



# The Angel of Darkness

Flashes of doctrine, science and common sense

FATHER JÚLIO MARIA  
Missionary of Our Lady of SS. sacrament

IV EDITION

**1950**

EDITORIA VOZES

The angel of the darkness – Priest Julio Maria – [www.valde.com.br](http://www.valde.com.br)

FATHER JÚLIO MARIA  
Missionary of Our Lady of SS. sacrament

# The Angel of Darkness

**Flashes of doctrine, science and common sense**

IV EDITION

**1950**

EDITORA VOZES Ltda,  
PETRÓPOLIS RJ

RIO DE JANEIRO - SÃO PAULO  
BRAZIL

## **IMPRIMATUR**

BY EXMO'S SPECIAL COMMISSION. AND REVMO. MR. DOM MANUEL  
PEDRO DA CUNHA CINTRA, BISHOP OF PETRÓPOLIS. FREI LAURO  
OSTERMANN OFM PETRÓPOLIS. 17-4-1950

**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

## APPROVAL

of the Hon. D. Carloto Távora

My dear Father Júlio-Maria. I am very grateful for the shipment of your new book: "Flashes of doctrine, science and common sense".

I went through these pages with real enthusiasm. How many beautiful, admirable things are on these pages that seem to be written with a feather of fire.

They are true flashes. After reading each of his theses, the reader feels overwhelmed ... and, whether he likes it or not, he is convinced of the truth exposed.

Everything is luminous and convincing under its burning pen; and it is not known what else to admire, whether the security of the doctrine or the enthusiastic and communicative way of exposing this doctrine.

How well will this new book do! I congratulate you on the result, as I know that your only goal is to do good to souls, leading them on the path of truth - the only truth, which is the teaching of the holy Catholic Church.

I ask our Lord to bless his apostolic works, and to bless, in a particular way, this terrible penalty that makes the enemies of religion tremble, and gives immense satisfaction to all sincere Catholics, and in particular to his old and dedicated bishop.

+ CARLOTO, Bishop of Caratinga

## INTRODUCTION TO SECOND EDITION

The angel of darkness is known to all. It is, in the words of St. John, that ancient serpent, which is called the devil and Satan, who seduces the whole world and was precipitated on earth ... Woe to the land and the sea, continues the seer of Patmos, because the demon descended to you, with great anger, knowing that you have little time left to lose souls (Apoc13, 9.12).

Here is an apocalyptic text and figure, which can be applied literally to the time we are going through.

It seems that the end of time is approaching, and that the demon, or angel of darkness, is in a hurry to take the time to lose humanity.

Today, we feel a breath above and within society, it should be said, a hurricane of revolt, of sensuality, of hatred that would be mysterious, if it were not diabolical. IS! But it's diabolical! It is the angel of darkness who is agitated and unfolds in a feverish activity, to foster human passions, hide the ideal of man and ignite hatred against priests, against the Church and against God Himself.

It is the work of the angel of darkness. But the devil does not appear personally, only rarely and with God's permission. He has his representatives, his emissaries, conscious or unconscious, to whom he dictates his wishes, and who serve him as slaves.

Whoever refuses to be a child of God becomes a slave to the devil! Whoever denies the light is in darkness. There is no other way out.

Without going into the details of a complete enumeration, as would be the case with a didactic work, it can be said that the authentic representatives of the angel of darkness are the well-known destructive sects:

1. Spiritism, which destroys intelligence;
2. Protestantism, which destroys the union;
3. Freemasonry, which destroys authority;
4. Divorce, which destroys the family;
5. Sexualism, which destroys modesty;
6. Communism, which destroys freedom.

In the pages that follow, without intending to make a complete, didactic exposition, I want to deal with these six angels of darkness, or demons, that attack the eternal rock of the Church today, trying to overthrow its institutions and undermine its principles. And with what will they replace what they intend to demolish? They are showing what they do daily. We can judge them by their fruits.

Spiritism is a producer of madness;

Protestantism is a producer of hate;

Freemasonry is a producer of revolt;

Divorce is a producer of discord;

Sexualism is a producer of debauchery;

Communism is a producer of slavery.

This book was born without a premeditated plan. It is the result of responses to various queries. These responses formed two volumes: Flashes and Polemics, with each of these volumes subject to refutation of errors and explanations of certain religious truths.

I decided to combine in one volume the refutation of errors, and in another one the exposure of religious truths.

In this way these two volumes will come out:

The Angel of Darkness, containing articles from the Flashes that refer to modern errors.

The Angel of Light, containing the other articles of popular theology, which refer to the sanctification of souls.

**Fr. Julio Maria**

## INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EDITION

Why Flashes? To see better, see higher and see deeper. We are in a time when the simple light is insufficient to impress the visual retina of certain people. For people who want to see, a glimpse is enough. For those who do not want to see, lightning is needed. Lightning forces you to see, makes everything see, manifests everything.

Today the truth needs lightning! ... and even thunder! It would not be too much the thunder of Sinai, when Moses received the law of God, while the Israelites were dancing around the golden calf.

Not being able to reproduce the thunder that manifests the divine majesty, nor the lightning that is like an echo of the divine light, at least, these little flashes.

I say small, because they come from a small source - man - but they are stunning, because they are composed of divine truths.

They are not flashes of genius; they are real flashes. And we really need them!

The world is full of modern Diogenes, walking in broad daylight, lantern in hand, to illuminate society; however the flashlight is without light, or contains only a smoky candle.

The Diogenes are: Protestantism, Spiritism, the lay pro-state coalition, divorce, communism, etc. How many Diogenes with their lanterns out, trying to light up the world at noon, while they themselves are blindfolded.

O lightning, O thunder ... from Sinai! where is your brilliance to illuminate the blind Diogenes, your roar to prostrate the dancers around the golden calf ...

It is not time to sleep; it is time to act. The devil does not sleep. Saint Paul calls all Catholics aloud: - Awake, you who sleep, and rise from the dead, and Christ will give you light (Eph 5:14).

The light, the only light, the lightning, is Christ. The rest are lanterns without candles.

Let us listen, therefore, to Christ, through the voice of his Church, of his leader, and let the modern Diogenes of impiety run into the abyss that awaits them.

The present flashes are addressed to all who, sincere and loyal, want to know the whole truth:

The truth that illuminates the intelligences;

The truth that stimulates the will;

The truth that guides the heart;

The truth that forms the character.

There is all of this in this book. It is not a single thesis: it is a series of theses, of pulsating relevance.

These are issues taken in the act of life, ideas and circumstances, manifested by consultations with different people.

Read these Flashes and I am sure that they will be for many a glimmer that will allow you to distinguish and understand what perhaps you had not yet distinguished, nor understood: - the truth, in the midst of multiple errors that the devil is sowing.

And such is the author's only aspiration.

**P. Júlio Maria**

**First angel of darkness:**

## **SPIRITISM**

1. What is spiritism.
2. Beauties of reincarnation.
3. The esoteric circle.

### **FIRST FLASH**

#### **What is Spiritism**

Below we give only notions about the spiritist doctrine, asking the scholars to use, for detailed explanations, our book: *Secrets of Spiritism*, where they will find a complete exposition of everything that refers to the nefarious sect.

#### **I. Definition of spiritism**

Spiritism is the theory (or hypothesis) that intends to explain certain abnormal facts as produced by the action of the spirits, manifested through mediums.

This theory dates back to half a century, having been codified by Alan Kardec, regarding scams employed by the Fox sisters, in North America.

There are no spiritist phenomena: first, because it would be necessary, according to the spiritist theory, that the phenomena were produced by the spirits; second, because the same phenomena observed in the seances are repeated outside them, as long as the medium (sensitive) is present.

This is a generic name that spiritists give to all the phenomena produced by the sensitives (mediums) in their sessions and that the common person repeats, without giving it an agogic sense, only as a synonym for normal phenomena, outside the scientific domain.

From there they acclaimed spiritist phenomena to the most natural phenomena, such as the supposed exteriorization of motricity, producing (sic) raps, displacements and transport of objects, levitation, etc., and the supposed exteriorization of sensitivity, producing (sic) doubles, ghosts, materialization, etc.

The very nature given to these phenomena clearly shows that they are independent of any extra-natural intervention; they are the function of the sensitive (medium).

Do not confuse spiritism with spiritualism. These two terms, which have the same radical, mean, however, opposite and opposite doctrines. This is the case of the donkey dressed in the lion's skin.

Spiritualism recognizes the existence of an almighty God, creator and providence of the world, personal and absolutely distinct from his works.

Spiritism professes a gross pantheism.

His god, if such a name can be given to him, is impersonal and is confused with nature. Like Haeckel, corifeu of materialism, they love the God-nature, synthesis of the true, the beautiful and the good. It is in the worst materialistic doctrines that spiritism will have it.

Spiritualism believes that man is composed of a body and a soul, in one person; it teaches that this invisible, intangible, spiritual soul, in a word, endowed with intelligence and will, is the principle of life, of sensitivity and motility, the shape of the body.

Spiritism, on the contrary, does not believe in the spiritual, immortal and personal soul and professes that, apart from a spirit more or less distinct from the divine, there is nothing in the body and around it but a subtle, material fluid, the perispirit, capable of explaining the manifestations of life and soul. The true soul is clearly sacrificed to this hypothetical principle that no fact favors and all philosophy condemns.

Spiritism pretends to be in possession of the secrets of nature and thinks it is capable of explaining all the mysteries.

Spiritualism defends, as its name indicates, the rights of the soul, the prerogatives of the spirit, without ignoring the demands of the body, without denying the substantial unity of man.

Confusing God and the soul, the spirit and the body, in a single substance, spiritism denies them equally and absolutely compromises the interests of spiritualism.

In the face of spiritualism that is definitely the winner of materialism, spiritism arises, in the present times, which intends to invade it, corrupt it, destroy it and take its empire from souls.

The alternative between them is necessary; the choice is not in doubt.

## **II. The basis of spiritism**

Spiritism is neither religion nor science: it is an illness. I will demonstrate this clearly, in a series of studies that I intend to publish on the subject.

Religion is necessarily based on revelation, on the word of God. Science is formed by data from experience. Religion and science are born, therefore, from completely different, even opposing points. Religion comes from heaven; science, from the land.

The first has God in principle; the second is based on human intelligence. Spiritism has no beginning, no basis; it is not from heaven, nor from earth. Neither revelation generated it, nor does science want to profile it. Sad orphan! Where did it come from? Where you go? What you want? That makes? Everything is mysterious!

Considering it from the sky side, it is a body without a head; on the science side, it is a disembodied head; and, after all, everything disappears in a chaos of absurd contradictions. This is spiritism!

That is how the sages who applied themselves to study it understood it. In 1920, the medical school of Bahia proposed as a thesis to doctoral students the identity of the medium and the hystero-epileptic.

Not long ago, Dr. Geley, a celebrated professor, wrote that hidden phenomena still need to be demonstrated.

Days later, Carlos Richet wrote in “Excelsior” that the result of metapsychic (study of the soul, or of the intellectual faculties) was null.

In giving credit to these judicious words, spiritism is nothing, and yet it is something.

Let's say, what is not: Biblical? ... It is not.

On the contrary: positively unscriptural, for disobeying the Bible,

God says: You will be saints to me, for I am sovereign Lord, and I have separated you from other peoples, that you may be mine. The man or woman in whom you find a spirit of spirit (that is, a spirit medium) or spirit of divination, receive the death penalty, be stoned and run on your own blood (Lv 20,26).

Later on, this divine prohibition was confirmed by the Lord: Neither find anyone among you who interrogates arioles and observes dreams and omens, nor is he harmful, nor charming, nor whoever consults spikes or diviners, or inquires about the truth of the dead. For all these things abhor the Lord (Deut 18: 10-12).

And in the prophet Isaiah: When they say to you: consult the studs and diviners, answer them that the people consult their God and do not need to consult the dead in favor of the living (Is 7,9).

Now, interrogating pythons or mediums, observing dreams and inquiring about the truth of the dead, are the ordinary practices of spiritism. Therefore, spiritists are transgressors of this very clear divine precept,

Spiritism is anti-Christian, because it denies the divinity of Christ, who demeans it to the point of proclaiming him a medium. To believe in Jesus Christ is to believe in all the truths revealed by him. Well, spiritists do not admit any of these truths, they want neither dogmas, nor mysteries, nor heaven, nor hell.

Spiritism is anti-Catholic, because it repudiates the sacraments, purgatory, the cult of the Virgin and the saints, the mysteries of the Most Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, the authority of Saint Peter, the whole Catholic cult.

Spiritism is anticlerical: it aims, above all, at the sordid campaign against the Church and its priests.

It is antimoral, because it denies free will, a source of responsibility.

Finally, what is left of this denial framework? Spiritism is, first of all, and only, the negation of everything. It's nothing, it's the vacuum ...

Notice this well; no basis, no principle, neither from heaven nor from earth. Nothing stands.

The six thousand years the world has lived is nothing ...

They left neither a memory nor an idea that will serve ... everything, everything must be new.

Spiritism has no basis ... or rather, as Father Dubois says very well: Spiritism rests on religion, like certain birds on the top of churches; to mess up the tiles, open leaks and splatter everything.

Just look at this principle to understand how spiritism leads so easily and directly to madness.

Our intelligence does not live only on imaginations, on assumptions; it seeks, first of all, (and this is its own element), certainty, conviction. Not finding it, she is disturbed, agitated and falls into a kind of despair that paralyzes her, and little by little, she is extinguished, due to starvation, anemia, because she lacks the proper food, of which she lives and strengthens itself: certainty or truth.

**Conclusion:** Spiritism is a ruin, it is the doubt, it is the denial of everything.

Now, denial cannot be sustained; we need something positive, anything that exists, be it in the material, spiritual, intellectual or moral order.

Who has ever seen pure denial? If you ask me:

what is man? ... I answer on the negative side, saying that it is not vegetable, mineral, nor pure animal!

Yes, but what is it, then? We want a positive response, which does not simply say what it is not, but still what it is.

Man is a creature, rational, composed of a body and a soul!

Well, in spiritism, nothing positive, everything is negation, and these new asylum scientists want our intelligence to be content with that?

Poor crazies!

### **III. The man in the spiritist concept**

In order to fully understand the spiritist game and explain the numerous charlatanescent phenomena of its followers, it is absolutely necessary to know what they think of man. What, then, is man in the spiritist concept?

I leave the answer to the sect's father, the well-known Alan Kardec: "Man, he says, is made up of three essential parts: material and sensitive body, analogous to those of other animals and animated by the same vital principle; the soul, an incarnate spirit, whose housing is the body, and the perispirit, a semi-material substance that serves as a wrapping for the body. The soul has two envelopes: one subtle and light, which is the perispirit, and the other material and heavy, which is the body. Death is nothing more than the destruction of the body, not of the spirit" (Spirits' Book, ch. 2, ns.135, 141, 155).

Please note these first and basic explanations of spiritism.

Religion teaches us that man is composed of a mortal body and a spiritual, immortal soul, created by God, in his image and likeness.

Of course, it is logical, it is sublime, this indoctrination, in its principle and in all its consequences.

But spiritists prefer, first of all, darkness, doubt and contradiction, to all existing and known truths.

What is old cannot be new; what is positive cannot be negative; what is clear cannot be mysterious, and spiritism wants something new, negative and mysterious. How to get it? Destroying the castle of universal wisdom, revelation and common sense. Poor crazies!

And, not wanting to accept man, as he bequeathed to us by divine revelation, Christian doctrine, the idea and common sense of the centuries, here is a new man that spiritism builds.

For him, man is a composite of soul, perispirit and body.

The soul is spiritual, it is not created by God. It is simply an incarnate spirit, any spirit, of those who fly through space, hoping to find a body to adapt to it better. This spirit, for the body, is like a chrysalis for the cocoon.

This is not an essential part of that.

Thus, according to the spiritist doctrine, the human body is not an essential part of man: it is like a fact that we wear until we are torn. Once this one is broken, another is sought.

Thus, the human body rendered useless by death, this wrapper is rejected and another reincarnated is taken.

Such is, according to spiritism, the nature of man, an absurd notion before healthy philosophy.

We are not just matter, nor simply spirit, we are constituted in our own essence by these two substances, essentially distinct, by their union, forming a new substance, which is man. As well as two separate gases, oxygen and hydrogen, properly combined, results in a new substance - water. Water is essentially distinct from its two components. Thus, man, body and soul, To destroy this notion is to destroy the same philosophy, religion and common sense.

But if spiritualism wants nothing to do with philosophy, religion, or common sense ...

Casmurro Alan Kardec understood better than all this, Imagined the perispirit - from the Greek: peri, around - what should be translated “around the spirit”, with which he understood made the spirit adapt to the body.

And the same Kardec, who knew philosophy as the vultures understand Greek, explains the nature of this perispirit, saying that it is semi-material, subtle and light ...

But, man of God! Philosophy, until today, has only discovered the material body and the spiritual soul. How can this perispirit be semi-material? Can not!

But in Alan's brain, it needs to be, for the very simple reason that he must glue a material body and a spiritual soul ...

One material substance, of course, would adapt to the material body, and another spiritual one could only adjust to the spiritual one, so the finório created the sub-material substance, subtle and light!

It's too much! I don't know if I should laugh at such cretinity, cry at such insolence, or raise my shoulders in the face of so much ignorance ...

But let us continue the study, or, better, the analysis of the passage quoted from the respectable god of spiritism.

The master remembered that we do not get rid of death, both Spiritists and Catholics.

And what is death? The destruction of the body, not the spirit, he says.

We Catholics say that it is the separation of body and soul.

Master Alan could not adopt such a clear formula; indeed it would be a contradiction to its principles.

Taking off the spirit body, he would have been obliged to say where body and spirit would hover.

The smart guy escapes and says that the body is destroyed by death, disappears, and the spirit flies through space, to the moon, where it came from.

But, illustrious master, what about the perispirit? Where will you stay?

Hidden in the wings of the spirit or adjusted to the body?

Is this semi-material substance also destroyed or will it accompany the spirit?

I will carefully read the spirit book, to discover this enigma.

And after death, what happens? ... Master Alan has already said it: the body is destroyed, nothing more, it is a dead animal, which decomposes, and only ...

As for the spirit adapted to the body, it flies, flies, until it finds any wolf or donkey hide that wants to wrap it up, to start the new life. This is what man is, in the spiritist doctrine. Notice it well ...

It's nothing ...

The destroyed body, the spirit that was not his, but of any body, became winged, nothing remained of the group that was the man. Nothing. It is destruction. It is ruin.

And to say that there are men who take this seriously, who believe that there is science, or religion! Ignorance cannot reach this point. Only madness!

The phrase of the eminent Dr. Carlos de Laet can be understood: "To attend a seance is to take an entry ticket to the insane asylum".

Now, tell me, the reader who reads me, if it is worth a man to watch a spiritist pantomime, to learn there that he is not a man, but simply any spirit adjusted to the skin of a fool?

I was already sure of that, but I bet the spirit mediums didn't know that.

Well, now find out.

#### **IV. The spiritist personality**

After all, I went through the Book of Spirits, by Alan Kardec, without finding anything. But, with friar's perseverance, I looked in another volume by the master, finding in the Posthumous Works this expressive phrase: "In the incarnation, the spirit keeps its perispirit, which is the organ of the transmission of all sensations, and with the perispirit, still attached to the body, the soul retains its individuality (Obr. post. Cap.2, nºII).

This curious perispirit, continues the master, is the organ for the transmission of all sensations.

The impression produced on an organ of the senses by external objects is called sensation.

The semi-material substance that surrounds the spirit serves, therefore, as a conducting thread, establishing relations between the organs and the soul. Thus, the sight, the smell, the hearing, performed by the organs of the body, are transmitted to the spirit by the adherent envelope.

The master goes on to say that the spirit, thus united with the body, retains its individuality. This means, clearly, that there is no substantial and personal union of the soul with the body, forming the human person, our inner "I".

Now, this is completely at odds with the truth. Religion, science and common sense teach us that each one of us has his own personality, his self, and this personality, which makes me really me, not another, that so and so is distinct from Sicilian and of beltrano, this personality, he said, comes from the substantial union of body and soul, thus forming a new substance which is man - man having his same personality.

In spiritism, none of that, The spirit of space incarnates, takes over the body, adjusts itself by the perispirit, without losing its individuality, completely dominating it, while life lasts, and then abandoning it as we left the house that threatens to ruin. The body, in short, is reduced to the annihilation of the sepulcher.

And where does the spirit go? The spirit will demand space outside, fluttering around us, as certain sinister birds fly around a decomposing animal.

