

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note to the Reader	1
THE ACCUSATION	
Letter addressed to Mr. Atila Sinke Guimarães on November 20, 1997 signed by Luis Nazareno de Assumpção Filho, President of the National Council of the Brazilian Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property (TFP)	1
Declaration signed by Fernando Antúnez Aldunate	7
Declaration signed by Nelson Fragelli	8
THE DEFENSE: The Reponse of Atila Sinke Guimarães to the Aforementioned Accusations	11
A Letter addressed to Dr. Luis Nazareno on March 25, 1998 in response to his letter of November 20, 1997 containing multiple false accusations and a threat of expulsion from the TFP.....	11
PART I - THE ACCUSATION	
Thesis I: The launching of the work is against the will of Dr. Plinio	13
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.....	14
General Conclusion and Penalties	15
PART II - THE DEFENSE	
1. First Premise: the ideological position of the author and the ideological character of the matter at point	16
2. Second Premise: Serious intellectual and moral flaws that compromise the seriousness of your accusation	17
A. Suspicious haste	17
B. Compromising partialities.....	19
C. Discreditable confusions	21
D. Groundless generalizations	25
E. Incomprehensible omissions	27
a. Religious question	27
b. Legal question	28
c. Institutional question, or identity crisis.....	30
d. Metaphysical-moral question.....	36
PART III	
THESIS 1: THE LAUNCHING OF THE WORK GOES AGAINST THE WILL OF DR. PLINIO.....	40
Argument I: DR. PLINIO WANTED ONLY A CONCISE DOCUMENT AND NOT A BOOK, MUCH LESS THE 11 VOLUME WORK THAT WAS MADE	40
Proof of the accusation in the text	40
Refutation to Argument I	41

Major refutation: The words of Dr. Plinio contrary to the accusation	41
1. The exposition of the doctrine underlying the Council, an important factor	41
2. To explain the obscure language of the Council, it is indispensable to know the thinking of the current that inspired it	42
3. The idea is born for a book of interviews, confirmed by documents	43
4. The opinions of the progressivist theologians, the bomb part of the work	44
5. The idea of a three-volume work is born	45
6. The germination of an even larger work begins	47
7. A Collection of many volumes	48
8. The constant importance given to the current of thought	49
9. The idea of a shorter document, like the <i>Message</i> , is born	49
10. The work plan: One <i>Message</i> , two summary volumes, ten support volumes	50
11. The aim to denounce the current of thought remained the same	52
12. A plan that did not undergo substantial changes	53
Major Conclusion regarding the texts of Dr. Plinio	55
Specific refutation	56
Specific minor conclusion	57
ARGUMENT II: DR. PLINIO WANTED THE WORK ONLY TO ANALYZE CONCILIAR TEXTS THAT ARE APPARENTLY INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE TRADITIONAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH...	58
Proof of the accusation in the text	58
Refutation of Argument II	58
Major Refutation: Dr. Plinio's words against the accusation	58
Major Conclusion regarding the texts of Dr. Plinio	59
Specific refutation	59
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	61
Proof of the accusation in the text	61
Refutation of Argument III	61
Major Refutation: Dr. Plinio's words that oppose the accusation	61
1. The final objective of the study is a clear attack against the Council	62
2. The background of the work is an accusation	64
3. As for the exposure method, it should be cold, presenting questions as one perplexed and avoiding the <i>J'accuse</i>	67
4. To enter the present fight to defend the Church is the very heart of our vocation	70
5. A polemic that can bring punishment as a consequence	71
6. With or without punishment, we shall make a battle cry in the presence of God	72
7. Could it be pleaded that the Council is null?	73
Major Conclusion regarding the texts of Dr. Plinio	73
Specific refutation	74
Minor specific conclusion	75
ARGUMENT IV: DR. PLINIO WANTED TO SUBMIT THE WORK AFTER ITS COMPLETION ONLY TO SOME VATICAN SPECIALISTS, AND NOT CRICULATE IT WIDELY	76

