturity inherent to the experience of life and by a special grace, you would be open to accept a serious review of your work, *conditio sine qua non* for its presentation to the Vatican ...

"It is in the context of this charitable action of postponing the review to avoid a confrontation with you that one should understand the complimentary words he sent you upon receiving your communication that the work was completed" (p.5 , §§ 2f).

#### Refutation of Argument VIII

Since Argument VII is baseless, this eighth Argument, which is based on the former, becomes *ipso facto* void.

Notwithstanding, I will say something about it as well.

Up to the present moment, your accusation provided no convincing evidence in any of its arguments. It could be said, therefore, that you should confine yourself in the remaining arguments to be strictly objective so that, at least in this final phase, you might make a decent exit from such a serious invective. However, the opposite seems to be true. In effect, you now pretend you must be believed – it is unclear under what title – as a faithful interpreter of what Dr. Plinio would have thought.

Possibly he did not confide anything to you regarding this Argument VIII. You were prodigal in presenting real, anonymous or general witnesses in the previous arguments. Thus, as an acquired habit, it would be expected that, in this Argument VIII, you would make use of expedients of the same type. But this did not happen. It is, therefore, not difficult to conclude that you had no foundation based on affirmations of Dr. Plinio to make conjectures.

This clarified, I turn to the analysis of your lucubrations.

**1. The indefinite postponement.** You suppose that Dr. Plinio was deliberately and indefinitely delaying the review of the study because of his disgust with me and the work.

**A** - How, then, would you explain that he had already suggested in 1993 to Rev. Fr. Olavo Trindade in a letter to His Exc. Dom João Corso (November 22, 1993), then Bishop of Campos, that he make an indirect mention of my work? In fact, the fearless priest said in it: **"We already have at hand the documents and studies that support and explain our perplexities ... These are serious, profound, extensive studies that still need complementary readings, reviews and re-touching, requiring some months yet to be fully ready."**

The same Fr. Olavo Trindade, together with the Rev. Fathers Gervásio Gobato, Antônio Paula and David Francischini sent a letter (August 8, 1995) to His Eminence Card. Antonio Inocenti in which they wrote: "We learned about the work of a Brazilian writer, a lay Catholic, a member of the TFP who since mid-1982 has been preparing a detailed analysis of Vatican II. **We entered into contact with him and were shown a work of many volumes already in the process of being published – lacking only the necessary retouching, reviews, indexes, etc., which may require some more time. We verify it to be an extremely serious study that attends to our needs. And we are certain that, when it becomes public, it will be seen that the magnitude of the work fully justifies the delay in its preparation. Incidentally, we had already mentioned this in the letter to His Excellency Dom Corso (November 22, 1993), who, in the course of the dialogue, assumed the work to be non-existent."**

Now, the passage in this letter relating to my work also was carefully reviewed by Dr. Plinio. As I have already mentioned, as far as I know, it was his last official document on the subject that he reviewed.

You see, therefore, that Dr. Plinio continuously desired to publish the work I wrote. How, then, can you pretend to attribute to Dr. Plinio that he would be prolonging the work indefinitely? Was Dr. Plinio, then, employing the same dissimulation that you attribute to him in dealing with me also with the four priests and the Holy See? If, in fact, he would have wished to postpone my work indefinitely, why would he have suggested the four priests to attest to the forthcoming publication of my work? And to do so before the highest ecclesiastical authority at a moment when they found themselves in a very delicate situation? [This would have made no sense.] If you sustain such a possibility, you are attributing to Dr. Plinio not only dissimulation, but also imprudence.

**B** - You and one of your witnesses acknowledge in other places that in 1993 Dr. Plinio was about to go review my work in France. All the TFP members witnessed this. The trip was so close to realization that the passports had already been prepared, the accommodations arranged and the meeting place established at the French TFP seat of Le Jaglu – in the town of Chateaufort-Timeret near Chartres.

A selection had been made of those who would attend the review meetings. Dr. Plinio had already established part of his agenda with me; my general expositions were prepared – subsidiary to the presentation of the texts – all the technical details were studied – computers, printers, copy machines, typists to record the corrections, etc. Even the problem of overweight baggage

caused by the indispensable books and devices had been dealt with and duly sent to customs. In a word, everything was ready for the trip. Dr. Plinio only waited to travel for reasons of climate, wanting to escape the last cold periods of the European March. This was when the first news of a judicial process against him arrived from Porto Alegre and prevented him from traveling.

In view of Dr. Plinio's manifest desire to travel for a review, a desire he openly made known in all the TFP milieus, I ask you this: Do you consider that Dr. Plinio would have made an artificial assemblage of this magnitude to dissimulate that he wanted to review a work when in reality he intended to postpone the review indefinitely? If you sustain such a possibility, you are attributing to Dr. Plinio not only dissimulation, but also folly.

**C** - In mid-1994, Dr. Plinio called me to say that he wanted me to start making presentations in the Auditorium about the situation of the Church, because he thought it was time to prepare TFP members for the publication of the work. In fact, for lack of time, I made only two series of expositions, although he made a certain insistence on doing several others.

In view of his decision, I ask: Do you consider that Dr. Plinio made such a decision because he wanted to postpone the review and publication of the work indefinitely?

Therefore, it is seen that, in attributing to Dr. Plinio this dissimulation, you would hardly fail to sin against the truth. And, perhaps worse, you would also seem to sin against the seriousness, prudence and loyalty you owe to Dr. Plinio. The person who you devised in your imagination is not him. In addition, it is seen that in attributing to Dr. Plinio such an intention, you seem to abuse your position as close friend to impute to me a gratuitous and absurd accusation.

**2. Excessive attachment.** In making the accusation that Dr. Plinio wished to avoid a confrontation with me, you suppose in me an inappropriate attachment to my work, an obstinacy to receive any correction, and an almost frenzied desire to see it published. You do not say this directly, but it would not be difficult for me to decipher your euphemisms to reach these results.

**A** - In composing this picture, you show yourself ignorant of an essential fact. Namely, the fact that several times I asked Dr. Plinio to dismiss me from the work, and it was he who insisted that I continue it. Were it not for his order and encouragement, I would have taken another direction in my life in the TFP. That is to say, the human sentiment that I experienced was not ambition, but skepticism before the ocean of impossibilities that I would have to cross before reaching the end of the work.

I remember well on one occasion, when skepticism overtook me, Dr. Plinio asked me why I felt that way. I answered, "I am facing a long string of impossibilities that will end in a disaster."

Dr. Plinio: "But why is this?"

Mr. Atila: "*First* of all, it is practically impossible for me to write this work; *second*, if I write it, it is impossible to publish something of this size (10 volumes); *third*, if anyone publishes it, no one will disseminate such a work; *fourth*, if such were to happen, nobody will read it; *fifth*, if some do read it, it will have no repercussions; finally, *sixth*, if it has repercussions, the Holy See will ex-

communicate me. That is, after a sequence of impossible efforts, the 'prize' that awaits me is to be excluded from the Church that I want to help defend. This is the panorama that I am facing."

Dr. Plinio: "But my son, it is necessary to do it for the good of the Church."

This is one of the many stimuli he gave me. Facing this panorama, perhaps you understand why he dedicated the work to *Madonna del Miracolo* [Our Lady of the Miracle].

You see that facing such a perspective, human ambition easily falls away.

**B** - Allow me another consideration. Do you know anyone who, for the sake of human ambition and inordinate self-love, would abandon the incomparable position of daily convivium with Dr. Plinio that I had as his personal secretary on various matters and give up his participation in the most important TFP study meeting, which was the MNF, and countless others occasions where he was Dr. Plinio's personal guest?

Why should I abandon all those advantages I had? For what? Would it be in order to sink into general oblivion as I did? To situate myself for 15 years in one of the most disagreeable districts of São Paulo, moored to old books in logistic conditions of an undignified poverty, in order to analyze heretics who are intellectually repulsive and literarily uninteresting? And, after that, to write tirelessly on topics completely unknown to me that I was forced to study without having any personal inclination and without receiving any academic recognition? Is this what you imagine the full realization of my ambition to be? It would be a *sui generis* type of ambition. There are certain things that are done only for the love of God. Such facts, in my judgment, speak clamorously in the opposite sense of ambition for human glory.

**C** - Also, I persisted in the decision that my name should not be put on the work until Dr. Plinio gave me the express order to do so. This purpose can be confirmed by some passages recorded on tape, along with many others that were not taped. For example:

\* On the trials the author faced regarding the work involved in his trip to Europe:

Dr. Plinio: "It must be said that some of these [unfavorable] prognostics were not grounded *in re*, but rather in appearances."

Mr. Atila: "On your part, never... [not even in appearances]."

Dr. Plinio: "On my part, no, this I know. In any sense. You never lacked confidence in me. What happened was that many times you did not understand me. This is true. And, moreover, this will have to happen other times. You did not understand me. Then, with time, you were seeing more. Some things that you did not understand then, you understand today. Not all, but today you understand. But in this we are walking slowly, isn't it so, my son?"

Mr. Atila: "One thing: **This whole work – if it were not to be the pedestal for you to do something, I would do nothing ... Because to have to ... sign Atila Sinke Guimarães is absolutely something that gives me human respect.**"

Dr. Plinio: "I see that very well."

Mr. Atila: **"I am doing it because you ordered me to do it. I am content to do it, but if it were not crowned by something that you will do ... to be a pretext for your work, then I would do nothing"** (São Bento, November 21, 1983, p. 9).

\* Before a eulogy that could make many lose their heads, the author preferred a position of discretion, attributing the strength and merit of his work exclusively to obedience:

Dr. Plinio: **"The atomic bomb of our combat is this [the work on the Council]! There is no question about it! That is, in our fight there are two stages: the *first stage* is everything up to this; the *second* is everything after.** There is no discussion about it, that's the way it is. You have to take it like that because that's the way it is!"

Mr. Atila: **"Your prophetism is proclaimed with this ..."**

Dr. Plinio: "It is impossible to have predicted more than ... it was! The reality, however, exceeds the prophecy."

Mr. Atila: "This is a new front where we take the enemy directly at its weak point. I consider this an R-CR grace."

Dr. Plinio: "I agree entirely."

Mr. Atila: "[Commenting on the two Bishops who did not follow the advice of Dr. Plinio] **I, an inept and sick horse, did this by obeying you. Imagine if they had corresponded ... Here it is you who is glorified.**"

Dr. Plinio: "If you had refused the invitation of 1967 [when the author made his consecration to Our Lady], you would not be doing it" (Symposium for EVP, March 2, 1987, evening, p. 17).

**D** - Let me reveal another fact. From the very beginning of the task he gave me, I always followed my resolve to not pressure him for the work to be published or not. I cite one recorded example:

\* Dr. Plinio: "Yes ... we are called to this destruction."

Mr. Atila: "I would like you to read it [the work]. **If you think that it should not be published, you will not have the slightest insinuation from me to do so, because I will have done what I could, even though my spear will not have touched the throat of the adversary. So then, there is no problem.**"

Dr. Plinio: "We must leave this to grace, leave the grace that blows on this matter to blow over you. Well then, you are going to have still other trials along the way of this process [of writing the Collection]." (São Bento, November 21, 1983, p. 7).

Such a disposition was invariable on my part up to August 1995. I recall that some of the last times I expressed to him this purpose, he repeated: "I see very well that you are not pressuring me to publish your work. I never stop thanking Our Lady for that and I ask her to keep you always with the same good disposition."

Hence, an inappropriate attachment of the author to seeing his work published is not proved. It is, therefore, unfounded. On the contrary, various facts mentioned and texts transcribed speak

in a sense opposite of the accusation. This gives credence, rather, to the author's docility in obeying Dr. Plinio. About the guarantee the author offers regarding the truth of his words, see Refutation of Argument IX.

**3. The confrontation.** Finally, you try to present a timid Dr. Plinio who is afraid to confront me and tell me, man to man, that he no longer wanted the work until I would become "more flexible," according to the euphemism you used. Also, in Mr. Fragelli's declaration concerning my alleged state of mind in 1986, one perceives the same attempt to overestimate Dr. Plinio's care to avoid a confrontation with me. Thus: "To calm the spirit of Mr. Atila was the explicit intention of Dr. Plinio" (p. 1, § 5). Later, when speaking with the witness about the possibility of publishing a *message* instead of the work, Dr. Plinio would have been very concerned: "It remained to be seen whether Mr. Atila would accept it..." (p. 2, § 7) .

This imaginary projection of a scared and uncertain Dr. Plinio, who would have commissioned a small work from a person who wanted to impose a huge work; who, instead of dismissing such a person, would find himself powerless and would let him continue to work exclusively to "calm his spirits"; who would be afraid of presenting his stronger criticisms in the review; and who lacked conditions to stop the progression of the work and its preparation for publication – such an imaginary figure does not correspond to the Dr. Plinio I knew. It better resembles the psychology of other persons – those with the delicate conception of the Counter-Revolution that I already mentioned above (cf. Refutation of Argument VII.5.C, 1<sup>st</sup> point).

The Dr. Plinio I knew commissioned me to make numerous works – about 30 on the most diverse subjects – which I keep in my archives. He used them as he saw fit, sometimes quoting them without mentioning the researcher; sometimes he simply read them and filed them in the archives; at other times he had parts incorporated into some work of the TFP, and yet other times, he sent me an apology for not having even had the time to read them. He decided whatever he liked about the advantage to be taken – or not taken – from each of these works, without ever having recourse to the tortuous exits that you and one of your witnesses attribute to him. I cite some of this list, to not remain in the realm of generalities.

**A** - Once, Dr. Plinio decided to hold a series of general meetings on the responsibility of TFP members to be reserved about internal matters – we were at the time facing a defamation campaign from persons who left the TFP leaving moles inside. These moles induced the unwary to tell what they knew and the imaginative to invent what they did not know. Under these conditions, he ordered me to study the doctrine in Catholic Morals about those who betray secrets of conscience, slanderers, calumniators, the imprudent, the reckless, informers, spies, etc. And he asked that I report the penalties that Morals established for each of these crimes, as well as for multiple delicts. In short, he asked me for an overview.

That work was done (65 pages) and delivered to him. Dr. Plinio read it, called me and commented: "I wanted to know the full extent of the Church's holy hatred against this type of person. How beautiful!" This was all he said. He did not make the meetings planned, gave me no explanations, nor did I ask for them. He returned the material to me. The subject was closed. He

was not afraid to face me, he did not try to "calm my spirits," nor any other suppositions you attribute to him.

**B** - Many years ago, Dr. Plinio planned to make a refutation of Freud. He called me and asked me to do a two-part study. One, an exposition of Freud's thought with its complete framework; another, the refutation of Freudian thought based on Natural Law, Catholic Doctrine and medicine. In this refutation, the emphasis should be on the defense of male chastity.

Mr. José Coutinho and I planned the study together and divided the tasks, the first fell to me, the second to him. For the first part, I asked the perspicacious and efficient research assistance of Mr. Roberto Luis Wasilewski, then in New York. Mr. Roberto Wasilewski gained access to specialized publications reporting the opening of the archives of Freud's daughter, a US resident, who had unpublished documentation on her father. He sent me the material, which I presented to Dr. Plinio.

With these excellent documents in hand, Dr. Plinio held a meeting with the Sectional Directors of the TFP of Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais, which included numerous doctors. He presented the results of Mr. Roberto Wasilewski's research as an example of what the physicians in TFP should have done long ago, but had only been accomplished now. The reception was good, and from this, the meetings of the Medical Commission were born.

The first part of the commissioned work on Freud changed somewhat. Dr. Plinio commented on the unexpected fruits of the research, and ordered me to suspend the first part of the work, which he would give instead to that recently started Commission. He was not concerned about avoiding any eventual resentments or excessive attachment on my part.

The second part of the study continued and came to an end, 380 typed pages on the practice of chastity as opposed to Freudian doctrine. I presented the result to Dr. Plinio, who was very pleased. He glanced through it, told me he would not have time to read it, and it was returned to the archives. I noted no fear in him to communicate his decision to me.

**C** - During the defamation campaign of the French TFP, he asked me for a detailed study on Prophetism, which I made (119 pages). A summary of the study was going to be incorporated as a chapter of the *Réfutation*. A certain person [Bishop Castro Mayer] vetoed its introduction, allowing only a mention of it at the foot of the page, thus leaving our flank open to the adversary. Dr. Plinio commented on this fact to me, without giving me any orientation on how that work would be used in the future since he also did not know. I understood his position and asked nothing. I was honored to share with him that perplexity. The work went to the archive. I did not notice in Dr. Plinio any fear to confront me, nor any concern about hurting me or the need to calm me down.

**D** - I could cite many more examples, because, thanks be to God, the works he asked me to make were countless, as I said. I close with one more, because it is a matter of importance, perhaps of greater importance than the work on the Council.

It refers to my work as secretary of the MNF meetings. From 1970 until the study on the Council [1982], I worked uninterruptedly in this secretariat. Dr. Plinio's objective for my work was to

prepare the subject matters dealt with since 1956 for publication. I made several summaries to meet that end. The principal of these was *The Human Process*, a book published in 1972 by Editora Vera Cruz. Other summaries, not made directly by me were, however, coordinated by me.

In 1983, on the occasion of the 75<sup>th</sup> birthday of Dr. Plinio, my assistants and I were able to present the completed work. We delivered 37 volumes of summaries-compilations of the subjects dealt with at the meetings. Those summaries were basically ready for publication. Four volumes of indexes accompanied the summaries.

Dr. Plinio was very pleased to receive this completed work and commented on the fact at various times and places, praising those who had worked on it. In concrete, however, he merely paged through a few volumes. A few days after it was delivered to him, the material was sent from his residence to my office, without mention of any immediate plans for its use. My collaborators and I were very pleased to have finished the work, without needing to ask him how it would be used. We continued to improve it until 1995.

Today, eight more volumes have been added to the 37, and two more to the four indexes. As it is known, with the exception of *The Human Process*, until now the material has not been published. In not publishing the work, did Dr. Plinio have any fear to confront me? Was he concerned about "calming my spirits" or making any effort to overcome my obstinacy? Was he waiting for my "intellectual maturity" or "my life experience" to grow? I noticed nothing along these lines.

If, in these and so many other works, he did not display the fears that you construed as being his, why should he have them with regard to the work on the Council?

**E** - In addition, from 1973 to 1987, I was the most frequent participant and assistant in the intellectual elaboration of the MNF meetings, held three times per week. The tapes of these meetings circulated and are still circulated by the TFP and there are many who can testify to what I affirm. When was Dr. Plinio afraid of confronting me or anyone else at these meetings? Innumerable times, I remember with gratitude and longing, he gave me a good bruising when I did not agree with something true. Paternally, certainly, but inflexible in defending the truth and Catholic Doctrine, he never feared anyone and never recoiled from the need to correct or even punish. And when it was not a matter of an intellectual dispute, he rebuked me privately.

I remember once having made a revolutionary critique of a certain custom of Louis XIV. He said nothing at the meeting. That night, however, when I had the privilege of assisting at his dinner with no one else there, he did not miss the opportunity to scold me paternally but severely: "At the meeting today you directed a sarcastic observation at Louis XIV. I want you to know that this is not an attitude to be taken in my presence." Of course, I was sorry and enthused to see this rigor in him. This is but one example among so many.

Having said this, I ask how can you suppose that Dr. Plinio would fear a confrontation with me in such a serious matter, which concerns the defense of the Holy Church? I repeat, you depicted another person.

### Conclusion of the refutation to Argument VIII

Having discussed this Argument VIII, we see that it has no basis in reality:

- *First*, because the accusation provides no evidence that Dr. Plinio would be indefinitely delaying the review of the author's work.
- *Second*, because the accusation presents no serious credentials to attribute this or that thought to Dr. Plinio.
- *Third*, because the attribution of an indefinite postponement clashes with the commitments that Dr. Plinio made or took in an opposite sense.
- *Fourth*, because the alleged reason – the author's recalcitrance to allow revisions and his attachment to the work – is denied by the facts and by evidence in meetings where Dr. Plinio recognizes or affirms the opposite.
- *Fifth*, because the attribution that Dr. Plinio would fear a confrontation with the author is contradicted by the author's long habit of doing intellectual work for Dr. Plinio without the latter ever having revealed such a fear.
- Therefore, the attributions of the accusation appear as fantasies or subjective compositions that present an unreal Dr. Plinio, shaped to fulfill the needs of the accusation.

\*

## ARGUMENT IX

### THE STUBBORNESS OF THE AUTHOR IN REFUSING A SERIOUS REVIEW OF HIS WORK WAS ONE OF THE SUFFERINGS OF DR. PLINIO ON HIS DEATHBED

#### **Proof in the text of the Accusation**

\* "He [Dr. Plinio] hoped and prayed that one day, through intellectual maturity inherent to the experience of life ... you would be open to accept a serious review of your work .... That day, unfortunately, has not yet arrived and was probably one of the many perplexities that Dr. Plinio offered to Our Lady at the hour of his death" (p. 5, § 3).

#### **Refutation to Argument IX**

In Item 2 of the preceding argument, the question of the author's inappropriate attachment to his work was dealt with, and in Argument VI the matter of the supposed refusals of reviews was addressed. In both cases the accusations were unfounded.

Now, it remains to respond only to the question of the author's recalcitrance being one of the reasons for Dr. Plinio's suffering on his deathbed.

Above, I analyzed your pretension to interpret what Dr. Plinio thought about this or that. In other words, you pretended to know, with regard to Dr. Plinio, what Catholic theology calls "the secrets of the heart" – that is, those private thoughts that a man does not reveal and which not even the highest angels are capable of discerning. Lamentably, however, your discernment was not objective, since it contradicts the facts, the evidence and the arguments that I have set out.

Now, your pretension increases. Going beyond the normal secrets of a man, it reaches the threshold where life and eternity meet, entering that supreme moment when Dr. Plinio was preparing to present himself before the Almighty Creator and Supreme Judge; at this moment, then, you choose to make the accusation against me that I added a weighty grievance to that suffering and sublime soul.

Not having proved what you desired either by evidence or arguments, now you go on to attribute to that dying man an intention that you are unable to demonstrate! So, you bring him, in his agony, to support the accusation that you have so lamentably presented, so clumsily developed and so unjustly concluded.

Faced with such an action – to produce the imaginary testimony of a dying man on his bed of pain – I have only one answer.

I appeal to him, I appeal to Dr. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira. He promised that he would not abandon the TFP in its struggles and trials. Then, in the name of the vocation that Our Lady gave me to follow him in order to fight for the Counter-Revolution, I ask him – from the heavenly place in which he finds himself – to intervene and clarify if you are speaking the truth.

After placing myself in his presence, in order to guarantee what I have written, I beg him to punish me exemplarily if, in this refutation, any of the unrecorded statements I ascribe to him are untrue. Not, of course, the precise wording, for words are never exact when reproduced from memory. But rather, the precision of the meaning I gave to the words that came from his lips.

But, if I ask such a punishment to fall upon myself, I also ask, under the same conditions, that the same chastisement may fall on those who accuse me: If the attributions that you and others have made of the words and thoughts of Dr. Plinio were not objective, then, let him punish you exemplarily. Not if you have acted in good faith. But if you and those who inspired and collaborated with you in fact are moved by the desire to impede the counter-revolutionary fight, then, let his holy wrath fall on the guilty in the inverse proportion of his love for the Holy Church.

This is the only response I think appropriate.

With this, I conclude the discussion of Argument IX.

\*

## CONCLUSION OF THESIS I

**THUS, DR. PLINIO DID NOT WANT THE MENTIONED PUBLICATION AND THE AUTHOR ACTED ABUSIVELY AND INTENTIONALLY IN SAYING THAT HE DID**

### Refutation of Conclusion of Thesis I

Contrary to the claim, one concludes that:

In **Argument I**, from the standpoint of the merit of matter (material logic),

- It became clear that Dr. Plinio, from the beginning to the end of his orientation, was thinking of a work of considerable proportions.
- It became clear that the author did not press for his work to have larger proportions, but Dr. Plinio himself insisted on this.
- It became clear that the idea of drafting a document to be made by him – like that of the *Message* – was suggested by the author, contrary to what the accusation claims.

Hence, it was demonstrated that the charge of Argument I is void.

In addition, from the moral point of view, it was shown that in the accusation

- There was partiality: the accusation made no effort to know about the texts exposed in the refutation;
- And also injustice: the author is punished for having obeyed what Dr. Plinio wanted him to do.

From the point of view of how the matter was treated (formal logic),

- It became clear in Argument I that three times the accusation went beyond what the testimony of one of the witnesses said.
- It became clear that this witness was slippery in his declaration; hence, he raised the suspicion of having made it to please interested parties of the accusation.
- The other witness invalidated the accusation, since he made it clear in his testimony that from the beginning Dr. Plinio had desired a larger work than the accusation alleged.

Hence, it became evident that the two charges made against the author turned against the accusation: excessive generalizations and hastiness.

In addition, from the moral point of view,

- In the accusation one finds mediocrity: it disproportionately diminished Dr. Plinio's plans;
- And pusillanimity: it obstinately refused to face the enemy clearly described by Dr. Plinio.

In **Argument II**, from the point of view of the merit of the matter,

- It became clear from the reading of the excerpts presented that at the beginning, middle or end of the preparatory period of the work, no deliberation of Dr. Plinio appeared that the analysis of the Council should refer exclusively to conciliar documents. Hence, it is evident that the charge of Argument II is void.

The other consequences by the defense in the conclusion of this Argument II are analogous to those of Argument I, repeating and reinforcing them.

In **Argument III**, from the point of view of the merit of the matter,

- It became clear that the accusation was mistaken in maintaining that an interpellation written in the form of a defense could not contain an attack.
- The accusation greatly erred in attributing to Dr. Plinio an attitude of "passive resistance" toward the current crisis of the Church, while the texts demonstrate the combative spirit of Dr. Plinio and his constant desire, through an interpellation – an eminently non-passive action – to put an end to that crisis.
- And it revealed total ignorance about Dr. Plinio's intentions and plans concerning the work of analysis of Vatican Council II.

Hence, it is evident that the charge of Argument III is null and void.

Further, from a moral point of view,

- There was a guilty forgetfulness regarding the teachings of Dr. Plinio – some of those who provided information for the accusation were present at the symposium (at the Hermitage of the Prophetic Union) made about the work, where Dr. Plinio indicated his will, contrary to the accusation.
- There was partiality shown by making no effort to learn about the impressive number of statements of Dr. Plinio contrary to the accusation.
- There was a strong suspicion of pusillanimity in defending the position of "passive resistance" as being the ideal for the TFP.
- There was suspicion of complicity with the enemies of the Church in trying to prevent the publication and dissemination of the work on the Council.
- And, finally, there was manifest injustice in condemning the author for doing something that is combative and for having obeyed Dr. Plinio.

In Argument III, from the point of view of the way the matter was treated,

- It became clear that the accusation did not provide any proof that, in the book *In the Murky Waters*, the author "entered spear in hand" and conferred to his study "an offensive character." The two assertions, therefore, are null and void.

- It became clear that the prosecution did not present the names of the witnesses – "the closest friends of our Founder" and "those who helped the author in the research" who would have said that Dr. Plinio wanted the work to be only a shield for the TFP. The two who make written statements do not address this issue. Therefore, the charge is null and void.

In **Argument IV**, from the point of view of the merit of the matter,

- It became clear from the numerous excerpts taken from transcribed meetings that Dr. Plinio intended to give the work a very widespread dissemination, and did not plan only a restricted distribution to the "higher spheres" of the Vatican, as the accusation claimed.
- This would not exclude it being directed and forwarded to the Pope and the Cardinals and, at the same time, have a wide circulation.

Hence, it can be seen that the accusation was wrong to attribute the character of exclusivity to the plan of Dr. Plinio. Therefore, the charge is null and void.

In addition, from the moral point of view,

- The accusation is guilty of disinformation for not having tried to know the abundant material that shows the opposite of what Argument IV affirms.
- As a necessary consequence, the accusation once again incurs the moral vice of partiality,
- Of having a prejudiced attitude towards the work and the author,
- And of a grave injustice for condemning the latter for having obeyed Dr. Plinio.

In **Argument IV**, from the point of view of how the matter was treated,

- It became clear that there is a contradiction between Argument I's accusation and that of Argument IV. In fact, *first*, in Argument I the accusation impugned the author for not being satisfied that Dr. Plinio would write a *message*, which by its nature would suppose a wide divulgation; *then*, in Argument IV the accusation pretended that the author's work should be exposed only to the highest "Vatican authorities." Therefore, the accusations are contradictory.
- In addition, one of the witnesses stated that the work was being translated into English for the purpose of presenting it to the Holy See. However, it is not customary to translate documents sent to the Vatican and, if they are, it would be into French or Italian. And Dr. Plinio, who was practiced in dealing with the Vatican, never employed English for this purpose. Therefore, the statement is contradictory to the praxes of the Church.
- In addition, the last statement is false, because it was clear that Dr. Plinio had the work translated into English with the intention of giving it wide publicity.

- And, so, such a statement raises the suspicion that the witness made these claims to circumvent the truth.

In **Argument V**, from the point of view of the testimony of the eyewitnesses,

- It was clear that the witness who read the work and described it as "un-publishable" and "without scientific rigor" omitted to say that, when he read it, the work was still an early draft and was not considered publishable by anyone. In order for his criticism to be valid, he should read it today, after it has been published. Therefore, his statement has no value.
- It was clear that the witness had failed to present the eulogies he made of it when he was acting as proof-reader. And today he is eager to speak about what he no longer knows.
- It was clear that by omitting in his statement that he had been a reviewer of the author's earlier work, the witness made himself culpable of the indiscriminate accusation of using excessive generalizations that he made against the author, since in that work there were no such generalizations.
- It was clear that in his statement the witness simultaneously accused the author of excessive generalizations and not accepting the corrections of the reviewers. Both charges are indiscriminate. However, the witness had previously been a reviewer of another work of the author where there are no generalizations. Therefore, either the author accepted the corrections of the reviewers or did not make generalizations. Hence the witness has failed to tell the truth.
- Since, however, he made his statement taking God as witness, one sees that the witness is guilty of perjury and sin against the Second Commandment.
- It was clear that the witness omitted mention the atmosphere of warmth at the beginning of the work. Hence, he becomes suspicious of partiality, for that climate testifies against his testimony that presents the author as hostile to all his reviewers.
- It was clear that the witness attributed to Dr. Plinio the statement that the author did not accept the corrections of the reviewers and others. Now, on the date when Dr. Plinio would have said this, the first review of the work, which had just been typed, would not yet have been reviewed. Therefore, it is strongly suspected that the witness exaggerated the words he attributed to Dr. Plinio.
- It was clear that the witness omitted the author's past experience, which he probably knew about, where the author accepted all the revisions of his work without even reading them. He also omitted mention of the agreement, which he also probably knew about, where Dr. Plinio had agreed that the author should choose his reviewers in future works. If purposeful, such omissions would reveal the witness's bad faith, since he gives a

dramatic air to both the possibility of the author not following the corrections of the reviewers and of exclusively choosing his collaborators.