It will even fly through metempsychosis, migration of the soul, from one body to another, in time and space, to an indefinite number of bodies from the three kingdoms of nature, without ever belonging, as it always preserves its individuality and will continue through transmigration to perpetuate itself, on this or other planets, until it reaches happy eternity.

Let's stop. To understand such explanations, it is necessary to reflect, repeat and compare. Evangelical teaching shines, however, because it is divine, it is the simple and positive expression of the truth.

Spiritist teaching is ambiguous, vaporous, as it rests on denial, destruction, on nothing, in short.

Let us try, however, to elucidate the idea of the master.

The soul, or rather the spirit, has its individuality.

This means that it is such in itself, by nature.

Since eternity there has been an incalculable amount of spirits, of different qualities, some pure, some impure, some serious, some mocking, some peaceful, some tormentors, some calm, some angry, some prayers, other guerrillas.

These souls, one day or another, must be incarnated in a body. It doesn't matter what that body is. The incarnation is done. The soul is adapted to this body by the Perispirit, and here is the formed man, because the soul dominating the body adjusts it according to its individuality.

If the incarnate spirit is a cruel, destructive vain spirit, here is a vain, destructive or cruel man; like it or not, it necessarily has to follow the individuality of the soul, the body being a simple machine driven by it. It is the horrible conclusion to be drawn from Kardec's teaching. Logically, spiritists must affirm, as the master does: "The good man is the incarnation of a good spirit", "and the wicked man is the incarnation of an impure spirit".

Therefore, the animal-man (the body) always and necessarily proceeds as a machine driven by the incarnate spirit. It is the denial of free will, of moral responsibility, the destruction of the foundation of all social and moral laws and of all Catholic doctrine, to give way to absolute fatalism.

We understand, therefore, what such a doctrine means, rather than diabolical. For if the devil denies it, he seeks, at least, to build a building in the middle of its ruins. Spiritism overturns, annihilates, pulverizes until it reaches nothing ... And the doctrine of despair. For our intelligence, nothing does not exist, but it becomes concrete in despair or madness. It is the sect's journey that tries to make proselytes among us.

But let us study the consequences of such principles. To be a sincere spiritist, a man should reason like this: "I don't have a soul that is mine; the one that is now in my body is perhaps the soul of Judas, Caesar, Solomon or Cain. After me, it will pass to someone else, I have nothing to do for her; because it's not mine. So what good works, what an honest life?

Why not kill, steal, murder, enjoy mud and gold? Life passes. It will not be me who will atone for my guilt, but the one who receives the soul that made me act. Why think about heaven or hell? They don't exist for me. My body destroyed, the soul that animates it will fly to another and continue the same life of irresponsibility. No one will

be able to rebuke or punish me, because I am not the one who does evil: it is the spirit of others that works in me ”.

All of this is horrible, and yet it is logical. The convinced and logical spiritist must renounce his personality. The spiritist personality is the soul, only the soul ... the body being just a heavy machine.

And there are dignified men who subscribe to such atrocities. And there are others that lead to cretinism to the point of proclaiming that spiritualism is scientific, it is moralizing!

Our century, proud of its inventions, is downgraded by the most stupid depression imaginable.

## **V. The God of Spiritists**

Do spiritists believe in God? What will your god be, if spiritism is presumed above the Almighty?

Opening the catechism to find out who God is, we find this brief and profound statement: God is a perfect, eternal spirit, creator of heaven and earth.

This is the truth that the whole world accepts, - I say the whole world, not the spiritists, because they are neither of this nor of the other world: they are of space, of the kingdom of nebulae and birds.

The true, unique God is one who, being one in essence, is triune in people. This is the God of Christianity.

Spiritism does not recognize this God: It despises him, ridicules him. Now, there is no other true God.

Rejecting the one, spiritists are left without God: they will be atheists.

Spiritists speak, without ceasing, in the name of God, in the attributes of God, but in practice they deny God, his attributes and even the divine essence itself.

Pagans also speak of their god: whether Baal, Bacchus, Jupiter, Brahma, or whatever.

When spiritism insists on showing itself as a believer in God, it sometimes falls into pantheism, now into polytheism.

Having Kardec once asked his family spirit, which liarly claimed to be the truth, if "God is a distinct being, or the result of all the forces and intelligences gathered in the universe", he had this answer: "God exists; you cannot doubt; this is essential: believe me, do not go any further; do not want to get into a labyrinth, where you cannot leave "(Spirits' Book, c.I, no.14)

Now, simply affirming the existence of God, without going any further, inquiring about the essence and infinite perfections, is to open a wide road to pantheism.

This is followed by spiritism, by the "lying truth" of its master Kardec.

This same thousand-thousand-master teacher teaches that "spirits are eternal and that, although imperfect in origin, they are able to reach perfection, and when the human spirit is no longer obscured by matter and has approached God, understand it ”.

Therefore, the spirit of man can become omniscient; being eternal and omniscient, it is God.

The perfect spirits will be just as many gods.

In this case, spiritism may have an incalculable number of gods: the god Cain, the god Judas ... perhaps even a god Trotsky, Lenin, Calles.

It is, therefore, very clear: - Spiritism does not admit the fact of the creation of beings, by God taken from nothing.

For him, everything outside of God exists, they are simple modifications of the absolute Being.

“Humanity, says Kardec, is not limited to the land or time. Before the earth existed, there were other worlds, in which incarnated spirits (men) went through the same phases that “now go through the most recently formed spirits”.

Now, this is positively absurd. It is to deny the creation of man in the image and likeness of God, in time, and not from eternity.

It is to deny the unity of the human species. It is to deny the real distinction between created beings and the supreme Creator. It is, after all, bumping into absurd pantheism. Logical consequence, irreparable!

Spiritism denies the true origin of man, his nature and his last destiny; he must therefore also deny, and in fact deny, his nobility, his elevation above all other irrational and insensitive beings, as well as his supreme and complete happiness, after the glorious resurrection.

All of that falls, disappears, like a building disappears if we undermine its foundations.

In the spiritist concept, there is nothing in this world but evolution. Evolution of spirits that are improving, or becoming more and more perverted.

Hence it follows that man is not distinguished from the brute; the spirit is not distinguished from matter.

Now, this! Where are we going to stop? Is man, then, the very same thing that irrational beings, with only the slightest difference in their outward conformation?

I recognize, now how inferior are spiritists! I feel sorry for them and start to understand a little why they did so.

To say that the bicharada is a modification of the absolute Being! Poor people! How this doctrine is doing me, giving me astonishment and chills!

## **VI. Conclusion**

Spiritists teach that “if man does not reach perfection in one existence, to become eternally happy, he will have to reincarnate one or more times”.

I do not know if everyone understands this business of reincarnations well through a happier existence than the one we live in, through the contact of cheap and insulting scholars and doctrines.

Finally, let the master of those who, in the gallery or in the press, constitute the champions of lies speak.

Kardec says that souls or spirits exist since eternity (first blunder). These souls, he adds, fly in space like flocks of birds of arrival (second blunder). To see a soul take a body is to incarnate (third blunder). To leave this body in its soul is to die or disincarnate (fourth blunder).

If this soul did not reach perfection in previous existences, it reincarnates, taking another body, until it becomes a perfect spirit (fifth blunder). Here is the spiritist doctrine,

To these five nonsense we would add those that we have hit here, with the weapons of truth and good faith.

Let us now, for an instant, follow the course of these principles, examining them in the light of common sense and sound science.

Souls have existed since eternity, not being created by God, for the Lord comes after, being only a perfected spirit. Now, existence precedes improvement; therefore, spirits existed before God.

And where do they come from? Will they know how to say it? Had they grown up in a vegetable being, made an incarnation of an inferior spirit?

But such spirits are not completely "spiritual". Let us remember the perispirit of semi-material casing and lynx eyes ... which, in spaces, seeks to discover the formation of any body, in order to take possession of it ... They penetrate everything and everywhere.

One cannot live in peace, surrounded by evil spirits, mockers, chatters, blasphemers, etc. etc.

The world is full, and we, poor humanity, think we are still living alone! How horrible! what life! what a torment!

They are true microbes, as they present themselves under all forms; or rather, there are no more microbes: there are only spirits: spirit of tuberculosis, spirit of leprosy, spirit of madness, spirit of fever, stegomy and anopheline, etc.

And this discovery is called spiritist science. This reminds me of the story of the steward of a northern municipality in the state of Pará. He was an honest, kind man, rich in persevering work, in the days when rubber was gold, he was the mother of the poor. One fine day he was appointed municipal steward, The brave man really deserved it, but, unfortunately, he couldn't read. After the election, the vowels made it clear that in view of his high dignity, he should learn to read a little and sign his name. The quartermaster did not make himself deogado, and behold, the next day, under the baton of the schoolmaster, in a private class, the man was spelling the ABC. He made serious progress and in a few days he knew by heart all the bá, bé, bi, bó, bú, even zá, zé, zi, zó, zú.

He was overjoyed, Walking the streets of the city, he repeated to everyone: Look, your friend, you better study; science is an admirable thing! We know everything, understand everything! It is a new life that begins for the old ... It cost, but, anyway, I already know. And there begins the monotonous and repeated spelling of ba, bé, bi, bó, bú, even zá, zé, zi, zó, zú.

And the compadres stood looking at the blue of the sky, gaping, ecstatic at the wisdom. Your friend, it's admirable! ... and did you learn all that? ... What good government are you going to do! ...

Every time they talk about improvised tribunes and spiritist writers, the old man of the friar also tears with mild commotion and barely represses the sobs of joy that shake his chest, when he thinks of the baubles of spiritism, repeating, under the whitened mustache: As now we will live happily, now with so many knowledgeable spirits that surround us under the scientific light of the lectures ordered and the brawny and discourteous rebates!

The lesson will continue, as this is only the abc of spiritist science ...

## SECOND FLASH

### **Beauties of reincarnation**

To see a soul take a body - it is to incarnate, says Kardec. Let us examine this false assertion in the light of reason and common sense.

The space is populated by souls or spirits, and as I have already indicated by Kardec's own words, these preserve their personality distinct from the body, which is only a material, transitory envelope that surrounds them. This union operates through the perispirit, a semi-material substance, by virtue of having to join the spiritual soul with a material body.

And for that, the genius Kardec invented his famous semi-material glue. Let us note, in passing, the stupidity of the invention. There are only two orders of true states: the spiritual state and the material state.

Kardec, however, understands to obtain a wrapper, or perispirit, which constitutes a third state and the entire basis of spiritist science.

Now comes the incarnation ... Such spirits must incarnate, that is, "get into the flesh.

But, let us note well, that such an incarnation can be done (Kardec says it) in the three kingdoms of nature, that is, in the mineral, vegetable or animal kingdom; in other words, the spirit can be incarnated in stones, plants or animals ...

### **I. Spiritist science**

The time for incarnation comes. - Notice the absurdity: to incarnate, to get involved in the flesh of a stone, or of a stick, in the flesh of an ant, cockroach or fish. The good Kardec could have invented the terms of stoning in the mineral, dressing in the vegetable, getting stuck in the aquatic, zoofitating in the animals, etc., etc. and fit into the human biped ...

Finally, in a matter of science, assumptions precede experiences, experiences give birth to facts, to which the terms are adopted ...

The old friar comes to bring his pebble to the spiritist monument, the proclaimed science of madness.

For now, let the term be incarnate in stone, wood or donkey!

So here is a brute spirit that deserves only stone ...

for there is no lack of a good stone, and, behold, the devil of the spirit seeks a stone to get into it ...

Here it is. Beaten by the waves, washed by the seas, insensitive, cold, inert, but, at a given moment, the spirit descends, penetrates the stone, fixes on it through its perispirit, and here is the stone, inert and raw, made into a being alive, intelligent, for every spirit is intelligent.

The stone is there, but it sees, hears, feels, grows and develops, because the end of the incarnation is the development, the perfection of the spirit.

Do not object to anything! This is scientific in the spiritist wisdom, where people must believe everything and examine nothing - do not object, since a stone has no eyes to see, ears to hear, or organs to grow.

Shut up, man, you don't understand spiritism ... You have eyes to see and ears to hear. This is cretinism of the Roman Catholic, who still believes in God; emancipated spirits, freed from the yoke of God, Christ, the Pope, the bishops, and the "shadow of the cassocks" of the priests, such spirits are far above such ignorance.

The spirit - any one of them - has its perfect personality, outside and inside matter. Soon, the spirit sees, hears and grows on the stone.

In fact, everything that lives must feed and grow. The stone lives by the incarnation of the spirit, therefore, it must feed and grow.

What does it feed on? How does a stone grow?

Until today, I judged, because they taught me in chemistry, that a stone increased by addition, from outside to inside. But this is Catholic. Kardec makes the stone grow from the inside out ...

Frankly, I'm afraid of the rocks. Until yesterday, man was supposed to be the king of creation, in peace and harmony with everyone, considering himself safe in his authority and power, and behold, suddenly, in the light of the spiritist lamp, everything changed, covering the stones of eyes and ears, mouth and teeth to destroy the kingdom.

Only now do I begin to understand the advantages of spiritism. I see how spiritist science is a great thing, - a sublime, luminous thing! And until yesterday I had understood nothing of it. It was necessary for the spirit lamp to dispel the shadows of my friar's intelligence. I just have to thank ...

## II. Spiritist reincarnation

Let us continue our scientific research in the spiritist field. After the incarnation of the spirits, according to the wonderful Kardecist teachings, on the stones of the sea, the road, the rocks and the houses, there is the incarnation in the vegetables.

- But, how will this work? I handled the commentators of such doctrine, on the case, and concluded that they were inclined to the hypothesis that the other kingdoms did not prevail over the vegetable.

From the seed the tree grows and when of a certain size, behold, some of their spirits fall in love. If the spirit is in progress, that is, after having completed its first existence, in any mineral, after disincarnating from the stone, right, it will put itself in the heart of the tree.

There is life here; it is better, there is no doubt. And, behold, the noble spirit expands, breathes, raises its lush hair to the heavens, stretches its arms in space, sets its feet on the earth ... and thus, firm and elegant, it will open its eyes, ears, mouth, to see, hear and communicate your impressions to the road travelers.

When he sees a Catholic pass by, he is indignant, as is natural, and, looking at him with disdain, he will whisper: "How ignorant, this man!"

And when passing a cassock? How horrible! A shade of cassock !!!! ...

But when he sees, in the midst of the forest concert, a vulgar indoctrinator, pouring out Kardecist insults, will extend his wide green arms, in a fraternal embrace of tenderness. Joyful sobs will shake your arboriform chest, a tear will sparkle in your follicular eyes, while sweet words will fall from your green lips: - Save, a thousand times, save!

And, continuing in Latin, (because the spirits also know Latin), the tree will continue: hodie mihi, cras tibi! ... Here I am today, tomorrow you will be!

O sweet colloquy! A spiritist should never be indifferent to a vegetable. With a soft smile on her lips, she should embrace him, a material body of an immaterial spirit, oscillate him affectionately, and murmur a few words of consolation.

We Catholics greet our friends and acquaintances when we meet them. We offer them union, always a handshake, at least a look of kindness, a sign of affection. And the

spiritists, so superior, so fond, are indifferent to the little brothers on the road, the bush and the backyards! What black ingratitude!

But there is worse than that. Spirits that cut off the vegetable itself, that cut the wood, that burn the wood ... Everything is a few bodies of spirits!

They shed their blood, tear their veins, hurt their meats, dissect their entrails, and these members, still throbbing with spiritual life and radiant with semi-material fluids, are thrown into the fire, there, by their death, sustain the lives of other spirits!

Spiritists thus become true anthropophages in the middle of the 20th century!

And at the contact of the ax that destroys him, the spirit shakes its wings, and almost paralyzed by the semi-material glue of the perispirit, it takes flight to the blue spaces of the firmament, hoping that it may return, one day, to incarnate again, in any more perfected tree ... fruitful, perhaps, after having produced by its breath and the fluid of its entrails tasty vegetable products, to be able to leave the prison green again and to incarnate itself in any animal body.

But, nothing is done by leaps in nature, says philosophy. It cannot be suddenly that the spirit, after being in the trees, can take possession of the body of a superior animal.

Rather, it must pass through the lower animal kingdom, through the natural history called zoophytes.

Here, then, is the spirit at the bottom of the sea, now made polipeiro, where thousands of polyps will develop, grow and die, each being an aquatic spirit ... What a legion of spirits in the corals and the sponges that populate the deep ocean!

And the transition is progress, because in the bark of the wood the poor spirit could not even move; nor would he give a hug to the neighboring spirit, nor would he punish the boy who stole his fruits ...

Now, yes, armed with tentacles, behold, he will be able to uphold the upper worlds ...

Here he is armed at the bottom of the ocean, until one day any cetacean, disturbing his spiritual life, or any iron ship anchor, or any submarine, snatching him from his secular pedestal, sending thousands of others to the firmament. spirits, adjusted to the cavities of their polipeiros ...

They become bodies without a soul, without a spirit ... But any reckless sailor, who did not know how to do his duty, soon falls into the sea, and the polipeiro will be revived by the reincarnation of the sailor's spirit, which will become like sea grass. .

Don't laugh! For that is what science says and educated people must always respect science and scientists. No admiration. This explains certain facts that are the domain of the Kardecist sect ...

### **III. Armies of reincarnates**

Always on, always in progress! Such is the motto of science. Spiritism, too, in order to progress, has even gone to the bottom of the sea, and, after immense struggles, it has reached where we are, the men of the land. Remember, however, that spirits are not from the earth, they come from the moon, from space, from the high regions where only the astronomer's telescopic vision or the searching eye of certain improvised "scientists" penetrates.

In order to be always impartial when exposing spiritist theories, it is necessary, from time to time, to remember Kardec's words, which form the basis of reincarnation: - "Man, he says, is made up of three essential parts: the material and sensitive body ,

analogous to that of other animals and animated by the same vital principle; the soul, an incarnated spirit, whose housing is the body, and the perispirit, a semi-material substance, which serves as a wrapping around the body. The soul has two envelopes: one subtle and light, which is the perispirit, and the other material and heavy, which is the body” (Spirits’ Book, Chap. 2, n.135,141),

This is what should be remembered, to conceive the spiritist plan in the most absurd of your inventions, which is reincarnation.

“The spirit is eternal, but imperfect, and able to achieve perfection”. This is still Alan’s. So far, we have followed the progressive improvement of an inferior, imperfect spirit, through the vicissitudes of metempsychosis, or transmigration of the soul from one body to another. Let us continue this curious study, until we reach the perfect man. Successively, this spirit was perfected, passing from stone to tree, and from tree to polipeiro ... We left the mineral and vegetal kingdom and entered, finally, among the lower animals of the land, the sea or the firmament.

Here, then, is the spirit that has reached the degree of the animal kingdom; this is the spirit like an animal. But, in order to avoid jumping, he must spend a few years in the skin of the lower animals: ants, greens, in short, flies, cockroaches, beetles, etc.

Don't be surprised! This is spiritist science - and in spiritism, the more a blunder is gross and flattering, the more it must be accepted blindly.

Here, then, is the incalculable underground army of ants and hawks, the aerial army of flies and beetles and the homemade army of termites and cockroaches, all animals of reincarnated spirits!

Spirits are everywhere; and among them are good and bad, destructive, mocking and impure spirits.

Great God, what a danger! While we poor bipeds, unwary and smiling, are dreaming of plans for the future, peace, unity, order and progress, behold, beneath our feet an enemy army is stirring, greater than that of the great European war, that digs, that gnaws, that undermines, that destroys, opening true undergrounds, digging volcanoes and chasms ...

And all this is done by intelligent spirits, whose end is the destruction of humanity, to carry out other reincarnations.

And if it were just that! But, while undermining the sole support of our pedestrian bases, behold, the house that shelters us is being slaughtered by the termite spiritist, while other spirits, in cockroach bark, destroy, dirty and poison the foods that must sustain our life. ...

Great God, let's go home ... It's a danger!

And while the poor man tries, at the neighboring farm, to escape the eyes and teeth of the rodent spirits, behold, another spiritist army plucks his hair, punctures his skin, sucks blood, excites the nerves, ignites the epidermis and makes of man, the most peaceful, a true dancer, dancer or ... spiritist speaker.

Great God, what a life ... Only spirits! Spirits everywhere: spirits on earth ... spirits in the air, spirits at home and on the farm, spirits even on people's clothing and skin, because even there parasites penetrate, more daring than pulex penetrans, and more ferocious than the maribonds.