Proof in the text of the accusation	76
Refutation of Argument IV	82
Major Conclusion concerning the texts of Dr. Plinio	82
Minor specific refutation	83
Minor Specific conclusion	83
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	85
Proof of the accusation in the text	85
Refutation of Argument V	85
1 st specific refutation: The witness who read the work	86
1. Omission of the method adopted	86
2. Omission of duty on the part of the reviewer	87
3. Omission regarding our previous collaboration	87
4. Denial of truth	88
5. Omission of the cordial atmosphere in the work	88
6. Unbelievable statement	89
7. Intentional memory failure or omission?	90
8. Two probable exaggerations	92
A. Exaggeration regarding the reviewer	92
B. Exaggeration regarding the writer	93
Conclusion on the value of the statement of the eyewitness who read the work	93
2 nd specific refutation: the ear witnesses	94
Conclusion on the value of the testimonies of the ear witnesses	96
Major Refutation: Dr. Plinio's words against the accusation	97
1. According to Dr. Plinio, the author would be proportional to the work requested of him... ..	97
2. Eulogies of the work and the author in its various phases	99
3. A method that leaves us shielded against possible attacks of theological insufficiency	104
Major Conclusion concerning the texts of Dr. Plinio.....	107
Repercussions of other persons who read Volume I.....	107
1. Persons in the circles of the TFP	107
2. Persons outside the circles of the TFP.....	109
Conclusion on the testimonies of those who read Volume I.....	118
Conclusion of the refutation to Argument V.....	119
Consequence	119
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.....	120
Proof in the text of the Accusation	120
Order of the accusation.....	121
1. Regarding the review of other members of the TFP	121
2. Regarding the review of theologians	121
3. Regarding the review by Dr. Plinio	121

4. The conclusion of the Accusation	122
Refutation of Argument VI.....	122
Specific refutation	122
1. Regarding the internal (TFP) reviewers	122
2. Regarding the review of theologians	126
3. Regarding the review of Dr. Plinio	130
Conclusion of Refutation of Argument VI	133
 ARGUMENT VII: THE AUTHOR REFUSED THE REVIEW OF DR. PLINIO FOR VOLUME I.....	 134
Proof in the text of the Accusation	134
Refutation of Argument VII.....	135
1. A cascade of generalizations	135
2. Memory weakness.....	136
3. Remiss participation.....	136
4. Entanglement of facts and interpretations.....	137
5. Refutation properly speaking	138
A. Reluctance to receive corrections.	139
B. Dr. Plinio made only superficial observations about the work.....	140
C. The author rejected countless proposals of Dr. Plinio, after discussing and heatedly justifying them	142
D. The author complained to Dr. Plinio about cutting short one of the meetings, which was embarrassing	144
Conclusion to the refutation of Argument VII.....	144
<i>Argumentandi gratiae</i>	145
A. The title: <i>In the Murky Waters</i>	145
B. The comma, defended as an only child... ..	147
 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	 148
Proof in the text of the accusation.....	148
Refutation of Argument VIII	148
1. The indefinite postponement	149
2. Excessive attachment	150
3. The confrontation	153
Conclusion of the refutation to Argument VIII	156
 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	 157
Proof in the text of the Accusation	157
Refutation to Argument IX	157
 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	 159

Refutation of Conclusion of Thesis I	159
 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	167
Refutation of Thesis II	167
Initial clarifications	167
 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.	169
Refutation of Argument I	169
Presuppositions	169
1. Civil society and family of souls.....	169
2. The organic nature of the internal life of this family of souls	171
3. The exercise of authority	172
4. Conclusion	174
5. Consequence	175
Refutation properly speaking	175
1. A sophism	175
2. The text of the <i>Statutes</i>	177
3. The text of the Brazilian Constitution	177
4. The <i>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</i>	178
5. <i>International Pact of Civil and Political Rights</i>	178
6. Comparison between the <i>Statutes</i> and the current legislation	179
Conclusion to the refutation of Argument I	179
 ARGUMENT II: THE AUTHOR PUBLISHED HIS BOOK WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE AND CONSENT OF THE RIGHTFULLY CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES OF THE TFP	
Proof in the text	180
1 st 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.....	180
Proof in the text	180
Refutation of the 1 st Consideration	181
1. A tendentiously phrased question	181
2. Evidence and strong indications of an unpublished decision: To not attack the progressivist Hierarchy and to not publicly criticize Vatican Council II	182
A. Dr. Luis Nazareno de Assumpção F ° and the <i>diktat</i> to no longer fight the progressivist ecclesiastical Hierarchy	182
B. Dr. Paulo Corrêa de Brito F & his "problem of conscience" to not deal with Vatican II.....	185