- In addition, he attributed to Dr. Plinio criticisms of the author that are not credible and, thus, incurred the suspicion of exaggeration.
- It became clear that the witness was once again seriously suspect of exaggerating the words he attributed to Dr. Plinio by contradicting his invariable courtesy, both with respect to the reviewer or the author.

From this one sees that the declaration of the eyewitness is a document without value to conclude the author's lack of intellectual capacity or the scientific rigor of his work.

In **Argument V**, regarding the ear witnesses,

- It became clear that the accusation did not provide evidence for attributing to Dr. Plinio the statement that the author's work "is insufficient."
- It became clear that this statement of "insufficiency," which the accusation affirms to have been said by one of the witnesses, was not in that witness' declaration.
- The accusation at times attributed to Dr. Plinio the assertion that the author's work was "insufficient," as if Dr. Plinio had read it fully; at times it affirms that Dr. Plinio could not have praised the work because he had not read it all. Therefore, it is clear that these two statements are contradictory.
- They also reveal partiality.

In Argument V, regarding the excerpts of Dr. Plinio,

- It became clear that he considered the author not only proportional to the work and capable of satisfactorily writing the Collection on the Council, but he declared that the Collection was "one of the lines he had expected of the author."
- Further, he did not spare praise for the work – whether partial or global – in numerous analyzes, several with the text before his eyes. This speaks strongly against the accusation that he considered it "insufficient" and "without scientific rigor."
- However, regardless of the intellectual merit of the author, Dr. Plinio conceived for the work a method to be followed in the writing that leaves it armored against possible attacks of theological insufficiency without, however, prejudicing the strategic purpose of the fight.

Therefore, the assertions of insufficiency and the lack of intellectual rigor of the work have no basis; but even if they had, they would not be such as to prevent the work from being published.

In Argument V, regarding the comments of persons who read the work both inside and outside of the TFP,

- It became clear that the cited letters oppose what the accusation says – that the work is insufficient from the intellectual point of view and without scientific rigor. This testimony against the accusation has different degrees: Everyone considered the work to have a good intellectual level. Those who read it in its preparatory stages naturally suggested improvements and, in this sense, they perfected its scientific rigor. Those reading it in the final phase were unanimous in considering it to meet very high intellectual standards and have scientific rigor.

Given the specific refutation of the eye and ear witnesses, the major refutation presenting the texts of Dr. Plinio and the refutation based on the testimonies of those who read Volume I after the eyewitness, it became clear that the charge of this Argument V is baseless. That is, the argument has no dialectical value, which is synonymous with being null and void.

In **Argument VI**, concerning the persons who read and made corrections to the work,

- It was conclusively demonstrated that the accusation that the author did not accept corrections from the reviewers is false. And anyone who imputes this denies the evidence of the facts and, therefore, is guilty of bad faith. The bad faith that becomes patent in this argument projects grave suspicion on the other charges.
- It became clear that the accusation was contradictory in accusing the author of not accepting the review of one person [Dr. Paulo Brito], when in that same letter the author manifested his desire to accept the reviews of eight others.

In Argument VI, regarding the subject matter of Volume I,

- It became clear that in Volume I there was no topic that required the consultation of theological reviewers. Hence, the complete superficiality of the accusation that reproves the author for not having submitted it to such reviewers is patent.
- In Argument VI, since Dr. Plinio had earlier considered the perspective of a profound review of the work, but later, before his death, he changed his mind, according to the author's account and confirmed by two documents: one sent to the Holy See by four priests and the other to Dom Estêvão Bettencourt by the author. It was clear that the accusation was based on misinformation and *ipso facto* is unfounded.

In **Argument VII**,

- It became clear that parts of the accusation suffer from cascading generalizations, since it presents the testimony of various unnamed witnesses: "the assistants" of the author, "some close associates" of Dr. Plinio, those "who over the years have collaborated in the work of the author," and "all the reviewers" of the work, without naming any of them.
- It became clear from the refutation of the accusation that one of the witnesses has a weak memory, for he confuses four essential facts in his testimony: He names the wrong year of the date of the symposium; he errs on the number of days; he does not remem-

ber the type of corrections that were made, nor does he remember the corrected work, all of which invalidate his testimony.

- It became clear that the witness' participation at the symposium was remiss, which speaks against the objectivity of his testimony, which was made more than 10 years after the fact.
- It became clear that the witness sought to adapt his presentation to an imaginative re-composition of the event.
- It became clear that the accusation claiming the author would not have accepted the corrections of Dr. Plinio was denied by Dr. Plinio himself and by other facts, duly set out.
- It became clear, from the exposition of the texts, that the issues dealt with in the review were not superficial, as the accusation pretends.
- It became clear that arguing points with sound reasoning and eventually not accepting some of them during a review does not indicate contestation, but is a common intellectual procedure, which invalidates the accusation, at least until contrary evidence is presented.
- It became clear, above all, that the accusation of the entire futility of the revision of Volume I is groundless.
- It became clear that an incident showing a lack of respect during a discussion does not invalidate the intellectual merit of the topic, since it was a moral issue. Nevertheless, if there were such a lack – there are no documents – the author apologizes publicly.
- It became clear that the accusation of the author complaining about shortening a meeting did not invalidate the intellectual review. However, if such a complaint were made, the author apologizes publicly.

In **Argument VIII**, the accusation extrapolated from the facts and opinions spoken there and captured on cassettes to attribute thoughts and intentions to Dr. Plinio that he never spoke. It became clear that such a procedure invalidates the charge, and that the defense, without any need, dealt with this Argument VIII merely to establish the truth. Thus, in the discussion,

- It became clear that the accusation that Dr. Plinio had deliberately delayed the revision of the work indefinitely is discredited by other actions of Dr. Plinio in which he committed himself to a forthcoming publication.
- It became clear that the accusation that the author would have been obstinate in accepting the review of Dr. Plinio was not proven; to the contrary, there are excerpts of conversation between Dr. Plinio and the author in which Dr. Plinio states or admits the opposite.

- It became clear that the claim that Dr. Plinio feared a confrontation with the author is contradicted by the author's long custom of undertaking intellectual works for Dr. Plinio, without the latter ever having expressed such a fear.

Therefore, the attributions of the accusation look like fantasies or subjective illusions that present an unreal Dr. Plinio, shaped according to the taste of the accusation.

In **Argument IX**, where the accusation repeats its system of assigning unconfessed thoughts to Dr. Plinio and imagines that the recalcitrance of the author would have been one of the causes that increased his suffering on his deathbed, it is clear that the author has no way to defend himself from this arbitrary sentence and, thus, he appeals to Dr. Plinio himself to address the issue.

With this summary I conclude the discussion of Thesis I.

\* \* \*

## PART IV

### THESIS II

**THE ESTABLISHED AUTHORITIES OF THE BRAZILIAN TFP HAVE THE RIGHT TO DECIDE ON THE WRITING, PUBLICATION AND DIVULGATION OF THE WORKS OF ITS MEMBERS;  
SINCE THE AUTHOR PUBLISHED HIS BOOK WITHOUT THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND CONSENT, HE ACTED AGAINST THE RIGHTS OF THE TFP AUTHORITIES**

#### **Refutation of Thesis II**

For the refutation of Thesis II, some clarifications are necessary as well as the exposition of some presuppositions.

#### **Initial clarifications**

**A** - For the presentation of this Thesis II, by reformulating the text a little (cf. letter D), it was possible to enunciate it in the form of a syllogism. This facilitates a clear exposition of the thinking expressed in your letter and, consequently, enables a greater precision in the response.

**B** - That said, I depart here from the inductive method, which I tried to make the governing rule of the refutation to Thesis I, to adopt the deductive. Such a method, however, as I explained above (see Part I, 2), cannot be adopted without adaptations, for your exposition presented itself in extremely variegated forms regarding the methodology adopted. These adaptations will adjust themselves to the reality. That is, I will analyze the data of your accusation that aim to strengthen each argument, independent of the rigor of the deductive method. This can give a certain impression of confusion. I will try to avoid this as much as possible, so long as it does not prejudice the objectivity of the accusation.

**C** – Still regarding the deductive procedure, I will modify the terms of the classical presentation – major premise, minor premise, conclusion. Instead, I will use Argument I, Argument II and Conclusion, and in this way try to give unity to the presentation of the two theses. I will, therefore, adopt the following distribution of the subject matter:

- \* **Argument I - The lawfully constituted authorities of the Brazilian TFP decide about the writing, publication and dissemination of the works of its members.**
- \* **Argument II - The author published his book without the knowledge and consent of these authorities.**
- \* **Conclusion - He thus acted against the rights of the TFP authorities.**

**D** - I used the expression: "reformulating the text a little" (cf. letter A). To what does this refer? It pertains principally to the confusion adopted in your accusation of mixing the concept of TFP as a civic society, governed by clear *Statutes* following the present laws of Brazil, and the concept

of the family of souls of the TFP, which is undoubtedly a very rich reality but one not yet governed by its own written laws. For this reason, since the accusation seeks to impose the statutory sanctions of a civil society on *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, it was necessary for me to "reformulate the text a little," limiting ourselves to the Statutes of a civil society, without taking into account the possible disciplinary conditions of the family of souls. I will deal with this question further on with due care (cf. Refutation of Argument I, Presupposition 1).

**E** - Given this confusion between a civil society and a family of souls, some of the supporting texts will concern the latter, but they should be considered as reinforcing the thesis of the civil society, since there is no established written legislation for the family of souls. This alone is consistent in determining whether the accused deserves punishment.

**F** - Since I have already demonstrated in Thesis I that Dr. Plinio wanted the publication of the work I wrote, the passages in which you declare that its writing was not desired by him or by the current Directory proves only the latter affirmation.

**G** - Finally, in this Thesis II, I will provide evidence from the text only after each argument is stated, and not after the statement of the Thesis and the arguments, as I did in Thesis I. This is understandable since here the arguments are contained in the thesis.

\*

## ARGUMENT I

### THE ESTABLISHED AUTHORITIES OF THE BRAZILIAN TFP HAVE THE RIGHT TO DECIDE ON THE WRITING, PUBLICATION AND DIVULGATION OF THE WORKS OF ITS MEMBERS.

#### Proof in the text

- \* "In these conversations, he [Dr. Plinio Xavier] insisted ... that with Prof. Plinio's absence, we were against its publication without an assurance that your writing was secure and that the occasion timely" (p. 1, §2).
- \* "The death of our Founder made this [review] even more necessary than in his life, as well as an evaluation – in the tactical-political field – to be made by members of the TFP chosen by us and recognized as capable of issuing an opinion" (p. 1, § 4).
- \* "The first condition for cohesion for an association is respect for authority. By going public in a matter of this gravity without the agreement of those who have the authority in our family of souls, you set a precedent that can be imitated in different areas by other members of the Group" (p. 8, § 1).

#### Refutation of Argument I

For the good procedure of my Refutation, I consider it necessary to establish some presuppositions.

#### Presuppositions

**1. Civil society and family of souls.** The TFP as a civil society is a reality. Its *Statutes*, its juridical structure, its governing body, the lives of its members, its dynamism, its numerous seats, the annual activity reports show that perhaps there is no civil society in our country so organized and active. However, in this same conjunct of members that compose it, there is another reality: the family of souls. Of itself, this expression is legitimate and, one would say, almost banal, because whenever several persons are united around the same objective, it can be affirmed that a family of souls is constituted. However, in the TFP such an expression has its own meaning. It is a reflection of a higher aspiration, which, without excluding or denying the objectives of the TFP (as a civil entity), in a certain way surpasses them. I cite some of its characteristics:

**Regarding its foundation**, this family of souls was instituted by Dr. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira. This is not the moment to record the history of its development. I only emphasize that its early beginnings precede by about 30 years the foundation of the legal entity of the Brazilian Society for

the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property. The family of souls of the members of TFP sees in Dr. Plinio its master and its model. Each of its components had a personal bond with him constituted by a union of ideals, will and dedication that moved him to surrender his life to the fight for the Counter-Revolution. And today, after his death, **a member continues to consider himself attached to him, rather than to this or that intermediate authority.**

**Regarding the goals** it seeks to achieve, without denying the noble and necessary struggles in defense of Tradition, Family and Property, this family of souls yearns for **the defeat of the Revolution**, as described in the book *Revolution and Counter-Revolution* of Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, both in the civil sphere and in the ecclesiastical sphere. **It seeks the establishment of a Church "without blemish or wrinkle"** (Eph. 5:27) in the spiritual sphere and, in the temporal sphere, **the rebirth of a new Christendom** that glorifies Christ Our Lord and His Blessed Mother in its customs, institutions and laws.

**Regarding the field where this ideal is exercised.** By analogy, this family of souls has found one of the most complete definitions of its aspirations in the prophetic description that St. Louis Grignon de Montfort made of the Apostles of the Latter Times, who will fight for the defense of the Catholic Church and usher in a new historical era. Such affinity would, thus, speak in favor of a religious ideal. But in such a way that this family of souls is turned toward analyzing what constitutes temporal society – its history, its politics, the various bodies that compose it, its hierarchy, the way to influence it for the good and protect it from the evil, the analysis of the public opinion that integrates it, the legitimate regimes of government that it can have, the organic structure of its institutions, the adequacy of its laws, etc. – that one would say it is turned only to the defense of the temporal order. Therefore, one sees that **the ideal** to which this family of souls aspires is extraordinarily broad. And, curiously enough, it **does not restrict itself to just one of the fields, ecclesiastical or civil, but encompasses both.**

**Regarding the juridical tools for the realization of this ideal**, in the temporal sphere the mentioned family of souls finds the basic elements for the realization of its ideal in the TFP, a civil society.

In the spiritual realm, however, a painful circumstance prevents the TFP from having an analogous projection in Ecclesiastical Law. That is to say, after Vatican Council II, a current of thought that this family of souls aims to fight – Progressivism – established itself in large circles of the Church and is having increasing influence on her. Thus, the possibility for establishing an institution in Ecclesiastical Law similar to what the statutory structure of the TFP reflects in Civil Law did not materialize. This was not even attempted in order not to expose this family of souls to the possible limitations that submission to the ecclesiastical authority implies. And such a status probably will not be achieved until Progressivism is wiped out of the Holy Church.

Hence, it follows that innumerable aspirations of this family of souls transcend in a certain way – and legitimately so – the limits of TFP as a civil society.

**Regarding the effectiveness of the juridical structure of TFP**, something similar occurred before the death of Dr. Plinio. Although the members of this family of souls had and have in large measure their civil expression, which is the TFP, as a rule they did not pay close attention to its

juridical structure. For, knowing that this was what Dr. Plinio wanted and that he had his eye on it, it was not a matter of particular concern to them. This mentioned juridical structure included, *ipso facto*, the ruling of these or those *Statutes*, the appointment of these or those persons for the official exercise of functions, the meetings requirements of the National Council or the National Administrative and Financial Director - DAFN, its minutes, reports, etc.

In other words, the life of the members of this family of souls in large part ran parallel to such juridical concerns, just as the lives of officers and soldiers deployed to a far-away battlefield can be understood to run parallel to the concerns of the commander or the crew of the transport ship regarding the technical requirements of the vessel and the voyage. And, in this way, many members of this family of souls, even long time members, educated and dedicated to serious study, never bothered to read the *Statutes*. The organic life that characterized such a family of souls was the richest reality about which everyone was concerned.

Now, with the death of Dr. Plinio, and in the absence of another juridical instrument in the ecclesiastical sphere that would reflect the many aspects of the ideal of this family of souls, the statutory reality of the civil association assumed a prominence which, from various points of view, does not reflect the amplitude of our ideals. That is to say, by considering the *Statutes* a guiding and decisive structure in the internal life of the TFP, one runs the serious risk of abandoning the living reality that characterizes us.

I conclude this 1<sup>st</sup> Presupposition affirming that the attributions of the persons appointed to directive positions in the National Council and DAFN are certainly in accordance with the *Statutes*. However, if, based on this point alone, they want to assume the authority that Dr. Plinio exercised cumulatively in the civil association of TFP and in this family of souls, they will commit the same mistake as a transport ship's crew that would pretend to give orders to the land officers and soldiers in the ship about the military operations that should be made after disembarking, based on the fact that the crew was responsible for the technical success of the transport of troops: that is, because it is legitimately established in its rights. In this case, the living reality of the body of troops, with its organic leaders, specific functions and characteristic goals would be disregarded.

**2. The organic nature of the internal life of this family of souls** used to fill the gaps of the absence of a more complete expression of our ideals in the religious sphere, and it also supplemented those points in the temporal sphere, which, in a certain way, the civil institution of TFP could not reflect entirely. Dr. Plinio never was disturbed by these deficiencies, but organically governed this family of souls according to these common ideals and aspirations.

He understood the normal development of institutions with a great future, whose principal rules and characteristics almost never appear on paper and in the registers of notaries before appearing in the living reality. He knew, then, that this family of souls would pass through its ups and downs until it would find the juridical expression – or expressions – that were perfectly adapted to it. Aware of this and patiently following this organic development, there was every possible harmony in this family of souls while he was with us.

**Regarding the distribution of functions**, he was also masterful. Without formal designations, he used to give the members of this family of souls the opportunity to develop their natural proclivities, be they of leadership, study or inclinations for works of various natures. And what if the chosen person proved themselves to be incapable? Without trauma, this person would be invited to other functions on another battle front. Or, if it were too painful for the person to resign his position, Dr. Plinio would establish an honorific title for him and, then, set up another body that could effectively meet that need. And what if the person proved capable and Our Lady blessed his action? Then, Dr. Plinio would encourage him to go forward and would give him assistants to take the greatest advantage of what Our Lady was blessing. And only then, would he endow this function with legal characteristics.

In this organic process, various persons were charged with different functions. This one was in charge of the apostolate and the internal life, another coordinated studies, another organized campaigns; that one was in charge of certain groups, this one of political contacts, another of relationships with priests. There were persons to deal with the press, supporters, donors, etc. So organic and harmonious was this process that when a person outside the TFP asked him if he was preparing his successor, Dr. Plinio replied, not one, but various successors, since each person charged with a duty was formed to continue to perform that function requested by him.

It is Dr. Plinio himself who recounts the fact: "You have the answer to the problem of my succession. I prepare my successors in this way. Because anyone [in TFP] has every opportunity to be capable of being my successor, as long as he, in this system, takes advantage of all that he can for his formation and dedicates himself as much as possible. It falls to those who live after me to choose this successor. I will have done my best to have made several. Because an organization that does not have several successors in the process of being formed does not deserve to live" (Meeting for Supporters, June 22, 1984, p. 3).

The same organic reality established by Dr. Plinio as a means to prepare the future of the TFP was addressed by him in a response to journalists (see interviews for *Zero Hora*, January 21, 1993; *Folha de S. Paulo*, November 8, 1993).

I conclude this 2<sup>nd</sup> Presupposition by stating that, should an authority come to establish itself in this family of souls, it should be based on the living reality of those organically placed in positions of responsibility by Dr. Plinio through the decades. If one were not to consider these persons, he would be acting outside of the reality. If he were to turn against them, he would have the temerity to combat the natural order and would run the risk of seeing this adage applied: *Chassez le naturel, qu'il reviendra au galop* [if you drive out the natural, it will return at a gallop].

**3. The exercise of authority.** If Dr. Plinio chose and formed his assistants in the organic process I have just described, his manner of governing was no less wise. He always presented wide-ranging and grand plans for each sector so that, to accomplish them, its directors had to make a great effort, leaving little idle time for internal squabbles. Periodically, he would again monitor the execution of such plans and update them in view of this or that new data in the R-CR pano-

rama. Thus, he governed *per altissimas causas* [by the highest causes] executing plans for the destruction of the Revolution and being attentive to the action of Our Lady.

His words are significant about what unites the members of this family of souls. Those who are united are those "who have similar forms of love for the Church, similar forms of enthusiasm, similar forms of dedication, who want for the Church a determined good. In our case, the destruction of the gnostic and egalitarian Revolution. This is an enormous good! A colossal good! This is what we should desire with our whole soul, we should give our lives for this" (Santo do Dia, July 28, 1993).

Further on, he applied this ideal to our life together and how to command: "As long as there is no harmonious mix of hatred [for the Revolution] and love [for the Church], there will be nothing. And no one will have learned to command. It is like this ... in the life of each one of you with me; in the daily life of each one of you with the immediate superiors of the various services, sections or house of studies where you are. Each one with another, brother with brother, equal with equal, living in the same way, with the same principle of proportional harmony of hatred and love for things much greater than ourselves, which are completely more than us. ...

**"When, in the daily convivium of the TFP, those who command do not seek any personal advantage for themselves, but only seek the victory of the Cause of the Counter-Revolution, such a person will have learned how to command.** Because we want the same ideal together, this is why we esteem one another. This ideal is so great, so true, so perfect that we will do everything for it. Thus, we do everything for one another. **The consequence is that, in the hour when one commands and another obeys ... a special solidarity unites us guided by the following thought: He is commanding me for the glory of Our Lady. I will obey. [The other says]: I will command so-and-so for the glory of Our Lady. I will exercise authority with care, respect and affection when I will touch this soul, which has been put into my hands so that I may command it. ... When this happens and he [the inferior] perceives that I am not seeking any personal advantage or personal good for myself, but I ask only in the name of the Cause of the Counter-Revolution, then I will have learned how to command"** (*idem*).

Dr. Plinio always tried to remove himself from the internal squabbles, although nothing escaped his vigilance. On one occasion, in my section there was an intricate problem between two members. The question demanded a judgment and punishment of the guilty party. I told him the case, and he said to me, "If I set myself up to try and punish those who commit misdemeanors, I will have to establish a tribunal in the Group and I will be able to do nothing else. Since I need to direct the Counter-Revolution, I do not have time for both. Let us leave Our Lady to resolve the case you present as she pleases. And let us try to move forward in our fight."

It is, again, a confirmation of his non-involvement in personal spats. *Plus ultra!* [Let us rise higher and higher] It was an expression he liked to repeat. Perhaps we could take it as a motto for the exercise of authority.

I conclude this 3<sup>rd</sup> Presupposition affirming that, if someone wants to exercise authority in the TFP family of souls, he must seek first of all to demonstrate his hatred of the Revolution and his love for the Church. Then, he must try to demonstrate his total devotion to the Cause of the

Counter-Revolution. Then he will surely find those who will obey and follow him. As long as this does not happen, he should not be surprised if his subordinates do not listen to him, for they will be hoping to find in him the kind of authority Dr. Plinio transmitted to us by his example and words. Regarding the disputes to determine who is right or wrong in internal quarrels, why not follow his example of magnanimity and wisdom, paying less attention to such problems and turning one's eyes toward the great struggle of the Counter-Revolution?

**4. Conclusion.** Having established:

- the contours of the two realities that are in the TFP: the civil organization and the family of souls;
- the organic limits the authority must respect, not violating the various sectors of leadership, studies and works where Dr. Plinio established certain heads;
- and the way of governing that he instituted in our family of souls;

I conclude the exposition of these presuppositions by raising the hypothesis that the punishment you issued against the author for having published a book desired by Dr. Plinio under the author's exclusive responsibility seems to contradict several of these aspects that characterize our family of souls, because:

- The authority that you assume and evoke to be obeyed seems to be exclusively the legal prerogative of the President of the National Council of the TFP, and not that authority that embraces the leadership of the much broader reality of our family of souls. For, in the election, carried out according to the statutory prescripts that raised you to the highest office of our entity in an election by the 9 voting members (see Articles 14, § 1, 1st part), the living realities that make up our family of souls have not had occasion to manifest themselves.
- In your act against the author of the book in question, no account is given to the fact that it was Dr. Plinio who placed the accused in charge of studies. He was in charge of the studies of the MNF from 1970 to 1987, and responsible for the analysis of the Second Vatican Council from 1982 to 1995, and after his death to this day – that is, 28 years of study, 25<sup>1/2</sup> of those years with his stimulus and under his orientation.

Whereas, you, only in recent possession of a statutory authority and without ever having been especially interested in studies, found it convenient to ignore and violate the organic reality I described above – at least in the case of the author – regarding authorities established by Dr. Plinio. The use of the word violent hardly seemed exaggerated to qualify your action since you and the current Directory, without dedicating a reasonable time to make a serious study on the topic, lack the necessary elements to have a good understanding of the whole of the Collection that was written and, consequently, to make a balanced judgment on it. Nevertheless, the release of the book was condemned without that study being carried out. Hence, it is difficult not to consider your action as violent, arbitrary and gravely unjust.

- Finally, your action reveals an obliviousness to the way of governing that Dr. Plinio always used and advised to be followed in our family of souls. More explicitly, you do not seem to have manifested concern for the defeat of the Revolution and the well-being of the Church; nor do you seem concerned about placing your action under the light of higher panoramas – for the excuses alleged about Dr. Plinio were vacuous, as I demonstrated in Thesis I. You also do not seem to have shown the abnegation that Dr. Plinio characterized as being an attribute of legitimate authority in our family of souls. To the contrary, several of the reasons given by you could be interpreted as being the fruit of an exclusive interest to maintain your command and the peaceful management of your term and the current Directory.

**5. Consequence.** From this conclusion a consequence can be drawn. It is that the whole discussion of your accusations referring to my action is situated exclusively in the ambit of a civil association. That is, it relegates to the shadows a huge gamut of the reality. Notwithstanding, since it is the only arena where there is established written legislation, I will enter into the matter to analyze it.

### **Refutation properly speaking**

Since the question is to analyze what foundation there would be for the affirmation of Argument I in Brazilian Civil Law, there is nothing more elementary than to expose what the *Statutes* of the TFP say that would support your action, as well as what is affirmed in the Constitution of Brazil and other international agreements in force today. This is what I will do.

**1. A sophism.** Beforehand, however, I would like to clear up a sophism that I note is circulating freely – and with a certain stimulus – in the circles around you and the current Directory. The sophism is characterized by assuming a contradictory dialectical position, which I will describe.

**A** - When you and the current Directory wish to make a certain point of view accepted and face some opposition, a punishment is often insinuated: Such opposition will be considered revolutionary because it contests the legitimately constituted authority. What is the basis for the legitimacy of this authority? It is the compliance of the *Statutes* with the current Brazilian legislation. Then, the approval of Dr. Plinio is invoked for having approved the current *Statutes*.

**B** - When, however, someone uses the current Brazilian legislation to defend himself and affirms that your actions and those of the current Directory have imperfect aspects that could be detrimental to his rights, this is also labeled as revolutionary, because the laws of the country – like most contemporary legislation – are based on the principles of the French Revolution. That is, on the motto *liberty-equality-fraternity* and the rights of man and the citizen, proclaimed as inspiring principles of the modern world.

Therefore, the current civil legislation is understood in one sense when you use it to defend the legal foundation for the *Statutes* and is employed in another sense that makes it revolutionary when anyone uses it in a legitimate self-defense. I go on now to clarify this sophism.

Thanks be to God, all the members of the TFP are against the French Revolution, following the thinking of Dr. Plinio as set out in *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*. However, since we live in the contemporary world as it is, and until a legal, persuasive and orderly ideological action backed soundly by public opinion is able to change the general principles that orient our laws, we necessarily have to accept these laws as they are.

It was under the aegis of such legislation that the TFP was established. Therefore, inspired by institutional models of the French Revolution, our *Statutes* established a General Assembly, the supreme authority of the TFP (cf. article 5, §§ 8, 10, 13b, art 12, 14, 17, 20). For the same reason, they chose the title of National Directory, the second authority in the TFP (cf. article 5, idem, § 13). For an analogous motive, as soon as possible the Articles of Association declare themselves to be submissive and conform to Brazilian law (cf., article 1, § 2 *et passim*).<sup>3</sup>

These are juridical realities that presuppose a practical adaptation to the modern world. Nor by this did anyone consider that Dr. Plinio, who approved the *Statutes*, to have conceded anything to the principles of the French Revolution. These are the same *Statutes* that legitimize your juridical power as Vice-President in the exercise of the Presidency of the National Council.

Now, if we accept the present day juridical reality in Brazil as it is, why should you appear scandalized and murmur about the revolutionary spirit of the member of the TFP who, in a judicial recourse, has an advocate that demands the cautionary measure of calling on articles of our legislation in order to guarantee him certain natural rights in the name of the same principles that govern the Modern State? Don't you and the members of the Directory see that this is an imperative of those who defend themselves based on the current legislation? The same legislation, I repeat, that confers to you the right to govern? Perchance, in order not to be a revolutionary, should such a TFP member suggest to his lawyer that he should argue based on the Carolingian Capitulars, the Decrees of Gratian, or the *Fueros* of Phillip or Ordinations of Manuel? They would certainly be more counter-revolutionary codes... But it would make no sense.

---

<sup>3</sup> "Assembly" and "Directory," in the habitual meaning of modern law, are terms that became popular after the French Revolution as expressions of the new type of government of the people. In fact, the Estates General convened by Louis XVI became the National Assembly (June 17, 1789), which, shortly afterwards, was designated the Constituent Assembly (July 9, 1789). It was this Assembly that approved the *Declaration of the Rights of the Man and the Citizen* (August 27, 1789), suspended the powers of the King after the escape attempt at Varennes, and took over the government of France. It also enacted the Constitution of 1791, which, in turn, approved universal suffrage and established the model of a tripartite system of government with executive, legislative and judicial branches.