It is a life of cannibals ... The lower spirits suck, injure, feed on the higher spirits that are us!

At the site, we are surrounded by dangers. Any mocking and executioner spirit, incarnated in a coconut tree, is capable of throwing a phenomenal coconut into our abdomen, while a cashew tree crushes our nose with its fruit, or a hose breaks the brainer with a mango.

Run, man, run! But, behold, in the flight the stones perk up, and another mocking and brutish spirit sits on a rock behind him, while another fierce spirit, hidden in the sting of a maribondo, penetrates his poison dart on his forehead ...

Run, man, save your life! Here it is, on the white sand of the beach! There, at least, you will find peace.

From the interior of the sands, however, the pulex penetrans spirit appears, the foot bug, which, without preamble, puts an army of other animals under its nails, while flies, beetles, mosquitoes and grasshoppers, all excited by ferocious and executioner spirits, they invade his face and hands.

Run, friend, run, maybe you will find some relief on the lakeside. Nothing! Just arrived, the man throws himself into the water, to cool his scorched forehead and breathless heart. But what a horror! Water is nothing but an agglomeration of horrible spirits, incarnated in the millions of insects, worms, small fish, frogs, frogs that bathe there and settle in. This time, the man fell into the spiritist arms of an armed army. ...

Better death than such a life! Just becoming a spiritist, so you can fly into space ... But go, man, don't get discouraged: one spirit kills another. To overcome so many evil spirits, swallow a glass of spirit from the spirit ... from the cane. Against great evils, great remedies!

Here is the spiritist science ... Tell me, my readers, is such an invention not splendid, and do inventors not deserve a free entrance to the asylums of the alienated?

It is what we can conclude from the rigorous principles enunciated by the founder of the sect and that many industries cover themselves under the pseudonym of Alan Kardec.

#### **IV. Poets from beyond the grave**

Perhaps someone would say that I am exaggerating, and that spiritists do not teach such successive incarnation?

There is no exaggeration. Here are some verses published by the living, but dictated by the dead.

Lately, spiritists have published a volume of verses by the spirits, entitled: "Parnaso from beyond the grave", and there we find verses, sonnets, of all the dead poets, that they made, flying through space, or reincarnating in any macaw.

Here is a curious specimen, made by the poet Augusto dos Anjos, and entitled: Voices from a shadow. Up there, on the moon, the shadow itself speaks, sings and even makes verses! It's to break the monotony of the moon! But listen carefully:

*Where do I come from? from very remote ages, from very elementary substances,  
emerging from cosmic matters, I come from invisible protozoa,  
From the confusion of embryonic beings, From the tiny cells of bacteria.  
I come from the eternal source of origins.  
In the whirlwind of all vertigo,  
In deep and enormous substantiations,  
Of the silence of the invisible monad;*

*Of tetrical and deep abyss, black and horrible, Vitalizing multiform bodies.  
I know I've evolved and I know I'm from the earth's work in the world,  
From the land in the large and immense abdomen; I suffered from internal  
torpitudes  
Of the microscopic and rude larvae,  
The infinite disgrace of being a man.*

Augusto dos Anjos.

Let's stop here. It is enough to prove that spirits, without judgment in this world, have not changed in the next.

Our great poet was once a microscopic larva, included in the abdomen of the earth ... and evolved ... until he became an invisible monad, then a protozoan, then a frog egg, then a frog, a rat, a cat, a goat, an ox, a horse, a monkey, and , anyway, man. He's the one who tells it ... and why not believe it? He does not say whether, being a monkey, he already wrote verses.

And today, what will he be? What animal or bird will he have reincarnated in? Crow, nightingale, well-seen-you, or canary?

And these poor spiritists tell such follies with serenity, as if they believed.

Poor poet ... you better go back to the realm of protozoa, and hide in the tiny bacteria cells! It must be the best address for a poet spirit!

The reader is seeing that there is nothing exaggerating, describing the series of reincarnations, and my narration of this world agrees perfectly with that of the poet from the other world! The only difference is that I write laughing, and that he sings crying.

## **V. Do you find scientific firewood**

It is time to study the reincarnations of higher spirits.

As they improve, through successive reincarnations, says Kardec, they will reincarnate in higher bodies.

This means, in a clear spiritist exposition, that the spirit, after having passed through the stone, through the vegetable, through the inferior insects, finally comes to reincarnate itself in the most important animals in the zoological scale.

Having been a diligent ant, a filthy cockroach, a voracious rat, a destructive termite, or even a flea on his feet, the spirit, more and more beautiful, after a few days of vacation in the bluish firmament of birds, reincarnates in the skin of any cat, dog, goat, monkey, calf, cow, ox, donkey, mule or horse.

Agree that it is a huge progress! The spirit, which barely knew how to groan, already knows how to howl, bark, howl, neigh, meow, or whine. The spirit that knew nothing but to screw, suck or inoculate poison, is already equipped with a regular jawbone, with safe teeth and sharp nails ... There is no doubt, that is progress!

Here, then, are the luminous spirits of airspace destined, as Kardec says, to one day become like God. For God, for Alan's proselytes, is nothing more than an ordinary perfected spirit.

Here they are, one in the leather of a cat, hunting for cockroaches, grasshoppers and mice; others on the dog's skin, devouring the entrails of a dead animal, or gnawing on rotten bones; others, still, in goatskin, to spoil plants and trees, gnawing at their new

leaves ... Others, even, encouraged by the donkey, to transport stones, sand and firewood, perhaps for hated Catholics; others, at last, grazing in the green meadows and fields ...

All of these are imperfect spirits, but in full improvement, through metempsychosis.

If the spiritist uproar would stop there ... But, no; goes further, always goes forward ...

One day, when the cat, the dog, the goat, the donkey, the ox, or the horse succumb, for different reasons, (admirable thing!), behold, the spirit, luminous and radiant, leaving the rented house that was that body, he throws himself into the spaces, and after a few days of rest, because he was so tight on the poor animal, he will go down, look, examine, and in return for having been a dairy goat, ox fleshy, vigilant dog, or hunting cat, will be able to reincarnate in the skin of any fool or any fool.

Before he can become an illustrious man (a speaker or a spiritist doctor), he must spend years and years constituting the ass of any idiot, the top of any Chinese, or the tail appendage of any chimpanzee.

Only after this preliminary training will he be able to penetrate the body of a regular man, worthy of the name.

This is the spiritist evolution of spirits. "If the soul did not reach perfection, in previous existences, says Alan, it reincarnates, taking another body, until it becomes a perfect spirit".

Note that here we assume that such a spirit is always faithful to its purpose and can, in this way, progress progressively.

Such are the conclusions of spiritist theories.

We must not omit the last conclusion, which is more accessible to the spirit of those who have little interest in studies and which refers to parents of families.

You are parents! You are mothers! In your arms, on your knees, the small, shaky little person, who you call "my little boy, my little girl", shakes, jokes and laughs; whom you cover with hot kisses, because it is a piece of your heart, of your body; the blood of your blood; the flesh of your flesh, the radiance of your conjugal love.

This little child, whom you love as yourself, whose smiles and whose first speech enchants you and are worth to your tenderness all the harmonies of the earth; that makes you forget the sweat on your face, the calluses on your hands and the wounds on your feet, to bring you daily bread and the comfort of education; this sweet, sweet, sweet, radiant little child, whom you call the most tender and most moved names, whom you cover with the warmth of your heart, even more than the smile on your lips - O fathers, O mothers, forgive I wanted to shut up, I feel my heart revolting against my penalty, forgive me, but the infamous spiritism screams at you:

- Fathers, mothers, this child is not what you think, not as you call it, baby, my little angel, my heart, my life; all of this is false; this is all Catholic; but, no, this child is simply the spirit of a cat, of a rabid dog, of a murderer ... Cast him out, far away, in the dung of the house; it may be an unclean spirit, the soul of a Judas, a Cain, a prisoner. And do you kiss her? O foolish father! Do you press it against your breast? O mad mother! Do you work to see her happy? Do you sacrifice yourselves for it?

Fathers, mothers, spouses, if a man came to your house to tell you all this, what would you answer? I know it! ...

You would not say anything ... however, taking a log of wood, you would make it describe a slight circumference, to finish, in a straight line, on the back of the disturber

of your happiness ... you would experience if the spirit leather is used as drum skin, or if it's just a fool's wrapper.

And you would be in your self-defense. The log of firewood would sometimes make a scientific argument, irrefutable. It is only these arguments that the spiritists understand. Religion and spiritist science are summed up for them in the "find of firewood".

Well, that's what they are saying, teaching, proclaiming in the face of everyone, the spiritist speakers who exploit you. They are insulting you in the most sacred thing you have on earth, after the religion of Christ.

And what can they deserve, facing your love, your acknowledgment, kindness? - "Finds" firewood, certainly, and scientific firewood.

## **VI. Devilish Science**

We come to the center of our study on reincarnation, the post where lapse best appears, the insanity of its principles.

There are religious sects, as there are occult sciences throughout this world, that lack a foundation, principles and common sense, but there is no sect as foolish and stupid as spiritism.

The principles of the new sciences are necessarily incomplete and flawed, but they can never disgust common sense and contradict certain and irrefutable principles from other sciences.

On the contrary, one science must serve as a basis, support and guide for others. Mathematics is the basis for geometry, engineering, agronomy, cosmography, etc.

Chemistry, basic and conducive to therapy.

Anatomy leads to physiology, histology, pathology and hygiene. The drawing serves as a basis for painting; grammar, literature, etc.

None of these sciences, whose principles are solid and proven, can be in opposition to each other. This is admitted by all who understand science and intend to penetrate its secrets.

A single explanation persists in wanting to be religion and science; breaking all divine and natural laws, and against everything and everyone, destroying religion, it intends to be religion ... and abjuring all the data and principles of science, than being science.

But, patience, spiritists, we are not on a scholarship or life regime, or believe, or die!

Modern society is not an agglomeration of fools, idiots, who cannot distinguish between colors, shapes, principles, or conclusions.

God Himself respects the human intelligence created by Him, and constitutes the noblest and highest part of our immortal soul. God has revealed true religion to us, but He does not impose it, without us being able, without having to study it, examine it, ponder it in the light of reason, as in the light of revelation.

God has given us religion with its dogmas and divine mysteries, where everything is harmonious, deep, in harmony with our spirit, our heart and our body.

We feel that the very mysteries that he reveals to us, and the weakness of our limited spirit cannot understand, are above our intelligence, never in contradiction to our intelligence.

God respects our freedom, and you, O spiritism, you dare to want to impose on us your ridiculous mysteries that disgust common sense, that contradict our intelligence, and treat inventions, studies of twenty centuries like filthy rags. of civilization.

You reject God, man, eternal life, human sciences, universal common sense, and you have the crest of shouting that you are the light, the truth, the progress, the perfection! "Vade retro, Satanas!" Back! You are the devil; you are the antichrist, you are the ruin, the desolation! You're crazy! No, we will never accept your dogmas, your mysteries because they contradict our intelligence and all acquired sciences! We want to see and we are seeing.

And what do we see? It is madness in its highest exponent ... Madness in the spirits, and madness in the sick audacity with which it presents itself to the face of an educated people.

## VII. Conclusion

What we have been discussing about reincarnations is enough for an intelligent man to rise up against such sickly delusions that can only germinate in the brains of the insane, the fascinated, the possessed or the subjugated.

This division, by the way, was already made by Kardec himself, predicting, without a doubt, that his followers would go down there.

We summarize, in a few words, the errors exposed, to better understand the beauty of spiritist conceptions. But, no, I prefer to quote here a clear passage from a spiritist organ, a quote that will have the advantage of showing that I did not invent anything, but I interpreted the spiritist teachings impartially.

I have before me a "spiritist profession of faith", made by one of the sect's choruses. It is not a profession of Christian faith, it is purely spiritist, pantheistic and materialistic ...

It lists the main branches of creation - the work of the Almighty, and says: "And the soul sleeps in the stone and in the fish of the ocean, and finally awakens within the human body".

Here is what is very clear and what summarizes my entire study on reincarnation, previously exposed.

So, according to such a profession of faith, the human soul, a very simple, spiritual substance, essentially free, before taking its respective body, already "slept on the stone", and then started sleeping in the insignificant protozoa, to follow the evolution until it constitutes man.

Now, to affirm the soul-stone, the soul-fish, before being the human soul, is to destroy the essential distinction between spirit and matter; it is to fall into materialism and become suspicious of absurd pantheism; all the more grounded suspicion, since it is true that many Spiritists profess this doctrine.

Alert, Brazilian Catholics! Do not be deceived by the tricks of diabolical spiritism. These unfortunate preachers, who advertise him, are men already fascinated by evil spiritism, which deceived and paralyzed their understanding and will.

Fallen, by their vices, in this pitiful state, they are guided like blind people, they are subjugated like slaves.

They say and write so much and such nonsense, that soon you see the brain badly screwed. They assume they are wise and become stupid. Christians flaunt themselves

and show themselves idolatrous. They take on the appearance of charity and beneficence and drag their supporters into the asylums of the alienated.

No, no, not a thousand times. Spiritism has nothing to do with science; is the destruction, the denial of science ...

for it is the negation of human intelligence, the basis of all science. Undermined the base, the building must collapse; contrary to common sense and throwing true facts to the feet in the light of intelligence and divine revelation, man is slaughtered from his pedestal of "creation king" to become a vile animal.

Such a science contradicts all human sciences, as it contradicts the doctrines of the divine Master.

It is enough to be judged. It is his death sentence: *Mentita est iniquitas sibi!*

You are right: indeed a "diabolic science", never human, to lose men and prepare the kingdom of the antichrist!

### THIRD FLASH

#### **The esoteric circle: The communion of thought**

As faith decreases in souls, superstition develops in spirits. Man cannot live without faith. Like it or not, you have to believe in anything.

Monsignor Bougaud said anywhere: "Man has to bow his head, and not wanting to prostrate himself before God, in a gesture of supreme adoration, he prostrates himself before a creature, in the attitude of an animal".

It is what we are seeing daily; in fact, it is the application of the adage of the ancient philosophers: *Corruptio optimi pessima*.

Our modern society rises to fantastic heights, due to the intelligence it searches, analyzes and invents; but when this society intends to emancipate itself from God, then, yes, it descends from its glorious throne and becomes involved in the most disgusting of the mudflats.

Spiritism is the weapon of ignominy that moral decay imprints on our century of material progress. It is like the balance of progress, because this progress, not being supported by God, and not being guided by religion, becomes a materialistic progress, exalting matter and demeaning the spirit.

Spiritism is the modern antichrist. He goes on his way, attacking and blaspheming, and, defeated on one ground, takes refuge in another. Tearing off his tunic, with which he covers himself one day, he wears other rags, so that he can continually present himself in new clothes, and under renewed aspects.

One of these new tunics is the esoteric or zotic circle. And it is this new aspect of spiritism that I want to study here.

#### **I. What is esotericism**

This esoteric circle is a branch of spiritism, it is spiritism itself, which aims to attribute to men a creative power.

Spiritism, by its principles, is deistic, that is to say it admits the existence of God, but not the providence of God.

Ultimately, spiritism, due to the progress it makes, progress that proves only that it is human and not divine, falls into the pantheism or system of those who claim that God is everything.

As long as someone turns away from the one truth, he falls from error to error, because the truth is one and the errors are many.

The esoteric circle is like the pantheism of the spiritist sect. Its principle is that man, by his intimate nature, is divine, even though his divinity remains hidden by the veil of the flesh. These are your textual words.

In Catholic doctrine, it is taught that man is composed of body and soul, material body and spiritual soul, created by God in his image and likeness.

Being the soul created by God, or the work of God, it is clear that such a soul is not of God and has nothing of God but spiritual resemblance.

The worker is necessarily distinct from the work.

The worker is God. The work is our soul. One must therefore be essentially distinct from the other.

Spiritist-esoteric friends think it best to confuse worker and work, and say that all of this is God. According to them, man is God hidden by the veil of the flesh.

The flesh is nothing but a dress of God. Here he dresses with the white and pink flesh of the European; there he dresses with the black meat of the African; further on, it sinks into the yellowish flesh of the Chinese. - And always God, but God who changes his dress, according to the weather, the countries and the diseases. Each man is a dress of God.

Bela What a beautiful invention! ... And they came to discover this in the 20th century ... Anyway, anyone who is unable to invent gunpowder, invent at least a dress for God. And God has to put on this dress, be it the skin of a Zulu or any idiot, the skin of a spiritist or a Turk.

From this esoteric principle, adherents draw this admirable conclusion, which I copy here verbatim from their manual.

Hi-lo: "In the future, philosophy will be something more than mental gymnastics; science will supply materialism; religion will be anti-sectarian; man will then act with all justice and love his brother as himself, not because he expects a reward, or fears a post mortem punishment, or because of human laws, but only because he will recognize, that he is a part of his fellow men, and that he and his fellow men are part of a whole and that the whole is One",

As you can see, man goes up ... In the beginning it was a veil of God, a dress of God; it is now a piece of the next; and he with all his neighbors are God Himself.

What a beautiful theory, but not for hot days, for people not to fall asleep in the face of so much pretension.

You can see immediately that everything is pure pantheism. The spiritist is a deist; the esoteric is pantheist.

## **II. The purpose of esotericism**

The purpose of esotericism is to join a piece of God to other pieces of God, which are men, and, by assembling these different pieces, to build the complete and whole God. God, thus divided into parts, naturally loses its full strength, like everything that is

divided. It is necessary to join and unite these parts in order to have the complete God in this way.

And how to do that? It is very simple, they say.

The communion of thought is established. Thought, for esoterics, is the strength of the soul.

Through this inner strength, they say, and only they could say it, because a sensible man would feel chills when saying such absurdities. Through this inner strength, man will overcome indolence, free himself from ignorance in the realm of wisdom! It's really admirable! ...

and it would be sublime, if it weren't too silly.

Every part of God, who is man, - it is always the esoteric masters who speak, - is a piece of fool ... but all these pieces of indolent fools, when they come together, will form the supreme force, the divine force, the realm of wisdom.

It is the same as saying that the gathering of one hundred illiterates will form a scientific body, or that two hundred roceiros will form a medical board, or that a thousand blacks will form a battalion of whites (!).

For the love of God, esoteric ladies, stop being stupid; be, if not wise, at least people, and this is not people.

The accumulation of zeros will never give a figure, as the communion of thoughts will never pass from thoughts. Thought is not a force, it is a notion, an understanding.

It is the will that is a force in man. Man can be wise by thought, but he can only be strong by will. To say the opposite, is to assert that man is skilled in handwork, when he knows how to run with his feet. Don't confuse everything, people! ...

### **III. Soul message**

For the idiocy to be accepted, it is necessary to give it a pompous name.

It is the story of the roceiro who wanted resounding names for his children that would attract attention; for this reason he called the first, to follow the alphabetical order, with the name of Amancebado, the second called Bombardino, and finally the third called Cavalgadura. Spiritists use the same procedure. An epileptic or hysteric is called a medium. A hysterical or nephropathic attack is a trance. A pointless bluster is a message.

And the gathering of thoughts of a number of nephropaths is called a message from the soul. It is necessary to know the spiritist vocabulary that is almost worth the Masonic dictionary.

In order to receive such messages from the soul, the spiritist indicates an hour, withdraws, joins his thought to the unknown thought of other spirits, and ready, there comes strength, light, such a radiogram through space. The message of the soul is done! ...

And there are idiots who still believe that! Was there really? I doubt it ... But, it is a way of life, and today, in this time of crisis, the digger of life enjoys everything. Spiritists evoke the dead, silence the living and speak to the dead.

The exoterics, having lost their thoughts due to lack of intelligence, invoke the thoughts of others, thinking they receive from this evocation light, warmth and love!

What to do then? Our Lord there said it: stultorium infinitus est numerus - the number of the crazy is infinite. (Ecli 1.15). Most spiritists today end up in madness, thus giving a solemn affirmation to divine words.

Just as there are madmen who believe they are emperors, kings, generals, the poor esoteric, at the appointed time, through space, in silent, imperceptible waves, thinks he is receiving the influence of the thoughts of others. He's a poor patient ... it's a craze like any other ...

The end of esotericism is, as they themselves confess, the study of the occult. This indication is enough for us to see that such esotericism is nothing more than a great superstition, a ridiculous, absurd and gross superstition.

Listen to this little piece of the esoteric manual: "Occultism has always lifted, to the extent that its initiates can advance, the veil that covers the great mysteries of the universe, whose laws and forces are only known to great initiates".