C. Dr. Caio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira and his support for Msgr. Wach, who preaches not to combat the progressivist Hierarchy.....	186
D. Dr. Plinio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira and the bulk mailing on the visit of John Paul II	190
E. Dr. Eduardo de Barros Brotero and the "harmonization phase"	193
3. <i>De facto</i> agreements and <i>de jure</i> agreements.....	194
4. From implicit to explicit: the <i>Villac Document</i>	196
5. Antiprogressivist surprise?	197
6. To not publish the work on the Council, a preconceived decision?	200
A - Overview.....	202
B - An enigmatic support for the work on the Council.....	202
C - The 'Quinn Case': from a discreet support to a surprising support	204
D - Incoherent demands, unprecedented violence.....	207
E - Calumnious and draconian measures.....	211
F - Empty amiabilities, unprecedented pressure and a valuable statement: "This is the book that cannot be published".....	215
G - Reviews: First requested, then denied. Publication: First praised, then condemned.....	220
H - A method in the procrastinations?	223
I - The author decides to publish the work and makes this decision known	224
Conclusion of the refutation to the 1 st Consideration.....	226
1 st conclusion against Argument II.....	227
2 nd Consideration: The decision to not publish the work became firmer due to important lacunas in the <i>Quinn Manifesto</i> , released by the author in December 1996.....	227
Proof in the text.....	227
Refutation of the 2 nd Consideration	228
Conclusion of refutation of the 2 nd consideration	232
2 nd Conclusion against Argument II	232
3 rd 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	233
Proof in the text	233
Refutation of the 3 rd Consideration	233
Conclusion of the refutation of the 3 rd Consideration	234
3 rd conclusion and general conclusion of the refutation to Argument II	234
Conclusion of Thesis II: The author acted against the rights belonging to civil societies	234
Refutation of the conclusion of Thesis II	234

PART V

CONSEQUENCES

1 st consequence: To the ecclesiastical authority and the public, the Collection appears to be instigated by the TFPs	239
Proof in the text	239
Refutation of the 1 st consequence	239
1. Distinction between the TFP and its members	239
2. The responsibility of the TFP and the confused link with the Horvat family.....	241
3. The reactions of ecclesiastical authorities and the public.....	241
A. Persons in favor of or indifferent to the TFP who support the book and consider	

it prestigious for the movement	241
B. Persons opposed to the TFP who, despite this, support Prof. Plinio and the book.....	241
C. Reactions of ecclesiastical authorities	242
D. Inalterable purpose	243
Conclusion on the 1 st consequence	243
2 nd Consequence: Such confusion will change the <i>status quo</i> of the TFP	244
Confirmation in the text	244
Refutation of the 2 nd Consequence	244
3 rd 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....	244
Confirmation in the text	244
Refutation of the 3 rd Consequence	244
A. Repeatedly, the confusion between a civil society and a religious institution.....	244
B. Almost unanimous consensus	244
C. Harmony and dissension	245
Conclusion of the refutation of the 3 rd consequence	246
4 th 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	246
Confirmation in the text	246
Refutation of the 4 th consequence	246
Conclusion of the refutation to the 4 th Consequence	247
 GENERAL CONCLUSION OF THE TWO THESES AND THE CONSEQUENCES	248
 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.....	248
Refutation of the general conclusion	248
 PART VI	
PENALTIES	249
<i>First:</i> The author is given an ultimatum to stop the publication and dissemination of his work.....	249
<i>Second:</i> He will be asked to apologize publicly for what he did.....	249
<i>Third:</i> If he does not comply with these conditions, he will suffer drastic measures – expulsion.....	249
Aggravating factor of the third: The threat of drastic measures is made with a tone of finality, with no deadline for its activation.....	249
Proof in the text.....	249
Refutation of the Penalties	249
Refutation to Penalties I and II	249
Refutation to Penalty III	250
<i>Statutes</i>	250
The Brazilian Constitution	251

<i>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</i>	251
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	251
Harmonization between the <i>Statutes</i> and current legislation.....	251
Final Words	252