The Directory was born (1793) to put an end to the excesses of the Convention, to consolidate the revolutionary achievements in France and spread them throughout Europe. It existed in the phase of the Napoleonic campaigns until it was replaced by the Consulate (November 9, 1799), that preceded the Empire (May 18, 1804).

**C** - The conclusion follows readily and is crystal clear: If one who accepts the legislation for some purpose is revolutionary, so also is another who accepts it for another purpose. If one is excused by the indissociable circumstances of the Modern State, the other also necessarily is excused.

So then, I hope that I have clarified the intimidatory sophism that is circulating in order to justify certain actions of you and the current Directory.

**2. The text of the Statutes.** I will now expose what the TFP *Statutes* say, in an official document of the 1<sup>st</sup> Civil Registry of Juridical Persons, signed on May 10, 1996 by Deputy Superintendent Dr. Eduardo de Barros Brotero. I will analyze what base can be found in the *Statutes* for the affirmation of this Argument I, that is, that you and the current Directory have the right to decide on the writing, publication and dissemination of the books written by members of the entity.

Article 5, paragraph 3, of the *Statutes* states the following: "It shall be the exclusive responsibility of the National Council, through the study of cultural and civic matters of interest to the Society, to speak on its behalf in these matters – collectively or through the President – and to direct social activities of a cultural, civic, philanthropic and charitable nature."

It is interesting to note that, unless it can be shown differently, this is the only paragraph of the *Statutes* that would allow you or the Directory to take some restrictive action against the members of the entity should any of them want to speak in the name of the TFP, thereby encroaching onto the field of your prerogatives.

Even so, in the issue at hand, the book that I published is not about cultural or civic matters, as set out in the aforementioned paragraph, but rather pertains to a clearly religious matter. Further, the author of the book formally declares in the work that he does not intend to speak officially or unofficially on behalf of any existing TFP group, but that he assumes full and exclusive responsibility for what he wrote. Thus, a possible application of this paragraph to the case would require a rather tortuous interpretation.

**3. The text of the Brazilian Constitution** that became law on October 5, 1988, has several items worthy of attention in the defense of the accused:

**A** - In Title II - In *Fundamental Rights and Guarantees*, Chapter 1 - *Individual and Collective Rights and Duties*, Article 5, n. IV, one can read: "Expression of thought is free, anonymity is forbidden." A linear interpretation of your Argument I could perhaps be considered a transgression of this principle.

**B** - In Number IX one can read: "The expression of intellectual, artistic, scientific and communications activities is free, independently of censorship or license." This legal precept speaks in a frontally opposite sense to Argument I. In other words, if anyone were to examine your argument verbatim, you would seem to be making a serious violation of the Brazilian Constitution.

**C** - In Number XXVII one reads: "The exclusive right of use, publication or reproduction of works belongs to their authors and is transmissible to their heirs during the period of time established

by law." The law here is quite authoritative – "The exclusive right to publish a work belongs to its author." It seems to me, therefore, that the right that you and the current Directory claim does not coincide with this clear instruction of the current legislation.

You can see that the current legislation, based only on the Brazilian Constitution, forcefully goes against your Argument I and supports the accused. But there is more. As it is well-known, there are international accords that Brazil has signed, which corroborate certain rules of the Brazilian Constitution. I will expose below some that apply to this case.

**4. The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.** Independent of the title and its indissociable revolutionary connotations, in this Declaration, which Brazil has signed, there are some principles of Natural Law. You will recall that such Law is considered by Catholic Doctrine as coming from Eternal Law, a law that is a reflection of God because He imprinted on it His image on Creation. It is from this point of view that I mention some articles of that *Declaration*.

**A** - Article XVIII states: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." As already mentioned, freedom of religion is added here.

**B** - Article XIX reads: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes the freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas by any means and independent of borders." The expression "without interference" is interesting. It would seem that your coercive attitude, based on the premise of Argument I, would directly violate this legal precept.

**C** - Article XXVII (n. 2) reads: "Everyone has the right to the protection of his moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author." This is the well-known author's right, which you forgot to take into account when elaborating your arguments.

Perhaps you think that I am adopting some liberal principles of freedom of conscience, expression and religion. You would be mistaken, for – without entering into the delicate questions addressed by many moralists and canonists – I am focusing on them here from the vantage point of Catholic Doctrine in applying them to my case. That is, the freedom a Catholic has to think, to express himself and so on. Thus, for my position to be clear, it would be indispensable to consider that such articles applied to a follower of the true Faith.

**5. *International Pact of Civil and Political Rights*.** Brazil is also a signatory to this pact. Although the topics that interest us here are somewhat redundant to the articles already cited, they will be mentioned here in order to see the cogent force they have.

**A** - Article 18, n. 1, reads: "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." I have already commented on this.

**B** - In article 19, n. 1, reads: "No one can be molested for the opinions he holds." It is a new formulation of a principle already commented on.

C - The same article, n. 2, reads: "Every person shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include the freedom to procure, receive and spread information and ideas of any nature, regardless of considerations of borders, be they verbal or in writing, printed or artistic, or by any means of his choice." This also was commented on.

**6. Comparison between the *Statutes* and the current legislation.** Having presented the legislation in force in our Country, to which the *Statutes* of a civil association are obviously subordinate, it falls now to compare the two.

In making such a comparison, one sees that nothing appears in the TFP *Statutes* that allows you and the current Directory to think that a member of our entity should depend upon your decisions in the writing, publishing and spreading of a work of which he claims sole responsibility.

To the contrary, there are numerous precepts of the current legislation in our Country that attest to the right of the author to publish his work and disseminate it.

### **Conclusion to the refutation of Argument I**

From what has been studied, everything indicates that Argument I is not founded on the TFP *Statutes*.

Further, it seems to frontally oppose the current legislation in Brazil on the rights that an author has over the intellectual work he makes.

I note that, according to the deductive method I adopted to make the Accusation clear, Argument I would correspond to the major premise of the syllogism. From what was exposed, one concludes that this premise is wrong, which has as a consequence that the rest of the reasoning necessarily suffers from a lack of foundation.

\*

## ARGUMENT II

### THE AUTHOR PUBLISHED HIS BOOK WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE AND CONSENT OF THE RIGHTFULLY CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES OF THE TFP

#### Proof in the text

\* "I was shocked at the news you gave to Dr. Plinio Xavier on Saturday, November 8, saying that a book under your authorship would be published in the United States (under the title *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* ) and that a text of Dr. Plinio would be used in its Preface" (p. 1 , § 1).

I would like to point out that this Argument II is the central point of your dispute. I stated it in a simple way to facilitate a presentation of Thesis II following the deductive method. It supposes, however, some nuanced details to link it to the reality of the accusation. I will designate the inductive antecedents that you present for this argument as **Considerations**. There are three considerations with nuances that seek to fortify your argument.

In view of the variety of methods used in the accusation, the defense, as you will note, must enter into the casuistry that conditions the veracity of each consideration. This casuistry will take the form of a small chronicle. I will also deal with underlying issues. In these three considerations of Argument II, the themes are difficult to harness under a general rule. Therefore, it seems better to point out *pari passu* the conclusions and consequences of each subject.

**1<sup>st</sup> Consideration: The current Directory was against the publication without having an assurance that the writing was secure and the occasion timely. It tried to create favorable psychological conditions for a theological review to be made.**

#### Proof in the text

\* "In the last two years, Dr. Plinio Xavier had several conversations with you .... he insisted that ... with Dr. Plinio's absence, we were against your publication without an assurance that your writing was secure and the occasion timely"(p. 1, § 2).

\* "The death of our Founder made this ['review by high caliber theologians'] even more necessary than in his life, as well as an evaluation – in the tactical-political field – to be made by members of the TFP chosen by us and recognized as capable of issuing an opinion "(p.1, § 4).

\* "That day [when the author 'would be open for a serious review of his work'] unfortunately has not yet arrived" (p. 5, § 3).

\* "After the death of our Founder and facing the first manifestations of your intention to publish the work, the TFP directors maintained the same policy [of indefinitely postponing the review] in order not to have to tell you, out of charity, everything that is stated above. Thus, we try to create favorable psychological conditions for an efficient review by well-oriented theologians" (p. 5, § 5).

\* "The truth is that the publication of *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* does not correspond .... to the conveniences of the TFP" (p. 6, §3).

\* "In short, your initiative substantially disregards the mold of action that our Founder imprinted on the activities of our family of souls" (p. 6, §4).

## Refutation of the 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration

### 1. A tendentiously phrased question

Before refuting this or that point, which I will do below (Item 6), allow me to make a preliminary note, which, in my view, alters the focus of your accusation. In effect, Mr. President, in your mis- sive you try to present the publication of my book under a disciplinary prism. I should obey the legitimately constituted authorities; I would not have done so, consequently, I am hastily considered insubordinate and deserving of punishment. However, this statement, which suits the purpose of your accusation, in my view, suffers from a certain simpleness. This does not seem to be the central question. The central question seems to be another, of an ideological and religious nature.

The central question, in my view, is this: Since Dr. Plinio is no longer physically present among us, does the TFP have the human and supernatural conditions to continue the fight against the Revolution, especially with its infiltration inside the walls of the Holy City, the Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church?

You and the directors of the TFP, who probably contributed to the writing of your letter, would seem to respond: No, we can no longer fight against Progressivism in the Church because we no longer have the conditions to do so. To combat it would be suicide. Let us wait and see what Dr. Plinio inspires us to do.

On the contrary, my position is that of one who affirms: Yes, we have the obligation to continue the fight of Dr. Plinio with or without the necessary human conditions. To the extent that we lack human resources, we must pray more and count on the aid of the supernatural, which will not be lacking. Not to fight is to betray our ideal. The combat is the only action that can attract from Heaven an orientation from Dr. Plinio in a brief time.

I will demonstrate what I have affirmed further on.

This is what, Mr. President, seems to me to be *le fin fond* [the very depths] of our dispute. The disciplinary problem in which you try to encapsulate my action does not reflect the whole reality.

It was with this underlying thought, trying to obey the orientation of Dr. Plinio exposed in Thesis I, that I launched my work. I did not forget, however, to give notice to those with a right to know that this was my decision, as I shall show below (Item 6). It seems to me that you also based yourself on the mentioned backdrop to decide to condemn me and threaten me with expulsion from the TFP.

## **2. Evidence and strong indications of an unpublished decision: To not attack the progressivist Hierarchy and to not publicly criticize Vatican Council II**

I pass to the demonstration of this point.

### **A. Dr. Luis Nazareno de Assumpção F ° and the *diktat* to no longer fight the progressivist ecclesiastical Hierarchy**

When the opportunity appeared to write the text of a petition against the *We Are Church* movement, I made it clear – in a meeting we had on Wednesday in the Eremo of Elias analyzing the march of the Revolution – that it would be very appropriate for the TFP as such – or some of its members – to denounce the radical goals of this movement. I was sure that some of the persons present would transmit my suggestions to you. In fact, the following night I received from Mr. Leo Horvat, who was in the United States, an electronic correspondence (e-mail) from which I transmit parts below:

"Kansas City, February 20, 1997. Dear Mr. Atila, Salve Maria! Dr. Luis called me yesterday and the call did not go well. I received a bad-humored ultimatum to return to Brazil. I also received a veiled threat of being expelled [from the TFP] through a direct threat of expelling you.

"Dr. Luis first wanted me to return to 'talk' within 21 days. ... He hit the psychological key of 'being expelled from TFP.' He extended his conversation to show that the unity has been maintained and that no one has mandates from Dr. Plinio: neither you, nor the Colonel nor Mr. João Clá. Everyone is saying that they have mandates and this will make the TFP ungovernable.

"You must have said something at yesterday's meeting in the Eremo of Elias about the possibility of doing a campaign against *We Are Church* before Pentecost, and this was already reported to Dr. Luis. He assured me that if you (and I) want to release manifestos, etc, without the consent and permission of the older ones (the Directory), they will be forced to 'remove you from the TFP. If you want to work with other organizations (TIA), you should be outside of the TFP and move to the US ... and make another movement. But the whole TFP ... cannot be compromised by your crazy manifestos, which you do not let anyone review.'

"He then entered into his usual tirades about your pride, self-love, refusal to work together or allow your work to be corrected. He said that, according to Mr. Miguel, your work is unpublishable, because you draw conclusions that have not been made [sic]. He stated that the Quinn manifesto did the same thing, put words in Quinn's mouth [which he did not say]. I said that I disagreed, that everything in the Quinn manifesto was in his speech. He replied that perhaps so, but what is important is that you would not allow your work to be reviewed by persons of the Group. ...

"He said he wants me to return to Brazil to 'show you that TIA is not a stepping stone for you to launch your manifestos and books.' He wants to make it clear to you that this will not be possible through TIA. And if TIA continues to publish them, it will divide the Group and cause great annoyance to the older ones.

"He wanted to know if TIA was preparing another manifesto against *We Are Church*. I asked him if the TFP was planning to do something in view of the plans for a Vatican Council III in the year

2000. He tried to show that they are doing what is most efficient in carrying out campaigns against Agrarian Reform, which indirectly attacks the Structure. ...

**"He said that the TFP cannot sustain a polemic with the Structure because we do not have Dr. Plinio to guide us. And, without Dr. Plinio, it would be suicide to publish something against the Structure.** Above all, because you would want to write the manifesto or another document and would not permit anyone to correct it. And that the future of the TFP cannot be gratuitously placed into your hands. He returned to make the same accusations against you, which probably he also makes against me: temperamental, uncontrollable, proud. You know the litany. ...

"He went on for a long time to show that the TFP cannot only be in the religious ambit, but also the socio-political one. And the Bagarre [Chastisement] will be based on the problem of egalitarianism, which he understood as the Agrarian Reform. I pointed out that the reforms of *We Are Church* and Quinn to be realized inside the Church in Vatican III are [based on] egalitarianism. **He returned to what he had said, stating that without Dr. Plinio we do not know how to conduct the battle** and we cannot leave it in your hands. ...

"This was roughly the general conversation. ... With the hope of hearing from you and seeing you soon ... with both still in the Group ... *qui vivra, vera. In Jesu et Maria, Leo.*" [Emphasis mine]

From February 21 to March 3, I sent the document above to some friends, asking them what they would do in my place. A rumor of dissatisfaction began to circulate in certain TFP milieus because of the threat of expulsion contained in the document, as well as the declaration that the progressivist ecclesiastical Structure would no longer be fought.

On February 27, you sent a fax to Mr. Leo Horvat. You affirmed in its text: "A preternatural action has concurred to circulate fantastic versions of what we spoke about over the phone recently. Thus, we judge it better – to escape the pressures of the devil – that I should communicate with you by fax. We hope that Our Lady will help us to make everything clear, thus avoiding anything being said different from what I spoke."

That is, you denied what Mr. Leo Horvat attributed to you. In addition, your fax insisted that Mr. Leo Horvat should come to São Paulo "as soon as possible" to talk to the five members of the Directory.

On March 3, I sent a letter to Dr. Plinio Xavier, asking how I should interpret what you said to Mr. Leo Horvat about my expulsion. He replied in a note on the 8<sup>th</sup> with these words: "Surely you already know about a fax sent by Dr. Luizinho to Mr. Leo Horvat last week, which denies the interpretation that Mr. Leo gave to a telephone conversation [illegible word] between the two. You see, of course, that one cannot take into account anything that comes about in this way, when there is a written text that clarifies the subject, In [illegible], Plinio."

That is, Dr. Plinio Xavier denied Mr. Leo Horvat's report as something "that cannot be taken into account."

On March 12, Mr. Leo Horvat, already in São Paulo, handed you a letter stating he was disposed to deal with all the subjects that you and the other members of the Directory wanted. He asked only that it be a written negotiation. Reporting on the 13<sup>th</sup> how the conversation with you had

gone, he wrote to me: "One point in particular was a relief for me. When we decided to deal with serious matters relating to TIA etc. in writing, he said that this was actually better, **because when he talks to me on the phone, etc., he sometimes says things he has to retract later, as was the case.**

"This was a relief because, by describing my email to you as a 'fantastic version' of our conversation, he was actually accusing me of being intriguing or lying. The fact that he concurs that he says things on the phone that he later has to deny left me justified and cleared of an unfair charge weighing over my head."

On March 13, Mr. Leo Horvat decided to place the following words below the original text of his e-mail of February 20.

"Having re-read this today, about 20 days after I sent this e-mail to you [Mr. Atila] to warn you of the seriousness of our situation, I affirm that everything I have written in this summary of my long conversation with Dr. Luis Nazareno de Assumpção is true. The only things I intentionally left out were some unfavorable comments about Mr. Atila's relationship with Dr. Plinio. If, for some reason, it is necessary to prove the truth of what I have written here, I am prepared to take a solemn oath on Dr. Plinio's tomb, and [in this case] I would invite anyone who would deny the content to do the same in an opposite sense" (An error of date: Mr. Leo set the date as the 22<sup>nd</sup>, but the notary's seal recognizing this document records it as the 13<sup>th</sup>).

Thus, the curious argument of Dr. Plinio Xavier that having a written document, a fax, would invalidate a telephone conversation – whose report was also written – is without value... For I can show anyone interested the two documents of Mr. Leo Horvat, cited above, written, signed and certified by a notary office.

I informed Dr. Plinio Xavier of this important addendum, placed at the end of the document of Mr. Leo Horvat. He sidestepped the subject. That is, he, who had denied its veracity, no longer considered himself in a comfortable position to sustain his statement under the conditions suggested...

In addition, two of our common friends – yours and mine – Mr. Wilson Gabriel da Silva and Mr. Leo Daniele, told me that they heard you make a verbal confirmation of the same assertions that you made to Mr. Leo Horvat.

Dr. Plinio Xavier himself, in a conversation with me some time later (August 19, 1997), tried to excuse your statements, which he now admitted was a side effect of a disease in the pituitary gland that sadly afflicted you.

You yourself indirectly confirmed what Mr. Leo Horvat had reported on that occasion when, in the ultimatum you addressed to me, you write without a trace of censure or retraction: "This demand for us to make contact only by written word was reaffirmed in a later letter ... in which you made a complaint along the lines that, in a conversation with Mr. Leo Horvat, I had vigorously criticized the initiatives that you were taking ... and I even raise the possibility of being forced to administer drastic sanctions "(p.2 , § 4).

Therefore, there seems to be no doubt about the fact that you did indeed say what is in the email of February 20.

With this, one cannot avoid the consequence: It is demonstrated that you effectively stated that **"the TFP cannot sustain a polemic with the Structure because we do not have Dr. Plinio to guide us. And without Dr. Plinio it would be suicide to publish anything against Structure."** That is, you seem to manifest the intention of rolling up the TFP standards in the anti-progressivist fight.

Having made this demonstration, which is the most important point I want to make, allow me in passing, Mr. President, to draw another fruit from this incident:

- First, you affirmed something very serious;
- Days afterward, you denied it in writing in a fax;
- Later you recognized what you had previously said and stated that you sometimes say things you later have to retract;
- You confirmed to two witnesses what you had said in the beginning;
- After some time you acknowledged in writing the first statements as being true.

A quite singular dance of affirmations and denials around the same fact... Dr. Plinio Xavier follows in your footsteps in a ballet of written negations and verbal confirmations in movements less complicated, but no less compromising.

Faced with such statements and denials, which in themselves would seem to reveal contradictions and duplicity, I ask with respect, but frankness: Where is the love of truth situated in the moral panorama of yourself and Dr. Plinio Xavier? Have you – two of the important directors of the TFP – been released from the practice of the commandment that obliges you not to bear false witness, aggravated by the fact that the statements you made touch the honor and good name of a fellow Catholic?

The answers to these questions will determine the judgment of you and Dr. Plinio Xavier before Almighty God and your own credibility before men in the future... Allow me one last question, on this point: Do you not see that this fact alone can put in question, if not annul, other verbal or written statements that you both have made? How can this suspicion not also fall on the letter you sent me?

I leave for your reflection this lamentable, but imperious, finding, and I return to the thread of the investigation of an agreement not to combat the progressivist ecclesiastical Hierarchy.

#### **B. Dr. Paulo Corrêa de Brito F and his "problem of conscience" to not deal with Vatican II**

In the refutation of Argument VI of Thesis I (cf. Specific Refutation.1.D.b), I described the curious "problem of conscience" that Dr. Paulo Brito revealed to me when he demanded that the manifesto against Msgr. John Quinn "not bring – either in the near or remote future – the obligation for the TFP to take a position on the Ecumenical Second Vatican Council."

Such a problem of conscience speaks of an agreement that you both would have had knowledge and probably been part of, which established that the TFP would no longer enter into a public doctrinal confrontation with Vatican II.

### **C. Dr. Caio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira and his support for Msgr. Wach, who preaches not to combat the progressivist Hierarchy**

The support that Dr. Caio Xavier gives to the small institute of apostolic life of Msgr. Gilles Wach, the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest, is not a secret to anyone. It is known that, through a cordial understanding, the assistance of the French mailing provided a secure financial basis for the work of Msgr. Wach.

At the beginning of April 1997, Msgr. Wach and three of his priests visited the TFP in São Paulo. The reception given to these ecclesiastics could not have been more prestigious.

The only lecture Msgr. Wach addressed to the TFP was on April 7 in the Auditorium of Our Lady Help of Christians. I translate the taped speech directly from the Italian. There Msgr. Wach said:

"We should not be surprised at all of the attacks against the Holy Church. Certainly we are astonished because we are of younger generations and perhaps do not know much about the History of the Church, our Mother. For us, it is something new, but [in reality] it is not new. If we are truly children of the Church, if we know the History of our Mother well... for us it [the current situation] is an episode in her History. Certainly a sad episode, but one of many ... That is why there is no need to be surprised. The Church is divine. She is a great truth and hope in this world where everything is falling apart, everything has collapsed. It may also seem that the Church has collapsed. No. The Church will never collapse and has not collapsed.

"What is happening today? The enemies of the early Church from the beginning wanted to destroy her. And you know this quite well because Prof. Plinio taught you who the enemies of the Church are. It is the Revolution. Who is the patron of the Revolution? The Devil. ... This revolutionary spirit made all the Catholic temporal powers and kingdoms fall to the ground. And having reached the modern epoch, all that remained was the Throne of Peter, which seemed to be submerged in the Revolution, but had not fallen.

"Until a few years ago, it appeared that the Pope condemned, refuted and fought the Revolution. **Then, something happened that we cannot understand.** What happened? **All these revolutionary forces were inside and outside the Church.** What are they inside the Church? They are the two great heresies called Modernism and Progressivism. ... What did they want to do? **They wanted to cause a great shock inside in the Church. The epoch of the Council came** where all the hopes of the utopians could be realized. And, **there, the enemies of the Church, both external and internal united.** The external enemies – for you there is nothing new here – are Freemasonry, Communism, which infiltrated the Church to destroy her from within. **And all these forces united in this time of the Council, which was the catalyst, to destroy the Church.**

"**But, look, they are wrong, because the Church will never be destroyed. It is true that the Church suffered a severe shock.** But, to give an example that the Church can never be destroyed – recall the words *Non praevalerunt* – I present the following figure: What is the Church? The

Church is like a small ship, which 2,000 years ago Our Lord Jesus Christ set in the waters of time and space. A small ship. Who was the commander of this little ship? It was Peter, who was not very competent. But to this little ship God gave the words of eternal life. ...

"Afterwards, the little ship sailed through the years, the centuries, now the millennia. There were good commanders; they improved the ship, put beautiful paintings in it, making it beautiful and great. Then, there were others who destroyed it somewhat. **Today, to tell the truth, these commanders make large holes everywhere in it. The commander does not know where it is going and, inside, the water is already starting to enter. Around us there are other ships that tell us: 'Enough! See how your ship is sinking. Enter ours.' No. *Non praevalent.*** ... The Bark of Peter has leaks, but she exists. And she will always exist. This is our Faith.

"It is true that today it is very difficult to practice the faith, but I know that you all have this faith. And today we who call ourselves the defenders of tradition must defend tradition. What is tradition? It is our Faith. Do we believe that the Catholic Church is divine? Yes. So then, we have nothing to fear. We are very certain. **And what do we see? We see that there are many people around us who are desperate. Many persons who are seeking illusions, human means to save the Church. No. None of us will save the Church. The Church will save herself. This is something very different. None of us will save the Church. It would be shocking to believe this.**

...

"It is necessary to be serious, but do not take yourselves too seriously [sic!]. This must be noted. ... Today there are various attitudes to take in the face of this crisis of the Church. There are many who have abandoned her, and this is understandable; they are the weakest, those who no longer see the visible Church, see her as she is ... **Then, there are those who have wanted to defend her. But, it seems to me that they have deceived themselves in the defense of the Church. They call themselves traditionalists – and there are many – but, in fact, they are modern. Why? Because they made an entirely modern analysis of the situation. That is, today we see that the authorities of the Church – the successors of the Apostles ... – are unworthy. Certainly. They are doing wrong. Certainly. So, we combat them and the whole Catholic Hierarchy because it is not good. This is a modern mindset. We are not revolutionaries, we are not modern, we do not accept or fight authority because it is good or not good. It is God Who will judge.** We remain faithful to Peter, to the Bark of Peter, and we remain inside the Bark. God will judge those who lead the Bark of Peter in today's situation. ... This is the truth. **Therefore, we should not have that mentality.**

"What is our mentality? It is to love the Church, suffer for the Church and work for the Church. That is, we who love the Church have the certainty that she will bring us to Paradise. We suffer for the Church because, today, whoever loves the Church suffers not only for the Church, but from the Church, and thus works for the Church. This is our whole life – yours and ours. ...

"Today we are not at the wedding of Canaan, we are not on Tabor, we are in the Passion of Christ. And Our Lord wants us to be with Him, united with Him to live the Passion of Christ. **Faithful to Him, without understanding. ... Only God understands God. We can only contemplate, love and fill ourselves with the things of God in our very little hearts and very small souls, which**

**can not contain all these beautiful truths.** Today, however, we must contemplate the divinity of the Church, the face of Christ in the Passion. That is what we should do today. ...

"You understand that this mission is great, that this mission is important. **And what it pleases me greatly to note in the TFP is that you have followed this path. That is, to love and serve the Church, without rebelling.** For, if the Church were human, we would have ten thousand reasons to rebel. But we should never rebel against our Mother, she always remains our Mother – and not just our natural mother, but our divine, holy Mother. You must understand this position well. **Few today can understand this position. And, frequently, we see around us many who have reacted in a completely human way. Those who wanted to save the Church on their own. Those who believed that they reacted, but did not practice their faith in the Church. This is what I wanted to tell you tonight.**

"You are doing a very great work, because you are witnesses of the divinity of the Church; **you are witnesses of God, notwithstanding the betrayal of those who should defend the Church.** You should not be proud of this, for we are called to be faithful to that mission that God has given us. Let us remember that the first of the virtues to exercise this faith in the Church is humility. ... We are not the teaching Church, but we must do our duty in our place. **And your testimony every day, every month, every year before those who are not good is such that one day, by that testimony, you will oblige those who should do their duty. You will not replace the authorities – you are not Bishops, you are not the Pope, you should not govern the Church. But you must be witnesses of this truth, you must be these Christians and these Crusaders ... It is only this Christian and supernatural language that can express these truths. ... If not for this, we will have only a horizontal view of the Church. The Church is not a human association where the heads are good or not, where they are chosen or not chosen. The Church is divine.**

...

"The positions that these Bishops and Cardinals have, God wanted or permitted them to take. **Therefore, with our prayers, our sufferings and our testimony we can convert them, we can oblige them to be what they should be.** .... And tomorrow the Church will have need of you. ...

"What Prof. Plinio gave you to carry is very heavy and very important. **You must think correctly, you must not think that you will save the Church.** But, you should think that God, through you – if you are disposed and open to His grace – God will do many things. Not because of us – **this would make heaven and earth laugh – if we were to believe that we are something and will save the Church.** No! But, through us. It is more in our hearts, with our souls opened to these truths of the Church. ...

"Therefore, you must suffer, because you are persecuted by so many authorities of the Church. Because you are in the Bark, and in it there are those who are making large holes, while you must cover the holes. However, those who cover the holes are more powerful. ...

"This is the message I would like to leave with you tonight. **I am very pleased, my soul is very happy to have found in you this profound spirit of love for the Church without rebellion. Because, I repeat, there are so many others who are faithful to tradition and yet, without realizing it, are faithful to the Revolution because they have a revolutionary mentality. This we do**

not have. For our position is ... to remain faithful to Peter, to recognize ecclesiastical authority. We remain in the Church conscious of this terrible crisis – and this is our suffering. We are aware of these terrible apostasies of many men who wear the miter, but always with love for this Church because *Non praevalerunt*.

"And we do not fight the Church, we do not fight the Pope, we do not fight the Bishops. We are with the Pope, with the Bishops and with Peter. This is our salvation. We do not understand very well what is happening. I will give you some advice that Cardinal Siri gave to those who lamented without understanding: 'Wait a little, because one day death will visit you. And there, up above, you can ask God: 'Why, then, did You lead Your Church so badly? Why are we in this situation?' Do not ask us why things are going wrong, ask Him. He will know how to answer.'"

In short, Msgr. Gilles Wach came to the Brazilian TFP to clearly convey the message that we should not fight against the progressivist ecclesiastical authorities and the crisis into which the Second Vatican Council launched the Church. He came to give us his version – which Dr. Plinio described as catacombist – which preaches that we should not fight to defend the Church, but we should cloister ourselves on a path of perfection and "testimony" so that, through this way and only this way, we will convert the ones responsible for the current situation.

Those who think about fighting to defend the Holy Church are labeled as "revolutionary" and having a human conception of the Church. And those who are greatly afflicted by the crisis, he advises them to wait for death to question the Creator why He has let His Church fall into the state she is in... This was not all. Msgr. Wach expressed great joy to consider that in the TFP there are persons who think like him...