Down with the hat ... O Brazil, and go on with the music! ... The esoterics finally found the philosopher's stone, which changes darkness into light, misery into riches, ignorance into wisdom.

And, to obtain all this, it is not necessary neither studies, nor research, nor God, nor demon. Just send the name, address with R \$ 30.00 contribution to the esoteric center, then send another R \$ 20.00 annually, and that's it ...

The sky opens, the horizon recedes, the darkness dissipates, and the new associate lives swimming in gold, in light, in love, in fraternity, while the spiritist directors majestically pocket the copper, light the cigarette, cross their legs and give a joyful laugh, enjoying the health of the fools who provide them with livelihood and fun.

It's heaven on earth! ... It's heaven for esoteric explorers. But the land remains for the poor skinned victims. Courage, gentlemen, it takes a lot of courage! ... But do not be discouraged: courage is transmitted in ethereal waves, in ethereal bottles, at the will of the esoteric. Just open your mouth and swallow the precious and mysterious invisible, impalpable, odorless fluid.

And how does this esoteric center work? It is a very simple thing. Each one can try it, without having to pay an annual fee of R \$ 30.00.

The esoteric secret is the following: At a given moment, people withdraw, and say in a loud and clear voice what they want and don't have, but say it as if they really had it. For example, being in misery, having no bread for the children who cry, nor work with which to earn daily bread, the poor man will say, facing east: I am a happy man, I am rich, I lack nothing! ...

And this esoteric thought will join with the same thought of other esoterics, in the same condition, and these individual forces, uniting, will form a creative force, so creative, that juicy bread will appear on the table, in the kitchen, rice and beans, for the worker, service and money ... Isn't that beautiful? .

If it doesn't work, at least they will save the R \$ 30.00 from the registration at the center ... And if it works, just continue ... Here goes the esoteric recipe. This is the message of the soul. This is esoteric activity.

## **V. The creative force**

This is called the creative force. Let's see. A mother loses her dear child; death had savagely pulled it out of her breast and arms. The mother cries, laments, and kisses the

face of the dear child with painful transport ... she prays ... and she resigns herself under the eyes of God.

EsThe esoteric, however, has another medium and another language. If the mother is enrolled in the esoteric circle of the communion of thoughts, she must do otherwise. She will stand, face turned to the east, and with a smile on her lips and eyes full of luminous tears, she will cry out: - I am a happy mother! My son who has just died is full of health and life, he is smiling at me, extending his little arms and asking me for a kiss ... And this cry will also join the cry of other mothers who cry the dead little boy also with invincible homesickness. And each cry, being a divine, creative parcel, fortified by the parcel of the others, will develop, strengthening itself more and more, until it becomes a divine power, and, in one move, in the blink of an eye, will resurrect the child

dead. Kissing his head and looking at the bed, which was once a mortuary, this bed will have changed into a throne of life and health ... and there will be the son full of health, happy, smiling, offering the rosy forehead to the heat of maternal kisses ...

How sublime this is! ... Will there be people who doubt? I do not doubt it, because I am absolutely sure that it is a great joke, and where there is certainty there can be no doubt.

But in the end, any weak spirit can doubt it. Well, for this one, just experiment. It is not necessary, for this to be in the esoteric center, because that center does not have the interruption button of such ethereal waves in hand, nor can it facilitate or prevent circulation, so there is no need for such inscription, not even the expenditure of R \$ 30.00.

Such is the practice of esotericism. As you can see, the reader is a practice of idiocy, of spiritism, of superstitions, and nothing else; it is a practice that makes a man of common sense laugh, as well as a cry for those who believe in this practice.

But today the world is like that - it wants to be deceived.

## **VI. The key to harmony**

To discover the clowning is to unmask it. That's what I want to do with such an esoteric center, which is rather a zotic center, (zote in Castilian means goofy, idiot).

Such esotericism is just a manifestation of a spirit of idiocy, or perhaps of stupidity. It may also be the product of hysteria and epilepsy. The truth is that it can never be the product of healthy, intelligent thinking.

We found new evidence of imbalance in the way such an esoteric hour should be performed. Esoteric society gives its initiates a small manual of instructions reserved for their brother's personal use, which is called the key of harmony ... which is nothing more than a key of disharmony and from which I will extract some authentic pieces.

The esoteric time is at six o'clock in the afternoon. It is time to plant the mental or psychic seed, says the manual. Interesting planting!

It is at this time that all zothics come together to, by zothic thinking, build a creative force! ... creating zotism.

"This is a state of complete abstraction (says the manual) in which the individual pays no attention to the phenomena that take place inside and outside himself".

It is quite idiotism or zotism. This is not in the manual; is my own.

The book continues: Sit down comfortably ... (This is easy!) Relax your mind and body, close your eyes and be perfectly still for a few minutes. Let your body soften by itself and make no effort. You will thus enter into calm and absolute peace. Then say to the Key of harmony (And always the speaking manual, the esoteric manual. Here is the formula to recite, in this

sweet beatitude of idiocy): "I wish harmony, love, truth and justice, to all my brothers in the esoteric circle of communion of thoughts. With the combined strength of the silent vibrations of our thoughts, we are strong, healthy and happy, thus forming a link of universal brotherhood. I am satisfied, at peace with the entire universe and wish all beings to fulfill their most intimate aspirations. I give thanks to the invisible father for having established harmony, love, truth and justice among all his children. So be it".

Such is the great zotic prayer. Reciting this, there are no more evils in this world. It is a kind of cocaine that sleeps hunger as well as suffering. There is no more God or demo, there is only the invisible father, and this father is not God, it is the gathering of all initiates of such zotism.

Poor God! Poor people! Can a sensible man take such superstitions seriously? Can not. Unfortunately, there are insane people, and for them such esotericism, or idiotism, is worth more than religion and God, because it is the product of an unbalanced brain and poor people who are in this category.

There is an element of self-suggestion in this practice. Nothing else. Such self-suggestion can be a stimulant, but it cannot be a principle, nor a seed, nor a state, nor a creation. The esoteric poor take the effect for the cause, the disease for health, the dream for reality.

Thought can stimulate us to act ... but by itself it is sterile ... far from being a creator. It is the big mistake, the absurdity of such esoteric thinkers.

## **VII. Pantheism**

If the practice of such a communion of thought is extremely ridiculous, the source from which it springs is supremely impious. And this anti-religious and impious side is what should be highlighted here, to show its wickedness and its perverse consequences.

Such a practice is an emanation of pantheism. What is pantheism? It is the doctrine of certain dreamers who say that everything is God.

The devil has several paths that lead to his tower of Babel, or to lies. It takes men with their own inclinations and presents them with a religion that matches their own tendencies. Since you can deceive them and keep them from the one truth, you are satisfied, regardless of how and by what means.

He presents deism to men who believe in God. God exists, but he does not care for this world.

To the friends of the positive sciences he offers empiricism, making him believe that God, although he exists, cannot however be reached, not even known.

He seduces sensual people through materialism, which says: There is no God, there is only matter.

To the reflected, philosophical spirits who seek to go beyond matter, he presents the speculative path of pantheism, showing them that God exists and that this God identifies himself with the universe, so that everything is God.

From this false and lying trunk two pantheistic branches sprang up, to satisfy everyone's dreams, and to distance everyone from the only Christian truth: The theory of emanation, which teaches that divine substance radiates, everything needs to emanate. To the theory of immanence, which attributes to God reality, exclusively while he exists in the world and for the world.

It is this latter theory of immanence that the esoteric circle has adopted as the basis for its mad elucubration of the communion of thought.

For them each thought is a force, and this force is a portion of God, a tiny portion, but which gains strength by the combination of other thoughts. This union gives you or restores you a creative force. This creative force performed the beautiful miracles described above, which are nothing more than ghosts, dreams and hallucinations.

It is enough to point out these gross errors, for common sense to refute them outright. God exists, it is certain. God is the supreme being, the creator of all that exists. Now, the artist must be distinguished from his work.

God is eternal, perfect, unchanging, infinite; the world is finite, limited, imperfect, changeable. Now, God cannot be both infinite and finite, perfect and imperfect, creative and created, immutable and changeable, what would happen if God were not distinct from this world. It is a gross error that disgusts common sense, as it disgusts our conscience.

Based on this principle, the esoteric circle is, therefore, an absurd error, a proof of ignorance, madness and a sign of imbalance, as indeed the whole spiritism is.

### **VIII. Conclusion**

The esoteric circle of communion of thought is one of the branches of spiritualism; it is a kind of introduction to spiritism. Every year the center of São Paulo publishes the Almanac do Pensamento, which would be more accurate to name the almanac of the crazy. It is a spiel of spiritism, superstition, astrology, magic and everything that can serve to sow doubt and stupidity in the human spirit.

If you believe in such explanations, everything would be determined in life, and man would become an unconscious machine. This world would be ruled by the moon, so men are just a bunch of lunatics.

And it would be the spirits who would direct the sun and moon ... Poor humanity, where are you going?

Years ago such absurdities would have been repelled and scorned; today, however, there are people who believe in this and who, before leaving home or doing business, consult without blinking the "Almanaque do Pensamento",

Every month the circle distributes a pamphlet of infamies against God, against religion and against the Catholic Church. .

However, the superstitious sect, as it is a true sect, writes in the head of its institution that "it does not conflict with any religion, sect or creed".

It is the demon's eternal camouflage. He wants to appear innocent, neutral, in order to better spread the poison and sow hatred for God and his holy Church.

### **Can a Catholic enter this esoteric center?**

- You can't in any way. The zodiacal circle is a perverse, anti-Christian institution, all based on superstition and on the condemned spiritism.

It is a low and miserable exploitation, a lie, and, as they themselves confess, it is a cult of occultism and witchcraft.

And that would be enough to attract the contempt of every sensible man.

So, far from us, the esoteric circles, the writings of such a center, its magazine of thought, its crude almanac ... because all this is nothing but low and shameful spiritism.

the truth is only one. Spiritism is condemned by the Church as anti-Christian, anti-social and anti-religious.

It is a real plague. Let us flee from it, in whatever form it appears. You can't play with fire! ... You can't argue with crazy people.

### **Second angel of darkness:**

#### **PROTESTANTISM**

1. Satan's inkwell.
2. The Protestant bible-ball.
3. First of all ... lie.
- 4, Protestant conversions.

#### **FLASHING ROOM**

##### **Satan's inkwell: The origins of Protestantism**

It is told in the story of Luther - it is he who narrates the fact - that one day, in the castle of Wartburg, while the revolting friar was translating the Bible, Satan appeared to him. The king of hell wanted to personally come to thank Luther for the demolition and perversion work that had begun, and perhaps he intended to give Luther a hug from a friend, or even a fellowship kiss.

Satan's scalp was so repellent and the smell so disgusting, that Luther was amazed, horrified, and instead of giving his father Satan a well-deserved hug, he threw the inkpot he was using in his face.

The contents of the ink cartridge, however black, did not stain Satan's scalp ... already so dirty ... however, this ink cartridge became historical and even historian.

Luther's inkwell became Satan's inkwell ...

and out of this diabolic inkwell came the Protestant sect, with its thousand branches, divisions and subdivisions of Protestant Lutherans, Calvinists, evangelists, Baptists, Sabbatarians, Presbyterians, some as black and as perverse as the others.

It is all ink from the same inkwell ... from Satan's inkwell.

## **I. The carrion and the worms**

Luther was the father of the litter, or rather the grandpa, because his children were in charge of multiplying the young, as the worms multiply in a rotten carrion. The carrion does not generate the worms, but everything that contains microbes and unhealthy germs develops quickly.

*Gloria peccatorum stercus et vermis est*, says the Bible (1Mac 2.62).

So in the Lutheran carrion. Everything that was unhealthy, addicted, perverse, was soon attracted by the nauseating smell of Luther's carrion ... and in the blink of an eye, microbes developed, multiplied in the midst of the apostate's rot.

Satan's inkwell became a hotbed of Protestant sects. The world was divided into two parts: The Catholic part, united, cohesive, firm, invariable; the Protestant part, composed of the moral rot of the world.

Whoever was unable to be a Catholic, became a Protestant; but, as the truth is one, and the errors numerous, such Protestants have been divided into hundreds and hundreds of erroneous sects.

São Paulo said admirably: whoever does not adhere to the truth, must believe in iniquity (Rom 2,8). The Lutheran carrion thus served as food and a nest for the development of all errors, all vices and all passions; as animal carrion serves as a pasture for all microbes, worms and pestiferous animals.

Luther was the father of Lutherans, Calvin of Calvinists, Zwingli of Huguenots, Henry VIII of Anglicans, John Huss of Hussites, Wicleff of Wicleffites, Knox of Presbyterians, Russel of Russelists, etc., etc. as many opinions as there were heads.

## **II. A negative religion**

It is a never ending: a true black ink cartridge, from where it comes, not truths, but dirty, black stains, which constitute the character of Protestantism. The tree is known by its fruits, said the divine Master (Mt 7,16). The fruit of Protestantism is division, disunity, fragmentation, protest ... and all of this is negative. Now, religion cannot be a negation, it must be a statement. It is Saulus affirmans ... *hic est Christus*, of the Acts (At 9,22).

Protestantism can only deny what the Catholic Church says, so its religion is the denial of Catholicism; Nothing else. And São Paulo, writing to Timóteo, indicates this disposition of spirit very well: I begged you to stay in Ephesus, to notify some who did not teach otherwise, and do not indulge in endless fables and genealogies, which are more useful for fights, than for the edification of God, which is founded on faith ... aberrating of which, some gave themselves up to empty speeches; wanting to be the doctors of the law, without understanding, neither what they say, nor the things of which they make the statement (1Tim1,3-8).

Here is the image of the false Protestant pastors. They are ignorant or perverse, as we have proven hundreds of times. Ignorant, because they should study Catholicism as it is, and not as represented by slanderous Protestant writings; perverse, because they make pastorate a means of exploitation, losing souls and proclaiming themselves doctors of the law.

Instead of seeing the negative side of their sect, they should look at the positive side; and this care doesn't even exist. They are unable, such doctors of the law, to present a religious thesis without attacking the Catholic religion.

And why don't they attack spiritism, communism, divorce, etc.? These, yes, deserve a stick, for being perverse elements of religion and society.

But the Catholic Church, what harm did it do? It only does good, as Carlos Pereira confessed, in his: "Latin America". Why, then, be throwing the stone at him? ...

Why, O shepherds? Because your sect is one of hatred, resentment, persecution and slander. Now, if such vices are condemned in individuals, how much more in a religious system!

### **III. Multiplication of sects**

Let's go to the practical side of the question, to the inkwell of Satan, to see, both its content and the doodles that come out of it. Only diabolic things can come out of a diabolic inkwell. Such a tree, such a fruit, said the Master. Such an inkwell, launched by Luther against Satan's scalp, is already an imbalance. This physical imbalance produces an organic and inevitable imbalance: what has always been the physiognomy of Protestantism. The historical diagnosis of the sect clearly reveals this organic imbalance, which is manifested by the fragmentation into sects.

As soon as Luther had assembled in Germany a stick of minions under his flag, and, behold, Zwinglio, in Switzerland, in a box, raises another sect, while Calvin, in France, recruits a new sect, enemy of the Church and enemy of his Protestant brothers. Older. England, for its part, judges itself with innovation rights; Henry VIII, by hanging his wives, in order to restart the comedy, founds Anglicanism.

Each sect intends to possess the pure gospel, hating one another, and having only one common thread: it is its hatred of Catholic truth. Lutheranism, Calvinism, Zwinglianism and Anglicanism, four names, four parties and four factions, all supported by the Bible, who never knew how to work together in a coherent whole in their doctrinal unity. For all of them the Bible is clear (they say), it is the word of God, it is the base of their sect, and with that they profess completely opposite doctrines.

Where does such hubbub and divergence come from? Only the lack of truth. They turned away from the single truth and fell into the thousand errors that surround this truth.

In each of these large sections the smaller sects abound. Anabaptists, antinomists, Socinians, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, fight in all Protestant countries.

Thereafter, each century saw dozens and even hundreds of new factions appear. Satan's inkwell has become an inexhaustible source of dissension, discord and sects.

Any unbalanced, fanatical or hysterical head that felt strongly enough to open new religious horizons to humanity, gathered adherents, built a shed, and founded a church. In Germany, 37 regional churches were registered a few years ago, not counting the free churches.

In England there were, in 1900, close to 300 sects. In the city of London alone there are over 100.

And in each sect, confessions of faith follow one another like leaves on a tree!

The United States takes the palm, and breaks the record of sectarian multiplication. Official reports close the astonishing figure of 288 sects. Its followers change their sect, as they change stores: where they sell cheaper.

Nobody thinks about a real Church anymore ...

the error is everywhere ... and each sect is nothing more than a football club or touring club. The Americans left the title of church, to adopt the name of evangelical denomination.

Everything there is evangelical: God, devil, Saint Michael, Satan, Caiaphas, Pilate, Judas, Barabbas, Saint John the Baptist, as Holofernes ... everything is an evangelical denomination.

Even the tower of Babel enters the dance.

And there are people who take it seriously!

It takes a lot of courage.

#### **IV. Nearly 900 sects (in 1950!)**

As a curiosity, and to better distinguish the product of Satan's inkwell, we scroll through the list of such sects for an instant. Only the name indicates the source and the error.

The patience to accompany me and count: - Lutherans, Calvinists, Zwinglians, Anglicans, Methodists, Anabaptists, Regular Baptists, Six Principles Baptists, 7th Day Baptists, Free Communist Baptists, Adamites, (those who walk in Adam's garb ), antinomists, trinitarians, antitrinitarians, socinians, latitudinarians, gomarists, episcopalians, presbyterians, huguenots, hussites, quakers, adventists, unitaries, free methodists, primitive methodists, westerners, Africans and independents, new Jerusalem, retired, regular and old Presbyterians school, spiritualists, bible christians, wesleians, estercorários, nipples, shepherds, mormons, pentecostals, supralapsaries, adventists, congregationalists, collegians, facientes, lagrusiantes, indifferent, multiplying, blessed, labatistas, scaqueros, sumpers, gloaners, millenários, rationales, wifeldenianos , generationalists, sonteistas, adiaforistas, enthusiasts, tires, int erimistas, berboristas, evangelistas, lutero-calvinistas, baptists, menicerianos, puritanos, sabaritanos, armeniosocianos, colônio-zwinglianos, osiandianos, lutero-osiandianos, estanerianos, antipresbiterianos, lutero-zwinglianos, syncretinianos, synergianos, ubiquistianos, ubiquistas cesederianos, cameronianos, philistines, mariscalianos, hofinsianenses, necessarias, edivarianos, priestianos, viliefcedrianos, ambrosianos, moravios, monasterianos, antimonienses, anomênios, munsterianos, clanculares, grubembários, estabários, baculários, nudipedes, sanguinos, sanguinos, sanguinos, sanguinos, sanguinos, sanguinos, nosagreios, sanguinos, nosáveis, sangueiros, sanguinos, sanguinos, confedos, sanguinos, sanguinos, sanguinas, sanguinos, sanguinos, nosáveis, anoerados, sanguinos, nosáveis, anoerios, sanguinos, sanguinos, nosáveis, anoerios, seixas, sanguinados, sanguinas? , austere, taciturn, joyful, demonic, weeping, free, spiritual, concubines, apostolic, potters, conformists, episcopalians, countermeasures, anticonvulsants, brownists, evangelists, mystics, conscientious, reassuring, calvinists, menovists, socialists, puscists. So far 134. Who can resist telling the rest?

Want more? There are still 760 sects left.

## V. Shattering

How is it possible to take the Protestant Bible seriously, since it makes the number of sects multiply, as well as the languages in the confusion of Babel! 900 Babels in place of the worldwide unity of Catholicism!

When Protestantism separated from the Catholic Church, it immediately suffered the greatest biblical confusions, and the geena of continuous digressions took place among the first sects.

From new to new, the newest sects are shattered into brand new ones, as seen in the following sample of the Methodist sect, which, for

to prove its fragility, it shattered into 10 fragments, which are 1. independent methodists; 2. Canada's methodism; 3. episcopal methodism; 4. southern methodism; 5. Protestant methodism; 6. methodism; 7. color methodism; 8. African methodism; 9. Congregationalist Methodism 10. African Episcopal Methodism Zion.

How much divergence instead of the unity of faith. And why even today they despise the invitation of Pope Pius XI, addressed to dissident Christians to return to the faith Catholic?