Now, what Dr. Plinio thought was precisely the opposite of what Msgr. Wach preached. In fact, at the Clippings Meeting of August 26, 1989, he said this about *30 Days* magazine:

"I am told by persons who follow [the magazine] *30 Dias* closely and are in conditions to inform me that the magazine does not take a stand [in relation to the crisis in the Church]. So, its readers do not know where the truth is. **It presents questions and, then, afterwards: 'Take it as it is, because this is the way it is.'**

**"This is what the TFP has never done. On the contrary, this is its characteristic way of acting: It shows what was the Tradition of the Church; that this Tradition of the Church is not the one being followed by this one or that; and that we remain faithful to the Tradition of the Church. When we take a position like this – when the matter allows it – then there is even a call to the people to stand in solidarity with our position, showing in this way that the Church exists.**

"For example, the signature campaign directed to Paul VI calling for measures against the communist infiltration in the Church. There were two million signatures collected throughout Latin America! Those who signed agreed with this position, saw that the petition was delivered to Paul VI and that we published it in the newspapers: Two million signed and it was delivered ... They saw that there are still people who think like this and that, therefore, the Church exists. She is still moving! **If we had kept quiet, prayed and said nothing, then we could be rebuked: 'You received the graces to see how it is. If you had spoken, many people would have seen that**

**something still moves and exists.' This something is one of the manifestations of the life of the Church that did not cease to exist. One of them, not the only one. But a salient, protuberant and vital manifestation of life. The conviction is maintained: The Church exists!"** (p. 17).

Several directors of the TFP, however, were present at the conference in which Msgr. Wach preached the opposite. No one took the floor to tell the monsignor that this thesis does not coincide with what Dr. Plinio always taught us. They made no public censure of him, nothing also seems to have been said in private.

Some questions need to be asked: Did Dr. Caio Xavier, who took the initiative of making the invitation, know the content of the "message" of Msgr. Wach? If he did not know, did he give any serious admonition to the speaker after he heard about what had happened in our Auditorium? Or did he continue, without saying anything, to favor his great friend with the support of the French mailing? Was he concerned about enlightening the members of the TFP to prevent them from being caught up by the words of the speaker and drop the "barrier of horror" in relation to the progressivist Structure and Vatican Council II?

What would the acquiescence and indirect support given by Dr. Caio Xavier da Silveira and other members of the Directory to the catacombist theories of Msgr. Wach reveal? Would it be inordinate to say that Dr. Caio Xavier da Silveira and the directors are suspect of having reached an agreement to no longer combat the progressivist Hierarchy and publicly criticize aspects of Vatican Council II?

#### **D. Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira and the bulk mailing on the visit of John Paul II**

This background can perhaps explain the singular decision of the five members of the Directory at the end of July 1997 to send to 275,724 donors and sympathizers of the "*Come, Our Lady of Fatima, do not delay*" campaign a letter extolling the visit of John Paul II to Brazil and asking for money.

I highlight a few excerpts from the letter where the campaign coordinator invited the devotees of Our Lady to participate: "I invite you to participate in an ENORMOUS '**chain**' of **prayers and sacrifices**, imploring Our Lady of Fatima to give, on the occasion of the Pope's visit, a torrent of graces to our families throughout Brazil. Acting in this way, we will be collaborating to reach that high goal set by John Paul II. And, of course, She who is the Queen of the Holy Family will smile in a special way on you and your family.

"The newspapers have been reporting ... this great event. ... We will also do our part. ... We will pray rosaries and offer sacrifices so that the high objectives set out by the Pope will be reached. ... We have to seize this unique opportunity for **the one who occupies the highest throne and the highest chair on Earth** to obtain special help from Heaven for Catholic families. In this way we will be doing our part to make the efforts undertaken by John Paul II successful. ...

"We, who are devotees of Our Lady of Fatima, will try to do something that completely follows the lines of what She requested. Until October 2, the day that the Pope's visit begins, we will offer Our Lady seven sacrifices ... I want to do everything possible to spread this idea so that our 'chain' ends up offering at least **ONE MILLION SACRIFICES AND ROSARIES offered by Brazilian**

**Catholic families.** ... This will be the best gift that the Pope will receive in Brazil. He will certainly be touched ... etc." [Bold, capitalization and underscore in original]

Such an euphorically collaborative attitude poured out in an un-elevated language contrasts sharply with the ways of Prof. Plinio.

Below, I will transcribe an excerpt from an article by Dr. Plinio addressed to John Paul II on the eve of his first visit to Brazil. There, he asked him to say something to stop the crisis in Brazil, but he put the request in such a way that it related to the crisis in the Church, so that should the Pontiff not attend to the appeal – as in fact he did not – it would crystallize part of the conservative public opinion in favor of the TFP. That is, it was a criticism that intelligently preceded the papal pronouncements and left a strong objection floating in the air in case it were not answered.

This is how Dr. Plinio expressed himself: "To this day the universal Church has never been through a crisis as serious as the present one. In the West – even among unbelievers – this crisis affects the most varied domains of the spirit. Thus, it has a much greater gravity than an atomic war, for so long as the world is the world, catastrophes will be more serious in the order of the spirit than that of matter. ...

"Partly for all this and partly for local reasons, Brazil is entering, in its turn, a crisis that can become the greatest of our History. A crisis upon which economic factors weigh heavily, but which only ecclesiastical subversion can render irremediable. As the Church undergoes a mysterious process of 'auto-demolition' and the 'smoke of Satan' is present in her – the expressions of Paul VI – the successor of that same Paul VI comes to Brazil. But, a marvelous thing! More than in any other epoch of History, in the most varied quarters of national opinion, all, without discrepancy, await your words with hope. My wish, then, is expressed by the centurion's plea: 'Say but a word and my Country will be saved'" ("*Dizei uma só palavra*" in *Folha de S. Paulo*, July 1, 1980).

When the trip was over, Dr. Plinio criticized the welcome some sectors of public opinion gave to John Paul II with the following words:

"I believe that the delight of receiving in a personal contact this optimistic message explains, to a great extent, the joy – which I would call frenetic if this adjective did not have something pejorative about it – into which many people entered just upon seeing the Pontiff come, go, smile, speak affably or pray. ... In the most affectionate people in the world [Brazilians]... some persons felt as if they were entering the Kingdom, the millennium, the restored earthly paradise. No more misunderstandings, no conflicts of interest, no struggles, no needs: The mysterious and irresistible Wojtylian '*know how*' will do away with all this forever. ... A generous, invigorating and appeasing certainty, many will say. A utopia, I fear. For, I do not see how to justify, before Catholic Doctrine, that hope, which seems to be forming in some. How can I agree that John Paul II should be seen, as Pope, as the doctor of this utopia and, as Karol Wojtyla, the worldwide condenser and tele-transmitter of these sentimental effluvia?" ("*A utopia e a mensagem*" in *Folha de S. Paulo*, July 29, 1980).

In the following article, Dr. Plinio continued to draw the consequences of these utopian longings created around that visit:

"Thus, this yearning has left me concerned, because it creates a potential of naivety and emotional precariousness from which some demagogue can take a sinister advantage at any moment. Such concord without reserve, a perfect and eternal peace between all men, all nations and all doctrines, total happiness, these things are not of this world. ... The suppression of this struggle [described by St. Louis Grignon de Montfort and commented on by Dr. Plinio] will bring an ecumenical reconciliation between the Virgin and the serpent, between the race of the Virgin and the race of the serpent, moving toward an era where the utopian cessation of battles brings about an accord among all rights and all interests, an interpenetration of all languages under a universal government, which will be one of abundance and unconcern.

"Behold the great utopia against which the masses must be forewarned. Behold the return (or rather, regression) to the proud Tower of Babel, which by any and all means Neopaganism is trying to rebuild. Behold the banner completely woven of illusions and lies to which, in all ages, the demagogues seek to drag the insurgent masses. Behold also what seems to me to be the danger into which many of those can fall, those who are seeing in our recent illustrious visitor not the august Vicar of Christ – or at least not so much – but rather an athlete or a demiurge in socio-economic matters. And by putting so much of their confidence in man, they end up undestimating or forgetting that he is the Vicar of Christ" ("*Volta à Torre de Babel?*" in *Folha de S. Paulo*, August 12, 1980).

Now, I ask, who does not see in these two articles about the reception given to John Paul II a critique of the ecclesiastical milieu that promote the visits of the Pope as "Wojtyla superstar," as some of the media called him? Who does not see in the strong censure of the relativist and neo-pagan utopia of the Tower of Babel a no less strong censure of the conciliar ecumenism of which John Paul II made himself, after the meeting of Assisi, the principal representative?

Are there, per chance, elements for one to say that in John Paul II's other visits he was received differently from the way Dr. Plinio criticized? There are no indications of this. To the contrary, it could be said that he described a general phenomenon.

Therefore, the aforementioned dissemination of this *bulk mailing* commemorating John Paul II's third visit to Brazil is totally different from Dr. Plinio's way of acting on his first visit. In fact, the *mailing* presents the "prayer chain" campaign precisely in the same spirit of "frenzied joy" that Dr. Plinio censured. It enters into the Mardi Gras dance of utopia described above. It also differs because it does not make the least restriction about the Pontiff's action in other fields, many of which – for example, ecumenism – raises the gravest reservations in TFP members. Finally, it differs in form, since it abandons the serene and noble language proper to the disciples of Dr. Plinio to adopt a style of expression with sensationalist and egalitarian connotations.

The decision to send such a *bulk mailing* – at first emphatically defended as "in accordance with the policy of Dr. Plinio" – soon proved to be an act of extreme incompetence and also gave the impression of an act of defection. Although the desire to lower the drawbridges was manifest there, the inelegance of the initiative – to ask for money for the visit of someone for whom we have publicly registered restrictions on countless points – and its weakness did not go unnoticed by the organizers of the papal visit, who complained about it in the newspapers and threatened a lawsuit. Also, and fortunately, they did not pass unnoticed before the eyes of several members

of our organization, who saw in this *bulk mailing* a betrayal of the anti-progressivist legacy of Prof. Plinio. Strong words sprang from indignant lips.

It was only before this double reaction – external and internal – that the five directors recognized their error. Those who expressed their indignation in writing – I know of two persons besides myself – were sought out by Dr. Plinio Xavier, who presented himself as the guilty party. He confessed that he alone was responsible for the initiative and alleged, with an enigmatic smile, that he did not possess inerrancy. Doing so, he cleansed the honor of the others.

This was undoubtedly, a noble and manly action, but insufficient, because Catholic Morals commands that public apologies should be made for public faults. If the three members to whom Dr. Plinio Xavier apologized understood that the reason for the strange bulk mailing was "a lack of inerrancy," what about the other 275,724 persons who received the mailing and were most probably led to think that the TFP was leaning without reservations toward the post-conciliar Church?

In view of what I have already narrated in the preceding letters with regard to the three other directors, I do not think it temerarious to ask: Would it have been the same agreement to not attack the progressivist Hierarchy and not analyze the Council that inspired the attempt to enter into the euphoria of John Paul II's visit?

#### **E. Dr. Eduardo de Barros Brotero and the "harmonization phase"**

I had the honor of being the last TFP member to hold a series of meetings in the Auditorium in the presence of Prof. Plinio before he left us. In fact, the last one was on August 2. The last general meeting that Prof. Plinio held for us was on August 19. In one of these meetings that I made on homosexuality in the post-conciliar Church, Prof. Plinio expressed his desire that the scripts of my expositions should be distributed to those who wanted them afterwards.

After his death, I sought out Dr. Eduardo de Barros Brotero and reminded him of this order of Prof. Plinio, asking him to consult with the other members of the Directory. Several persons had asked me for the promised scripts. I pointed out to Dr. Eduardo Brotero that this provided a good opportunity to send our message to the progressivist heads that the battle would not cease. For the text of the conference analyzed key documents of the Council and the post-Council that had opened dikes for the flood of homosexuality we are witnessing today. In addition, it touched on scandals involving the then Cardinal of Vienna, Msgr. Hans Hermann Gröer, and the Primate of England, Cardinal Basil Hume.

After giving this explanation, I waited. After some insistence on my part for an answer, I received a visit of Dr. Eduardo Brotero accompanied by another person, whom I see no need to name. This person presented himself as a spokesman for Dr. Eduardo, who, present there, endorsed what he said. After the usual courtesies, the person said approximately this: "In view of the phase of harmonization which we are now in, it was considered better not to divulge your work [against homosexuality]."

I remained silent. Later on [in that same meeting], a distribution plan was suggested to me that would reach exclusively the older members of the TFP, under conditions of special reserve. I

accepted it, though it was clear that it was not what Dr. Plinio had wanted. Then, because of the lack of initiative of the spokesman who was put in charge of part of the plan of execution, not even this was done.

I thought the statement endorsed by Dr. Eduardo Brotero was very strange. With whom was this "harmonization" taking place except with the progressivist Hierarchy that was attacked in my text? Today, in view of other facts that were exposed, it is not difficult to conjecture that, already then, the initial phases of the supposed pact were being put into practice.

Aren't the facts exposed so far enough to raise the suspicion that an agreement was made by the current Directory to remove the TFP from the fight against the progressivist Hierarchy? A pact to prevent its members from publicly analyzing controversial points in the teachings of the Vatican Council II? And wouldn't this suspicion, in its turn, explain your action, in agreement with the other four directors, to condemn the launching of the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II* in the United States, and to impose draconian conditions of "penance" and, should I not comply, to expel me from the TFP?

Questioned by me as to whether they had made an agreement not to fight against the progressivist Hierarchy (November 17, 1996), three of the aforementioned directors – Dr. Plinio Xavier, Dr. Eduardo Brotero and Dr. Paulo Brito – denied it. Some days later, perhaps coincidentally, the Brazilian TFP would make the only public criticism of the Brazilian Episcopate made since October 3, 1995, inserted in a manifesto against Agrarian Reform (December 4, 1996).

Thus, we are faced here with a clash of statements: they made a pact; they did not make one.

The way to clarify this matter is not by way of affirmations.

### **3. *De facto* agreements and *de jure* agreements**

Perhaps someone with a legal mind would think that I am referring to a formal agreement established between TFP directors and representatives of the progressivist Hierarchy. This is not my central idea. Let me express myself by an example.

When Dr. Plinio was at the First Session of the Council, he commented that everything was taking place as if a pact to not combat Communism had been made. In fact, from beginning to end, no official combat against it was made at the Assembly and the final documents did not contain the banned word. Today, it is well known that Dr. Plinio was right because documents came to light revealing that, shortly before the Council, Cardinal Eugène Tisserand – in the name of John XXIII – and the schismatic Metropolitan Nikodin – in the name of the Moscow patriarchate – met in the French city of Metz and agreed that there would be no fight against Communism at the Council. This accord is usually referred to as the "Pact of Metz." I do not know if there was a document drawn up.

There are, therefore, tacit pacts that are revealed by the facts, and explicit pacts made evident by the discovery of secret meetings or written documents. With regard to the suspicion I raise about the current Directory, I refer especially to tacit agreements, similar to the suspicion raised by Dr. Plinio against the directors of the Council: Everything looks as if there is one...

Independent of what I analyzed in the preceding number 2, anyone who considers TFP's public actions during the last two years finds that practically nothing has been done that undermines Progressivism. The present Directory, *per viam facti*, has oriented its activities as if there were an agreement not to combat the progressivist Hierarchy.

It would seem that, led by the current Directory, we are voluntarily entering under an "iron curtain" and assuming the position of a "Church of silence," without any effective power impeding us from defending the Faith, as in the case of the communist governments. *Servata proportione*, it would be a kind of "curtain of fear" that would replace the "iron curtain." The world's largest anti-communist and anti-progressivist lay association would be afraid to seriously confront its natural enemies. To this would be reduced the disciples of the one who wrote *The Freedom of the Church in the Communist State*, defending that it was better to face the nuclear hecatomb than to live in a regime of collaborationism, reproved by Catholic Morals.

With these words of faith and fire, applicable even more to the advance of Progressivism inside the Church, Dr. Plinio concluded his well-known essay:

"If, to avoid war and hecatombs, the Western nations were to commit a sin greater than the present ones, such as that of agreeing to live under the communist yoke in conditions reproved by Catholic Morals, they would in this way defy God's wrath and call down upon themselves the effects of His ire. ...

"Facing the dramatic option of the present hour ... let us not reason like atheists, who ponder the pros and cons as if God did not exist. A supreme and heroic act of fidelity in this hour could wipe out a multitude of sins before God, inclining Him to turn away from us the cataclysm that approaches. ...

"What the Mother of Mercy said to the world in the Message of Fatima is that wars are turned away by prayer, penance and the amendment of life. And not by hasty, shortsighted and fearful concessions... May Our Lady of Fatima obtain for all of us who have the duty to fight, the courage to exclaim '*non possumus*' (Acts IV, 20) in the face of the insidious suggestions of the international Communism" (São Paulo: Vera Cruz, 1967, p. 31).

I conclude, affirming that, according to the teaching of Dr. Plinio, the act of ceding the battle against the progressivist Hierarchy, of impeding a public analysis of Vatican Council II and of adapting to a Catholic life under the yoke of neo-Modernism is, analogously, "a greater sin than the present ones," "defies the wrath of God" and "calls down upon us the effects of His ire" and earns the critique of "like atheists, who ponder the pros and cons as if God did not exist."

I also point to the fact, which can only be annulled by facts that discredit it: the cease of fighting against the progressivist Hierarchy and the combat against the launching of the book against the Council seems to amount to a tacit agreement.

This suspicion cannot be clarified by asking the mentioned directors: Did you make a tacit pact? In my judgment, the problem of one or another of them asserting that no agreement exists deviates the subject from the objective order of facts to a subjective and perhaps sentimental perspective: whether this or that person is credible, whether this will harm his reputation or not,

etc. Such a suspicion should be wiped out by facts. If the current Directory inaugurates a serious fight against the progressivist Hierarchy and encourages a public analysis of Vatican II, it certainly will not have made the suspected agreement. If it does not take these actions, one must face this verification: Everything looks as if there is one...

#### 4. From implicit to explicit: the *Villac Document*

This part of the rebuttal was already written when I received, on February 4, the work *And Msgr. Lefebvre did not die...* [*E Msgr. Lefebvre não morreu...*], authored by the Commission of Studies of Hermits and Camaldolenses. On page 49, I came across what I will call the *Villac Document*. In fact, quoted in this work, for another purpose, are excerpts from a letter from Canon José Luis Villac.

The letter is a response to affirmations of the Cardinal Primate of Brazil, Dom Lucas Moreira Neves, who, in the July 3, 1995, issue of the newspaper *A Tarde* of Salvador, maintained that the TFP does not accept the New Mass and Conciliar reforms. The reply is dated September 18, 1995. The *Villac Document* seems to contain the confirmation of the existence of the mentioned agreement. If this hypothesis is true, then we would no longer be facing a tacit but an explicit agreement.

I will transcribe excerpts from the letter in the mentioned work, without adding comments:

"The words of Your Eminence that 'the TFP does not hide its opposition to the Second Ecumenical Vatican Council ... and takes a critical attitude towards the Mass of Paul VI in favor of that of St. Pius V, also denotes misinformation.

"The attitude of the components of the TFP toward Vatican Council II and the New Mass of Paul VI is quite nuanced. Regarding the latter, **the TFP has always maintained a position of discretion**, and does not want to make public certain theological difficulties raised by the *Novus Ordo Missae*. **It awaits a full elucidation of the theme from the supreme authority of the Church.**

"Before the very serious problems that afflict the Church in our days – so often mentioned by John Paul II – this is, Your Eminence, the position of the great majority of the members, supporters and correspondents of the TFP:

"1. They declare themselves perplexed by certain reforms and events that have taken place in the Church since the pontificate of John XXIII;

"2. This perplexity is defined as a non-comprehension and strangeness;

"3. This perplexity is not an affirmation that there is error in these events and reforms, and also it is not an affirmation that there is no error. **The members of the TFP, as cultured and instructed Catholics, declare themselves incapable of solving all the very complex theological, moral, canonical and liturgical issues** (Cardinal Ratzinger has referred to them more than once) **that are at the root of these oddities.**

"In view of this, they seek to follow the debate that arises here and there in the ecclesiastical sphere on these issues, waiting for the matter to be duly clarified.

"While awaiting this clarification, **they fully adhere to the terms set forth by Pope John Paul II in the Apostolic Letter *Ecclesia Dei*, which are in the protocol that various traditionalist groups have signed with the Vatican: '3. With regard to some doctrines taught by Vatican Council II or to later liturgical or canon law reforms, which may seem difficult to reconcile with declarations of the previous Magisterium, I assume the obligation to maintain a positive attitude of study and communication with the Apostolic See, avoiding any controversy.'**

"I give my word as a priest to guarantee to you that this is the balanced and conciliatory attitude that TFP members have always adopted, and from which they have no intention of departing." [author's emphasis]

*À bon entendeur, salut!* [Did you get it?]

### 5. Antiprogressivist surprise?

It was with hope that I received the news of the publication by our brother in ideals, the American TFP, of a manifesto addressed to John Paul II. The document was printed in four U.S. newspapers on January 13, 15 and 16. I thought, before reading the text that finally TFP would take advantage of the imminent visit of the Pontiff to Cuba to sound throughout the entire world a vigorous echo of the *Declaration of Resistance* that Dr. Plinio wrote and all the TFPs launched in 1974 against the Vatican *Ostpolitik*.

In fact, the situation could not have been more propitious, because on that occasion, the drop of water that had made the cup of non-conformity overflow was precisely this visit to the Island-Prison and the statement of his Cardinal Secretary of State Msgr. Agostino Casaroli that "Catholics lived happily under the Communist regime." Thus, it was crucial for the TFPs, before John Paul II's visit to Cuba, to recall that memorable action of *Resistance*, which, as far as I know, is still in force.

I remember some time ago having commented with some friends on the excellent opportunity that this would present; one of them, the author of the mentioned document, manifested the desire to do something. Some points of a possible manifesto, with even the title – "Say just one word..." that Dr. Plinio had used in an article for John Paul II's first visit to Brazil were suggested as highly propitious for the interpellation.

It was, therefore, with hope that, seeing that a manifesto with that title had been published and, at first glance, recognizing some points of the scheme proposed in our conversation, I imagined that the American TFP would raise the banner of the Resistance. I assumed, of course, that the *Ostpolitik*, which in a certain way, was consecrated with the Pontiff's visit to Cuba, would be analyzed. One need not be too astute to deduce that, with this, Progressivism – which inspired that policy – would suffer a serious setback. Also the Second Vatican Council, where the pact to not combat Communism was agreed upon, could not fail to be mentioned, especially since it was precisely on this point that Dr. Plinio made his greatest criticism of Vatican II in *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*.

The text I will use for making my observations is the Spanish one, faxed from the Foundation for a Christian Civilization, pages 2 to 5, on January 17, 1998, at 11:54 am, according to the data recorded by the machine. This document – the one published in the *Diario las Americas* (January 14, 1998) – was circulated in the Brazilian TFP. It has, therefore, the necessary credibility.

*A - Reading the manifesto, what did I find that was praiseworthy?*

Certainly it is a manifesto with a fluent language. Undoubtedly, one finds in some parts of it an appropriate argument against the horrors of Stalinist Communism, which was perpetuated in Cuba. Inarguably, there are some good criticisms of Cardinal Jaime Ortega, Archbishop of Havana, and of certain members of Cuba's collaborationist clergy. Also, there is one or another insinuation against "the Shepherds who attempt a *captatio benevolentia* toward Marxist governments" (p. 2, § 9).

*B - What did I find that was not praiseworthy?*

*From the religious point of view:*

- There is not even a mention of the *Declaration of Resistance*, which I find incomprehensible in view of our fidelity to Dr. Plinio and the ideals of the Counter-Revolution;
- There is no clear reference to the Vatican *Ostpolitik*, which I consider inexplicable, given the history of some 30 years of TFP fighting against this policy of the Holy See;
- There is no criticism of the progressivist current as such;
- There is not even a reference to Vatican II and its non-condemnation of Communism;
- There is no criticism of John Paul II, the true architect of the visit and promoter of the collaborationist policy of the Cuban Episcopate.

*From the socio-political point of view:*

- The extraordinary emphasis given to the critique of Stalinist Communism and the small emphasis given to a critique of the self-managing neo-Communism of a liberal, multi-partisan form can easily incline the reader to think that the TFP would favor various aspects of it. This is, however, the principal enemy of the Counter-Revolution today, the target of innumerable attacks by Dr. Plinio (see "*Self-managing socialism: in view of communism, a barrier or bridgehead?*" in *Folha de São Paulo*, August 1, 1982; "*Morto o comunismo? E o anticomunismo também?*" in *Correio Brasiliense*, October 18, 1989; "*Comunismo e anticomunismo na orla da última década deste milênio,*" in *Folha de São Paulo*, November 14, 1990; *Revolução e Contra-Revolução*, Part III, Chapters I-III, São Paulo: Chevalerie Artes Gráficas and Ed., 1993).
- It also failed to make clear mention of China as the great representative of pre-Gorbachev Communism, despite the unconvincing reforms of Deng Xiaoping. Consequently, there is also no mention of the great deceptive ploy by which China is attracting the West. Namely, for it to become the main supplier of labor for the West, thus creating conditions for a vital dependency and preparing for the "dictatorship of the proletariat" at the level of nations.

*C - What did I find singular?*

- The presentation of the Vatican's policy of entering into relations with Cuba as being primarily a concern "to enable the Pontiff to give some spiritual encouragement to millions of Catholics" (p. 2, § 1).
- The suggestion that the great danger for Cuba would be the creation of joint business ventures that favor "savage capitalism" with Cuban companies and, thus, "illicitly achieving certain prosperity" (see p. 5, §§ 8- 12). It would have been to avoid this "supreme sin, that John Paul II should say a word to save Cuba (cf. idem, §§ 13f). Above all, this is an economic focus, quite unusual in a request of a TFP to a Pope.

*D - What did I find contradictory?*

- The affirmation that "it is possible that Castroism, which finds such great resistance in public opinion, could be metamorphosed into an anarchic-libertarian revolution, much more harmful and timely than the already worn-out Stalinism and with more possibilities of expansion" (p. 4, § 2). Then, in contradiction to this, it maintained that "Communism no longer poses a worldwide and immediate threat, as was the Soviet Union" (p. 4, § 11).  
If the neo-communist revolution in Cuba is so dangerous, why it is not in the countries of Eastern Europe?
- The affirmation that "the Castro-Communist regime has transformed in a certain way the focus through which ... Stalinist ferocity is brought together and articulated, which has turned the country into a kind of immense concentration camp" (p. , § 10). This, therefore, supposes a slave labor there.

Then, in contradiction to this, it maintained that "savage capitalism" would have as an "unconfessed end the establishment of slave labor in Cuba " (cf. 5, 2nd subtitle). How can something be established where it has existed for decades?

In summary, I had thought that the American TFP manifesto would be clearly anti-progressivist. Hence I assumed that, under your inspiration and other members of the Brazilian TFP, the North American TFP had resolved to spearhead a lasting *renouveau* in our movement. A vain hope! Not even an ephemeral anti-Progressivism surprise was considered prudent...

One sees that the publication of such a manifesto, to the extent it was influenced by you and the other directors of the Brazilian TFP, did not break the rule to abandon the fight against Progressivism and Vatican II. And, far from denying the hypothesis of an agreement, it only seems to strengthen it.

Permit me, Mr. President, to reap a secondary fruit of the publication of this manifesto. I was informed that this document was written here in São Paulo, more precisely on the second floor of Rua Alagoas, and that the text counted on the collaboration – or at least the acquiescence – of the five mentioned directors. If this is true, how can one understand that you did not see the omissions, the singularities and, above all, the blatant contradictions that I pointed out above?

How can we understand that similar censures of "being insufficient" and "without scientific rigor" – which you placed on my book and the Quinn *Manifesto* – have not fallen upon the writer of that document? How can one imagine that Dr. Paulo Brito's delicate moral sensibilities did not manifest themselves here, as they did for me, saying that the non-existence of contradictions in the TFP documents "is a characteristic of the documents that Dr. Plinio left us, a characteristic which, in good conscience, we wish to follow" (Letter of November 18, 1996, p. 1, § 3). It would seem that, once again, the current Directory would have applied two weights and two measures...

Do you not see that, independent of the injustice I have pointed out, the document at issue seems to expose the American TFP to be publicly labeled as inconsistent with the previous views of Dr. Plinio and contradictory in the exposition of its own thinking? Therefore, Mr. President, the fears that you harbored seem to have been realized, that is, the name of the TFP would be in danger. Not, however, because of my book or the document against Msgr. Quinn, but because of a manifesto of the American TFP, drafted, to my knowledge, under the baton of the five directors of the Brazilian TFP.

Thus do I note a certain irony in the march of events: You and the current Directory, considering yourselves competent referees from the intellectual point of view, assail my book for not having passed the review of the censors you chose; however, in my book so far no error or contradiction has been pointed out. But, in a manifesto written under your initiative – with the support of all the censors desired – several serious omissions, improprieties and contradictions are evident. It would seem difficult here not to apply the words of Our Lord: "Woe to you ... who strain at a gnat and swallow a camel" (Mt 23: 24).

This is what I would have to say about this recent action.

Having dealt with the ideological and religious questions (Items 1-5), which I believe are at the bottom of the decision not to publish my work, I will turn to the disciplinary question.

## **6. To not publish the work on the Council, a preconceived decision?**

In your letter you try to present yourself as impartial. There you write:

"In the last two years, Dr. Plinio Xavier had several conversations with you about this study of yours. In these conversations he insisted ... that, with Prof. Plinio's absence, we were against its publication without an assurance that your writing was secure and the occasion timely" (p. 1, § 2).

One could say, therefore, that if you and the members of the Directory had a guarantee that my writing was secure, you would begin to prepare for its publication, which would be done as soon as the time were opportune. The picture you present is one of impartiality and a desire to carry on the work.

The same impression is reinforced when you state, further on: "We tried to create favorable psychological conditions for an efficient review by well-oriented theologians" (p. 5, § 5). Thus, you and the present Directory would have created the conditions for the author to make a re-

sponsible work, and he would have released his book out of rashness and the desire not to be bound by the reasonable conditions you requested.