Whoever studies the numerous variations of Protestantism in its miraculous proliferation, will be convinced that this anti-evangelical Babel can never be the new law and the divine beacon in the dark seas of life.

No! Faith, in the analysis of all doctrines, must categorically present as an inalienable and fundamental concept, the intangible unity and the perfect coherence of all its articles.

The despair of Protestants themselves is so great because of the babelic confusions of some "900 pure gospels", that some already intend to consider the truth of beliefs as "useless", as the Protestant author, Paulo Stapfer advises: "Since so many beliefs have lapsed, let them fall and do not replace them. Let us do better; above all, let us abandon this error that the truth of religious beliefs is essential to the Christian".

It is as if someone says in mathematics: "Although someone teaches that the circle is square, and someone else considers it as triangular, it is enough that we cultivate mathematics because the truth of teaching does not matter."

In the turmoil of contradictory doctrines in which the sects perform their dances and contradictions, there are, in fact, hundreds of affirmations and denials - round, square, triangular - about God, Jesus Christ, the Bible, Lucifer, eternity, etc.

## VI. Disagreements and disagreements

In order not to fatigue the reader with countless quotations about these differences between the biblical pastors, we present, just as a curiosity, the inquiry, opened by an American, Mr. Betts, among Protestant "missionaries". He did a questionnaire to be answered by 700. And got the following result:

About God. - 13% of missionaries and 36% of Protestant seminary students deny or question God's omnipotence; 12% of missionaries and 62% of seminarians, immutability; so do 58% of ministers and 95% (!) of students, with the creation, told in Genesis.

About Jesus Christ. - They talk about him mellifluously, but say that he had a father and mother like other mortals, 29% of ministers and 75% of seminarians; that is equal to the Father, deny 24% of ministers and 56% of seminarians.

About the Bible. - When they started, the Protestants stated that for them the Bible was everything. Today, they deny or question the divine inspiration of the same, 2% of Lutherans, 34% of evangelicals, 38% of Baptists, 60% of Episcopalians, 70% of Methodists and 92% of Seminarians. It's a dread! May the Bible contain stories, like mythological legends, support 21% of Lutherans, 44% of Baptists, 63% of Evangelicals, 82% of Presbyterians, 87% of Methodists, 96% of Seminarians.

They are too much enemies of the devil to the point of denying their existence. They will do little harm to Satan with such denial. On the contrary, they touch water for the mills down there. Of the Methodists, 65% do not trust the devil and doubt his existence ... Same, 32% of Baptists and 83% of Congregationalists.

There are still some who deny even the afterlife.

Let's stop here. The enumerations given are more than enough to assess the stormy rise of Protestantism to the culminations of the greatest confusion that has ever existed in the world: "biblical Babel".

The painful aspect of disorganization in the world of heresy, if we must fill our hearts with compassion for the fate of our errant brothers, it will also offer us plenty of reasons to bless the ineffable goodness of God that gave the true Church the system of pontifical infallibility, for which 400 million Catholics retain the clarity of the same faith, in the doctrinal and moral sense, united around the rock of S. Pedro, where the evil of the sects can never rise!

## **VII. Where's the unit?**

Nor do the well-known Satanists appear on the list, who are the EXs who became Protestants because of a skirt: example: Oscar Oliveira, from Campinas, the Jóia, and not Gioia, from S. Paulo.

And do not say, as certain pastors do, ashamed of their Protestant decline, that there is among these sects a fundamental unity in creeds, these names being only denominational varieties of their historical life. This is an ignorant argument.

Anyone who knows a little about the various Protestant sects knows that there is no connection or doctrinal agreement between them. Many of them are completely opposed to each other, and profess radically contrary dogmas.

Where will the Protestant unit be? It does not exist, it never existed, it will never exist, because it is the error, and the error is multiple, as the truth is only one. Unus Dominus, un tides, un baptismum. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, says São Paulo (Ef4,5). That is what is fundamental.

Protestantism is all divided: it rejected the only Lord, for joining one of the sects of Luther, Calvin, Knox, etc. that there are so many lords, how many sects they represent.

They rejected the single Faith, because, among the 900 sects, there are not two that profess the same faith.

They rejected single baptism, as there are more than fifty different baptisms among them, and different sects even suppressed baptism.

How can they be with the truth? Either São Paulo is mistaken, saying that unity is the hallmark of true faith, or Protestant friends are deluded in the mix of their beliefs!

The conclusion is therefore strict: Where the unity is, there is the truth. Such unity is not in Protestantism: it is, therefore, an erroneous sect. She is in the Catholic Church; that's where the truth is ... the only truth.

The Catholic Church, throughout the world, and in all centuries, professes the same Lord, preserves the same faith, administers the same baptism: - unity is the seal of truth. We must try to preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, says São Paulo (Ef4,3). "

The 888 Protestant sects retain no unity and no peace, as they continually seek to wage war on the Catholic Church: - they are, therefore, wrong.

The unity of faith is the image of the unity of God, and the characteristic of the children of God, says St Paul (Eph 4,1-14). The various Protestant sects have no unity; they are, therefore, separated from God, while the Church preserves this divine character entirely and without restriction. It is, therefore, the only true Church.

The rest is nothing more than doodles from Satan's inkwell.

## VII. Conclusion

Poor Protestants, who allow themselves to be deceived by low exploiters, who call themselves shepherds, but who are nothing but ignorant, addicted or obsessed fanatics; open your eyes ... and have the courage to see the truth: it is one.

The Catholic Church appears to you, through the calumnies and prejudices of your pastors, like a monster, like an executioner, like a Babylon.

They are hollow words of low slanderers; the truth is different. Examine closely, and for yourselves, what the Church is, and you will find it beautiful, majestic, holy, divine, such a luminous beacon, which illuminates every man who has come into this world.

Poor Protestants, you are worthy of pity and compassion, for you are deluded; the culprit is this miserable, fallen, exploitative caste, which you call shepherds, and who, in biblical language, are devouring wolves (Mt 7,15), lupi rapientes.

Do you not see that those whom the Church rejects, as unworthy, become your guides? You are ex-priests, addicted, fallen, unworthy, unable to keep your chastity, seduced by the skirt, who become your high masters!

Poor masters! They are men without faith, and without morals solely concerned with accumulating money without working; advocacy rulers, unable to earn a living, who become the leaders of Protestantism.

Fallen Catholics have become Protestants ... serious, educated Protestants have become Catholics as daily newspapers show us.

Poor Protestants, it is time to shake off the yoke that such teachers impose on you, and to resume the soft and sweet yoke of Jesus Christ, which the Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church preserves and represents.

## FIFTH FLASH

### **The "Bible-ball!" Protestant: Comrades fight**

Protestantism is a real club for fun and fighting. Today there is football, basketball, volleyball, etc. There is also the bible-ball, this is the bible made into a ball (bible: bible) in the hands of Protestants, to have fun and fight with each other.

## I. Health and Diseases

Each Protestant sect is necessarily an enemy of the Catholic Church, just as error is an enemy of truth. But what is worse for Protestants is that each sect is the enemy of others - they fight, they hate each other, they insult each other, they bite each other, until they can no longer.

It is a fight with friends. If the Church intervened in the fight, ah! ... then they would all be united by politics; two fingers would be given - not the whole hand, to attack the common enemy.

This is natural: The truth is one, Errors are many; and all errors are opposed to the truth, absolutely, as health is one, and diseases are many, all opposed to this health, When a Christian falls ill, illnesses come together to fight his health and take his life. One disease is often opposite to the other; they even fight, but to disturb their unique health, they all combine admirably and form an army, which often wipes out the science, goodwill and efforts of the most famous doctors.

Protestantism is not a religion; it is a denial of religion, just as disease is a denial of health.

Protestantism is a disease; each sect is a disease; and just as there are many diseases to destroy a single health, so there are also many Protestant sects to attack the one Catholic truth.

This notion, very accurate, explains how the sects multiply to infinity.

Every day we see a new one appear, as in medicine, every year, we see new diseases appear; they are practically the same, but a new name is given, a new tunic ... a new and ready remedy is prescribed: this is called progress.

The ancients said that someone suffered from the chest; successors said it was tuberculosis; moderns say it is physical; tomorrow they will say that it is pulmonary breakdown.

In the past, there was talk of brain fever: today it is meningitis; - it was once bleeding from the nose: today we have an epistaxis; eye disease became ophthalmia, kidney disease, lumbago; the cold, scrofulous moods; and phlegm, runny nose.

It is the law of progress, in the name, at least.

Once the enemy of religion was wicked, atheist, heretic; today it is called Protestant, Socialist, Bolshevist, Communist, etc. They are only Protestants: all of them, such as the illnesses that attack health, are errors that protest against the unique truth: - they are Protestants.

And these Protestants, according to the most salient error, take different names, as the disease, according to the way it attacks an organ, takes different names.

The stomach is only one, however, depending on the illness that disturbs it, its disease is gastritis, gastralgia, indigestion, gastric embarrassment, hematemesis, cancer, etc.

The lungs are a single organ, however, the disease that attacks them can be bronchitis, pneumonia, pleurisy, phthisis, pulmonary congestion, hemoptysis, emphysema, asthma, whooping cough, etc.

So it is with Protestantism. It is the denial of Catholicism, just as the disease is the denial of health.

The Catholic Church is one, as health is one. The great disease, according to the organ, or the Catholic truth, which attacks, becomes Baptists, Evangelists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Sabbatarians, Adventists, etc., etc. It is all one, at the bottom, but one attacks baptism, another, Sunday, another, the Eucharist, another, the Pope, another, good works and so on.

They are diseases, daughters of the great Protestant disease, all having one purpose: to destroy health or the truth.

The name doesn't matter: it's a disease, that's enough. Every disease is bad and it ruins health.

## II. Comrades fight

But it is time to watch, for a moment, a fight between Presbyterians and Baptists.

The two sects are in "field". It is interesting the fight of the two compadres.

Listen to the summary of the fight made by a Protestant "ex-Presbyterian, and today Baptist" of the bible-ball party.

The document was sent to me by a Catholic. Listen to this: "The Baptist Church had to go through, despite professing to have only the Bible as a full rule of faith, and not

teaching contrary doctrines, I repeat, it had to go through hard and disconcerting embarrassments, when, in 1925, the church Presbyterian, by its official organ “The Puritan”, of May 7, 1925, responded to an attack made by the Baptist newspaper against one of its teachings and challenged, at the same time, the Baptist church, in the following way: “Our colleague, “The Jornal Batista”, a few days ago ... showed the desire to give the splendid amount of a thousand contos de réis for a single case of child baptism that was found in the New Testament, in a positive way ”...

“If, because we do not have an absolute proof for infant baptism in the Bible, this takes away the value of the doctrine, tell us here the purity of the good thing in the newspaper“ where the colleague is with Sunday and not Saturday ? ” Can the colleague show in the New Testament or anywhere in the Bible, in a positive way, a commandment for keeping Sunday? We give the colleague two thousand contos de réis if he presents it to us ”.

As for the proof of infant baptism, the Presbyterian church did not receive the prize offered for a thousand contos de réis because it was unable to show a single case, within the Bible, of children's baptism.

Nor did the Baptists receive the two thousand contos de réis offered, because they could not and cannot find, anywhere in the Bible, that Sunday was kept by any servant of God in the old dispensation; and, in the new, by Jesus or any of the disciples and apostles, before or after the death and resurrection of the great Teacher and Savior ”.

### **III. 3,600 prize tales**

These Protestant people have lots of money! Baptists promise 1,000 short stories to Presbyterians if the latter prove, through the Bible, that a child can be baptized.

Presbyterians, even richer, promise Baptists 2,000 short stories if they prove by the Bible that the Sabbath is not the Lord's day.

The case is serious! He can lick his lips to any hungry person. It is true that it is very poor who cannot promise. I am also going to do a challenge to Baptists and Presbyterians, promising them the prize of 3,000 contos. Promising costs nothing, as they do.

And to win these 3,000 contos, you don't have to be very clever, or exegete. I just want people to prove to me, by the Bible, that we can shave our beards, because I read in Leviticus (21: 5): “They will not make your head bald and they will not shave the tip of your beard, nor will they hit you your meat ”.

This is clear and positive. However, I see Protestant pastors, who must have been the successors of the Levites in the Bible, walk bald, bald, shaved, powdered, perfumed, and even with razor blows in the flesh, which is absolutely forbidden.

I think that good and true biblical scholars, like me, should grow their beards and hair, and forbid the use of a razor. This is what is biblical.

I ask the two fighting cronies to examine the Scriptures well and to quote me the text that portrays this order of Leviticus, not to cut the end of the beard.

I offer a prize of 3,000 contos. Come on, dear friends, in this time of crisis, for 3,000 contos, it is worthwhile to spend your fingers, saliva and a bible, to discover the requested step. 3,000 contos for Baptists and Presbyterians.

These 3,000 contos will be paid immediately by the 1,000 contenders by the Baptists and the 2,000 by the Presbyterians, which I will win, proving to them that they are

both right, against each other, as one disease is right against the other; but, that both are wrong about health or the truth.

It is as if the lungs demand from the stomach that they have no reason to be physical; and the stomach to prove, by the Bible, that they have no reason to have gastritis.

Both have the same right, both kill the man.

Both Protestants are also right, but they kill the truth.

#### **IV. 1,000 tales of Baptists**

Do Baptists want proof that children should be baptized? Yes; I also want proof that you can cut your beard.

But every issue has a positive side and a negative side.

There is, in the Bible, a positive text; but won't there be negative texts? If there is no order, there is also no prohibition.

Now, in dubiis libertas, say theologians. There is no order to do; there is no prohibition; we can and must and act in this case as prescribed by legitimate authority.

Baptists are right: there is no positive text in the Bible; but won't there be negative texts? If there is no order, there is also no prohibition.

Go, teach all nations, says Christ, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son of the Holy Spirit (Mt 28.19).

Do children not then belong to the human race?

Aren't they a part of the nations? If they are, they can and should be baptized.

The Catholic Church, a faithful interpreter of the Bible and the traditions of the early centuries, adopted the baptism of children. That is why Baptists, as good Protestants, are, reject it.

Listen to Dionísio Areopagita (from the 1st century): It is a tradition that comes from the apostles, that children should be baptized (Eccl. Hier. Cult.).

Santo Irineu (from the 2nd century), also says: All those who are regenerated in Jesus Christ, that is: children, young, old, will be saved (Sup. S. Lucas) São Cipriano (from the 3rd century), writes for his time: It seems to me that the children are baptized even before eight days (Lev. III epist. ad fid).

2nd century traditions, so close to the apostles, are sufficient arguments to resolve a doctrinal doubt.

No positive prescription and no prohibition exists. It is necessary, therefore, to resort to the history and traditions of the first centuries to see the meaning of the words to baptize, all nations. It is what the Catholic Church does and practices.

Who's right? The Catholic Church alone. Give me the 1,000 escudos, dear Baptist, to pay anyone who finds the requested text, who gives me a license to shave his long beard.

#### **V. 2,000 short stories of the Presbyterians**

Presbyterians, founded by the libertine and murderer Knox, get on horseback over the text of the bible.

The seventh day will be the Sabbath of rest (Lev. 23: 3).

They want to keep the Sabbath holy, while Baptists adopt Sunday.

Among them, Presbyterians are right. It is in Scripture, and this ordinance was not portrayed by God: "Keep my Sabbath, because it is a holy day" (Ex 31,14).

It is law, and positive law! Presbyterians are therefore right against Baptists, and Baptists are right against Presbyterians.

Let's see it well. Are we Christians or Jews? If the Presbyterians are Jews, they are right: The Sabbath is the Lord's day (Lev 23: 3). If they are Christians, they are wrong.

Sunday is the Lord's day, for Christians, because Jesus Christ rose on this day. The Catholic Church, following the teachings of the gospel, interpreted the law and the facts very well.

The law is that the seventh day is a day of rest, the day of the Lord. But, to know the seventh day, it is necessary to know the first.

Now, I wanted the Presbyterian friends to show me, in the Bible, that Sunday was the first day and our Saturday was the seventh day.

Look for this text, will you? They won't find it.

The question is therefore resolved by the first day, which must be Sunday.

## **VI. The Sabbath**

The word Saturday does not express the specific day of the week, but, in Hebrew, it means: cessation, rest (shabath). When should this day of rest be?

- The seventh day.

- And what is the seventh? God never determined it.

What He wants is that, after six days, the seventh is consecrated to him.

The Sabbath was the day of the Israelites for three reasons, which the Bible points out:

1) In remembrance of creation: In six days the Lord created heaven and earth ... and blessed the Sabbath day (Ex 20, 11).

2) In remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt: The Lord your God brought you out of Egypt ... therefore he commanded you to keep the Sabbath (Dt 5,15).

3) As a sign of a covenant between God and the people of Israel: They will keep the Sabbath as a perpetual concept (Ex 31, 16).

These three reasons, as noted, are particular to Jews, and as such they enter ceremonies, and not into dogmatic, moral, or universal legislative. As such, the Sabbath is a convention rather than a positive precept.

A word from our Lord confirms this interpretation: The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, he says (Mt12, 12), thus showing that the Sabbath had been instituted for man's spiritual and physical needs, and not as a perpetual precept.

Knowing a little bit of the Bible and exegesis, or the art of interpretation, the issue is resolved with all clarity.

In the old law four types of precepts are distinguished: dogma, morals, ceremonies and national laws.

Of these precepts, only dogma, completed by Jesus Christ, and morality, perfected by him, stood in the New Testament.

As for the ceremonies, they were figurative, and the figures disappear in the face of reality. National and local laws, typical of the Jews, also disappear in the face of universal gospel legislation. This is true and accepted by all: Catholics and Protestants.

Now it is urgent to know in which category the Sabbath observation should be placed. There can be no discussion, if there is sincerity.

The Sabbath does not belong to dogma: it only indirectly belongs to morals. God wants a day of rest - this belongs to the moral ... but, what is this day? this part is ceremonial.

Now, the ceremonial part of the Old Testament was not confirmed by Jesus Christ, it has been abolished.

Like all other precepts of ceremonial law, this part began to fall into disuse during the life of the Savior, and ceased with his death, making it unlawful for Christians, as long as the gospel was promulgated.

Since then, the synagogue was as if buried., And anyone who observed the Jewish legions or ceremonial laws was guilty.

### **VII. Either all or nothing**

The Sabbath being a ceremonial prescription, of course it falls, and can be replaced by another law, by the authority of the Church. To maintain the contrary is completely absurd and illogical.

In fact, if you want to keep the ceremonial prescriptions, you have to keep them all; there is no reason to keep one and despise another.

Presbyterians, who keep the Sabbath prescription, must also keep circumcision (G 17,10), Neomines or lunar days (Ps 113,19), sacrifices (Lv 5,14), burnt offerings (Lv 7,8 ) the oblations (Lv 2,1), the libations (Nm 10,1) the Passover with its ceremonies (Ex 14), the feast of the first fruits (Nm 28,26), the tabernacles (Lv 23,39), the atonement , with the scapegoat Azazel (Lv 16), not to mention any of the thousand particular prescriptions regarding fasting, legal purifications, (Lv3; 11.13; Dt 14.21), civil law (Js 17.14 ), and criminal (Dt 16,18), loans (Dt 15,7), deposits (Lv 6,2), properties (Ex 21, 33), wages (Lv 19,13).

Why, among the multiple ceremonial or national prescriptions, do Presbyterians keep the Sabbath, only the Sabbath, and reject everything else?

Is the Bible sacred, or is it not? If it is, it must be fully accepted: if it is not, then it must be rejected completely, as it no longer has authority.

Why, my dear Presbyterians, do you keep the Sabbath and reject so many other prescriptions of equal value, even the precept given to the Levites not to cut their beards? This is illogical, even absurd.

This is enough to prove that the Sabbath can be changed, as thousands of other ceremonial prescriptions have been changed. It can be changed and has been changed by the \* Catholic Church, for justified reasons.

### **VIII. The Sunday**

The observation of Sunday, in the new law, is not prescribed, neither by nature nor by positive divine law, but by ecclesiastical law, based on the example of the first Christians and the tradition of the apostles.

Let us now see the reason for this change. The reason is threefold, as threefold is the reason for the institution of the Sabbath.

1º) For Jews: remembrance of creation. For Catholics: remembrance of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which is like the end of redemption.

2) For Jews: liberation from Egypt. For Catholics: deliverance from sin, which is the Savior's great mission.

3rd) For the Jews: sign of alliance. For Catholics: a sign of love, represented by Pentecost or the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles, which was done on a Sunday.