Such an incomprehensible action on his part would have caused you a just shock – "I was shocked at the news you gave to Dr. Plinio Xavier on Saturday, November 8, saying that a book under your authorship would be published in the United States (under the title *The Murky Waters Of Vatican II*) and that a text of Prof. Plinio would be used in the preface" (p. 1, §1). Faced with such a lack of discipline, you and the current Directory would have been forced, for the maintenance of order and to avoid a precedent, to punish the insubordinate author.

Now, although such a presentation is logical and properly awakens the sympathy of orderly minds, a question can be placed against it that is somewhat disruptive. In fact, this picture does not correspond to reality in various ways, as I will proceed to show.

Before this, allow me to warn you, Mr. President, that until this day I have not wanted to bring to public knowledge the facts I am going to report, because I preferred to remain silent about the many dishonorable moral acts that I witnessed in the members of the Directory. I would have sufficient reason to speak out now, since these same members launched a strong campaign of detraction and boycott against me and those who supported me in the publication of the *Quinn Manifesto* for close to a year, as I will show below (cf. Letters D, E, F). But, I preferred to remain quiet in order to preserve the prestige of these older directors whom I have always respected and still respect as such.

Although with distaste, I now speak, pressed by an imperative of self-defense, which I quoted earlier. I am obliged to do so by two orders of fact. *First*, because the accusations contained in the letter you addressed to me, in order to be answered, necessarily require me to describe what has happened in my contacts with members of the Directory. *Second*, in view of a new and surprising international campaign of slander being addressed inside the TFPs against me and those who support the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*. Such attacks are, as a rule, based on your letter.

Thus, I no longer consider that the members of the Directory, who out of respect for their reputation I have said nothing, merit my silence when I am being attacked by you and them in what is dearer to me than life itself – my love for the Holy Catholic Church, my relationship with Dr. Plinio and my personal honor. *Hora est tacendi, hora est loquendi*. [There is an hour to remain silent and an hour to speak].

I have not the least uncertainty about the essence of the facts I have witnessed or about the precise meaning I give them. Perhaps one detail or another that escaped my written records can be wrong, as well as some indirect testimony that I used. However, any fears you may have about the truth of what I affirm should be calmed by the guarantee I present at the end of the refutation of Thesis II. And if any interested person wants to relativize what I say or to deny it in its essence, he is kindly invited by me to do so under the conditions I establish there.

Having clarified this point, I enter into the question.

## A - Overview

- In the beginning I received from the current Directory enigmatic support for my work on the Council (letter B);
- Later, an euphoric support for my initiative to publish the manifesto against Msgr. Quinn (letter C);
- Next, a sudden cut of all support, without any reasonable explanation (letter D);
- After that, because of the *Quinn Manifesto* and originating from the Directory, a violent campaign of detraction and boycott (letter E) began against me;
- Under the tenuous appearance of cordial relations, the cycle of detractions and pressure took on unprecedented proportions (letter F);
- At the same time, theological revisions and new internal reviews were proposed to me; I accepted them and, for reasons unknown to me, nothing happened (letter G);
- I expressed my surprise at the indefinite postponement of the decision to publish the work or not (letter H);
- Finally, I decided to publish it under my own responsibility and communicated that purpose, which was accepted with coolness and, then, with complacency (letter I).
- I now receive an ultimatum of expulsion, alleging that I acted without the knowledge of the Directory and against its decision.

I go on to describe the various phases.

**B - An enigmatic support for the work on the Council.** On July 25, 1996, a meeting was held with Dr. Plinio Xavier, Dr. Eduardo Brotero and Dr. Caio Xavier on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor at my request. Its purpose was to attend to my request for guidance in my work. I gave a detailed account of the following agenda, which I still have: Division of labor. Plan of Dr. Plinio. Target audience. Progression of the work at that time. Deadlines set by Dr. Plinio. The situation of the Church. Launching the work.

On each of these points I made a brief presentation, which was followed by questions and comments. The meeting lasted about three hours. Regarding the last point – the launching of the work – which concluded the presentation and was the object of my consultation, I transcribe the agenda I addressed: Will the work be launched by TFP? When? Or would you prefer that it came out in my own name? In this case, will the TFP officially support it? Or will it support it only in fact? In this case, can you provide the administrative tools, the funds, distribution lists? Isn't it the case to start things moving? These were the questions I asked and kept written records of.

Closing the presentation with these questions, I noticed a curious rush for the door. Dr. Caio Xavier, who until then had been very calm, suddenly expressed concern about a dinner commitment with Mr. Benoit Bemelmans and hurried to leave; Dr. Plinio Xavier, who had a cold, got up to set up the altar for the reception of Communion that was scheduled and began to move

chairs, armchairs and tables, which visibly precipitated the end of the meeting. A detail: there were two younger assistants in the lobby, who could have made those preparations in one of the three other unoccupied rooms. It seemed to be an artifice to avoid giving me the official guidance that I sought.

With this mistrust and in view of the urgency of time – the Blessed Sacrament was about to arrive – I asked them straightforwardly and in a loud voice because of the clamor, addressing myself especially to Dr. Caio Xavier: "Please give me a response. I took you seriously, gave you a thorough presentation on my work, and set out the guidelines Dr. Plinio left me. I am asking for guidance. Why, now, this flight from giving the decision? "

Dr. Caio Xavier, after re-seating himself, replied: "I never bore such a great burden of responsibility in my life! We need time to think. "

I asked him, "How long? Give a point of reference."

His answer: "Within three or four days you will have a decision."

At that time he would be traveling. On the day of his travel, I was in my office on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, waiting. Dr. Caio Xavier passed by to exchange some amiable words; upon leaving he told me: "I am going up to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor now to *pour faire le point* [discuss your case] with the others on your matter. Then, Dr. Plinio Xavier will give you the answer."

Soon afterwards he would be leaving to catch his plane [back to Paris]. I went down to accompany him to the floor of the building. I came across Dr. Eduardo Brotero, who was taking him to the airport, and he took the initiative to say to me: "Later Dr. Plinio Xavier will give you an answer on that matter." Such successive transference of delivering a simple decision – the answer about whether it would be published or not, published on behalf of the TFP or in my own name – was enigmatic.

A few days later, Dr. Plinio Xavier would come to me and give me this ambiguous decision: "Go forward with things, as if it were to be published." To my clear questions, I received a slippery answer. Even this was not the direct answer of the three, but of only one. The whole thing seemed strange to me.

In the middle of my presentation, I offered the three of them copies of Volume I [*In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*] of my work to read. I left two copies at their disposition, asking them to make all the corrections and observations they wanted and telling them I would be willing to accept them. Dr. Caio Xavier quickly alleged a lack of time and declined the invitation to read it, the other two said nothing. Dr. Plinio Xavier eventually read the work and, from time to time, praised the documentation and the exposition of the work. Dr. Eduardo did not read it, although the copy was available for more than three months at his residence.

Notwithstanding, up to this point three things are quite clear.

- Already in July of 1996, the author had asked the three members of the Directory whether the work should be published either by the TFP or by himself without directly involving the TFP;

- And, having insisted on a decision, he was told, "Go ahead with things, as if it were to be published;"
- In addition, the author gave Volume I to the three directors for their corrections.

From this, we can draw consequences related to Argument II:

- There was no ignorance on the part of the three mentioned directors. The author did not act insubordinately in preparing for the publication of his work on the Council.

**C - The 'Quinn Case': from a discreet support to a surprising support.** After this, I "went ahead with things, as if it were to be published." Once or twice a month until mid-November, I met with Dr. Plinio Xavier to bring him up to date with my progress. This was when I informed him of the establishment of Tradition in Action in the United States, an organization devised by Mr. Leo Horvat, with my knowledge and full support, and directed by his sister, Dr. Marian Horvat. It is an entity that has among its aims the fight against Progressivism and that was willing to support us in the *Quinn Manifesto* and, eventually, in the launching of the work against the Council. Dr. Plinio Xavier listened with interest and apparent satisfaction and gave me some political advice.

Anyone would suppose, therefore, his tacit approval, as I did. I offered him a draft of the organization's *Statutes*, but he showed no interest. I told him some time later that the organization had been recognized as a foundation and had tax exemption status. I remember that he was amazed. He asked for details about everything, especially about the people involved: who was supporting it, what social level they had, what was their influence, what conservative current they followed, their economic situation and so on. I tried to answer everything to the best of my knowledge.

At one point in our encounters, I reminded him of the request for lists of names that I had made to Dr. Caio Xavier at the meeting (see Letter B), since they would be very useful for contacts in the United States. Dr. Plinio Xavier dismissed the subject. Sometime later, I asked him again. He dismissed the subject again. I found it curious. He, who was so interested in getting information about my supporters, did not seem to want to give anything in return. I registered that fact and turned the page.

This was the way our encounters were going when, in August, I read in the Italian bulletin *ADIS-TA* the text of the conference that Msgr. John Quinn, retired Archbishop of St. Francisco (USA), gave at Oxford (England), on June 29, the Feast of St. Peter. In it, the Prelate analyzed what he thought needed to change in the traditional conception of the Papacy in order to satisfy the ecumenical aims of conciliar Progressivism. He proposed that a Vatican Council III, to be held in the year 2000, should reform the Papacy. In addition, he advocated various other changes of a revolutionary nature – abolition of celibacy, introduction of the female priesthood, liberalization of premarital morals and birth control, acceptance of homosexuality, etc.

I studied the text, made a first critique and presented it at two or three meetings on Wednesdays in the Eremo de Elias, where the Revolution was analyzed. It raised general indignation. The participants – about 12 persons – expressed a clear desire for the TFP to take a position on the

issue. I recall that you, present at one of the meetings, joined in the general sentiment and invited me to give a report in the Auditorium. I declined the invitation, preferring a meeting with the Directory to address a possible public action, which I judged to be urgent.

This meeting took place on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor in the second half of September. Present, in addition to you, were Dr. Plinio Xavier, Dr. Eduardo Brotero and Dr. Paulo Brito. I gave a summary of the conference and the essential points of my critique – a manifesto that I had already written. I emphasized the advantage for the TFP to raise its banner in this campaign and expressed my hope that such a position would prepare the ground for the launching of the work on the Council. But, I proposed, in case they did not judge it convenient to take responsibility for its publication, that then it could be done through my friends in Tradition in Action with no commitment of the TFP.

Dr. Plinio Xavier gave some support to the idea that we needed to do something. You gave the opinion, "The worst that can happen is that it would be a shot in the water." It was, undoubtedly, a judicious metaphor and a prudent calculation regarding the security of the TFP, since I proposed to assume all the risks. But, no decision was made *sur le champ* [at that meeting]

A few days later, Dr. Plinio Xavier informed me that the publication of the manifesto was authorized and that it could come out in my name as a scholar of the Brazilian TFP, without any official commitment of the group. I could avail myself of the services of Tradition in Action. Although it was well-known that the TFP cash desk was comfortably full, no financial support was mentioned for the initiative. I found this last point curious; it seemed like a test to see if I would have conditions to do something without the TFP and, thus, confirm the information I had given to Dr. Plinio Xavier. Colonel Carlos Antonio Poli, in charge of the distribution of the funds of the General Treasury, at that time was my close friend. I asked him to read the *Manifesto* and give his opinion.

On October 3, after the one-year anniversary Mass of Dr. Plinio's death, we had dinner together. On that occasion he gave his opinion: I summarize: "Without Dr. Plinio, anything we do will go wrong. Especially in the fight against the Hierarchy. Since you do not have inerrancy, you will inevitably err and it will be worse than if we do nothing. For this reason, I am against publication."

A curious echo of the attitudes of the five directors, analyzed above (cf. Item 2). I thanked him for his opinion, amiably acknowledged my disagreement, offered several arguments that did not convince him and said good-bye. The funds were cut. The refusal fit with the test implicitly proposed by the Directory. The next day, Mr. Leo Horvat returned to the United States to start our initiative there.

From then until the middle of November, my meetings with Dr. Plinio Xavier continued as described. That is, he expressed a great interest in knowing the details of the progress of the initiative and the persons involved and stimulated the action. Dr. Caio Xavier had expressed the wish that my Manifesto be reviewed by theologians he knew, I believe, from the Institute of Msgr. Wach. I agreed.

On November 4, I recorded, perhaps a few days later, in my notes: "Dr. Caio Xavier told me, through Dr. Plinio Xavier, that he considers the *Quinn Manifesto* well-documented and secure, so he sees no reason to send it to a theological reviewer, as he had suggested." The initiatives of Mr. Leo Horvat and Dr. Marian Horvat proved to be successful: They had raised funds for its publication in *The Wanderer*, promises for the *Diario las Americas* and possibilities of having it published in *The Washington Times*. The test was panning out.

On November 13 around 5 p.m., Dr. Plinio Xavier telephoned me to transmit a sensational turn of affairs in the discrete support I had been given thus far. He advised me that members of the Directory would clearly support the *Quinn Manifesto*. The American TFP would publish the document in their next issue of *Crusade Magazine* and sponsor the publication in *The Wanderer*, *The Washington Times* and *Diario las Americas*. He invited me to lunch the next day to work out some details. There, he delivered the extremely cordial news: "We (the five directors), considering the high intellectual level of your document, want to present it to the American TFP with the possibility of publishing it." *Tropo amabile!* [Very amiable!]

In spite of this show of munificence, a question remained in my mind: Why now and not before? Why publish in the same newspapers for which we had already arranged or were in the process of getting the funds? Something did not sound right. Could it be that the test was made and the directors were trying to prevent me from getting the promised support? Perhaps. But, since "you don't look a gift horse in the mouth," I thanked him and waited to see what would happen. The next day, the encouraging proposals continued. Brazilian *Catolicismo* magazine would publish the manifesto, as would various organs of other TFPs.

Such are the facts that constituted the phase of support that the directors gave the *Quinn Manifesto*.

I would like to call attention to some points:

- The **Quinn Manifesto** was presented to the four directors as a step toward launching the work of the Council;
- It was clearly stated that Tradition in Action supported the *Quinn Manifesto*;
- The author raised the possibility of having the support of TIA in the larger project on the Council;
- Dr. Caio Xavier approved the writing of the Quinn document;
- Dr. Plinio Xavier emphatically praised its intellectual level.

From this, we can draw some consequences related to Argument II:

- There was no ignorance on the part of the directors that the *Quinn Manifesto* was meant to be a preparation for the launching of the work on the Council;
- There was no ignorance, on the part of Dr. Plinio Xavier, that TIA had been established having, as one of its possible purposes, the publishing of the larger work;

- Given the support – first discreet and then official – for the *Quinn Manifesto* from the Directory, and given that the author clearly stated the connection between it and the work on the Council, it cannot be said that the Directory was unaware of the coming publication of the work on the Council.
- The same reasons – added to the general permission given above (see letter B) – can be argued to state that, given such support, even if it was later withdrawn, the author could consider himself authorized to publish the work on the Council, for when the authority makes contradictory statements, the principle *in dubio libertas* [in doubt, freedom] applies. And, in the case of the accusation in Argument II, the principle *in dubio pro reo* [in doubt, for the accused] would also apply.

These points conclude against the statement that the author acted hastily and without the knowledge of the directors.

**D - Incoherent demands, unprecedented violence.** On the 14<sup>th</sup>, then, one day after the support was offered and soon after the enticing suggestions to publish the *Manifesto* in *Catolicismo* and other TFP organs, Dr. Plinio Xavier placed a review by Dr. Paulo Brito as the condition for that support. To request a review, nothing could seem more normal; as for the reviewer being Dr. Paulo Brito, I confess that I did not appreciate the choice because of the first antecedent I described above (see Thesis I, Refutation of Argument VI, 1, D, a).

"Could it be someone else?" I asked. "No, he is the best prepared of us all." I returned to the charge: "But, Dr. Caio Xavier said that it did not need a theological review..." "Yes, but now it needs to be reviewed by Dr. Paulo Brito."

I told him about the precedent of the articles on the Popes and asked him if at least he – Dr. Plinio Xavier – could be present in the meeting to avoid the usual scruples. He told me he would see. In fact, he was not. After this short discussion, I accepted the condition of Dr. Paulo Brito's review. The description of what happened in that one and only review session with Dr. Paulo Brito, I have already made (cf. *idem*, b). About his comments on the presence of generalizations in my work, I will answer in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration.

Dr. Paulo Brito and I left the review as good friends: He would study *Lumen gentium* and suggest other modifications; I thanked him beforehand, and guaranteed that I would accept everything possible and we said our farewells. But, I was left with a vague impression that the aim of this review was to block the work and not to really publish it.

The day after that review, I telephoned Dr. Plinio Xavier, amiably complained about his absence and asked him whether the real aim of the review was to halt the publication of the *Manifesto*, given the dilatory study that Dr. Paulo Brito had determined to make of *Lumen gentium*. Dr. Plinio Xavier's response was elusive. Everything ended cordially. I remained disposed to accept the observations of the reviewer.

The negotiations in the United States were going reasonably well. Although *The Washington Times* could not be arranged, publication in *The Wanderer* was guaranteed and the *Diario Las*

*Americas* was almost certain – it depended on a donation that eventually came. Dr. Marian Horvat had given the *Manifesto* to an acquaintance of hers, who worked for the newspaper, for him to read it. He approved the document and referred it to the publisher of *The Wanderer*, who also considered it good.

He made two objections, however. He believed that the American TFP had recently chosen a line of moderate conservatism that would not appeal to the public that would normally applaud the *Manifesto*. For this reason, he asked to remove the note that the author was a member of the Brazilian TFP. For the same reason, he considered that the name of Dr. Plinio, cited at the end of the document as a great Catholic thinker, was indissociably linked to the TFP. He asked that it be taken out also.

I received the e-mail with this information from Dr. Marian Horvat on November 15, a Friday. I was working in my office on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Next door a meeting attended by Dr. Plinio Xavier, Dr. Eduardo Brotero and Col. Carlos Poli was being held. I interrupted this meeting and consulted with Dr. Plinio Xavier on what to do in view of the objections of the publisher of *The Wanderer*. He told me very emphatically: "You must demand that the name of Dr. Plinio and your belonging to the TFP remain." I agreed with the decision.

I returned to my office and began to write the response. Before I sent it, I went back to consult again with Dr. Plinio Xavier, who emphatically ratified the first decision. I sent the e-mail. Late that evening, I received another. It reported that Dr. Horvat had called the publisher, told him that the name of Dr. Plinio and my membership in the TFP must remain, and the publisher had agreed. In view of this, they agreed that the *Manifesto* would come out in the next edition (on the 21<sup>st</sup>) or on December 5. Because of practical reasons – an excess of paid advertisements in the newspaper – the *Manifesto* could not be printed in the edition of the 28<sup>th</sup>.

We were all very pleased and saw in this the help of Dr. Plinio. I transcribe below a part of the email reporting the events of the 15<sup>th</sup> that Mr. Leo Horvat sent me from Dallas, where he had gone to spend a few days:

"Dr. Plinio did indeed noticeably intervene in *The Wanderer* matters. Marian was very upset by the attitude of Al Matt [its publisher] in the last phone call. Today, she called him with instructions to publish the article exactly as you had resolved or to cancel the whole business. He was very cordial, but advised against the use of the name of Dr. Plinio. When Marian insisted he said, 'Very well, put it in, but we need to explain who this Mr. Atila is.' Therefore, we are able to put in your name as a member of the TFP, exactly as planned. It was a real and surprising intervention of Dr. Plinio in this case."

The next day, Saturday morning, I telephoned the 4<sup>th</sup> floor to communicate the news to Dr. Plinio Xavier, who asked me to come and see him that afternoon in his residence. At the appointed time, I went there and told him what had happened. He received the news politely but very coldly and told me, "This puts our support in question." I asked him why. "Because the American TFP had agreed to pay *The Wanderer* and you preferred TIA's support." My reply, "But, it was all agreed with you. Even the conditions for publication were decided by you yesterday afternoon." Silence.

Then, he asked, "Can you stop the publication?" I replied: "Up until yesterday afternoon it was possible; today it is not. The persons who gave their support there would not understand and the publisher of the newspaper would think we were crazy." He said, "I will speak with the others, but I believe that our support will have to end." We parted company coldly.

On Sunday the 17<sup>th</sup>, I received a conference phone call from Dr. Plinio Xavier [PX], Dr. Eduardo Brotero [EB] and Dr. Paulo Brito [PB]. Dr. Plinio Xavier spoke for the group (an approximate summary follows):

PX: "We just talked to Caio and decided to withdraw our support for your *Manifesto*."

AG [Atila Guimarães]: "Why?"

PX: "Because you did not wait for the review of Dr. Paulo Brito and this was our condition."

AG: "But, I was very willing to receive his corrections. The consummated fact was not created by me. The final decision was made by you yesterday evening. My willingness for the review continues for any future publications; he can make the corrections that he wishes, and I will introduce them in the *Diario Las Americas* and in the possible publications promoted by the TFP."

PX: "Well, I want to communicate to you that our support is ended and that you need to remove your name as a member of the TFP [from the *Manifesto*]."

AG: "What?! You specifically decided this the day before yesterday! Don't you see that the TFP is going to look like a group of madmen to the Americans who supported me and the publisher of the newspaper?"

PX: "You must do everything you can to remove your belonging to the TFP; if you don't, we may have to issue a public statement disassociating ourselves from your *Manifesto*."

AG: "Even if I decided to attend to your requests, I am not sure I can do it."

PX: "In that case, we may have to publicly disassociate ourselves."

AG: "You have this right. I don't have the least fear of such a pronouncement. If you wish, I can even write it for you."

PX: "Thank you very much. We feel capable of writing it."

It was then that I asked them: "Can you answer a question? Since Dr. Plinio passed away, the TFP is doing nothing in the anti-progressivist fight and this change of attitude from the day before yesterday reveals that you fear the progressivist Hierarchy as Dr. Plinio never feared it. Therefore, I would like you to answer this question: Do you have an agreement with the Structure not to combat it?"

Individual answers: PX: "No". EB: "No". PB: "No." The coldest possible good-byes.

The next day, November 18, Col. Carlos Poli was the bearer of an official letter from Dr. Paulo Brito, who wrote as Secretary of the National Council of the TFP. He confirmed the contents of the conversation and its demands, starting from the same false assumption that I would have created the consummated fact: "The publication, in the terms and conditions you communicated to us to be definitely agreed upon, in addition to counting on support outside of the TFP, makes

these negotiations [about the promised publications in TFP organs] unviable "(p.2, §2). The indirect mention of TIA confirmed my previous hypothesis of a test.

I telephoned Mr. Leo in Dallas, asking him to apologize to our donors and to the publisher. I explained there was a demand that my belonging to the TFP be removed, and asked if it would be possible to do so, etc. After recovering from his great astonishment, understandably, he said he would do his best. The *Manifesto* came out with the demand of the Directory duly followed.

That surprising support had lasted for three days...

From the narration of this phase of the author's contacts with the mentioned directors, these facts are clear:

- After requesting another reviewer, the author showed his willingness to receive the revisions of Dr. Paulo Brito;
- He complied with the decisions of Dr. Plinio Xavier on the demands to publish the *Manifesto* with the name of Dr. Plinio and with the author being a member of the Brazilian TFP included;
- He did not create a consummated fact for the publication of his work, but rather it was done on the decision of Dr. Plinio Xavier and by the agreement established between Dr. Horvat and the publisher of *The Wanderer*, in conformance with the demands of Dr. Plinio Xavier;
- The manifesto was published meeting the last minute demand of the directors that the author belonging to the TFP be removed.

On the part of Dr. Plinio Xavier, the following is not clear:

- The reason why *he imposed* the review of Dr. Paulo Brito after he himself had told me that the document "was a work of high intellectual level" and that Dr. Caio Xavier had affirmed the work would not need to be sent to a theological reviser, since it was "well documented and secure";
- Whether the condition for a review by Dr. Paulo Brito was to stall the publication or not;
- Whether the decision to require the publisher of *The Wanderer* to publish the name of Dr. Plinio and the author belonging to the TFP objectively referred to its publication or was moved by the hope that the publisher would refuse and close the possibility of its publication;
- Whether the support that he had promised – funding for publication in three newspapers and several organs of the TFP – was sincere or not since, faced with its irreversible publication, he withdrew that support. It would seem that if he were sincere, he would have been pleased and given the promised support and funding for the other publications.

On the part of Dr. Plinio Xavier, this remains clear:

- He was contradictory in demanding on one day that the author include his membership in the TFP in the article and the next day take it out.

- He was contradictory in saying on Saturday that the reason for withdrawing support was the author's imaginary refusal of the American TFP's support in favor of TIA's, and on Sunday that the reason for withdrawing support was the imaginary refusal of the author to submit to the review of Dr. Paulo Brito;
- He does not seem to have been truthful in either of the two statements above since the author never denied the support of the American TFP, as also he never refused the future reviews that Dr. Paulo Brito would make of his *Manifesto*. In the refutation to the second consequence, this will become even clearer;
- He was slippery every time the author questioned him about the clear and unclear points exposed above.

Having said this, an additional serious shadow of suspicion falls on Dr. Plinio Xavier and, to a certain extent, on the other members of the Directory, regarding the honesty of the purposes they profess. This has inevitable consequences regarding the violation of the precepts of Catholic Morals and the scandal its gives to subordinates.

With regard to this 1<sup>st</sup> consideration, at least as far as the *Quinn Manifesto* is concerned, it cannot be said that the alleged presumption of impartiality is true, which raises the same suspicion about the discussions on the work of the Council.

**E - Calumnious and draconian measures.** After the aforementioned phone call and letter, the rumors that had been circulating here and there increased considerably. The initial rumors (*first wave*) sought to ridicule my "pretension" to publish a whole page in *The Wanderer*. After the facts mentioned above, other accusations (*second wave*) were added: I "did not accept Dr. Paulo Brito's comments;" the document "was full of mistakes;" I "have the vice of attributing to others what they did not say;" I "would compromise the TFP, dragging it into a risky adventure," and more.

Anyone who wanted to know where the rumors were coming from could see that some of the information they included was known only to Dr. Plinio Xavier, Dr. Paulo Brito and myself. Besides that, the propelling sources of these rumors, whom I avoid naming at the moment, were very close to you or the other directors. Therefore, it would seem that the new campaign of rumors was inspired by the directors themselves.

When the one page ad came out in *The Wanderer* with a small print, those who maintained that it would never come out were deflated. But, soon a new round of rumors started (*third wave*). Still making the old accusations, the new ones now attacked "the small print" of the article; "A tactical error, because only the enemies will read it." This print revealed "that Our Lady had not blessed the initiative." But, this was not the end of the campaign. Harsher accusations came to light: "A compromise had been made with the false right and Freemasonry." Here again, certain signs pointed toward a campaign promoted by the directors. I could list them, but other facts will give credibility to what I am saying.

In effect, other unambiguous measures indicated the same source. The punishment of the "defaulter" continued by the way of facts: "I was denied the funds (about US \$167) to pay for three long telephone calls to the United States. However, before making them, Dr. Plinio Xavier had authorized them and guaranteed me that they were covered. I was denied the US \$500 monthly allowance with which I paid the rent for two storerooms to keep papers of confidential studies. I was cut 40% of the normal amount I received for my personal maintenance. Such cuts, always attributed to practical reasons, have remained to this day.

Col. Carlos Poli also warned me that the funds for a construction work at the Eremo de Elias (of which I was in charge) would be cut. In addition, shortly after the publication, the remaining 60% of the funds for my personal maintenance were cut. Again, the claims were practical. Later I was told that it was just a "coincidence," a mere "cash transfer problem." The complete cut of funds lasted three months. I add: It ceased only because some friends pressured the directors, showing the unprecedented nature of that action and its absurdity.

A particularly noteworthy detail: Prof. Plinio, in a letter of testamentary instructions to those who were to administer his estate (you, Dr. Eduardo Brotero and Dr. Caio Xavier) clearly stated his intention that six persons – among whom I was included – were not to be reduced to "a serious state of personal need" (cf. p. 1, § 2), and gave instructions that his patrimony should be used to prevent this from happening. However, it was certainly the directors of the TFP – including yourself and the two others mentioned above – who decided to cut the funding that reduced to me to serious state of need.

The situation was, therefore, paradoxical. By trying to create a means to carry out the order of Dr. Plinio to publish my work on the Council, I was financially punished by those who have a testamentary order to assure that I would not be reduced to that state which they forced me to enter.

In addition, the Wednesday meetings at the Eremo de Elias, whose number of participants was growing modestly from week to week – we had reached 16 – diminished significantly after these facts, until we were reduced to 2 or 3 participants. One of those who left, Dom Luiz de Orleans and Braganza, told me in polite excuses that he had been advised to stay away by you, who told him he thought it more beneficial to his health not to travel from Amparo to the meeting. I noted that others were recommended to not attend by persons close to you or the current directors. I do not mention their names to prevent them from suffering any reprisals.

One of my reviewers, Mr. Paulo Roberto Rosa, who corrected the *Manifesto* and supported it, wrote a letter of protest to the Directory about the criticisms he was hearing, saying that what mattered in the Quinn case was not whether the *Manifesto* had mistakes or not, but whether TFP would enter the fight, because the fight was the legacy of Dr. Plinio. Before sending the letter, he was heavily pressured by Col. Carlos Poli not to do so. Mr. Paulo Roberto Rosa personally told me this.

Others of my collaborators were sought out by one or another of the directors who criticized that *Manifesto*. These directors repeated the same rumors, thus indirectly trying to dissuade

these persons from continuing to help me. It was these collaborators who reported the attempts to me; again, I do not name them to prevent them from facing new pressures.

In the United States, shortly after the publication of the first edition of the *Manifesto*, Mr. Luiz Antonio Fragelli held a general meeting attacking the publication, the author and those who supported him, repeating the accusations that were made here, according to a correspondent present at the meeting. Should there be a judicial need, I will not hesitate to name him; otherwise I will keep his name private to prevent problems for him.

Mr. Leo Horvat was called several times by you to try to put him against me. Later, he was pressured to leave the United States and return to São Paulo "to show you [Atila] that TIA is not a stepping stone for me to launch my manifestos and books," as Mr. Leo Horvat later reported to me (January 1, 1997).