This change was made by the apostles themselves, as shown in Revelation, where Sunday is called the Lord's day (Kyriaké heméra).

Presbyterians therefore lose the challenge and the copper.

Give me here, dear friend, the 2,000 contos, so I can pay "to the Presbyterian or Baptist Protestant, who will discover the text that allows me to cut my beard.

1,000 and 2,000 short stories make up 3,000 that I promised.

Do not forget the biblical text: "They will not shave the end of your beard" (Lev 21: 5).

3,000 prize stories, to be paid by Baptists and Presbyterians.

## **IX. Conclusion**

The conclusion is that which I put in front of this discussion. Protestants make the Bible a real game, and each sect is just a club. It is bible-ball.

They kick the Bible, punch it; it's a ball, and this ball has to fly, to the side that the strongest push: bible-ball.

They take a text, interpret it to their taste, and think they have the truth. The Baptist pushes the Bible into immersion baptism. - The Anabaptist kicks the biblical ball, denying baptism. The Presbyterian pushes the Bible for the Sabbath; while hundreds of other bolistas push it for Sunday. It is a bible-ball club.

How, above these fights, stands out beautiful, solemn, majestic, and divine, the Church of Jesus Christ, founded by Christ, on Saint Peter. She does not argue, but, assisted by the Holy Spirit, who promised to be with her, until the end of the centuries (Mt 28,20), she preserves the divine treasure of the sacred Scriptures intact and inviolable.

With infinite care, she compares the texts, handles the originals, compares, consults the ancients of the early centuries, and presents her children with the truth, a holy, unchanging of their dogmas and morals, always supported by the word of God. writing.

Poor Protestants! when will you understand that the divine word is in the Bible and not in your heads? that the truth of the Bible is objective and not simply subjective? that it must be taught by a competent, infallible authority, and not by the head of any ignorant person?

Understanding this, you will leave the vile and lying sect to which you belong, in order to follow the glorious standard of Christ, which the immortal Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church unfolds.

## **SIXTH FLASH**

### **First of all ... lie**

#### **Response to an Evangelist Journal**

São Paulo, in his energetic language, speaking of the struggles he sustained for the glory of God, says that he runs, not in luck, he fights, not as if he whips the air, but punishing his body, so that it does not happen that, having preached others, lose yourself (1Cor 9,26).

These words come to mind when reading a Protestant newspaper that a Catholic sent me, asking me to refute an article contained therein. The newspaper is called "O Evangelista", to show that there is nothing evangelical about it, as certain people with a

very bright color are fond of the names of Branca das Neves, Cândida Leite, Alvinha dos Lírios, Aurora Clarinha, Belinha das Graças .

It is the craze for oppositions. It is also a craze for Protestants. The poor Protestant, having no more of the gospel than the cover, calls himself an evangelist; no longer an elder, he is called a presbyterian; not knowing S. João Batista, he is called a Baptist; being a bohemian of life, he is called a crybaby, and being paralyzed, he is called a hopper; not wanting to work on saturday, he is called a sabbatarian, and wanting to lead the life of a libertine, he becomes impeccable ...

### **I. First of all ...**

But now we go to the article of the “The Evangelist”, entitled: First of all. I ignore the meaning of the title.

Maybe it is first of all ... lie.

The scribbler did not scribble anything; it was plagiarizing old and musty objections, a thousand times refuted, and it was, in the expression of São Paulo, whipping the air, gesturing, shouting at things that don't exist ...

It attacks the Catholic Church, which it does not even know; speaks of abuses, which never existed; he disapproves of uses, which Catholics ignore ... he shouts and blasphemes without knowing what and against whom, just for the pleasure of formulating objections.

Poor Protestant ... it's not worth it. We do not fight an unknown enemy, nor attack a name, but a reality. First of all, a little knowledge and common sense.

To satisfy the friend who sent me the ignorant newspaperman, we went through the formidable objections plagiarized by the father of the article. It is an eternal repetition ...

But, at last, it serves at least to record the truths in the mind: - Ars studii repetitio, said the ancients.

Let us go through that article for a moment, pointing out its contradictions, its errors, and showing, clearly and irrefutably, that Protestant biblism is contrary to the Bible,

The first paragraph begins with a formidable biblical lie.

The columnist writes: “Archbishop D. Duarte Leopoldo e Silva, when vicar of Santa Cecília, in São Paulo, said:“ For a long time, strength is to confess it, the Gospel was, for Catholics, a closed book, a unknown book, and therefore the God of the Gospel is becoming an unknown God. To introduce the Gospel into a home is to bring our Lord Jesus Christ into the bosom of the family, putting the whole family in communion with the word of God ”.

It's a simple saying ... I guarantee that S. Excia. D. Duarte Leopoldo did not say this, for the very simple reason that the Gospel was never a closed book for Catholics; on the contrary, it is the book constantly open, read, meditated and practiced. I do not speak of those who are only Catholics by name, but of those who profess and practice their religion.

The gospel is read and commented on by the vicar in every church on the occasion of Sunday Mass. Magazines, parish bulletins and newspapers publish and explain the same gospel. Catechism, which is the summary of the gospel, is taught in all Catholic churches and schools, as well as within families.

There is a difference between the Catholic and the biblical method, and this difference is already marked in the Bible itself. The prophet Malachi said: The lips of the priests

must keep science, and the people must learn the law from their mouth, because he is the angel of the Lord of hosts (Mal 2,7).

Obedying this biblical law, Catholics, instead of wasting their time and common sense, in wanting to understand for themselves a science that often exceeds their capacity and studies, turn to the priest and receive divine science from him, the law, the rule of life, while the Protestants, rejecting the divine authority of this “angel of the Lord”, raise themselves up as teachers, preferring, in this way, their own ideas to the ideas of the Bible, They are biblists without the Bible! ..

The poor Protestants read the bible, that is, the texts, without understanding anything, such as the Ethiopian comic by Candace, to whom the Lord sent Philip to explain the texts (Acts 8.27). They can also be asked: Do you understand what you are? And they should answer - if pride does not obsess their spirit: - How can I understand, if there is no one to explain it to me? (At 8.31).

## **II. The letter and the spirit**

Catholics turn to priests to hear the explanation; Protestants want to give themselves such an explanation, believing themselves inspired by the Holy Spirit who, however, by a singular contradiction, did not want to inspire Candace's eunuch. Why these preferences of the Holy Spirit? Won't all men then be children of God? Or is God a father to some and a stepfather to others? All of this is extremely ridiculous.

The gospel is therefore not an unknown book for Catholics. The book may be unknown to the illiterate, as it is to Protestants without letters, but for any Catholic the law in the spirit of the gospel is ignored.

Now, what should be known is less the letter than the spirit. The observation is from São Paulo. The letter kills, he says, but the spirit quickens (2 Cor 3, 6). God made the priest a minister of the spirit and not of the letter, he says (2 Cor 3,6).

Protestant pastors are ministers of the letter, and not of the spirit, they are bibles without a bible ...

Another ridiculous mess. To introduce the gospel into a home is to bring Jesus Christ into it, says the pamphleteer. Poor man! So to introduce an accounting book into a house is to bring the bookkeeper into it?

A book is a dead object in itself; Christ is alive.

It is not enough to have the book, it is necessary to know how to interpret it. Candace's eunuch is a biblical example: - he had the book, but he didn't understand it.

Jesus Christ, my dear Protestant, is not a book, he wrote no book, nor recommended any book; he is an authority, and the authority is not transmitted through the book; only ideas are transferable; authority must be a spoken word, and this word is the authentic interpreter of the written word, which we Catholics call the teaching Church, or authority of the head of the Church, whom Christ said: Whoever listens to you, listens to me (Lk 10.16).

Nowhere did Christ say: Whoever reads this book will know my will.

The Old Testament Bible existed at the time of Jesus Christ; however, he never recommended reading his Bible to his apostles; nor that you acquire without a Bible; but he recommended to everyone to listen to those who explained the Bible to them in an authentic way, even if they were wicked and addicted men, since they constitute the

legitimate authority: On the chair of Moses the scribes and the Pharisees sat; therefore observe and do whatever they tell you; but do not imitate his actions (Mt 23,2).

It is clear and irrefutable: The Master does not recommend reading the Bible; he orders to practice it, according to the explanations of the chiefs, capable of interpreting it.

This is what Catholics do and what Protestants do not. The former, although they do not have the letter of the Bible, seek to know with the priests the obligations of the letter or its spirit.

The seconds are limited to the letter, reading and understanding as they want and according to their dispositions, without asking if the meaning they understand is really the true meaning of God.

And no legitimate authority can resolve their doubt, since everyone is equal: pastors and believers, intellectuals and illiterates.

### **III. The unknown God**

The Protestant friend, with a mellifluous voice, and a gallbladder overflowing, continues: Everyone, who calls himself a Christian and does not read the Holy Scriptures, adores an unknown God ... He

is phenomenal! ... but this is called Protestant wisdom! ... So, before the Bible existed - and it was started by Moses in the 15th century before Jesus Christ - men for 25 centuries or 2,500 years worshiped an unknown God.

Our first parents Adam and Eve did not have the Scriptures, and as a result they could not read them.

So they worshiped an unknown God?

The patriarchs Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and others even Moses, did not have the Bible and could not read it; then did they worship an unknown God?

The Bible says and repeats that they worshiped the true God - Et adoravit Dominum (Gn 24,26), but our Protestant, more perceptive than the Bible itself and wiser than the Holy Spirit, comes to tell us that they all worshiped an unknown God .

And in the New Testament, things are even worse. Before Gutenberg's invention of typography in 1430, there were very few copies of the Bible, and the vast majority of the people were illiterate, so that out of a hundred there was perhaps one who owned or could read the Bible.

Almost all of the Christian world worshiped an unknown God.

And today we can still say, that, taking the global population of the world, half do not know how to read - and this in the 20th century - so that half the world adores an unknown God!

Only our brave Protestant adores a known God, and this God is a paper god: it is the Bible itself, He despises the God of the Bible, but he adores the Bible of God. It is a real idolatry!

### **IV. The second commandment**

The musty objection of worshiping images could not be lacking. This is a stone that crushes the conscience of the Protestant, who can only breathe after removing it and throwing it against Catholics.

He continues, always mellifluous: "Dear reader, do you not know the Bible? Do not remain in this ignorance.

I asked ... even the priest, to show you first the 20th chapter of the book of Exodus, where the decalogue is located and pay close attention to what the 2nd says. commandment in which it is forbidden to make images, to worship them and to worship them ”,

Now, yes, the stone fell ... the good Protestant can breathe full lungs. So is it forbidden to make images, in the 20th chapter of the Exodus? But, for whom is this prohibition? ... E ”for everyone, or is it only for Catholics?

Is it for everyone? ... So how do Protestants have images in their homes and not their books? Here I have about 20 volumes of Protestant works, illustrated volumes, with illustrated cover, representing biblical scenes, patriarchs, and even the holy family, Jesus, Mary and Joseph. How is it, dear Protestant? ... It is forbidden to do images or not?

As for worshiping images, this already smells like the antiquated use of 20 centuries. It's so ridiculous that it doesn't even deserve an answer. The friend doesn't even know what it is to worship ... If he did, he wouldn't say he loved images ... as they don't say: having a glass of water. You don't love an image, like you don't eat water. You can worship an image, like drinking a glass of water. Worship and image are two terms that are excluded as the terms eat and water are excluded. Anyway, let our Protestant say: like a glass of water and drink a plate of rice.

In the doctrinal language, to worship means: to worship someone supreme. Now, the Supreme Being is one: - God. Only God can be worshiped. Now, who has ever seen a civilized man worship a statue, or an image?

In the past, savages and pagans, devoid of any religious notion, were capable of this; but today, the most foolish and backward of civilized society knows how to distinguish between God and a statue, between living God and a dead image. Only a Protestant, to come and talk about such absurdities.

God is the only Supreme Being; only he can be absolutely adored. The images are just dead representations, and as such they do not deserve any worship; they only have religious value - apart from artistic and material value - by the person or object they represent.

An image can never be adored; it can only be honored, in remembrance of the person it represents, and always in a relative way. Adoring an image therefore includes the same antagonism as eating water, or drinking meat. Just obsessed fanaticism to say it.

Those who are idolaters are not Catholics, who worship God in spirit and in truth, but, rather, the Protestants, who worship the Bible as a God, despising the word of God it contains. That, yes, is the truth!

## **V. In spirit and truth**

Another Protestant babble ... Listen to the wise biblical scholar: “The rational worship that we should pay to God is that which the evangelist Saint John recommends in ch. 4.24: God is spirit and it is important that those who worship him worship him in spirit and truth. I asked your religious advisor to explain to you the fact that some religions teach the opposite of what is written in the Bible. Ask him whether the Bible is the word of God or not ”.

If I asked my Protestant friend what it is like to worship in spirit and truth, he would be as troubled as a child to be asked what trigonometry is. Protestant friends shuffle and confuse everything.

So listen to a little catechism link to understand the meaning of the words. To worship: - it has already been explained: "It is to render a supreme cult to someone".

In spirit and truth, it means: inwardly and outwardly. Inwardly, by the spirit: it is the inner worship. Outwardly, through the body: it is the outer cult.

God wants to be worshiped through this double cult, because, since man is composed of body and soul, it is necessary that these two elements, which are works of God, enter into the homages that he pays to God. The soul adores in spirit, and the body, outwardly manifesting the soul's senses, adores in truth.

No one sees our soul, and in consequence, our inner worship, so that it may appear to be lying to others, and it only becomes certain, true, when it is publicly manifested.

This is what Protestant friends are completely ignorant of, as they think they find in this text an objection against the Catholic religion, when they find in these words the formal condemnation of their sect.

In fact, Protestants do not have an outer worship ... not even an inner one, because all their worship and worship consist of reading or listening to the Bible, singing hymns and eating a piece of bread, which they call supper.

Catholics have an inner and outer worship service, manifested by the majestic ceremonies of religious service, or liturgy.

Our believer friend "went to get wool and came back shorn"! Does he have the courage to recognize his baldness?

It is doubtful ... The devil is stubborn and holds well those who fall on his nails.

## **VI. Foreign language in the Church**

Another formidable stone! The Protestant friend, who fishes nothing in Latin, accuses the Catholic Church of praying in Latin. It is wrong, dear friend, the Church is the meeting of the faithful, and they pray each in their own language.

Brazilian and Portuguese pray in Portuguese; French, in French; the German, in German; Russian, in Russian, etc ... and the Protestant does not pray in any language, he only objects, and looks for stones to break the roof of the Roman Church. Fortunately, the Church has foundations, walls and everything made of stone, against which nothing can the stones of hell, according to the Master's words.

But, anyway, why does the Catholic Church use Latin in its priestly ceremonies and prayers ... and not the language of the people?

The reason is very simple. The Catholic religion is a one, universal, immutable, divine religion.

Being one, it needs a universal language, not to preach, but to maintain perfect unity in its dogmas, ceremonies and communications. Without a single language, it would be impossible to preserve unity, as words translated from one language to another can easily acquire new meaning, or at least be ambiguous, in order to be subject to different interpretations. Since the language is one, in the whole world, there can be no changes, neither in the expressions nor in the sense. The Church, being one, is therefore a need for a single language.

In fact, unity must exist and remain in faith, worship, government. Now, in order to preserve unity in metaphysical truths, throughout the world, it is essential to have fixed terms to express such truths. In translations there are always mistakes, because many terms in one language do not find a perfect equivalent in another language. It is the reason why we have adopted in all countries the terms of latitude, longitude, instead of width, distance, etc. because such terms do not retain their own geographical significance worldwide.

The same reason flows from the unity of worship and government, To the word pater, for example, is known throughout the world to mean the minister of God, as the noun Pope means, for everyone, the supreme head of the Catholic Church.

Protestants walk in an inextricable mix, for lack of this unity, To indicate their leaders, who are neither priests nor elders, because they do not receive any spiritual endowment, they resort to the terms of shepherd: any cowboy is a shepherd; minister: any layman in civil investiture is a minister; preacher: any illiterate person is a preacher.

Worldwide, the Catholic priest is a pater; everyone knows it and everyone understands the term. This is the advantage of the one language, in one religion. And so on.

The Catholic Church is universal; as such it needs a universal language that allows the supreme chief to communicate with all subordinate chiefs: cardinals, patriarchs, bishops and priests, whether they are Chinese, Arabs, Russians, Americans or Africans. Protestant sects, being local, without union, without connection, without unity, can each use their own language.

Quot capita, tot sensus, each of them is filled with his own opinion - the apostle predicted (Rom 14,5). Hence the 888 different and antagonistic sects, all with the Bible under their arms.

The Catholic Church is still immutable, and as such it needs an immutable language. Now, among languages, only dead languages, not officially spoken, are immutable.

As for living languages, they depend on academics, philologists, grammarians, etc., who continually introduce novelties, changes, so that there can be nothing stable about them. Everything that lives changes and evolves.

Among the dead languages the Catholic Church adopted the oldest, the most beautiful, the richest and the most harmonious, which is Latin; one of the three, in which the Savior's sentence of condemnation was written. And it was written in Hebrew, in Greek and in Latin (Jn 19:20).

Hebrew and Greek are still spoken; the first by the Jews; the second by the Greeks, the third became extinct, leaving only its numerous branches, such as Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and French. Such a language was, therefore, naturally and logically indicated to become the universal language of the Catholic Church, the center of which was ancient Rome, the center of the Latin language.

The Church is divine; as such it cannot depend on purely human elements. Adopting a living language, it depends on men, countries, customs and times, without ever having a secure basis to express with certainty the immutability of its dogmas and the basic truths of its teaching.

Looking in the tradition of the ancients, in the first priests and doctors of the Church, the doctrinal teaching of any point, it would be necessary to do a linguistic study to know the value of the terms at that time, which perhaps they no longer have today.

It is one of the foundations of Protestant disunity and proof of its human organization, while the Catholic Church shows its divinity by the immutability of its teaching. The terms we use today were already used in the first centuries, by the heads of the Church, in the same sense and in the same Latin language.

Now a distinction is necessary. The doctrinal, liturgical and governing language of the Church is Latin; but its precious language as an explanation is the vernacular of each people. The priest receives his teaching in Latin, but transmits the doctrine in popular language, so that everyone can understand it. It is he, and only he, who can know Latin, while the people retain their popular language.

And there are no secrets in liturgical offices; if the priest's private, official prayers, such as Holy Mass and breviary, are in Latin, the faithful have vernacular translations, which they can understand and follow.

Latin, in the Church, instead of being a hindrance, as Protestants judge, is proof of its incomparable superiority over all different religions, since only it has its own, universal and immutable language.

### **VII. Invocation of the saints**

The volley continues ... but this time there are stumps of ignorant people. Listen carefully to the reasoning of the poor scribbler: "In the Gospel of St. Matthew, ch. 11:28, says Jesus: "Come to me, all of you who are sad and overwhelmed, and I will give you rest". "Anyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved." These words of Jesus exclude the invocation of the saints. If Christ relieves me in my afflictions, what need do I have to go and tell my miseries to this or that saint"?

In short, the reasoning is this: The Bible does not speak of the invocation of the saints; therefore, such an invocation is not necessary.

It's really clapping! It does not appear in the Bible that we should wear shoes, a hat, a shirt; therefore, our Protestant must walk on the floor, without a hat, without a shirt.

It does not appear in the Bible that we should have breakfast, lunch and dinner; and our Protestant does it all.

It is not in the Bible that we should bathe our faces, cut hair and nails, shower, comb hair and shave ... and here is our Protestant doing all this.

And where is it in the Bible that objections should be made against the Catholic Church, attacking the pope, the priests, insulting the Virgin herself, the sacraments and all that Catholics do; where does this appear? ... and yet this is the life of Protestant fanatics. It would be silly reasoning, if it weren't for a child.

It is useless to prolong this matter, because it has already been dealt with in "Light in Darkness".

### **VII. The cult of Mary ssma.**

The good Protestant could not help attacking the Ssma cult. Virgin. Without this, your attack would be incomplete; the attackable and attacked trinity, inseparable in glory, as it is in Protestant attacks, is Mary Most Holy, the Pope and the priest. Most Holy Mary, because she is the Mother of God. The pope, because he is a representative of God. The priest, because he is a minister of God. These are three closely linked names that always receive the tributes of Catholics and the hatred of Protestants.

In fact, they are like the three foundations of religion. Most holy Mary, as a mother, is associated with the redemptive work; by her free consent to the Incarnation, she is the distributor of divine graces. The Pope, as Saint Peter's successor, is the depository of eternal truth, is the pillar, the indestructible rock, on which Christ founded his Church. The priest, by receiving the sacrament of order, is the administrator, the instrument of divine graces.

Protestants, rejecting Jesus Christ himself, in order to preserve only the Bible, must necessarily reject the Blessed Virgin, who Catholics so confidently love and invoke, as they must hate the Pope, who is the sustenance of the Church, preserving her from disunity, the revolt that Luther came to sow in the world. They must also hate the priest, because he is the great propagandist of the truth, the tireless sower of the evangelical truths that the Protestant denies and blasphemes.

Such attacks are therefore a necessity for the poor Protestants in revolt against God and against the Church.

But, tell me, dear Protestant, does the friend think that he pleases Jesus Christ, insulting his most holy Mother? Curious way of wanting to win the friendship of a son, insulting his mother! Can Jesus Christ be insensitive to this hatred that Protestants vote for their Mother?

So will he have other feelings than us? ... Will he be the worst Son of any of us?

We demand respect for our mother, and Jesus Christ will be pleased to hear insulting the one he chose among all women, whom he filled with grace, whom he obeyed during his mortal life, and whom he loved with all the tenderness that a son necessarily have for a good mother!

And you, poor Protestants, think you are honoring your son by treating your mother as an ordinary woman, even an unfaithful woman, because even then your blasphemies come, saying that, besides Jesus, she had other children.

The gospel tells us that she knew no man (Lk 1:34). It is true that Mary Most Holy did not have children of Saint Joseph ... but then whose children will these be? The evangelist Saint Mark calls Jesus the Son of Mary (Mk 6,3), and not a son of Mary, which clearly denotes that he is the only son of the Blessed Virgin. For those who know Portuguese, this expression means a widow's only child.

The so-called brothers of Jesus, who are his cousins, as is clearly seen in the gospel, were never called children of Mary. See Lc 6,15,16; Mt 27.56; Mc 6.3. These passages resolve all doubt and show that such brothers are cousins.

In all this, dear Protestant, hate is felt ...

Now, hatred has never been and will never be virtue. It is an obsessive addiction that blinds and makes committing all crimes.

This hatred of the Blessed Virgin, the Pope and the priest, is enough to prove that your belief is not of God and does not lead to God.

The nonsense of wanting to honor Jesus, and to despise his Mother, shows the obsession, the misery of his sect, which violates the very laws of nature, to be able to say the opposite of what the Church says. Instead of insulting, it would be better and more sensible to ask the Virgin Mother of Jesus to open your eyes, your intelligence and your heart, so that you can better understand the gospel word instead of listening to the low objections that your pastors instill in you!

## **IX. Conclusion**

Another half dozen gimmicks follow; but it is not worth refuting them. I have already responded to all of these objections in the various published books.

He who sincerely seeks the truth and loyally wishes to embrace it, will find the answer to all his doubts in the series of refutations already published, which can be found in any bookstore.

They are: Light in Protestant Darkness. - Complete response to major Protestant objections and Protestant Attacks on Catholic Truths. In these books are clear and proven answers to almost all Protestant errors.

It would therefore be tiresome to repeat the same truths over and over. The columnist speaks, for example, about salvation, purgatory, confession, true Church, fasting, Virgin Mary, Eucharist and change of religion; so many points already discussed at length in the first book quoted.

Poor Protestant, reflect a little. Listen more to the word of God, as found in the Bible, instead of listening to his head, which is not biblical.

I ask the good God, Father of mercy, to enlighten your intelligence to know the truth, and your will, to have the strength to practice it. To object, to insult and throw stones, is not religion: - it is cowardice.

If the friend has the conviction - but does not have it - and thinks he is with the truth, then practice this truth, and let others alone practice what they think is true. Don't you want to hear the Catholic priest? Well, listen to your pastor ... and leave others alone.

Catholics own and read the Bible; they listen to the explanation of the word of God given to them by priests, who for many years studied the sciences, religion and the Bible, and whose word is well worth it, it seems to me, the word of an almost illiterate, fanatical, exploitative pastor .

In doing so, you will follow the advice of the divine Master who said: Learn from me, that I am meek and humble in heart (Mt 11:29), instead of deserving the supreme curse of the Savior against the one who scandalized the next: "What to scandalize one of these little ones, who believe in me, it would be better if the millstone that a donkey makes spinning around his neck hung around him and that he was thrown into the bottom of the sea (Mt 18,6).

Your objections, lies, slander, blasphemy and hatred, my dear evangelist, scandalize all those who sincerely believe in Jesus Christ and seek to follow his divine law. Pay attention, therefore, to the millstone and the bottom of the sea. The threat is from Jesus Christ ... and they are found in the Bible.

## **SEVENTH FLASH**

### **Protestant conversions and bile from Baptists**

Protestant pastors have a gallbladder of a formidable size. Until now, I was unaware that Protestantism had an influence on the liver.

He knew that he had, as a specialty, nurturing hatred against the Roman Church, obsessing the spirit and closing his heart with half a dozen objections against the pope, the sacraments and the worship of the saints; but I did not know that he had a predominant influence on the gallbladder.

And yet, it is a pathological case. It would be good for doctors to examine this fact; it may even be a new disease. As a diagnosis, we can point out: romophobia, or hatred of Rome, why, violent emotions, Hatred, cholera attacks, in short, exert a real influence on the liver, to the point that medicine signs it cases of instant death from hemorrhage, jaundice, spill of bile, caused by anger and hatred.

That was what caused a note from “O Lutador”, as we read in the illustrious “Jornal Batista”. In this newspaper, Baptists pour bile by weight, and hatred of Romanism, without measure. It is an interesting newspaper, because of the lies it says in cold alligator blood.

Mind, slander, not being able to anymore; and then, as innocently as the cat who steals a piece of meat, the scribbler looks innocent, and ... revolts when any news contradicts him.

Listen to what he writes without blinking: “The Fighter”, by Father Júlio Maria, under the above heading, published the following note: “In the second week of November, 50 ministers of the Anglican Church in London published a manifesto in which they finds the following precious statement: “The only way to get out of the current ecclesiastical chaos is through union with the Holy See in Rome”. Most clergy are people who have held high positions in the Anglican Church for many years ”.

If the news is true, and not one of those pious frauds that Roman Catholicism is so fruitful, we are in full agreement with the 50 judges of the Anglican church, who, at the same time, live from it, digging the ruin, doing in the its bosom to papist propaganda. If you are papist, move on immediately with weapons and luggage to papism; kneel reverently, ecstatically, before “his holiness”, kiss his holy feet, indulge in his holy foot odor, obey - perinde ac cadaver - his infallible orders and decrees, but don't be hypocrites and traitors, within the corporation to which they are only linked by mercenary interest, and by the political interest of the sect to which they actually belong”.

### **I. An answer**

The note in “Jornal Batista” deserves a small answer. Here it is: I ask the good journalist: - why stop this outburst of anger against such 50 Anglican pastors, against Rome and against the Pope?

The sensible man reflects, thinks, compares and draws conclusions. The idiot lets himself be carried away by nature, sees only his own idea, and condemns everything else.

The authentic fact that 50 Anglican pastors return to the heart of the Catholic Church has a probative value, and this value increases considerably, when it is added that these 50 pastors are all doctors, professors at universities, men of high society and responsibilities.

Such a fact should reflect, for an instant, any serious Protestant. A Protestant must ask himself: Will my religion really be true?

Is this Roman Church, so attacked by Protestants, so slandered, really what Protestants say it is?

If such a Church is so perverse ... if the Pope is such a horrendous monster, how is it that this Church always and always dominates the world? How is it that the Pope is the

most beautiful, most sublime and most acclaimed figure the world has ever known? Where does this come from?

We live in a century of passions and struggles, disbelief and persecution, and yet this pope is always the same, immobile in his greatness, smiling in the midst of hatreds, triumphant in the world and in hell. How's that? Is that natural or divine?

It can only be divine! It is this divine truth that is the fulfillment of the words of Jesus Christ: You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it (Mt 16:18).

The 50 English pastors, all men of culture and science, studied, and through study, aided by divine grace, understood that they were no longer connected to the true Church, and that, therefore, they moved away from Peter's rock, fixing their house of worship on Luther and his cronies.

Men of intellectual value, and not low exploiters as are Brazilian pastors - they understood that the gospel, which they professed, was no longer the gospel of Christ, but Luther's interpretation, and following Saint Paul's advice, preferred to listen to the voice of your conscience instead of following the interests of your purse.

If anyone, even though he was an angel from heaven, says the Apostle, announces another gospel to you, let the one I have announced to you be anathema (Gal 1,8).

Then they had courage. The world applauds them, while "Jornal Batista", on the contrary, comes out with a basket of stones, and throwing stones and sticks, shouts: - "Judas ... are Judas! ... papists ... go to kiss the saints the Pope's feet ... will indulge in his holy foot odor ... you are hypocrites ... traitors ... mercenaries! ... "

## **II. High there, your pastor**

High up there, my dear shepherd ... let's go slow, and let the leaps go to the irrational kids. Tell me one thing, one, allowing me to draw the logical conclusions that flow from it, Tell me whether or not it is allowed to change your religion. Either yes or no, without resorting to the thousand and one sophisms that form the basis of Protestant science.

If it is not allowed to change religion, mr. he is guilty ... because being an ex-Catholic, as all Protestants are, he changed his religion, contrary to his own ban. And in this case, the Judas, the traitors, the hypocrites, it is you, my dear shepherds. If change is allowed, then there is no reason to shout so loudly, as these men used their own right.

If it is not allowed, how did you, Baptists, you Brazilians, children of Catholics, deny the faith of your parents and grandparents? How did you apostatize the national religion of Brazil, to join a sect born from the debauchery of Luther and his cronies? The dilemma is hopeless.

If it is not allowed, how can you, mercenary pastors, use all the means to apostatize Brazilian Catholics?

Do you not see that you are doing a work that your own conscience and your own maxims disapprove and condemn?

If Anglicans are not allowed to return to their parents' religion, how are Catholics allowed to join a sect, like the Baptist, who is not even a Christian?

You say to yourselves disciples of John the Baptist. Now St. John the Baptist was a Catholic, a disciple of Christ. He was never a founder of religion; it was just the forerunner of the Messiah.

And being the forerunner, his mission is limited to preparing the ways of the Messiah, and not to founding religious sects!

Think about it, my dear Baptist. It is not enough to drool; this is not an argument: it is dirt. It is not enough to accuse; accusation is not an argument, it is a complaint. It is not enough to attack; the attack is not an argument, it is a destruction.

Before attacking the Catholic Church, it is necessary to prove the authenticity of the Baptist sect. And that never Mr. did, and will never do, because such proof is impossible, outside the lie. And lying is not proof; it's baseness!

Now, another absurdity, my dear Baptist, which denotes a complete lack of logic, or an overflowing abundance of obsession.

Tell me honestly: Is it, or is it not allowed to go back, in the choice of the religion that is professed? Is it or is not it? ... Answer.

If you say you are, then my dear Baptist is a slanderer, for he insults and slanders the 50 Anglican pastors for having abandoned the Protestant error, and for having returned to the first religion that is Catholicism, because before Henry VIII - the murderer of wives, - England was Catholic.

If you say that it is not allowed to go back, then the beautiful epithets so generously applied to neo-converts must be applied to you because you have gone back, and once Catholics and children of Catholics, you became disciples of the Baptist, who is the forerunner of Christ, and not Christ himself, as he himself confessed.

You are, therefore, in revolt against the religion of your parents and grandparents, you have renounced the religion of Christ in order to return to the baptism of penance of Saint John the Baptist. It is a new dilemma with no way out, where the Baptist slanderer receives the stone he has cast on others.

You see, dear friend, that, before throwing stones, it is prudent to examine the roof itself, because being glass, the return of the stones can cause a lot of breakage.

### **III. Free interpretation**

But there is something worse. Tell me, dear Baptist, “it is not a principle of your great reform that: 1st the Bible is enough to know the truth; 2nd Can each one interpret the Bible according to their personal inspiration? ”

But if so, why doesn't the Baptist friend let others enjoy this right?

- Why do you want others to adopt your interpretation?

- Why would the Holy Spirit not inspire a Roman, an Anglican and even a Turk, as he inspires a Luther biblist?

So, is there no freedom, neither for God nor for men? How is it, dear Baptist? I do not understand ... and only his formidable intelligence is capable of deciphering such an enigma.

If such fundamental principles of the reform are general, it must grant everyone the right to read and interpret the bible to their own content.

We Romans read the passage above Saint Matthew, and we interpret that the only true Church is the one founded by Christ on Saint Peter, the first chief, the first pope.

You, Protestants, for the pleasure of contradiction, interpret that Saint Peter is worthless, that the Catholic Church has nothing with Peter, but, rather, with the faith of Peter, which does not appear in the Bible.

Why is your opinion or interpretation more valuable than ours? Our interpretation is literally, literally; yours is pulled by the hair, without fitting, through intercalations ... why and in which yours is superior to ours?

And if it were superior, (which it really is not), as long as there is a personal interpretation - why will my personal opinion be inferior to yours? We are two people ... why and where would my person be inferior to yours?

Each one - and that is very Protestant - is free to follow his idea. I follow mine ... the Baptist friend follows yours ... and Anglican pastors follow theirs. And there is nothing to say about it, according to the basic principles of your sect. It is a new dilemma with no way out.

Therefore, these are neither traitors, nor hypocrites, nor Judas; - these are free men who study and follow the voice of their conscience. And this is noble ... it is sublime, while its torturous curses are nothing more than a stinking scourge of an explorer pastor ... tired from the exploratory journey of the nickels.

The fact of the conversion of the 50 Anglican pastors is not a pious fraud of Romanian faculties. The Catholic Church does not need to make up stories: the facts are so numerous that there are no articles enough to quote them.

The Catholic Church does not need to resort to Protestant foot odor; all that is needed is the truth and the constant triumph of his faith in the world.

Let us quote here some less significant pieces.

#### **IV. Protestant witnesses**

“The well-known Catholic newspaper “The Universe”, in London, on the 10th of July, published the sincere testimony of a Protestant minister from the English Presbyterian sect, who deserves to be known.

A recent speech by Professor Curtis, a Presbyterian pastor, at the sect assembly in Edinburgh (the newspaper says), is deplored by a letter sent to the “Glasgow Herald”, signed by a “church member” (Presbyterian), in which he says that this speech is proper to provoke that sharp sectarianism that, due to happiness, thought to be extinct.

The aforementioned letter continues: “I have been a member of the Church of Scotland for forty years, and in my daily work I find myself in the midst of people of all classes and of all creeds. I have never seen any malicious propaganda on the part of many of my Catholic friends. On the contrary, I have to admire the tolerance that they knew how to use when, thoughtless Protestants, they spoke of the papacy and the papists, and the imaginary machinations of Rome. They shook their heads, letting everyone say their nonsense. And this, certainly, has been able to verify any man of common sense,

“It is a fact that the Roman Church develops its work and promotes it well, with tranquility and seriousness, and the fruits of such work are visible in the development of that Church and in the devotion of its members. Our church would do well to imitate some of its methods, for example, in caring for the poor in the poorest neighborhoods of our city; in the Catholic Church’s interest in youth; in the dedication of their priests to their duties, and, in a nutshell, in doing seriously what they do”.

This statement, says The Universe, seems to be proof that not all of our dissenting brothers are overcome by that intolerance, which so often manifests itself in the general assemblies of their speakers.

The aforementioned letter concludes with this helpful advice: “The united (Presbyterian) church would do much better if it devoted its energies and the remains of its human potential to a social work, among the so despised poor, and let others persevere in their way and your efforts.”

## **V. Glories of Protestantism**

A German Protestant newspaper writes of the conversions: “We are obliged to confess the fact that in almost all cases, in which Protestants become Catholics, these conversions are a positive profit for the Catholic Church. There can be no doubt that the passage to the Catholic Church, almost without exception, is founded on religious motives. This, however, does not happen when a Catholic becomes Protestant; more often than not, this passage occurs for other reasons that have nothing to do with religion. Such conversions do not profit Protestantism; it can be a profit in number, but not in value”.

Indeed, it is true that those who are today the glory of Protestantism were yesterday a shame of the Catholic Church.

Once, one of the leaders of Protestantism sincerely complained that, when the pope sweeps the Church, he throws trash into Protestantism.

It is true. Protestantism, with the exception of a small number that sipped maternal heresy, is almost entirely in Brazil in apostates. They were Catholics, bad Catholics, ignorant, and easily passed to heresy, which dispensed them with a lot of uncomfortable things.

And among these unfortunates are some priests. They were certainly not the best. The vessels of honor and choice are not thrown away with the broom. Guided by shameful passions that they neither wanted nor resisted, they left the Church. The Church did not allow them to live according to their passions. The Church had requirements of virtues that they did not want to submit to.

It was necessary to move to a loose, easy, comrade religion. To a religion in which virtue was cheap, without requirements incompatible with the demands of the flesh. And they moved on to Protestantism!

And Protestantism welcomed them with open arms, and made them heroes. And they went suddenly, from ignorant (as all ex-priests are) to wise, from immoral to virtuous, from exploiters to worthy men.

Why? Because they were married in the civil and they hold conferences against the Church.

Did they go to Protestantism in search of perfection?

No. They were carried away by impurity.

Were they virtuous, mortified men, fulfilling their duties? No. They were a thorn in the heart of the Church.

Who were these priests? He is one of those unfortunates who will tell us so, in a spontaneous confession. Rafael Gioia Martins, a priest, now a loving and well-paid pastor, writing about another unfortunate fellow, said, “The Evangelist”: “It was Father Francisco Benjamim Melito, my old friend, a companion of good and tasty wines. pasta”. It is no wonder that those who live for the cup and fork, find the laws of virtue heavy, and go to vent their passions away from the Church. These are the former priests of whom the Protestant press is so honored!

## **VI. Conversion of a Methodist pastor**

Let us also quote some lines from Pastor Stanton converted to Catholicism, for his visit to the Holy Father Benedict XV, in 1920, and today a fervent Catholic priest.

Only Stanton had entered the Protestant seminary, began to read a summary of Luther's works and Newman's Catholic apology; this last book made a profound impression on the young man. He writes: "I was certain that I could not become a Catholic, but in the midst of the confusion of Protestantism I became convinced that the Catholic Church was always standing. Take the Catholic Church out, and all Protestant sects can prepare to leave."

However, Stanton had become a Methodist minister; every Sunday he celebrated one or two services: a prayer, a song, a reading of the Bible, plus some songs, and finally a blessing collection. At the end of the service, he was to give his hand to hundreds of men and women returning home.

One day, he attended the Catholic Mass on Christmas Eve, which made a deep impression on his soul.

During the holidays that followed, he spent a few days in a Carthusian convent, and religious life seemed to him the most noble form of Christianity. He writes: "These men lived for God in order to unite themselves more and more with God, to save their own souls and to do good to the world", in this way he was preparing to embrace Catholicism at last.

His friends already knew that he was gradually inclined to follow Catholic doctrine, and so they tried to dissuade him from this step. One of them wrote to him: "If you ever know Catholicism in its reality, you will hate it forever".

He was told that in Rome there were many ignorant and irreligious priests, recruited from the lower classes of Italian society, and that the people's superstition, seduced by the clergy, was incredible.

Stanton knew that this information was false, but he decided to go to Rome, the capital of Christianity. Kneeling in St. Peter's Basilica, he began to see the truth of Catholicism, and finally had an audience at the Pope's palace.

Admitted to the presence of Benedict XV, he was deeply moved. He writes: "When I took the Pope's hand and kissed his ring, I realized that this episode was the height of my visit to Rome and perhaps of my entire life. Representative or not of God, in any case there was before me the most influential man in the world".

Returning home, he kept busy with the big question: where to find true Christianity.

But all his studies could not lead to true faith; he still lacked grace, and faith is the gift of God. This grace finally received it the Methodist minister, reason why he hurried to give his resignation of pastor.

Instructed by a Jesuit priest, in June 1921, he confessed and received his first communion.

He also writes: "As for my future and livelihood, I did not remember this; but I sacrificed everything to possess the truth; he was to obey God.

Now I can do nothing more than ask for the grace to remain faithful to the Catholic faith in the midst of the greatest difficulties that perhaps await me".

## **VII. The example of Pastor Campos**

I must not fail to remind the Baptist friends of the abjuration of one of their most intelligent, most zealous and exemplary pastors, Pastor Campos.