Dr. Marian Horvat was approached by Mr. Mario Navarro da Costa, on behalf of Dr. Caio Xavier, to propose a series of advantages that could be arranged for TIA under certain conditions, one of which was the following: "When Tradition in Action wants to publish intellectual works of persons who call themselves members of the TFP or disciples of Dr. Plinio ... and there is a risk of giving the reader the impression that this is an unofficial reflection of the TFP or the thinking of Dr. Plinio, a prior understanding must be made with the directors" (Fax of March 24, 1997). Regardless of whether the requirement was quite strange from a judicial standpoint, it seemed an attempt to divert the attention of Dr. Horvat to other matters and block the possible publication of the work on the Council.

Mr. José Aloisio Schelini [living in the United States in a TFP seat], translator of the work into English – whose funds for his personal maintenance came directly from the patrimony of Dr. Plinio, who told me he opened this precedent to express his support for the work on the Council – was called by Dr. Caio Xavier and pressured – under penalty of being expelled from the TFP and losing that funding – to sign a document that he would do nothing to promote the publication of my work (January 1997). Later, he was forced by the same director to choose between either keeping his name on the TIA Directory or having his funds cut (July 1997). In addition, he was required to cease any contact with Dr. Marian Horvat and Mr. Leo Horvat.

Mr. Roberto Luis Wasilewski went to Texas to spend some time with Mr. Leo Horvat and Mr. Aloisio Schelini. On one occasion during his stay (August 3, 1997), he received a telephone call from Mr. Fernando Antúnez forbidding him, on your behalf, to wear the TFP pin at TIA meetings. Detail: Since there had been no TIA meetings, this seemed an euphemism to say that he could not wear it at the review meetings of my work that were taking place there.

In the same call, Mr. Antúnez urged Mr. Roberto Wasilewski to return to São Paulo, apparently pressuring him so that he would not stay and continue to support the work on the Council. When I complained to Dr. Plinio Xavier of such an arbitrary command – it was unheard of for a member of the TFP to be forbidden to wear his pin wherever he went – and asked him to explain the fact, he simply replied: "That is Mr. Wasilewski's version of the story" (August 19, 1997). However, other persons had heard that same phone call...

I will not relate the systematic and successful boycott made against three other members – one from the Argentine TFP, one from the Brazilian TFP and another from the American TFP – who wanted to move to Texas in order to join the efforts to publish the work desired by Dr. Plinio, which they considered important for the defense of the Holy Church. Each one was dissuaded by some of the directors of the Brazilian TFP or one of their advisors.

It may seem to you that I am incurring the same error that I accused you of in your letter – leaving out the names of witnesses. You would be wrong. In both this case and the others where I mentioned the facts and not the names, I have a record of what took place. Should it become necessary for my defense, I will not hesitate to name them; you know that this is a natural right of the accused.

However, as my defense is quite solid – so far none of the nine main accusations you made in Thesis I remains standing nor does Argument I of this Thesis II – I see no need to name friends who wanted to help me and were forced not to do so for compelling reasons: financial needs for their health and sustenance or the threat of detractions.

This simple description of the facts, Mr. President, necessarily leads to these consequences:

- You, members of the current Directory and some of your auxiliaries have, for more than a year, been spreading rumors and acting against the work on the Council, the intellectual initiatives the author takes, those who support him and his person.
- It is, therefore, quite difficult to conclude that you and the current Directory are unbiased toward the author's work, as this 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration presupposes.
- Likewise, the pretended "charity" that in your letter you allege to have shown toward the author – "we have maintained the same policy [of indefinitely postponing the review] in order not to have to tell you, out of charity, everything that is stated above" (p. 5, § 5) – sounds more like hypocrisy than the truth.
- In addition, if it is true that the campaign of rumors came from the directors, they could be accused of defamation, since it was clear in letters B and C that, unless proven otherwise, the author was not acting pretentiously as the rumors claim, (cf. Thesis I, Refutation of Argument VIII.2), but rather by obedience to Dr. Plinio (letter B) and for the love of the Church (cf. *ibid.*, letters A, B, C, D).
- They could also be accused of slander [from the moral point of view if not from the juridical], because in those letters it became clear that the alleged refusal of the author to receive the corrections of Dr. Paulo Brito is false.
- But, unfortunately, this is not all. There was the financial oppression made on Mr. Aloisio Schelini, that is, on a man who abandoned everything to serve the Counter-Revolution and, for his decades-long dedication to this ideal, finds himself today without the resources for a decent lifestyle. The directors who exercised or exercise, supported or support such oppression seem to participate in the sin of denying a worker his just salary, which, as you may recall, is a sin that cries out to Heaven and calls to God for vengeance.

- Further, in the case of the total cut of the author's budget with which he maintains himself for three months, one sees that this oppression is similar to that suffered by Mr. Aloisio Schelini, and has the serious aggravation of being in direct disobedience to the testamentary order that Prof. Plinio left to you and the two other directors.

**F - Empty amiabilities, unprecedented pressure and a valuable statement: "This is the book that cannot be published."** The rumors did not stop, the attempts to coerce those who supported me did not cease, the cut of the monthly US \$500 for renting the two storerooms and my maintenance budget (100% for three months, 40% until today). However, after a phone call from you to Mr. Leo Horvat at Christmas, in which he confirmed the re-publication of the Quinn manifesto in larger print on December 26 on two pages of *The Wanderer* and on the 29<sup>th</sup> in *Diario Las Americas*, the situation changed again. Mr. Leo Horvat gave you the repercussions of the first publication, which were already considerable.

On December 27, Dr. Plinio Xavier called me, very kindly inviting me to lunch on Saturday, the next day. It was only a gesture, for the conversation did not address the publication of the previous day. On the way out, I asked for a meeting with him, which was scheduled for January 2.

Col. Carlos Poli advised me that the funding for the construction at the Eremo de Elias would no longer be cut. A curious paradox: At the time, the entire amount for my personal maintenance had been cut. Now, under these conditions and considering that the money for the construction, which I administer, had returned, could this be interpreted as an invitation for me to misappropriate those funds? Perhaps.

Prior to the launching of my book (November 11, 1997), I asked the accountants in charge of both the funds at the Eremo de Elias and at the Administrative Directory and the Financial Directorate to examine the accounts of the construction during the whole time I administered them. Thanks be to God, I have with me today a written statement from the first meeting and an oral statement from the second attesting to the honesty of the expenses made there.

On December 30, you telephoned me to invite me for a glass of champagne on New Year's Eve. Again, a gesture; the two publications were a forbidden topic.

On January 2, in the meeting I had requested, Dr. Plinio Xavier praised the publications without emphasis. I took advantage of this "opening" to speak frankly. I complained to him about the campaign that was being orchestrated against me and mentioned the accusations based on information that only he and I knew. I complained about his contradictory actions and those of the directors; I reaffirmed that I had not refused the corrections of Dr. Paulo Brito and that, if the publication was an accomplished fact, it was his decision. I told him that I had not publicly defended myself because this would discredit them. In view of this, I asked him to explain to me what had happened.

I remember his response well: "I prefer not to discuss the matter, because the Devil entered the picture." Case closed. How curious! Dr. Plinio Xavier, so little turned toward the action of the angels and devils, now imposes silence on an eminently political matter because of a preterna-

tural action... However, it seems that the "Devil" continued to act, because the rumors continued that I had refused the revisions of Dr. Paulo Brito, etc. Further, your letter also includes the same slander, which I will deal with in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration.

On January 9, I had another lunch with Dr. Plinio Xavier. He expressed his concern that TIA and I were being supported by the false right. I reminded him of what I had told him succinctly a few months ago, namely that TIA had been conceived to launch my work as one of its main objectives; for this reason alone it could not be supported by the false right, which would never want it published. I noticed that Dr. Plinio Xavier, who, in the first account I made to him about TIA, listened inattentively to what I had told him about TIA's purposes, then paid extreme attention to the other information. In passing, I also mentioned the plan of Mr. Leo Horvat and Mr. Aloisio Schelini to move to Texas. Attention redoubled. Amiable farewells.

The next day, January 10, you called Mr. Leo Horvat, expressing concern about TIA and me. Allow me to reproduce an excerpt from the communication in which he reports what happened:

"Dear Mr. Atila, Salve Maria! I did not have to call Dr. Luis, he called me. He seemed worried about you and TIA and wanted me to return to Brazil as soon as possible. Be careful, S is telling him everything that you tell S or anyone in the Eremo de Elias. He said that you are planning a trip to the USA, a grand launching for your first volume, etc. All moved by your self-love, of course. ... We had an amiable conversation but it is obvious that you were the target and that they want to stop this project at all costs, alleging that you refuse to allow anyone to review your work"(January 11, 1997).

Your telephone call to Mr. Leo Horvat initiated a new cycle of pressures or, better, resumed the cycle, as the respite lasted only 11 or 12 days. In fact, on the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup>, Dr. Caio Xavier met with Mr. Aloisio Schelini and Mr. Michael McKenna in Milan. The conversation, as far as I know, took place in a climate of amiability, allowing them to understand that Dr. Caio in principle looked favorably on the proposals of the two and insinuating his support [for the work]. Mr. McKenna would have exposed his propensity to move to the U.S. to do apostolate and help TIA. The subject of the publication of the work on the Council would have surfaced, because – a curiosity that runs counter to your accusation – at that time Dr. Caio Xavier recognized that my books on the Council should be published because he knew that was what Dr. Plinio wanted. I believe the news of the move [of Mr. Schelini] to Texas was also mentioned.

This confirmation of his move to Texas, my previous clarification that a primary purpose of the TIA was to launch the work, added to the possibility of the Mr. Michael McKenna's move must have caused a certain turmoil.

So much so that, on the same day of the 15<sup>th</sup>, you called Mr. Leo Horvat again, pressuring him not to move to Texas but to return to Brazil. After your call, also on the 15<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Mario Navarro called him to offer him a plane ticket and make the practical arrangements for the trip. The next day, Mr. Mario Navarro called again. On the 18<sup>th</sup>, you telephoned Mr. Leo Horvat another time, insisting that he leave the next day. Unfortunately, he could not attend to your pressing request, since he wanted to be present for a delicate surgery his father was undergoing.

On the 19<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Mario Navarro gave him another phone call, abandoning diplomacy and expressing his indignation at the publication of the *Quinn Manifesto*. He said that he "was not afraid to confront us" – a rather strange sentence among idealists who want to attack Progressivism, the common enemy.

Between the 20<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>, Dr. Caio Xavier, contrary to the support he insinuated a few days earlier, demanded a written document from Mr. Aloisio Schelini stating that he would do nothing to advance the publication of the work on the Council, and could only continue the translation requested by Prof. Plinio. This demand was made under the threat of expulsion from the TFP and, consequently, the cutting of his funds, as mentioned before (cf. Letter E).

At this time, I learned (January 27, 1997), confirmed by a correspondence dated July 10, 1997, that in one of your previous telephone calls to Mr. Leo Horvat, you would have assured him that my work would "never be published." In fact, having recently asked Mr. Leo Horvat whether he would confirm the veracity of such a statement, he not only confirmed it (January 16, 1998), but added that already in 1996, before he left for the U.S., you would have said, "This is the book that cannot be published."

From this burst of telephone calls to force a trip and pressures to extort a document until the arrival of Mr. Leo Horvat in Brazil (March 11, 1997), important facts occurred, the details of which I have already mentioned (see Argument II , 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration, 1.A). In summary:

- I insinuated that I would launch a new manifesto against WAC (February 19, 1997);
- On the following day you telephoned Mr. Leo Horvat demanding that he come to Brazil to agree with the Directory that TIA dissociate itself from my intellectual work (February 20, 1997);
- In a telephone call, you threatened him and me with expulsion should I publish anything else on in my own name and affirmed that the TFP would no longer combat the progressivist Structure;
- Mr. Leo Horvat warned me of the danger we were both running (February 2, 1997);
- I circulated among some friends the communication that I had received (21.II-3.III.1997);
- A certain discontent arose;
- You sent a fax to the U.S. denying what you had said (27.II.1997);
- I questioned Dr. Plinio Xavier about what to think of the matter (3.III.1997);
- He also denied the incident (8.III.1997);
- Later, you confirmed that you did in fact say what Mr. Leo Horvat had reported (12.III.1997);
- Sometime later (19.VIII.1997), in a phone call Dr. Plinio Xavier also confirmed what you said.

It was in this tense and novelesque climate that Mr. Leo Horvat arrived in São Paulo (March 11, 1997). One of your secretaries was supposed to be waiting for him at the airport and take him to the seat of Jasna Gora. Soon after, he would be taken to a first meeting with four directors – Dr. Caio Xavier would only arrive [from Paris] a few days later. The negotiations should unfold, it is to be supposed, following the purposes already expressed by you. However, because of some action by Divine Providence, your secretary went to the wrong arrival gate. Thus, when Mr. Leo Horvat arrived, he was met only by a friend, the one who is writing to you now.

After we waited for some time and no one else appeared, we went to visit Prof. Plinio and Dona Lucilia at Consolation cemetery and had lunch together. He communicated to me the decision he had made: not to make any oral negotiations, but everything should be made in writing. On the 12<sup>th</sup>, he delivered a first letter to the directors. No written response. You told Mr. Leo Horvat that you were not in psychological conditions to deal with the case, but would refer him to Dr. Caio Xavier to deal with it later either in the United States or after Dr. Caio arrived in São Paulo – he would arrive around the 18<sup>th</sup>.

You also communicated that the directors had resolved to no longer deal with these issues in writing, since they had had an unfortunate precedent pending with Col. Carlos Poli, who would have addressed matters "in an illogical way." Days after this response, you were leaving for Europe and the United States on a trip to rest. In the meantime, Dr. Caio Xavier was involved with a worrisome medical procedure caused by a serious cardiac disorder.

On March 26, still without a written response, Mr. Leo Horvat directed a letter to you and Dr. Caio Xavier, noting that you, who had previously only dealt with these matters in writing, now refused to do so, based on an unconvincing excuse. For even if there had been one unfortunate precedent, that did not prevent the same procedure from being used – *abusus non tollit usum*. It was strange and incoherent that he should be called urgently [to Brazil] and, then, be ignored after arriving. In a later phone call, Dr. Plinio Xavier gave imprecise information about when Dr. Caio Xavier would arrive, which obliged Mr. Leo Horvat to change his [return] ticket; finally, Dr. Plinio Xavier said he thought Dr. Caio Xavier would be here on April 19. But even if he did not come, he suggested to Mr. Leo Horvat that he meet with you at the seat of the American TFP in Pennsylvania to address the issues.

Given the uncertainty of Dr. Caio Xavier's arrival date and having left pending commitments in the USA on urgent matters, Mr. Leo Horvat addressed a letter to Dr. Plinio Xavier on April 11, again noting his [Leo Horvat's] previous perplexities and adding two more: If you had declared yourself without the psychological conditions to deal with these matters, then how could you do so now? If you called him from the USA to Brazil to deal with some pressing matters, why were you now sending him from Brazil to the United States to address the same issues? Such are the facts.

From the above, there is no difficulty to conclude the following:

- The courteous gestures of you and Dr. Plinio Xavier at the beginning of the year did not reveal any real intention to support the ideological effort to which the author was dedi-

cated. On the contrary, from the same sources, the detractions and the draconian cut of funds continued. This seems to reveal dissimulation.

- Dr. Plinio Xavier did not want to respond to the author's frank invitation to explain his misunderstandings over the *Quinn Manifesto*.
- He especially did not take into account that the author once again peremptorily denied having refused the corrections of Dr. Paulo Brito. Nonetheless, this calumny continued to circulate, which, if one supposes that the source of that rumor was the Directory itself, seems to reveal bad faith and contumacy.
- Dr. Plinio Xavier appears to have re-established good relations with the author in order to gather information, which he promptly passed on to the other directors for their actions in the U.S. and Italy, boycotting the TFP members and the organization that were supporting the author – when months before Dr. Plinio Xavier had approved it after the author informed him of it. These actions seem to reveal disloyalty and a desire to destroy.
- Also suspicious is the incoherent measure of completely cutting the author's personal maintenance allowance and, at the same time, not carrying out the promised funding cut for the construction work in the Eremo de Elias. The least that can be said is that such measures create a near occasion of sin for the author, with the disagreeable consequence of [the Directors in charge of money] inducing the author to misappropriate the funds of the construction for his own maintenance.
- Your discussion with Leo Horvat about the hypothesis of the author launching the book on the Council in the United States reveals that you were aware of the author's intention. And, therefore, your surprise expressed in this 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration is not true. Again, then, the suspicion of hypocrisy seems to surface.
- At the meeting in Milan, Dr. Caio Xavier acknowledged that Prof. Plinio wanted the publication of the work on the Council, which shows that he knew that the essence of Thesis I of your accusations, which claim Dr. Plinio did not want it, is false
- It would be almost impossible for you and Mr. Mario Navarro to put more psychological pressure on someone than what you put on Mr. Leo Horvat starting January 11. This is against all Catholic customs and is a revolutionary way of acting, especially considering that the background of this pressure was the threat of expulsion. Besides the fact that this method was never employed by Prof. Plinio, it seems to characterize what is usually called extortio
- Such an offense is even more serious when, added to it, was the threat of expulsion and the funding cut made to Mr. Aloisio Schelini and the requirement of a written document signed under pressure. This is an oppression, as I have already noted, that seems to fall under the sin of denying a worker a just wage. Requiring the document under the conditions described seems to be against Natural Law and Catholic Morals.

- Your comments that the author's work "would never be published" and that this "is the book that cannot be published" seem to reveal a pre-conceived and biased position, with the suspicion of connivance with the progressivist thinking attacked by the book or, at the least, the suspicion of pusillanimity.
- In addition, these comments seem to reveal that your statements affirmed in your 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration – that the Directory would publish the author's work if it were reviewed, occasion timely, the argumentation sound, etc. – were not true.
- The refusals to deal with Mr. Leo Horvat on matters for which you called him to Brazil with unprecedented pressure and urgency reveal a disconcerting incoherence. This, in turn, appears to reveal that you and the other directors could have had concealed intentions regarding the meetings with him that you thought imprudent to record in writing. Given the precedent of the demand for Mr. Aloisio Schelini to sign a document, it does not seem rash to suppose that analogous and perhaps even stronger pressures were planned to obtain a written document from Mr. Leo Horvat that would definitively close Tradition in Action or at least prevent it from supporting the work on the Council.
- The dizzying back and forth positions that the directors took regarding the trip of Mr. Leo Horvat seems to reveal disequilibrium in the general coordination of the Directory's action and a lack of moral concern, since the excuses given reveal that the truth was not always told.
- Beyond and above all, what has been exposed in this letter F seems to reveal a pertinacious determination not to publish the work on the Second Vatican Council.
- Almost all of these conclusions of letter F disprove your 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration.

**G - Reviews: First requested, then denied. Publication: First praised, then condemned.** Parallel to these events, discussions on revisions to my work were taking place. For example, in this climate of hostilities I described, I had lunch with Dr. Plinio Xavier on January 18. I transcribe below the notes I made on that day:

Dr. Plinio Xavier "asked if I would agree to deal with the matter [the publication of my work] with the five older ones (I had previously asked to deal only with Dr. Plinio Xavier, Dr. Caio Xavier and Dr. Eduardo Brotero), as well as Col. Carlos Poli, Mr. Fernando Antúnez and Mr. José Antonio Ureta. I asked if Mr. Mario Navarro would be taking part. He told me no, because they were displeased with him. I pointed out that Mr. José Antonio Ureta is unreliable. He did not reply. I also pointed out that Dr. Luis Assumpção usually keeps no secrets about anything. He replied that it was a calculated risk. I accepted, stressing that the responsibility for the risk would be theirs.

"He asked if I would accept internal reviewers. I said yes, but not Dr. Paulo Brito. He asked if I would accept a theological reviewer from the outside. I answered yes, but I would not show the whole work but only make partial consultations that would not reveal our objective."

There was no initiative taken in the sense of moving forward on what had been agreed. On February 27, I wrote to Dr. Plinio Xavier a letter, from which I extract below some excerpts relating to the review:

"Dear Dr. Plinio Xavier, Salve Maria! About a month ago, seated around a table in the Bolinha restaurant, you asked me about a review for my work. You asked me then if I would agree to ... [the description made above follows]. If I understand well, that aim of that review is to inform the mentioned distinguished members and to improve the writing by means of the subtle, erudite and timely corrections that they will certainly make. I would like to ratify here my same disposition expressed at that time. I am entirely ready to be corrected, as well as to clarify any doubt or respond to any objection to the best of my knowledge."

What was the *lendemain* [the day after] of that proposal? Nothing. None of the directors dealt with the matter with me anymore. That is, such revisions were not carried out either by an express wish or by an omission of the directors. For my part, as clearly seen, I was fully disposed.

Regarding the theological reviewer, something similar happened. I transcribe two paragraphs from the same letter of February 27:

"However, the main purpose of this letter is a point analogous to the first, but not properly the same. On two occasions – one on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor three months ago, another in La Traviatta restaurant more recently ... – you asked what criteria Prof. Plinio had given me for the revision of the work by professional theologians and philosophers. I then transmitted to you the norms I received.

"To wit: 1. To divide the matter into specific themes so that the mentioned intellectuals could not recompose the general form of the work. 2. To seek out the most accredited scholars in Europe and present them the questions in writing. 3. The responses should be written and signed, and their opinions paid for at a good price. 4. I should be present in the preliminary conversations with those professionals to check which schools or sub-schools of thought they belong to, and only then make the consultations. That would save us time and money. Eventually, if the answers did not meet our needs, I should go back to have further conversations with them.

"Such consultations, in my view, can be put into execution as soon as the directors decide."

I received no response from that proposal.

The only mention I have received of my readiness to make theological consultations came in the expulsion ultimatum that you addressed to me. There you try to make excuses, giving a version that is not exact. In effect you affirm:

"In that letter [of March 16, 1997], Dr. Plinio Xavier said nothing about the review of the book, the subject of the first of your letters. But it was implicit in this silence that he would also write you on this topic. He did not do so immediately because there was not a serene climate to deal with such a delicate matter" (p. 2, § 7).

This excuse is hardly objective.

- *First*, because neither Dr. Plinio Xavier nor I were ever bothered by non-serene climates. The two talks I mentioned came after the release of the *Quinn Manifesto* and in the full heat of the detraction campaign that I described in the two letters above.
- *Second*, because to write a letter of response a serene climate is not necessary. The creation of a "climate" requires at least two people. And the writing of a letter is usually done by a single individual.
- *Third*, because in the letter of March 24, 1997 (not March 16, 1997, you erred on the date), Dr. Plinio Xavier shows no lack of serenity that could obscure the exposition of his thought.
- *Fourth*, because in the long letter of April 7, 1997, in which I answered the questions posed by Dr. Plinio Xavier and placed others to him, there was no problem of a lack of a "serene climate" to discuss the subjects I wanted.
- *Fifth*, because after a long time passed without me receiving an answer on the theological reviews and proposals I made in the letter of April 7, Dr. Plinio Xavier (August 19, 1997) advised me that "with the life that we are leading, we no longer have time to answer things in writing." Therefore, it was not implicit in the silence that he would answer me, as you claim. To the contrary, he asserted straight out that he would not.

On January 20 of that year, I received an e-mail from Dr. Marian Horvat, informing me that she had been contacted by the publisher of *The Wanderer*, Mr. Al Matt. He complained of an ad published in his paper about the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*. That complaint was based on a phone call from Mr. Thomas McKenna, Vice-President of the American TFP, assuring Mr. Matt that my book had gone to press without a theological review and that it was "a bad job."

One can understand the concern of the publisher of *The Wanderer*. Dr. Horvat passed on to him the opinion she had received a few days earlier from the Rev. Fr. Brian Harrison, OS, Doctor of Theology. In possession of this prestigious review, the concerns of Mr. Matt were quieted.

Such are the facts. However, as far as the theological reviews are concerned, I would especially like to emphasize my acceptance to receive them and the lack of action on the part of the current directors.

From the above one can conclude that:

- Regarding the requests for reviews, after the acceptance of the author and the lack of providing them on the part of the directors, one could raise the hypothesis that such requests would have been made only to see if the author would deny them, and thus give the pretext for the detraction made against him in this regard, which has been circulating for more than a year. If such a hypothesis were true, it would reveal bad faith and the *animus injuriandi* [desire to injure].
- Regarding the excuse you made that Dr. Plinio Xavier needed a serene climate in order to write to me, one sees that it does not seem to be true from two viewpoints: It is not true

that this alleged serene climate was necessary and it is not true that he would write regardless because it was clearly stated to me that these topics would no longer be dealt with in writing.

- Since you suppose yourself informed about what Dr. Plinio Xavier thinks and wants, your excuse seems more like a smokescreen to hide a weak point of your accusation than a serious statement, which, if made with premeditation, would show bad faith.
- The weak point of your accusation is the strong point of the defense of the author. Because it is demonstrated here that he was willing to have his work reviewed, either internally by other members of the TFP or externally by professional theologians.
- From what was narrated about Mr. Thomas McKenna's initiative, some questions necessarily arise: Would he have phoned the aforementioned director without an express order from Mr. Luiz Antonio Fragelli or Mr. Mario Navarro? Would these, in turn, have stimulated such a call without the express recommendation of Dr. Caio Xavier, who had begun to orient various activities in the United States, or Dr. Plinio Xavier? Was the phone call from Mr. Thomas McKenna, of which the author received knowledge, the only one or has a series of other phone calls been unleashed by the directors to the various press organs that have published ads and reviews of the book?
- Further, supposing the answers to these questions are positive, that is, supposing the assent and perhaps the encouragement of the directors of the Brazilian TFP and Brazilian mentors of the American TFP for the action of Mr. Thomas McKenna, a new question arises: Why didn't they wait for the presentation of the author's defense in order to hear the side of the accused party? Why have they precipitously accepted as indisputable the accusations of your missive, which, however, are very far from being so? Would this not characterize yet another injustice, another defamation, another manifestation of *parti pris* [partiality] in relation to the publication and dissemination of the author's work? On this basis, how do you pretend that there was impartiality in relation to the aforementioned work, which is the supposition of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration being refuted?

**H - A method in the procrastinations?** Contact after contact I began to notice a method in the procrastinations. I spoke clearly about such delays with Dr. Plinio Xavier during a lunch (January 1997) in La Traviatta restaurant in the following terms: "As you all are indefinitely postponing the publication of my work, I will begin to take for myself the measures deemed fitting."

I remember his response: "We are not putting you off indefinitely. We are hoping that a consensus can be reached between you and the five of us about the timing of the publication. Or that there is an unequivocal sign from Prof. Plinio."

I said nothing but thought to myself: A consensus is not possible because they do not want to publish it and I have the order to do so. I found somewhat amusing the terms of the other condition: "an unequivocal sign from Prof. Plinio." Only Dr. Plinio Xavier would not know that the supernatural never manifests itself unequivocally... otherwise faith would have no value.

From the above, it is clear that:

- Since January 1997, the author informed Dr. Plinio Xavier that he intended to publish the work under his own responsibility – contrary to the affirmation that he would have made such a publication without the authorities knowing.
- In denying that the directors were indefinitely postponing the publication, Dr. Plinio Xavier left open the possibility that it would be done. This contradicts the affirmation of your 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration, according to which the Directory would have always expressed the desire not to publish the work.

**I - The author decides to publish the work and makes this decision known.** Given what I described in the previous items, I considered myself released from the procrastinations of the members of the Directory and decided, under my sole personal responsibility, to attend to Prof. Plinio's desire to publish the work. I transmitted this decision to Dr. Plinio Xavier in the talk I had with him (January 18, 1997), of which I took notes that day. I will transcribe my argument from my notes:

"In talks with me in mid -1995, Prof. Plinio said that I would be amazed at the review he would make of my work because he had been paying close attention for some time to everything I said about its themes and thought they were well-presented and well-grounded. And, therefore, the review of it would be very simple and fast. On this occasion, I asked him when he intended to publish the work. He responded as soon as it was fully ready. On my part, only a few updates remained, everything else was ready. So I asked him if, on his part, he had any notion of the time. He responded that he thought that it should be published within five or six months.

"Given this, I feel the obligation of conscience to publish the work as soon as possible. Both in obedience to what Prof. Plinio ordered and because of the urgent need for the good of the Church. For such publication I would normally expect the support of the TFP. But I did not exclude that, without it, I would seek other means to do it."

This was my constant position in our conversations. And, to the degree that I became certain of a deliberate omission, if not overt hostility, on the part of the Directory, I was preparing to publish it under my own responsibility.

I never hid this position from anyone. On the contrary, I spoke about it to all those who asked me about the work. I used to argue more or less in the following terms: "Prof. Plinio dedicated my life to studies and to write this work. Now I have the work ready, but I lack an organization, persons to help me and the material means to finance it. Therefore, having done my part, I hope he [Prof. Plinio] will send me these three things. If he sends them, the work will be published as soon as possible, with or without the human support [he expected from TFP]."

I affirmed this to all who asked me about it, from the lowest to the highest, as I already stated to the directors at the July 25, 1996 meeting. Thenceforth, I never ceased to do so.

I even remember a warm discussion with Mr. Mário Navarro [MN], still in 1996, when he asked me if I would publish the work without the support of the five directors. I recall roughly the words of the discussion:

Atila Guimarães [AG]: "Look, Mr. Mario, during the 13 years that Prof. Plinio directed me in this work, he told me to consult many persons, but I do not recall even once that he asked me to consult any of the five [directors]. Under the orientation of Prof. Plinio, the work was made by me with the support of my collaborators. I do not see why things should change now. The five do not have conditions to comment on the subject because they dedicated their lives to other things. How can they comment now on things they don't know about?"

MN: "But would you publish it without their support?"

AG: "If Prof. Plinio sends me the means, I will do everything I can for the five directors to support it. But if they do not, it still will be published."

MN (extremely overexcited): "Then, a curse will fall on you similar to that which is falling on Mr. Joao Clá for not obeying the directors!"

AG: "Wait a moment! Since you are choosing the tone for our discussion, under these conditions, let me tell you – cursed are the lukewarm whom Our Lord vomits from His mouth. I am trying to defend the Church and, for this reason, if I have the means I will publish it. On the contrary, you have the means to defend her and do not use them because you are lukewarm. In truth, you repeat the episode of handing over Our Lord for the crucifixion; you form the party of Pontius Pilate!"

These were very strong and, perhaps, somewhat exaggerated words. Nevertheless, they serve to corroborate that I never hid my intention to publish the work.

Without discussions, I repeatedly transmitted to Dr. Plinio Xavier my decision to publish the work (cf. Thesis I.2.E.b) as soon as the means would appear.

Even after consulting a lawyer (September 4, 1997), I told him that I had made that consultation. And I made it clear that I was trying to publish the book. I remember two occasions when we talked about it (in September and October of 1997). In those talks he showed interest in the progress of the negotiations and told me at the end: "Go forward, just keep me informed." On November 6, on the eve of the book coming off the press, I recorded our dialogue in my notes I made that night after I spoke with him on the phone. My notes read:

"Dr. Plinio Xavier [PX] called me today, saying more or less the following:

PX: "I just received a phone call from Mr. Mario Navarro [in the United States] saying that Mr. Leo Horvat is circulating the news that your book will be out in the next few days with a Preface by Prof. Plinio. Is this true?"

AG: "A Preface by Prof. Plinio? I wish it were true! But the preface is by Miss Marian Horvat in which she cites two comments of Dr. Plinio commending the work. There is also a preface from another intellectual who read the work and made a very complimentary eulogy."

PX: "Well, this is not a preface by Prof. Plinio. I knew there was an exaggeration."

AG: "The phrases were taken from material I sent to the United States to counteract charges that Prof. Plinio did not want the work published. I read some of them to you at a meeting with you (in 1996)."

PX: "I remember that."

AG: "So, this is what it is."

PX: "**And when will the book come out?**"

AG: "It is better we don't say on the phone. **But I can assure you that I'm doing my best to get it out as soon as possible. I have already told you this several times and you told me to go ahead.**"

PX: "**That is what we had agreed upon.** How about lunch on Saturday?"

Such are the facts.

Hence one concludes that:

- The affirmation that the author did not communicate his intention to publish the work is baseless;
- The affirmation that he would have made the publication without the knowledge of the Directory is also baseless;
- The accusation on these two points frontally denies the truth. And if Dr. Plinio Xavier sustains the accusation, as you insinuate, he would seem to be suffering from either some memory loss of a type of amnesia, or he would seem to incur the serious moral fault of bearing false witness.

Ending the chronicle of my relations with the various directors, and especially with Dr. Plinio Xavier, it is not difficult to conclude that the orientation I received was extremely confusing. Undoubtedly, throughout the innumerable oscillations of the Directory on the decision to publish or not publish the work on the Council, it can be affirmed that what is more probable – from what I presented here – is the decision was made to not publish it, although it was not a clear conclusion.

In this hypothesis, such a decision would constitute the deliberation-*princeps*, from which everything else would hang. Supporting this conclusion are your statements to Mr. Leo Horvat about my work, that "this is the book that cannot be published" and this is the book that "will never be published" (cf. letter F).

### **Conclusion of the refutation to the 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration**

Would it, therefore, be proved that the current Directory "was against its publication without an assurance that the writing was secure and the occasion timely"? Not necessarily. For, since the position of the members of the Directory was confusing, the author can argue in his favor that from July of 1996 to November of 1997, the Directory held to the line of its agreement to publish

the work. And that despite the many oscillations, even as late as November of 1997, Dr. Plinio Xavier recommended to the author: "Go ahead [with the publication], just keep me informed."

Therefore, in cases like this involving a confused authority, the principle *in dubio libertas* prevails; and in relation to the accusation, the principle *in dubio pro reo* applies. Thus, your 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration is irrelevant, which is tantamount to saying that it does not qualify as an accusation.

In addition, having described the constant hostility directed by the Directory against the author and those who supported him, your pretension that "for the theological review, the Directory tried to create favorable psychological conditions" appears as absurd and laughable.

### **1<sup>st</sup> conclusion against Argument II**

Given what has been presented in the presupposition and 6 items of the refutation up to the 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration, one can see that the allegation of indiscipline does not appear to be the real background of the question raised by you in the accusation. It is difficult, therefore, not to have the strong suspicion of a tacit agreement established with the current progressivist ecclesiastical Structure not to fight it and not to publicly criticize Vatican Council II. This would reveal that your opposition is of an ideological nature.

In addition, from the strictly disciplinary point of view, it has been proved that it was impossible for you to pretend that the Directory had no knowledge of the publication or that there was no consent given for it.

Thus, only with what is exposed in the refutation to the 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration, one sees that Argument II has no base.

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration: The decision to not publish the work became firmer due to important lacunas in the *Quinn Manifesto*, released by the author in December 1996**

#### **Proof in the text**

\* "Our desire for a double review grew after you published a manifesto in *The Wanderer* on a talk given by Archbishop Quinn about new ways of exercising the Papacy. On that occasion, we were obliged to write to you to demand that the TFP not be involved in this initiative and we noted important lacunas in that manifesto, calling particular attention to a forced interpretation of the words spoken by Archbishop Quinn" (p. 1, § 5).

\* "You even previously acknowledged this fact in conversations with Mr. Alfredo MacHale, alleging this to be a strategic resource to raise a polemic" (p. 1, § 5).

\* "In a later conversation you had with Dr. Paulo Brito, you also accepted some critical remarks he made about the anti-Quinn manifesto, even agreeing to insert his proposals into it" (p. 2, § 1).

\* "We therefore had reasons to fear that the work on Vatican Council II, incomparably more delicate and vast than the analysis of Archbishop Quinn's conference, could present similar problems" (p. 2, § 2).

### Refutation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration

Thus, just as a *vexata quaestio* [question disputed with passion] was created around the theological reviews, which ended in nothing (cf. Thesis I, Refutation of Argument VI.2), another one was also raised around the generalizations that I would have made in the *Quinn Manifesto*. Allow me, Mr. President, a moment of analysis, to see to what proportions this question should be reduced.

1. Regarding the *Quinn Manifesto*, you remit the proof of your accusation to a different document: "On that occasion ... we noted important lacunas in that manifesto, calling particular attention to a forced interpretation of the words spoken by Archbishop Quinn." It would seem, then, that you have a uncontested proof.

Now then, when we go to the basic document, the letter of November 18, 1996 – which you and the other directors probably wrote together judging by the use of the first person plural, although only the signature of Dr. Paulo Brito appears – we find a maneuver of the same genre. Indeed, it is written there: "We cannot agree with the text in its current version. I began to show you some of the corrections that I felt were indispensable to introduce into it. In this telephone call, you yourself agreed with these corrections, which principally concerned interpretations of the text of Msgr. Quinn – very nuanced – that went beyond the meaning of what he said."

Dr. Paulo Brito sternly continues: "The coordination of the real meaning of a text and its interpretation is a characteristic of the documents that Prof. Plinio left us, a characteristic that, in good conscience, we wish to follow" (p. 1, § 3).

No part of the *Manifesto* is presented that justifies this judgment. What one finds, then, is a curious way of arguing: You remit the evidence for your serious accusation to a document of Dr. Paulo Brito, and, then, when we go to the source, we find the same accusation, but also unaccompanied by evidence. That is to say, it is a dialectic mystification. In both letters the material proof was concealed. I am, therefore, patiently waiting for you to offer concrete evidence to continue the discussion...

On his part, in order to be believed Dr. Paulo Brito presents only two assertions: *First* – he thought that errors existed; *second* – since I agreed with some of his corrections, then there must also be others. Let us examine the value of Dr. Paulo Brito's "proofs."

*First.* St. Thomas Aquinas divides the evidential strength of an argument, from the natural point of view, into three degrees. The weakest of them is the argument of authority; the next is the argument of reason; the strongest is the presentation of facts. Now, if Dr. Paulo Brito was so certain that he could correct the errors of generalization in my document, why did he not list them and analyze them, as I did above (cf. Refutation of the 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration 5) when I showed the omissions, singularities and contradictions in the recent manifesto of the American TFP and

as I will do in the following paragraph about the letter of Dr. Paulo Brito? If he had done so, he would have the strongest argument in his favor.

Why did he choose instead to assert that I – who know the reality – must rely exclusively on his word in order to convince me? Allow me to observe that such a maneuver cannot be considered as exempt from suspicion of bad faith. For it could well be said that he wrote the letter, which he knew was not objective, with the purpose of having a document to show third parties demonstrating that he did not agree with my action.

In addition, by making a general accusation unaccompanied by evidence, would Dr. Paulo Brito himself not be incurring the severe censure he makes of me? If he alleged that he could not support my document because "in good conscience" he wished to be faithful to Prof. Plinio's practice of not making generalizations, why did he launch the same kind of accusation against me?

So then, is the condemnatory sentence valid against me, even unaccompanied by evidence, but not valid against him, even when accompanied by the facts I have just analyzed? It would be very interesting for Dr. Paulo Brito to explain how he managed to quiet his delicate conscience in order to make the violent accusation he unleashed against me.

*Second.* It is true that I accepted all or almost all of the observations that Dr. Paulo Brito made to me during the corrections session imposed on me as a condition to receive the support of the TFP for the publication of the article on Msgr. Quinn (November 14, 1996). Would Dr. Paulo Brito have been unaware that the main reason for my acceptance of his observations was not to improve the writing but to obtain the promised support? If he did not notice this, *je suis desolé* [I am sorry].

This was, however, the reality. Certainly, one or the other suggestion improved the text, but to conclude that this would justify all the other observations he would make is to go too far. Here again, the consequent is disproportionate to the facts of the precedent. That is, the consequent cannot be drawn from the data listed. Which is tantamount to saying that the argument is baseless.

Additionally, on the matter of generalizations in the exposition of a thesis, there are certain limits of common sense that need to be observed. For, strictly speaking, a specialist could always consider some conclusion that does not reach the degree of precision that only he is capable of as a generic observation. Hence, the picturesque definition of a specialist, so often found in the Anglo-Saxon academic milieu, that Prof. Plinio liked to repeat: A specialist is the man who knows more and more about less and less, to the point that he knows everything about nothing. This kind of expert could always consider as generic a statement of someone who does not follow his degree of precision.

To use a metaphor, I would say: Generalizations in an intellectual work have a minimum and a maximum limit like well done or rare meat in cooking. No one should serve raw meat, just as no one should make a completely general statement. Similarly, no one should serve meat so well done that it could be confused with the cracklings – this would be, in generalizations, the degree of precision of our specialist. There are limits of common sense, which should include the personal tastes and preferences of each one. Roast beef, for example, can be served *tremblant*

[very rare], *saignant* [rare], *au point* [medium] or *cuit* [well cooked]. Analogously, intellectual theses can have a greater or lesser degree of generalization, within the limits admitted by common sense.

Therefore, in order for Dr. Paulo Brito's assertion to have some foundation in reality, he should present the texts of my article that would lie outside the aforementioned limits. Until he does this, his accusation remains in the air.

*Moral consequence.* Notwithstanding the vacuity of Dr. Paulo Brito's accusation, it was broadly circulated and was the object of persistent rumors that, for more than a year, have discredited me and sought to discourage those who help me (see Refutation of Argument II, 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration, 6. E, F).

Even if his accusation were true, I would still be entitled to my good name and, therefore, the Directory should take a discreet action to correct this defect. But, since the members of the Directory seem to have been the promoters of the rumors, the consequence is that they incur a moral offense known as defamation.

In addition, given that the accusation is not true, the same action takes on a deeper moral aggravation, since, besides having the right to a good name, the accused has the right to the truth. To such a moral offense Catholic Doctrine gives the name slander.

You see that it is not a position worthy of the Secretary of the National Council, endorsed by the President-in-Office of our entity.

Having sought to reduce this "haunted" issue to its due proportions, allow me to make a summation:

My document against Msgr. John Quinn was first published on December 5, 1996, in the American weekly *The Wanderer*; it was published again in the same organ on December 26; on December 29 of that year it was published in Spanish in Miami's *Diario Las Americas*. From then until now, rumors have circulated that there are generalizations in the document. Now, from the one year and three months since its publication until the moment I write to you, I have not received any proof of the terrible errors that Dr. Paulo Brito claimed to see in my document. However, even so, you felt authorized to write that there are "significant lacunas" and "a forced interpretation of the words spoken by Archbishop Quinn."

These are, therefore, indictments made without evidence. In view of this, you, Dr. Paulo Brito, the other members of the Directory and their dedicated advisors are formally invited by me to bring the evidence to light and point out the defects. If this is not done and the rumors continue, I can rightly think that you are not interested in the truth. In such a case, it would be lamentable to note that such a select group of TFP members would have, once again, deliberately opted for the disloyal course of defamation and pertinacious slander.

**2.** You are horrified that I might have set some traps in my document. Do you really think that this would result in proof of errors and my intellectual disqualification for the greater work on the Council? Permit me a brief analysis.

In fact, I left two or three weak points, as I always do in my documents – including the one I am writing to you – purposely placed there to attract the attention of Msgr. Quinn and call him to a polemic. I learned this method you censure from Dr. Plinio. You censure the method, *hélas!* We have two different ways of thinking.

You no doubt are thinking of the security of your position as President-in-Office of the TFP and want an uncomplicated action. Dr. Plinio was always thinking of the defeat of the enemy, and I modestly try to imitate him in this respect. It reflects that small difference that mediates between the noble conception of life of the warrior and the secure conception of the bourgeois. If you consider "important lacunas" the fact that I did so, you will find two or three of them in that document. I cannot ask your pardon for this, because I have no regrets. But it is an interesting test to see if the five astute directors will discern the traps I have left in the generalizations of which they accuse me.

**3.** Further, if there were an error in my document, what difference should it make to you and the illustrious directors since you demanded that I withdraw my membership in the TFP from my signature on the article? And even if I had spoken as a member of the TFP, would I not have the right to speak on any topic that I desire like every Brazilian citizen? (cf. Argument I).

I find the presupposition that you adopt curious: You would seem to think that only inerrant persons can defend the Catholic Cause. You would be quite deceived in this regard. One of the greatest sons of the Church was St. Augustine, who, however, left at the end of his life two volumes of retractions of the errors that he had found in his writings. Judging from the prudence of the current Directory, if he had depended on them, St. Augustine would have never written a line so as not to cause you problems...

Even with this attitude of extreme caution you adopt, some error can always sneak in. Your letter is an eloquent example of this...

If it is normal to err in the fight, then I ask: Why do you tear your garments in horror and raise an indignant cry should a writer perhaps write something wrong? What is sincere in this criticism? Is it really the cause of the Church that you want to defend or is it the writer you want to silence?

**4.** And, if I am responsible for what I have written, I believe that I, with the help of Dr. Plinio, will know what to do in a polemic: be it to recognize without trepidation the error I have made, be it to seize the enemy if he steps into the traps I have prepared for him, or be it to counterattack on the open field in the most important points of our dispute. You can see, by the example of the present refutation, that I can handle myself without embarrassment in a polemic. Here, allow me to transcribe something that corroborates my words, a paragraph from a friend who wrote to me on August 18, 1984:

"Dear Mr. Atila, Salve Maria! As soon as I received your argumentation against O.F., I devoured it almost entirely. ... I finished it today. And with emotion for the filial attitude that it signifies. May the Mother of Prof. Plinio, unjustly accused, be the one who will obtain from Our Lady the recompense for what you have done. Having said this, I send my fraternal and effusive compliments to the neo-lawyer. You can open a law firm! I was not aware of your penchant and talent

in this regard. The arguments are well made, both those aimed at the person of the accuser, and those that aimed at the merits of the charges.

"The accuser comes out poorly in the story, for sure. And the accusations are unraveled or cast to the ground or pulverized. How far we fall! Only the humiliations prepared for the God-Man can explain that the recompense of Prof. Plinio's fidelity is the blind persecution of the envious and the destroyers. And you demonstrated well what O.F. wants to stone. When the sack of stones is ready and full, the only thing lacking to begin it are pretexts. This is how those who are not content with what they received from God work."

Who would have thought that my friend [the author of this accusation] 13 years later would have "a sack of stones ready and full," using every pretext to stone the one he once praised? Yes, Mr. President, at the end of that missive I read, "Yours, very gratefully, *in Domina*, Luis."

If you analyze the observations about me that my friend made above, you will see that among them is that of having reduced the enemy to silence: "accusations that have been unraveled or cast to the ground or pulverized." Thus, Mr. President, if you do not believe in the evidence of the facts, at least believe in the point that this friend seems to have objectively discerned, for in the polemic – as in this one that I have the pleasure to engage in with you – I employ the same method I adopted at that time.

### **Conclusion of refutation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> consideration**

It is difficult not to conclude the discussion of this 2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration without saying that since its affirmations are devoid of evidence and the two trembling allegations that try to sustain it do not resist criticism, it has no value.

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Conclusion against Argument II**

To the extent that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration seeks to corroborate Argument II, confirming that the author would have acted without the consent of the current Directory, and since it has been shown to be unfounded, Argument II is baseless.

So then, as the 1<sup>st</sup> Conclusion against Argument II was shown to be baseless, this 2<sup>nd</sup> Conclusion is no better.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Consideration: A dialogue on theological reviews was established. The dialogue was postponed. The author, however, continued on the sly to go forward, preparing its publication. Now he presents a consummated fact. This is opposed to the ideal of chivalric obedience practiced in our family of souls**

### Proof in the text

\* "In this context of a dialogue that had only been postponed, you (secretively) continued negotiations with the aim of publishing your work in the United States without waiting for our reply on the subject of a prior review. And now you surprise us with the imminent launching of the book " (p. 3, § 1).

\* "It is painful to say this, but such a procedure does not conform to the ideal of chivalric obedience practiced in our family of souls. Hence my shock at your recent communication" (p. 3, §2).

### Refutation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Consideration

Since the refutation is coming to an end and the greater part of the antecedents has already been presented, I can abbreviate the answers.

This 3<sup>rd</sup> Consideration has several elements, which will be addressed successively in the Arabic numbers below.

1. **"In this context of a [written] dialogue that had only been postponed ..."** As I affirmed above (cf. Refutation of Argument II, 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration, 6.G), there was no postponed dialogue. Dr. Plinio Xavier told me clearly that "with the life we are leading, we no longer have time to respond in writing" (19.VIII.1997).

Therefore, at the initiative of at least one of the directors, the written dialogue had ended. You are misinformed.

2. **"... you (secretively) continued negotiations with the aim of publishing your work in the United States ..."** As I said above, I informed Dr. Plinio Xavier of the various phases of the negotiations for the publication (cf. *ibid.* G). With regard to the decision to publish the book under my sole responsibility, I also informed Dr. Plinio Xavier several times of this (cf. *ibid.* H, I). Therefore, there was no secret action in either its publication *in genere* or publishing it under my responsibility, *in specie*. Once again, you reveal yourself to be hasty in accusing and slow in informing yourself.

However, even if I had not informed the Directory, I would have the right to publish the work, as I demonstrated in the rebuttal of Argument I.

3. **"... without waiting for our reply on the subject of a prior review."** As I said, Dr. Plinio Xavier had closed the written correspondence (see Item 1). There was no point in waiting for a written response. Besides, if I had waited for a response to act, I would be waiting until today because it still has not come. Thus, knowing that it was my intention to publish the work and remaining silent, to the Directory is applied the principle *qui tacet consentire videtur* [who is silent seems to agree]. Further, Dr. Plinio Xavier, whether in his own name or the directors – I am unsure – told me regarding the publication: "Go ahead [with the book], just keep me informed" (cf. Refutation of Argument II, 6.I). Therefore, there was no point in expecting a written response, but there was a tacit response from the Directory and an explicit one from at least one director.

4. **"And now you surprise us with the imminent launching of your book."** As I said above (*ibid.*), on the day of November 6 when Dr. Plinio Xavier telephoned to know if the book had been published, when I confirmed my effort for it to come out as soon as possible, he agreed, saying: "That is what we agreed upon." Therefore, if you were surprised and shocked, it is not my fault; you should check with him to see why he did not inform you.

5. **"Such a procedure does not conform to the ideal of chivalric obedience practiced in our family of souls."** Since the antecedent is not objective, the consequent necessarily is not. That is, since what has already been seen in this 3<sup>rd</sup> Consideration is baseless, your consequence is gratuitous. And, *ipso facto*, the moral censure you make of me has no basis in reality.

### **Conclusion of the refutation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Consideration**

This Consideration suffers from a chronic lack of information and a disconnection from reality, which, in apologetic terms, means that it is an empty charge, unfounded.

### **3<sup>rd</sup> conclusion and general conclusion of the refutation to Argument II**

Since the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Considerations have brought nothing to light to favor Argument II, the 1<sup>st</sup> conclusion prevails against it, which, thus, coincides with the general conclusion of the refutation to Argument II. To wit,

- That the allegation of indiscipline does not appear to be the background of the question raised by you in the accusation.
- There is a strong suspicion of an agreement established with the current progressivist ecclesiastical structure not to combat it and not to publicly criticize Vatican Council II. This would reveal an ideological opposition.
- In addition, from the strictly disciplinary point of view, it has been proved that it is not possible for you to sustain that the Directory had no knowledge of its publication or that there was no consent for the publication of the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*.

And, with that, I close the discussion of Argument II.

**Conclusion of Thesis II: So then, the author acted against the rights belonging to civil societies.**

### **Refutation of the conclusion of Thesis II**

The refutation of the conclusion of *Thesis II* is not complicated. As this thesis was presented in the form of a syllogism, according to the praxes of the deductive method, it obeyed this order: major premise (Argument I), minor premise (Argument II) and conclusion. Now, since neither the major nor the minor premises presented any consistency, the conclusion is necessarily empty.

That said, I can only summarize, as an *aide-mémoire*, the various partial conclusions reached in the discussion.

Contrary to what the accusation pretended:

In **Argument I**, in its presuppositions, it became clear that the assignments of the persons holding directive positions in the National Council and the DAFN are certainly legitimate and in accordance with the *Statutes*. However, if, under this title alone, they wish to assume the authority that Prof. Plinio exercised cumulatively in the civil association of the TFP and in the family of souls of its members, they will commit the same mistake of a transport ship's crew who resolved to decide the course that the officers and soldiers should follow in their military operations after landing, based on the fact that the crew is responsible for the technical success of the transport of troops, because this crew is legitimately established in its rights. The living reality of that army corps, with their organic authorities, their specific functions and their characteristic purposes would be disregarded and cast aside.

In addition, it became clear that if an authority wishes to establish itself in this family of souls, he should adopt as the base for his action the existence of those leaders organically instituted by Prof. Plinio over the decades. As noted earlier,<sup>4</sup> if he were not to consider them, he would be acting outside of the reality. If he turned against them, he would have the temerity to fight the natural order and run the risk of seeing this adage applied: *Chassez le naturel, qu'il reviendra au galop* [if you drive out the natural, it will return at a gallop].

In addition, it became clear that if one wishes to exercise authority in the TFP family of souls, he must above all seek to demonstrate his hatred of the Revolution and his love for the Church; then, he should try to show his total devotion to the Cause of the Counter-Revolution. With this, he will certainly find those who will obey and follow him. As long as this is not done, you should not be surprised if the subordinates do not listen to you, for they will be hoping to find in the authority that which Prof. Plinio bequeathed to us by his example and his words.

From these principles, applied to the letter that threatens to punish the author, it became clear that the authority the President assumes and evokes seems to be exclusively the juridical prerogative of President of the National Council of the TFP and not that authority that includes the leadership of the broader reality of our family of souls. For, in the election carried out according to the statutory norms that raised you to the supreme office of our entity by the mandate of the nine members who have the right to vote (see Articles 14, § 1, 1st part), the living realities that make up our family of souls did not have the occasion to express themselves.

Moreover, in your act as the President against the author of the book in question, it became clear that you took no account of Prof. Plinio's establishing the accused as one in charge of studies. He was in charge of the MNF studies from 1970 to 1987 and responsible for the analysis of Vatican Council II from 1982 to 1995, and after Prof. Plinio's death to this day – that is, 28 years of study, 25<sup>1/2</sup> of those years with his stimulus and guidance.

---

<sup>4</sup> Part IV, Refutation of Argument I, Presupposition 2, p. 172.

Therefore, the President, in possession of a recent statutory authority and without ever having been particularly interested in studies, considered it appropriate to ignore and violate the organic reality described – at least in the case of the author – of those in charge of functions and responsibilities established by Dr. Plinio. It does not seem exaggerated to use the term violate, since the President and the current Directory, without a reasonable time spent in serious study, would not have the necessary elements for a good understanding and, consequently, a balanced judgment regarding the subject matter composing the framework of the Collection that was written. Notwithstanding, the launching of the book was condemned without that study being carried out. Hence it is difficult not to regard such an action as violent, arbitrary and unjust.

In addition, the President's action seems to have been oblivious to the way of governing that Prof. Plinio always employed and advised to be followed in our family of souls. More explicitly, the President does not appear to have manifested concern for the defeat of the Revolution or the good of the Church, nor does he appear to be concerned about presenting his action in the light of higher panoramas – for those he alleged as coming from Prof. Plinio were baseless, as demonstrated in Thesis I.

The President also does not seem to have demonstrated that abnegation which Dr. Plinio characterized as being the prerogative of legitimate authority in our family of souls. On the contrary, various reasons given by the President could be interpreted as being the fruit of his interest to preserve his command and peaceful management.

As a consequence, his whole argument in the accusation applies exclusively to civil associations. That is, it relegates to the shadows a very large gamut of the reality.

By a comparative study between the statutory rights of the President and the current Directors and the civil legislation presently in force in Brazil, it became clear that Argument I is not based on the TFP *Statutes*.

Further, it seems to oppose the legislation in force in Brazil regarding the rights of an author to dispose of his own intellectual work.

It is noteworthy that, according to the deductive method that was adopted to make the accusation clear, Argument I would correspond to the major premise of the syllogism. From what was exposed, it was concluded that this premise is false, which means that the rest of the reasoning will necessarily suffer from a lack of foundation

In **Argument II**, in your 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration, one could ask: Was it proved that the current Directory "was against the publication without an assurance that the writing was secure and the occasion timely?" Not necessarily, since the position of the members of the Directory was confused, and given that the author can argue in his favor that, from July of 1996 to November of 1997, he kept the Directory informed of his negotiations to publish the work. Moreover, despite their many oscillations, as late as November of 1997, Dr. Plinio Xavier recommended to the author: "Go ahead [with the publication], just keep me informed."

Therefore, with regard to the confused authority, the principle *in dubio libertas* prevails here; and with regard to the accusation, the principle *in dubio pro reo*. Thus, your 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration is unnecessary, which is to say that it is not based on facts.

In addition, having described the constant hostility of the Directory towards the author and those who supported him, the President's claim that "for the theological review the Directory tried to create favorable psychological conditions" becomes absurd and laughable.

In your 2<sup>nd</sup> Consideration, it became clear that its affirmations are devoid of evidence and that the two shaky claims that it tries to sustain do not resist criticism. Hence, it becomes clear that it has no value.

In your 3<sup>rd</sup> Consideration, it became clear that it suffers from a chronic lack of information and a disconnection from reality, which in apologetic terms means that it is an empty charge, baseless.

Since your 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Considerations provided nothing to favor Argument II, the 1<sup>st</sup> conclusion prevails against it, which, therefore, coincides with the general conclusion of the rebuttal of Argument II. Namely, that the allegation of indiscipline does not seem the real base for the complaints presented by the President in his accusation. Once again, it is difficult not to have the strong suspicion of an agreement established with the current progressivist ecclesiastical Structure to not combat it and not publicly criticize Vatican Council II. This would reveal an ideological opposition.

In addition, from the strictly disciplinary point of view, it was proven that it is not possible for the President to maintain that the Directory had no knowledge or had given no consent to the publication of the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*.

As this thesis was presented in the form of a syllogism, according to the praxes of the deductive method, it obeyed the order: major premise (Argument I), minor premise (Argument II) and conclusion. And it became clear that if neither the major premise nor the minor premise is consistent, then the conclusion is necessarily void.

\*

In concluding this Thesis II, I would like to say that I have not the least insecurity about the essence of the facts I have witnessed, the statements attributed to persons and the precise meaning I gave them. Certainly, I do not pretend to maintain that there has not been one or another lacuna, since the written records on which I based myself were usually made the evening of the same day, and the memory does not always reproduce the exact words. Beyond this, I declare that I obliterated nothing from the data I recorded in my notes, and that there is nothing transcribed there that I did not witness. I also confirm that I faithfully transcribed the statements of third parties, without distorting their meaning or adding data. I disavow any imprecision that may be due to my imperfect knowledge of the English language, on which I based some of the indirect information included here. I also exempt one or another inaccuracy of date due to the fact that my recordings were sometimes made after midnight and the computer I use automatically assigns the date when it is typed.

And, for the assurance of you and the members of the current Directory, their possible advisors and anyone who may read this refutation, I want to place myself in the presence of Prof. Plinio and ask that he punish me exemplarily if I have adulterated the truth in anything in this defense.

But, if I take this measure against myself, it is only right that I should also assume it in my behalf. That is to say, I ask Prof. Plinio to punish exemplarily any or all of those who give false testimony against what I have written here or to try to relativize the essence of the facts and statements I leave recorded in this document.

With this, I close the discussion of Thesis II.

\*

Notwithstanding the refutation I made of your accusation in Theses I and II, I would like to express my firm intention to correct in the book I launched any eventual error against the Catholic Faith and Morals that will come to my attention.

\* \* \*

## PART V

### CONSEQUENCES

In principle, having proved that the two Theses are unfounded, the consequences that come from them are likewise void. Therefore, I could close my refutation here. However, as there are certain aspects of the accusation that have not yet been dealt with, I will consider them here so that it cannot be said that I have avoided responding to any of the points it raised.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> consequence: To the ecclesiastical authority and the public, the Collection appears to be instigated by the TFPs**

##### **Proof in the text**

\* "To the ecclesiastical authorities and the public ... *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* and the subsequent volumes of the announced series *Eli, Eli, lamma sabachthani?* can be seen as if they are being inspired by the TFPs" (p. 6, § 5 ).

\* "This impression that, on the theological level, the TFPs would be opening fire against the Council could be favored by various circumstances: your status as a long time member of the Brazilian TFP; your residence in one of the principal houses of study in São Paulo; the two books you wrote in defense of the organization; the participation of a team of TFP members in the research that served as the base for your writing; your regular contacts with Dr. Plinio and, above all, the text of our Founder that you ordered placed in the Preface.

"This unavoidable implication of the TFP in the conception, writing and publication of the book will be further reinforced, in the eyes of the public, by the fact that it is being promoted and directed ... by Miss Marian Horvat, in collaboration with her brother Leo, a former Camaldolese from Jasna Gora, both siblings of Mr. John Horvat, an outstanding member of the American TFP" (p. 7, §§ 1f.).

##### **Refutation of the 1<sup>st</sup> consequence**

In this consequence I note confusion in some concepts, which I will distinguish in order to analyze them. *First*, the confusion between the civil society of the TFP and the conjunct of its members. *Second*, the curious confusion of the kinship in the Horvat family and the responsibility of the TFP. After clearing these confusions, it will be easier to consider the repercussions of my book on the religious authorities and the public. Let me examine each case.

**1. Distinction between the TFP and its members.** Above, the distinction between the TFP civil society and the members who compose it was analyzed (cf. Refutation of Argument I, Presupposition 1). And it was seen that one cannot confuse the civil association, which operates in the

temporal sphere, with the action of its members as Catholics. These actions must be considered separately.

Since they are distinct and independent fields, it only remains to say that your fears are unfounded. Given that neither the current Directory nor the author of the work wish this work to be an official document of the organization, I see no reason for fear. If you or any of the directors is questioned about it, you need only answer as Prof. Plinio responded to an interviewer in a similar case, which I transcribe below. Simply put, you need only respond that the TFP as a civil society cannot pronounce on theological issues and add that the author is speaking in his own name.

For my part, I have already been asked four times whether the aforementioned book should be taken as a position of the TFP and I simply responded, no. I have referred the ones who asked to the paragraph on page 4, § 9, of the American edition, in which I affirm that I do not wish to speak either officially or unofficially in the name of any of the TFPs, and that I assume full and exclusive responsibility for what I wrote.

Permit me now to transcribe part of an interview that Prof. Plinio granted to Prof. Marcelo Otoni about the book that analyzes the *Novus Ordo Missae* and the possibility of a heretic Pope. The interview took place on March 8, 1990.

Prof. Otoni: "In the early '70s, Mr. Arnaldo Xavier da Silveira wrote a book about the new Mass. This book had a very restricted divulgation. In the '80s, Bishop Mayer left the TFP, and even came to be excommunicated for the criticisms of all the renovations in the Church in recent years. Why didn't the TFP, which also disagrees with these novelties, have any problem with the Holy See in this case?"

Prof. Plinio: "**This was not a TFP book. This is a book written by a TFP member, who has the right [to do so], just as the TFP has the right for one of its member to write a book as an individual.** In the TFP, as persons, as Catholics, almost all – not all – agree with the book. **But this is a theological matter. And on this matter the TFP, according to its *Statutes*, cannot take position. The position of the TFP is on temporal matters. So then, this book does not represent a TFP attitude,** even though the majority of TFP members agree with the book." [My emphasis]

It is undoubtedly a lucid distinction, as everything was lucid in the thought and action of Prof. Plinio. Therefore, I suggest that you follow his example: to give a similar response when asked about the responsibility of the TFP in the writing and publication of my book.

Once such a position is assumed, none of the aggravating factors you point out – my being a long time TFP member, residing in a TFP seat, having written two books in defense of the group, having a team of TFP collaborators – is a juridical reason to conclude any commitment of the association. If you wanted to be at complete peace, perhaps you could add another true and, in my opinion, decisive fact. That is, that the author and his collaborators, as Catholics and without speaking for the TFP, wrote that book to follow an expressed desire of Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, to whom they had personal bonds of obedience. As you and the religious authorities know, personal bonds of obedience fall outside the scope of civil law and also of ecclesiastical legislation. They fall strictly to the responsibility of the contracting parties.

**2. The responsibility of the TFP and the confused link with the Horvat family.** In your letter, you assert, "This unavoidable implication of the TFP in the conception, writing and publication of the book will be further reinforced, in the eyes of the public, by the fact that it is being promoted and directed by Miss Marian Horvat, in collaboration with her brother Leo, a former Camaldolese from Jasna Gora, both siblings of Mr. John Horvat, an outstanding member of the American TFP." I confess my difficulty in understanding this connection. Why would the spreading of the work by means of the benevolent TIA, competently directed by Dr. Marian Horvat, "reinforce the avoidable implication of the TFP"? I see no connection between one thing and the other. It would seem that the opposite of what you affirm would be much more probable. Because, since neither Dr. Marian Horvat nor TIA has a juridical relationship with the TFP, how could an action by the former compromise the latter?

Could it be because Dr. Horvat is Mr. Leo's sister? It seems that this is what you are implying. Because then you seem to find an aggravating factor in the accusation that Mr. Leo, brother of Dr. Horvat, collaborated in the dissemination of my book and, afterwards, affirm that both are siblings of Mr. John Horvat, "a distinguished member of the American TFP."

Here you seem to disregard the validity of the Civil Code of our country – and its U.S. counterpart – that establishes every adult citizen as entirely and exclusively responsible for his acts, by adopting a strange "family law," whereby the actions of each member of a household, already of age, would imply the responsibility of the others. Even supposing the validity of such a "right," it would still be difficult to define how the Horvat siblings – two supporting and one not supporting the launching of the book – could "reinforce" the TFP's involvement in the initiative. I would be grateful if you could clarify this matter.

**3. The reactions of ecclesiastical authorities and the public.** You state: "To the ecclesiastical authorities and the public ... *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* and the subsequent volumes of the announced *Eli series, Eli, Eli, lamma sabacthani?* can appear to be inspired by the TFPs."

With regard to repercussions of the public, perhaps you are a bit mistaken. The repercussions I have received run in a different sense, if not opposite, to that which you dread.

**A - Persons in favor of or indifferent to the TFP who support the book and consider it prestigious for the movement.** Most of the testimonies I transcribed above (cf. Thesis I, Refutation of Argument V.2) are written by persons who are indifferent to the TFP, one or another is sympathetic to it, and two others strongly opposed to it. Notwithstanding, you saw that in none of these repercussions was the book referred to in the way you fear. On the contrary, it can be noted there that the book was regarded as a serious and prestigious study under the responsibility of the author. His belonging to the TFP was taken with naturality and was not the main object of interest.

**B - Persons opposed to the TFP who, despite this, support Prof. Plinio and the book.** Even when there was a clear mention, the feared repercussions that the work "was inspired by the

TFPs" did not occur. Very symptomatic of the position of independence between the book and the TFP is the review of John Vennari, who even before he wrote us (cf. *ibid.*, letter O) had published a review in the February *Catholic Family News* with a heading on the first page and the review occupying the entire page 6. The monthly circulates in the United States and Canada. There, the journalist made high eulogies of the book and the author, starting with the title: "A Great Myth Put to Rest." The myth to which Mr. Vennari refers is that Vatican II could be interpreted following the tradition of the teachings of the Magisterium but would have been deviated from that course by some more advanced progressivists. This myth would have ended with the publication of the book *In the Murky Waters*.

According to the veteran critic, the book "is truly a ground-breaking work of immense scholarship." He goes on to say that the book "is a brilliantly documented demonstration that serious anomalies exist in the documents and 'spirit' of Vatican II." He concluded his review with this advice: "Every Catholic concerned about the present crisis in the Church should secure a copy of this book for his library and become familiar with its contents. It promises to serve as an invaluable reference tool for years to come." One could say, then, that the journalist could not be more favorable to the book.

However, he has restrictions about the TFP. And he says it politely: "The book was written under the direction of Prof. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, the late founder of Tradition, Family and Property (TFP). The TFP is a Catholic group that was responsible for notable work in the 1950s, keeping Communism out of Brazil, but that today has become extremely controversial. Here and there throughout *Murky Waters*, the TFP is praised by the author. Yet even the TFP's strongest critics will recognize that this does not detract from book's real worth. The outstanding work in this volume exists quite independently from the cloud over the TFP. *Catholic Family News* is in no way associated with the TFP, and its endorsement of the book should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the TFP."

Thus, with regard to public repercussions of the book, so far your fears seem rather exaggerated. For it neither appears to be inspired by TFP nor does it belittle TFP. As you can confirm in the paragraph above, the book is clearly dissociated from the criticisms of the TFP circulating in the United States.

**C - Reactions of ecclesiastical authorities.** Until now I have received no reaction from an ecclesiastical authority as such, that is, members of the Catholic Hierarchy. I have received praise from two of America's best-known conservative clergy, Fr. Malachi Martin and Fr. Brian Harrison. Another courageous priest, Fr. Charles Fiore, known for his tenacious opposition to the late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, Archbishop of Chicago, wrote a very favorable review, as I have already mentioned (cf. *ibid.*, letter Q). In addition to this precious intellectual assistance, Fr. Fiore bought 100 copies of the book to distribute to a select group. He told me that one of his intentions was to send the work to the more conservative American Bishops. If he did this, we may soon have the reactions of the Hierarchs.

You can see that, even as the campaign begins and even without the support of those who should normally promote the spreading of this book, a good dozen or so courageous Catholic intellectuals, some quite renowned in the United States, have already clearly come out in favor

of the work. I have the hope that others will also do so. You know that the Catholic Hierarchy has every interest to prevent any controversy being raised around the Council. Do you think that the Bishops are going to enter the field and thus have to confront such intellectuals, who certainly will not retreat in face of a public dispute? It seems unlikely.

All the more so since it is likely that the Catholic Hierarchy in the United States is aware of the existence of the book, because, with the blessing of the *Madonna del Miracolo*, the first 1,500 copies are out. Thus, if the Hierarchy, who knows about the book, had wanted to go public against it, it probably would have already done so. Hence, one can conjecture that public statements of Bishops and Cardinals will be improbable. In these conditions, you and I are without the necessary elements to evaluate whether "to the ecclesiastical authorities, *The Murky Waters of Vatican II* and the subsequent volumes of the announced series, *Eli, Eli, lamma sabacthani?* can be seen as if they are being inspired by the TFPs."

**D - Inalterable purpose.** Whether there is a polemic or not, whether there is a condemnation or not, one thing I can assure you and the current Directory: Regarding this work, should there be a risk of sanctions, imputation of doctrinal error or fault in the argumentation, accusations of imprudence or anything of the sort, I will publicly state that the responsibility for the work is entirely mine. I have the firm intention to leave the TFP out of any hostile consequences of my publication.

On the contrary, whenever there are compliments, manifestations of prestige, recognition of some capacity or effectiveness in the work I wrote, the merits will be at the disposal of you and the current directors. This is my inalterable purpose. Thus, you may sleep peacefully without the fear of any possible responsibilities that come from my work could weigh on your shoulders.

### **Conclusion on the 1<sup>st</sup> consequence**

One sees that the publication of the work has the prudential conditions necessary to not bring unfortunate consequences to the TFP, provided that the current Directory distinguishes between the statutory attributes of a civil society and the right that each member has as a Catholic and Brazilian citizen to freely express what he thinks. Nor is it likely to have harmful consequences for our organization given the fact that the book will be disseminated by TIA and given that this association and its President have no juridical ties with the TFP. Until now, the work has drawn no bad consequences from the public or even the ecclesiastical authorities.

Therefore, there are no valid reasons – either in your previous argument or the allegations made here – to conclude that the 1<sup>st</sup> Consequence is probable and much less to conclude that it is certain. In these conditions, the consequence does not call for taking action. It is situated in the sphere of mere possibilities and personal opinions. And, even against such risk, the author presented a reasonable guarantee.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Consequence: Such confusion will change the *status quo* of the TFP**

### **Confirmation in the text**

\* "The confusion that will thus be created is such as to profoundly transform the current *status quo* of the TFP before the Hierarchy and its sympathizers" (p.7, §3).

### **Refutation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Consequence**

Since the 1<sup>st</sup> consequence is unnecessary, the 2<sup>nd</sup>, which presupposes the 1<sup>st</sup>, is even less so. That is to say, in addition to what has already been refuted, you present no evidence to support the claim that the work would be such as to "profoundly transform the current *status quo* of the TFP."

## **3<sup>rd</sup> consequence: It will lead to internal dissension among the members of the TFP regarding this or that point in the analyses of the work and the convenience of launching it**

### **Confirmation in the text**

\* "The inspiration of our temporal action is fundamentally religious, and up to now there has been an almost unanimous consensus in the TFPs about the serious problems created by the post-conciliar crisis. An internal dissent among TFP members about this or that point of your analyses or, in any case, the convenience or inconvenience of launching your book, can open a very deep wound in this consensus. Such a disagreement would profoundly affect the harmonious development of our activities"(p. 7, § 6).

### **Refutation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Consequence**

This consequence addresses questions of diverse natures that should be distinguished.

**A - Repeatedly, the confusion between a civil society and a religious institution.** You return to the same question of confusing the statutory powers of the Directory with the superiors of a religious association that was not formed. If you wish to be obeyed as a religious superior, perhaps it would be the case to found the institution you want to direct. Until the moment I write to you, I am not aware of such an association. Could you point out the terms in the *Statutes* of the TFP, civil law or ecclesiastical law which prescribe that I owe you obedience in religious matters?

**B - Almost unanimous consensus.** You affirm: "Until now there has been an almost unanimous consensus in the TFPs on the serious problems created by the post-conciliar crisis." You do not state, however, on what points such a consensus exists. Judging by the *Villac Document*, cited above (cf. Refutation of Argument II, 1<sup>st</sup> Consideration 4), the consensus to which you would be referring is to not publicly criticize the Council. Is that correct? Now then, with the documentation I presented on the desire of Prof. Plinio in Thesis I, it is shown that if such a consensus were to exist, it is contrary to his thinking and wishes.

Should it be understood that the expression "almost unanimous" would exclude from the consensus Prof. Plinio and those who think like him? However, if such a reflection is true, to whom do you and the current Directory pretend to follow? Who would be the true mentor of the TFP in the current court? If Prof. Plinio were included in the aforementioned consensus, it would be helpful if you would present his texts that would deny the abundant documentation that I transcribed.

**C - Harmony and dissension.** You state, "An internal dissent among TFP members about this or that point of your analyses or, in any case, the convenience or inconvenience of launching your book, can open a very deep wound in this consensus. Such a disagreement would profoundly affect the harmonious development of our activities." Allow me a respectful analysis.

**a.** You and the current Directory decided to follow a policy towards the members of our family of souls which, independent of my work, produced the greatest institutional catastrophe that has ever been witnessed in the TFP's 38 years of existence. In our entity unity no longer exists, harmony no longer exists, a consensus no longer exists. The very purpose for which we dedicated our lives – the defeat of the Revolution and the fight against the crisis in the Catholic Church – seem to have disappeared from the center of concerns. Unfortunately, as a consequence, parties were established. The official leaders of the TFP take with them but a very small portion of our family of souls. Further, many of those who follow it do so from self-interest or necessity and not from conviction.

Allow me, Mr. President, in self-defense, to delve into what seems to me to be the real cause of this dissension. Instead of changing the aforementioned policy, which common sense orders, **you and the current Directory are increasingly taking measures that conflict with the spirit and teaching of Prof. Plinio.** In addition to this orientation, not infrequently creating the impression of misgovernment, our family of souls has been afflicted for some months now by the introduction of violent methods: expulsions, threats, arbitrary cutting of funds, the use of force – surprise dismissals of those in charge of services, invasions of offices, appropriation of files, changing locks etc. – and various other measures that it is not the case to describe here. Such violations are happening with increasing frequency.

These measures undermine the organic structure that Prof. Plinio instituted among us (cf. Refutation of Argument I, Presupposition 2), whose effectiveness – a known fact – has always had greater importance than the statutory structure. This is why we find ourselves in the paradoxical situation of the legitimate authority of a civil association employing its statutory attributes to destroy the living organic reality of those in charge of functions in our family of souls.

And what is the reason to destroy this? In order to guarantee the holders of the statutory positions an authority over those functions, in which they have failed to establish themselves by their personal capacity, and over those persons whom they have failed to convince by reason or attract by idealism. This disaster was born, in large part, by the lack of discernment between the legal reality of the civil association and the living organic reality that was handed down to us by Prof. Plinio. It is in this context that your letter situates itself about a fundamentally ideological book.

**b.** If such a description is objective, it is rather strange that you try to attribute to the release of my book the opening of "a very deep wound in that internal consensus." For it is evident that the deep wound had been already opened – and not by me. So then, at the same moment when you commit an act of brutality threatening me with expulsion – thus confirming by the facts the real reason for dissension – you attribute the cause of the current discord in the TFP to an ideological action that lies far outside that crisis and is made under the sole responsibility of the author. Don't you see that, to the lamentable picture described, your action adds untruth, injustice and despotism?

### **Conclusion of the refutation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> consequence**

One sees that this consequence is also unfounded because:

- *First*, the allegation that the authority in the TFP has the right to prevent the publication of a religious work finds no basis in the *Statutes*, civil law or ecclesiastical law;
- *Second*, the allegation that there is an almost unanimous consensus in the TFP is unclear regarding the object of that consensus and its effective force, since it is not certain that Prof. Plinio would be included in that consensus;
- *Third*, the allegation that the author would be responsible for creating the dissent in the TFP is untrue since the dissent already existed prior to the launching of the work.

**4<sup>th</sup> Consequence: Since the condition for cohesion is respect for authority, the initiative of the author will set a precedent that can lead to internal chaos and the destruction of the work of Dr. Plinio**

### **Confirmation in the text**

\* "The first condition for cohesion in an association is respect for authority. By going public in a matter of this gravity without the agreement of those who have the authority in our family of souls, you set a precedent that can be imitated in different areas by other members of the Group. This would thus establish a real internal chaos, which would destroy the work of almost 70 years of our Founder" (p. 8, § 1).

### **Refutation of the 4<sup>th</sup> consequence**

This consequence presents almost nothing new in relation to the previous one. Here we see repeated the confusion between the competence of the authority in civil and religious associations; likewise the accusation of chaos is repeated – before it was a "deep wound" in the consensus. The arguments presented above are, therefore, also valid for this consequence.

The only two novelties are aggravating factors adduced by the accusation: *First*, a dramatic tone in the accusation of chaos: the author's initiative would destroy the work of Prof. Plinio; *second*, the allegation that the precedent of the author's action could be imitated.

As for the *first aggravating factor*, since it has become clear that chaos has already been established in the TFP for other reasons, regardless of the launching of the work in question, that aggravating factor is unfounded. That is, if what the accusation claims can happen in the future is already taking place, it cannot be attributed to the author.

The *second aggravating factor*, the problem of opening a precedent that hinders the exercise of authority, should be analyzed after clarifying the preliminary question. That is, whether the author has the right to launch his work and whether the Directory has the right to prevent it. Until this is clarified, the question of a disciplinary matter is not relevant. However, even if it were relevant, it would have already been answered above (see Argument I).

#### **Conclusion of the refutation to the 4<sup>th</sup> Consequence**

The fourth consequence is baseless.

\*

## **GENERAL CONCLUSION OF THE TWO THESES AND THE CONSEQUENCES**

**THE AUTHOR IS GUILTY OF REBELLION AGAINST THE WILL OF DOCTOR PLINIO, ABUSE OF HIS NAME, DECEIT IN CLAIMING TO FOLLOW HIS WILL, RASHNESS IN THE PUBLICATION OF HIS WORK.**

**FURTHER, HE IS GUILTY OF DISOBEDIENCE TO THE CURRENT DIRECTORY, DECEIT IN HIDING HIS NEGOTIATIONS FOR PUBLICATION AND IMPRUDENCE IN NOT FOLLOWING THE TFP POLITICAL LINE.**

**HE IS ALSO GUILTY OF BEING A PROMOTER OF INTERNAL DISSENSION AND CHAOS AND AN ACCOMPLICE IN THE POSSIBLE DESTRUCTION OF THE WORK OF DR. PLINIO**

### **Refutation of the general conclusion**

Given that neither Thesis I nor Thesis II nor the Consequences presented dialectical or juridical consistency, the general conclusion turns out to be void, since there being no cause, there can be no effect.

\* \* \*

## PART VI

### PENALTIES

**First:** The author is given an ultimatum to stop the publication and dissemination of his work.

**Second:** He will be asked to apologize publicly for what he did.

**Third:** If he does not comply with these conditions, he will suffer drastic measures – expulsion.

**Aggravating factor of the third:** The threat of drastic measures is made with a tone of finality, with no deadline for its activation.

#### Proof in the text

Regarding penalties, I will present together the proofs in the text and my refutation to them.

\* Proof for the first penalty: "I am writing you to avoid having to take extreme actions to prevent this chaos. I am also giving you this last chance to step back and stop the printing and/or dissemination of this work" (p. 8, § 2).

\* Proof for the second penalty: "We will eventually be forced to take practical measures to prove that this withdrawal [public and official in relation to the book] is not a mere *flatus vocis* [empty words], but an actual reality. This would be analogous to what happened recently at the Gregorian University, whose directors and faculty felt required to ask a doctorate candidate (Fr. Gerard Murray) for a retraction of his thesis that the excommunication of Dom Marcel Lefebvre would have been invalid ..." (p. 8, § 5).

\* Proof for the third penalty: "... under penalty of seeing himself excluded from the academic board of said institution of studies, in order to prevent that the institution be judged as being in solidarity with the conclusions of the author" (*idem*).

\* "In a conversation with Mr. Leo Horvat, I had vigorously criticized initiatives that you were taking independent of the direction of the TFP, even to the point that we might be forced to execute drastic sanctions" (p. 4).

\* Proof of the third aggravating circumstance: "I am giving you this last chance to step back and stop the printing and/or dissemination of the mentioned work" (p. 8, § 2).

#### Refutation of the Penalties

##### Refutation to the First and Second Penalties

In Thesis II, Refutation of Argument I, I have already indicated the articles of the Brazilian Constitution that contradict your desire to prevent the publication of the book *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, an ideological and religious work that I wrote in obedience to the will of Prof. Plinio

under my sole and exclusive responsibility. Should you not only want to prohibit its publication, but continue in your determination to execute the first and second penalties, you will appear even more disdainful of the current legislation.

### **Refutation to the Third Penalty**

Permit me, Mr. President, to bring to your consideration a comparison between the *Statutes* governing the TFP's action and the Brazilian civil law to see what legal tools you have to uphold the execution of the most drastic penalty promised in your letter – my exclusion from the board of TFP – and what legal recourses the accused would have.

#### ***Statutes***

According to the *Statutes* the accused is in the category of an effective member.

**A** - Article 10, paragraph 2, reads as follows: "The effective members will be admitted by a deliberation of the General Assembly on the proposal of a founding member and for a term to be fixed by the same assembly that admits them, which may be extended by another assembly as many times as it wishes ... After this period, they will lose *ipso facto* the status and condition of membership."

Here I confess that I am unaware of the term, left vacant in the *Statutes*, for the renewal of my title as an effective member. It seems to me that I have been a member for around 30 years, but I never knew who proposed my name or who supported me – I suspect it was Prof. Plinio, but I cannot say it for sure. I especially do not know how often my name has been re-examined. Let us say that the renewal of my name in the board of TFP happens every year. You could, then, opt for an easy bureaucratic exclusion, without fanfare... You would only need to review my name and veto it, and the punishment that you want to give me would be accomplished.

**B** - In article 12, one reads: "The General Assembly may at any time exclude any member, be it a founding, effective or honorary member who: a) not being an honorary member, stops attending meetings of cultural and civic formation or the other social activities for more than three months and without written permission; b) does not fully adhere to the doctrinal principles and the ideals of the Society, as they are set out in article 1 and in the books and publications recommended by the National Council; c) displays moral conduct that does not comply with the standards in force among the members; d) breaches any provision of these *Statutes*. The exclusion becomes fully effective when it is recorded in a notarized document ... or communicated in writing to the excluded party."

It seems somewhat difficult to frame the accused as violating any of these items that would call for exclusion because none of them would apply to the indiscipline that he would have practiced by publishing his book. But this would be more a concern for you and your possible lawyer than mine. I restrict myself to citing the article of the *Statutes* which deals with exclusion. I found nothing else that could be used to justify my possible exclusion from the TFP board.

### **The Brazilian Constitution**

**A** - In Article 5, Item VIII, one can read: "No one shall be deprived of his rights for reason of religious belief or philosophical conviction ..." One also sees that such a drastic sanction that you promise could be considered religious persecution.

**B** - In Item XLI, one reads: "The law shall punish any discrimination that violates fundamental rights and freedoms." No comment.

**C** - In Item LIV one reads: "No one shall be deprived of his liberty or property without due process of law." No comment.

**D** - In Item LXXI, it reads: "A mandate of injunction shall be granted whenever the lack of a regulatory rule renders the exercise of constitutional rights and freedoms and of the prerogatives inherent in citizenship unfeasible." No comment.

### ***Universal Declaration of Human Rights***

**A** - In Article XI, n. 1 one can read: "Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial in which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defense." The general tone of your letter, the absence of an opportunity for the accused to speak before pronouncing your sentence, as well as the penalties that you promise would seem to contradict the elemental precept of justice that this text translates.

**B** - In article XII, one can read: "No one shall be subjected ... to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such attacks." In various points of your letter, you took no care to respect the honor and reputation of its recipient. This fact seems to be aggravated by the widespread dissemination – direct or indirect – that you gave your letter.

### **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**

**A** - In Part II, Article 2, n. 3, one can read: "Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes: a) To ensure that any person whose rights and freedoms are herein recognized to be violated shall have an effective remedy, notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity." No comment.

**B** - In Part III, Article 17, n. 1, one can read: "No one shall be subject ... to unlawful attacks on his honor and reputation." Already commented on.

### **Harmonization between the *Statutes* and current legislation**

**A** - Certainly you and the current Directory can exclude the accused from the board of the TFP by means of not bringing up his name in the annual renewal session (see article 10, § 2). However, since you announced drastic measures for ideological, political and disciplinary reasons, the bureaucratic recourse of the non-presentation of the name of the accused to a position he has held for almost 30 years could be interpreted as a violation of his legitimate rights.

**B** - The hypothesis of using your attributes as President-in-Office of the National Council to exclude the accused (cf. art. 12) could easily allow him to take, in his self-defense, legal recourses for religious persecution, denial of freedom of expression and violation of his legitimate author's right. Further, he can have appeal to an even more ample resource based on Natural Law, asking if the course the current Directory has given to the counter-revolutionary struggle by avoiding combat with the enemies – against whom the TFP members first united themselves – is not contrary to its first pre-statutory purpose that inspired its very foundation.

### **Final Words**

If the threat of expulsion becomes effective, the accused does not know whether he will file such appeals or simply leave without resistance. For, if the exclusion takes effect, the TFP's legally elected Directory, by its show of anti-anti-progressivism, will give evidence of its pact with Vatican Council II, its inspiring ideas and its consequences for the Church and the world.

In addition, it will have clearly opposed the plans of Prof. Plinio to publicly analyze the Council and combat the crisis in the Church.

And, if there is not a salutary and proportioned reaction of other members, could it not be said that the TFP as a whole would have adhered to the same collusion? In such a hypothesis, what will be the worth of remaining in a society whose members no longer hate the gnostic and egalitarian Revolution and no longer love the Holy Catholic Church? Wouldn't the society that is characterized by these positions have ceased to be the true TFP? In this case, it would continue to live in those who remain faithful to the spirit and teachings of Prof. Plinio.

\*

With our eyes set on Dr. Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, who is accompanying the present chastisement to which our entity is submitted, and on Our Lady *Acies Ordinata*, Our Lord *Gladifero* and Almighty God, I close the present refutation, being certain that, by the tortuous ways that are habitually the prophetic ways, the vocation of the destruction of the gnostic and egalitarian Revolution installed in the Catholic Church will be fully accomplished. It is with the hope that the days of this trial of the Church be shortened that I make my own the words of David the prophet-king:

"Why hast thou cast us off until the end, O God? Why is thy wrath enkindled against the sheep of your pasture?"

"Remember thy congregation, which thou has possessed from the beginning. The scepter of thy inheritance which thou has redeemed: Mount Sion in which thou hast dwelt.

"Direct thy steps toward these irreparable ruins; see what things the enemy hath done wickedly in the sanctuary.

"And they that hate thee have made their boasts in the midst of thy solemnity. They have set up their ensigns as trophies. ...

"They have set your fire to thy sanctuary; they have profaned the tabernacle of thy name on the earth. "They said in their heart, the whole kindred of them together: Let us put fire to all the sanctuaries of God in the land.

"Our standards we have not seen, there is now no prophet to guide us: and who can tell us for how long.

"How long, O God, shall the enemy insult us? Is the adversary to blaspheme thy name forever?

"Why dost thou turn away thy hand: and thy right hand out of the midst of thy bosom forever?

...

"Remember this: the enemy hath outraged the Lord, and a foolish people hath blasphemed thy name.

"Deliver not up thy dove to the vulture, and forget not forever the souls of thy poor.

"Have regard to thy covenant, for hidden places and the fields are filled with violence. ...

"Arise, O God, defend thy own cause; remember the outrages which the foolish man reproached thee all the day.

"Forget not the cries of thy enemies; the roar of them that hate thee ascendeth continually" (Ps. LXXIII).

I have nothing more to add in reply to your letter. Thus, I take my leave, remembering with longing that friendship of old that united us under the shadow of the same standard and under the orders of the same Lord in the fight against the common enemy. I ask Dr. Plinio to give us his spirit of Elias so that, filled with zeal, which molds heroes and martyrs, and prudence, which chooses the best means to achieve the end, we may again be united for the good of the Counter-Revolution.

*In Jesu et Maria,*  
Atila Sinke Guimarães