Mr. Campos was a sincere man, pastor by conviction and religious spirit, loyally seeking the truth, and finding this truth in the Catholic Church, which he adopted, and in which he persevered for some 25 years, and today he is an ardent propagandist of good press and a fervent Catholic.

We collected only a few excerpts from a brochure he published after his abjuration; in this brochure there are passages that show the beautiful soul of Senhor Campos, and at the same time the error and the Protestant hatred.

“The happiest day of my life is, unquestionably, the abjuration I made of the mistakes of Protestantism. None of the important acts of my existence were performed with more thought, conviction and tranquility. Even, calculating all the war that was going to suffer, the hard fight that this resolution was going to cause, the loss of friends of many years and of chained interests, and even, as it happened, hatred of the family and the separation of the faithful and esteemed wife, only because they were Lutherans, the joy, the joy, the intimate happiness, which I enjoyed in such a solemn moment, did not diminish.

“Everyone who knows me knows that a series of providential events predisposed me to abandon Protestantism, after some shining militancy in it. It was to be expected that I (like almost all disillusioned Protestants) would fall into the despair of unbelief, losing confidence in men and versatile doctrines; but not!

“Providence guided my steps. He advised me to leave my Baptist flock in the city of Campos, and to come to São Paulo, in propaganda for my then-evangelical Diário. This was in September 1903. When I arrived in this city, I learned that a priest was combating the errors of Protestantism in fulminating conferences given at the headquarters of Santa Cecília.

“I went there, heard it and was struck. I came to São Paulo to look for elements for my tenacious campaign against the Church of God, and I fell, astonished, on this true road to Damascus. The eloquent, convincing, unanswerable word of the notable tribune, Dr. João Gualberto do Amaral, was the withering flash that threw me to the ground.

“- What should I do? I asked myself, on the steps of the majestic temple and listening to the crowd's comments.

It is true that the Protestant leaders, for blatant insincerity, had for years caused deep blows of doubt in my spirit. But Protestantism still smiled at me as an acceptable system...

“It was in November. As soon as I arrived, I officiated to the congregation that I was a pastor, declining the position and declaring that I was no longer a Protestant, a job also communicated to Campos' diaries, which dealt with them as a remarkable fact.

“A month later, on December 14, after a spiritual retreat, I deposited my resolved abjuration at the foot of the Immaculate altar, in the chapel of the Mariana Congregation.”

### **VIII. William Orchard**

Who is he? He is one of the most regarded professors at the celebrated Oxford University, perhaps the most prominent figure in the Anglican “high church”.

What happened to him? - He will tell us; let us listen to it, which is well worth it, “I felt, says the eminent professor, that my spiritual theory neither gave me satisfaction to reason, nor was it a foundation for the hopes of social redemption that I longed for. Insensibly the Roman Church has revealed itself to me, through its history and constitution, as the only serious guarantee of authentic doctrine regarding the doctrine of Christ. It is only the Roman Church that continues to develop this doctrine logically, to express its corollaries that safeguard the faith and reconcile it with the progress of human demands.

“Only the Roman Church has a defined program and has a central organization in order and a worldwide apostolate, capable of presenting faith to humanity as a revelation - humanity today cruelly divided by so many social and political struggles. I had long since convinced myself that the pontificate was not only the only fulfillment of Christ's promise to build his Church on a stone, but that that stone itself is the unshakable rock to which all human hope of peace between nations, and social policy, if it does not want to drown in the sinking under the violent storms that plague the modern world. The true Church had to be the one that maintained the unity of the doctrine of Christ; but he kept it visibly.

“This Church, of universal and visible unity, I concluded, must be one that can be identified, without a doubt, with the ministry of the apostles. Only the Catholic, apostolic, Roman was. My last steps, therefore, I took less from feeling than from the need to fulfill an intelligence duty. Not only to find what corresponded externally to my desire to love Christ, but to join the visible Church as one who performs a duty before his fellow men, especially before those who are still far from her. Wasn't it really what I had to do best, as a contribution to bringing the sheep that wander astray to the Church?

“Today I think that I practiced an act of love towards humanity, showing him, with my step, that only in the Church of Rome can she find the fulfillment of the great dreams that torment the heart of man.

“These dreams were never as fervent as they are in our day. But they were never more apt to deceive, to disorient and to despair, if “they are not based on the divinely revealed faith and they do not seek the center in the stone of the visible Church of Christ”.

### **IX. Luther's Confession**

Let us conclude these confessions of converts by Luther's own confession. Luther writes about the consequences of his preaching, with which he intended to reform the Christian world: “People are amazed when they see that everything was once calm and peaceful; peace reigned everywhere, whereas today everything is full of sects and factions, which makes it pity ... I must confess that my doctrine has produced many scandals; yes, I cannot deny it: these things often terrify me, especially when the conscience tells me that I shattered the Church's past, peaceful and peaceful under the papacy.

“Men today are more vindictive, more avaricious and without mercy, less modest and more incorrigible, worse, in short, than in the time of the papacy.

“Scandalous thing! Since the pure doctrine of the gospel was brought to light, the world is going from bad to worse every day. We intend to show that we are evangelicals, celebrating communion under the two species, breaking images, saturating ourselves

with flesh, refraining from fasting, praying, etc .; as far as faith and charity are concerned, we care little. The malice of men in a short time has reached such a point among us that the world cannot last for five or six years yet ... It is an indisputable experience: we others, preachers, are now more lazy, more careless than before. in the darkness of papist ignorance.

“The more we are sure of the freedom acquired by Christ, the more we are shy and indolent in observing teaching and prayer, in doing good and enduring injuries.

”There! I believed everything the pope and the monks said: at present I cannot believe what Jesus Christ said, who, however, does not lie ”.

It was the general persuasion of the people that religions are more pure and clean when closer to their sources. If we judge Protestantism by this criterion, a religion cannot deserve a favorable view, which, still fresh from the breath of revolution, which breathed life into it, made its entry into the already impure and corrupt world, like the ignoble passions that served it baby crib. This astonishing corruption, which stains the dawn of Protestantism with mud and blood, shows in this way its earthly and base descent and, therefore, its falsity.

### **X. More conversions**

Conversions in England in 1983. - The “Official Catholic Directory” of England for 1934 says that the number of converts received in the Church in 1933 was 12,288, i. it is, 126 more than in the previous year; among them many prominent, ministers of different sects, as rev. Thomas Whitton, Anglican minister for 31 years; rev. Harold Cheesman, ex-Anglican vicar of Collaton, Paington; rev. William Forre Stead, chaplain at Worcester College, Oxford; rev. WV Thomas, former Anglican vicar of Santa Agnes, Cardiff; Miss Bidwell, daughter of Anglican bishop Bidwell, in Kent; and mrs. Catarina Beryl Gallagher, sister of Lord Inchiquin; Vice Admiral Robert Hornell and many others.

Counted by thousands are the people who convert to the Catholic Church every year. In June last year, Protestant pastor Dr. Orchard became with 18 other colleagues.

In the United States, Episcopal Pastor Dr. Booyar Campbell was converted, who was disgusted by the resolutions of a conference of wise men (?) Who spoke in favor of the restriction of birth rates.

The Anglican military chaplain from Oxford, who accompanied the American army during the war, and a well-known writer, passed on to the Catholic Church.

Likewise the Anglican missionary, in Bombay, in English India.

In a village in West Nigeria, no less than 190 black Protestants were welcomed into the Catholic Church.

Fifty Anglican ministers issued a statement, saying that the only way for Protestants to get out of the current ecclesiastical chaos is through union with the Holy See in Rome. A Baptist newspaper, referring to this statement, treats these ministers as “judas” of the Anglican church, as if it were a betrayal to recognize the truth. This same newspaper claims that these conversions are made by mercenary interest; to which a German Protestant newspaper replies: “There can be no doubt that the passage to the Catholic Church, almost without exception, is founded on religious reasons. This, however, does not happen when a Catholic becomes Protestant, and such conversions do not profit Protestantism; it can be a profit in number, but not in value ”.

600 German evangelical pastors applied for admission to the Catholic clergy. - Berlin. It was learned from habitually well-informed sources that 600 evangelical pastors petitioned the Holy See, requesting admission to the Roman Catholic clergy, setting out in detail the reasons that lead them to do so.

They all belong to the opposition wing of the evangelical church, now organized across the country.

On the 2nd of March, Captain Etton Home, of the English fleet in the Indies, was converted and baptized in the Salesians' chapel in Naples.

Speaking about the process of his conversion, he said that Protestantism inevitably leads first to indifference and then to atheism and that he for thirty years was almost atheist, managing, only after many struggles and helped by the examples and advice of good Catholics, to get out of these states soul and find the truth in the Catholic Church. - Always the same experience! Protestantism, a false religion, cannot make man better, but makes him indifferent and unbelieving, so sincere and willing Protestants always feel bad, until they find the truth in the Catholic Church.

## **XI. Conclusion**

Let us finish with this conclusion, as simple as logical, certain and practical. Jesus Christ founded and instituted one religion. This is a historical fact admitted by everyone, Catholics and Protestants.

Everyone also admits that Jesus Christ established a single Church, because whenever he refers to it, he speaks in the singular. He says, "I heard the Church," and not the churches; "On this rock I will build my Church", and not my churches. He compares his Church to a flock with a shepherd; to a kingdom with a monarch, and a form of government, to a code of laws. This Church of Christ is the congregation of all the faithful who, being baptized, believe and profess the same faith, receive the same sacraments, worship God with the same sacrifice and are governed by their legitimate pastors under a visible leader - the pope.

Now, there are several sectarian denominations claiming to be the true Church of Jesus Christ. It is true that only one can be, and that he himself established in the year 33. Any other church, which did not exist 1933 years ago, is not the Church that Christ, the Son of God, founded before he left the world to go. for your Father.

There is a Church (history proves it) that existed during this time. The Catholic Church alone existed 1936 years.

It alone is the work of God; all other churches are of recent date, and are morally human inventions.

There was never a Protestant or Lutheran church before Martin Luther in the 16th century. There was never an Episcopal or Anglican church before Henry VIII. There was never a Presbyterian church before John Knox. There was never a Methodist church before John Wesley. There was never any Quaker before Jorge Fox. There was also no Anabaptist or Baptist church before Nicolau Stork.

These men had no more right to found a church than our dear readers or anyone else.

Religion must come from God. Only the Catholic Church has a divine founder.

Christ promised, with a solemn oath, that his Church would and will remain until the end of the age. And the Catholic Church has stood firm, despite all the persecutions and oppositions.

False prophets with their churches have come and gone, because everything human is condemned to end.

The truth is this, dear Baptist. You don't even believe in your own bluster; he is Protestant as a way of life, as another is a mechanic, carpenter or blacksmith. It's a breadwinner.

To these bluster, perhaps the best answer would be that which Cardinal Newman, converted from Protestantism, gave to one of his friends who were still Protestant.

He said: "I am convinced of the divinity of the Catholic Church; but I cannot decide to become a Catholic ". Newman knew everything, and taking a paper, writes the word "God". And showing it to his friend, he asked: "What do you read?" The other replied: "God".

Newman then took a gold coin, and placed it over the written word. "What do you read now?" he asked.

The man was ashamed, as he understood why he lacked the courage to convert to Catholicism. How many are afraid to lose some terrestrial advantage and therefore fail to serve God!

Third angel of darkness:  
**THE FREEMASONRY**

- 1) Modern Freemasonry.
- 2) Masonic clowning.
- 3) Freemasonry and Rotarism,

EIGHTH FLASH Modern Masonry

### **Can a Catholic be a Mason?**

Another consultation, and a consultation whose solution is capable of shaking the horns of Satan and his cohort, It matters little: the truth is above all, and he fears neither the satanases of the other nor of this world, because the truth is of God , is God Himself: Ego sum veritas (Jn 14,6).

### **I. Consultation and response**

A Catholic writes: Mr. Padre Júlio Maria. I am Catholic, apostolic, Roman; as such I entered this world, as such I intend to leave it; but it turns out that a friend invited me, a year ago, for me to enter Freemasonry, adding that it is a charitable society, and that I can be perfectly good Catholic and Mason.

I ask you to tell me what is really in it.

First of all, I am a Catholic; being able to combine my Catholic duties with Freemasonry commitments, I will accept the invitation; not being able to, I will reject it without hesitation.

Please clarify this issue, and tell me with your known competence and clarity what is in this regard, and what the Church's doctrine is. Thanking you for your answer, I ask V. Revma. accept my respectful feelings. - PN

This is what is said to be understood. The frankness, loyalty, sincerity and docility of my worthy consultant elevate him very high, in the reader's concept; so much greatness of soul deserves a clear and positive answer. I want to give it away. The question is of a pulsating current, and, moreover, of an absolute necessity, in the chaos of slander and lies that the enemies of religion spread everywhere.

I will try to fully satisfy the friend, showing him clearly what Freemasonry is, where it comes from, what it intends, and what means it employs to achieve its end.

After these strictly certain considerations, the friend himself will draw the conclusion, according to the dictates of a straight and enlightened conscience.

## **II. What is Freemasonry**

The best definition is that of our Lord: False prophets, who come to you, dressed in sheep and inside are rapacious wolves. - By their fruits you will know them: perhaps grapes are picked from thorns? (Mt 7.15).

It is the best definition. But it is not enough to define. Let us try to know their mysterious history.

Where does such Masonry come from? Freemason, Freemason, freemason, as its name implies, was at first a common association of masons (Freemasons, in French). Such an association was founded in the middle ages among stonemasons, engaged in the great architectural works of those times.

There were apprentices, officers, teachers. Later, with the successive decline of architecture, these associations became more or less superfluous. That is why the freemasons abandoned their primitive end, putting their sights on different objectives. At first, the Masons were not hostile to Christianity, nor to the Catholic Church.

In 1717, however, a radical change took place in the heart of the old Freemasonry: four lodges merged into one, elaborating new statutes and adopting special rites. Protestant ministers Teófilo Desagulier and James Anderson, plus archaeologist George Taine, chose such a mr. Antônio Sayer; this took place in London on the 24th of June of that year, which is why this day (feast of Saint John the Baptist) is generally considered to be the foundation date of modern Freemasonry.

## **III. Its religious base**

The philosophical-religious basis of this store was deism, a system that recognizes and worships a supreme Architect of the universe. However, it denies any divine intervention in the government of the world, and rejects the revealed dogmas. In its early days, therefore, current Freemasonry did not declare itself an atheist, but rather an anti-Christian.

It should be borne in mind that the philosophical-religious evolution of Freemasonry is not the same, in all countries; each nation gave its stores a characteristic feature more or less different from that of similar ones. So there have been and there are stores that demand from their candidates, as a condition of admission, profession of Christianity, as happened, for example, in Sweden.

Article 1 of the constitution of French Freemasonry, still in 1877, read as follows: "Freemasonry is based on the existence of God and the immortality of the soul". Later, however, the Grand Orient ordered that everything referring to God be eliminated.

Italy went into the waters, also making its stores atheistic and declaring loud and clear that from then on God was no longer governing the universe.

The Berlin Masonic magazine "Herald" declares without bluntness: "Our enemy is ultramontanism (the Catholic Church); breaking your power is our end" (December 5, 1909, no. 45). Grandmaster Cocq, of Belgian Freemasonry, made this declaration at the 1900 Masonic Congress: "What is needed is to end religion, because it takes advantage of the clergy to deceive the popular masses. The war between Freemasonry and the Church is life and death - a war without truce and without losses". (Bulletin des Travaux du Suprême Conseil de Belgique, no. 51, p. 59).

#### **IV. Anti-Christian Spirit**

In 1877, English Freemasonry, and later the Alpine Lodge of Switzerland, as well as that of Berlin's "Three Globes", broke off relations with French Freemasonry, because it suppressed the traditional formula: "For the glory of the great Architect of the universe

At the head of the Grand French East is the Order's council, made up of 33 members, who are obliged to belong neither to any religion nor to them or their families (Gr. Oriente, 1893).

This anti-Christian and anti-Catholic spirit is even more clearly manifested in Italian Freemasonry. When Minister Deprete, grade 33, sought to peacefully resolve the "Roman question" between the Vatican and the Quirinal, the lodge sent him an energetic note, reminding him of the oath of obedience given to Freemasonry, and summoning him with Article 23 the universal laws of secret societies, an article that reads: "The Freemason, invested with public office, has an obligation to respect the Freemasonry program; and not doing so, he commits a crime of rebellion against the orders and decrees of the Grand Orient".

Over the years, these struggles of hostility to religion have changed only for the worse, and this change consists of better hiding the plots and plans of struggle.

Freemasonry acts on the sly. She is weak at heart, but to give herself an air of power, she recruits ignorant partners in all layers of society, just to make up a number. Then this number prevails, not wanting to know whether such partners are militant Freemasons or not.

It explains why among us, in Catholic Brazil, there are Freemasons who, with the greatest good faith and most naive simplicity, are amazed when they are told that Freemasonry is a perverse sect.

They don't want to believe it, because - they say - they never heard, nor saw anything, in Freemasonry, that religion condemned.

It may be, because they make only numbers, ignoring everything, and serving only Freemasonry for the monthly fee they pay, for their moral influence and the number of their person. Enough is enough: they contribute indirectly to the evil that Freemasonry is doing.

## V. Devilish spirit

Freemasonry in Italy reached the height of hatred for Christianity, glorifying Satan as a symbol of reason and rebellion against God. The “Rivista della Massoneria Italiana” (1906, p. 157), conferred on Satan the honorific title of “the great”. On solemn occasions the hymn to Satan, composed by Freemason Josué Carducci, in which this verse occurs, is publicly sung:

Salute, Satana! Ribellione!

Forza vindice della Ragione!

That is: Hail, Satan, O genius of rebellion, O avenging force of reason!

This diabolical hymn was sung in Rome on August 27, 1893, at the “Teatro Umberto”, as well as in 1893, on the occasion of the inauguration of the monument to the infamous Freemason Garibaldi.

It was not all: At the inauguration of the monument in honor of the famous Mazzini (22 June 1882), and at the great demonstration in Genoa (20 December 1883), the shops had a black banner with the figure carried on the streets of the city. of Satan, the color of fire; and the speakers publicly and publicly affirmed that it was the intention of society to plant the pavilion of his satanic majesty at the top of the Vatican and in all churches in Italy. It is true that English and American Freemasonry have not yet reached these excesses; and there was a time when the South American lodges were to a certain extent tolerant, and there was no lack of “brothers” who thought they could combine the Masonic program with that of the Catholic Church.

This singular syncretistic tendency is understood when Freemasonry is considered to be a secret society, which does not reveal the most intimate secrets to any of its members. There are not a few Freemasons among us who claim to be Christians and even Catholics, due to the fact that they have no exact knowledge of a “last word” of the sect. The real Mason, aware of the characteristic purposes of society, considers the idea of “Catholic Mason” as absurd and impossible as the concept of a “square circle”. One concept excludes the other.

Since the end of the last century, South American Freemasonry has developed closer relations with lodges in Europe; today all stores here are allied with the Grand Orient of Paris, which keeps them up to date with the movement and aspirations of the sect, through the “Bureau of international freemasonry”, whose objective is the atheist world republic (Congresso, 1900, August 31 to September 2).

In 1905, when asked about the relations between Freemasonry and Catholicism, the Grand Orient gave the following answer, which we translate in textual translation: “The Freemason cannot be Catholic, nor the Catholic can be a Mason: the incompatibility is radical”.

“Freemasons even have an imperative need to fight the Catholic Church, the biggest obstacle to the ends of Freemasonry”, (1995, March, year 40, nº 3, p. 172).

## VI. Masonic Secrets

Freemasonry is a secret society. This is true of his ritual, the Mason apprentice and other adopted books. And what is this secret? The secret is that the Mason is an

instrument in the hands of his chiefs, to do what they tell him to do, without revolting, without reacting, without speaking, under the threat of the death penalty.

Freemasonry is an association, the purpose of which is to do evil, and to protect evildoers. What is good does not fear daylight; what is bad and perverse is hidden as much as possible. Freemasonry is hidden because it is perverse; it demands the strictest secrecy about all its management, in order to be able to do evil and not be discovered.

All of this is absolutely right. Why are these horrible, creepy oaths uttered by their adherents? To ensure impunity. This diabolical oath that is required of the members will not be without interest. Read this solemn and diabolical obligation well, which is extracted verbatim from the ritual, officially adopted by the Grand Orient of Brazil:

Pledge: I F ... swear and promise, of my free will, for my and honor and for my faith, in the presence of the supreme Architect of the universe, which is God, and before this assembly of Freemasons, solemnly and sincerely, never to reveal any of the mysteries of Freemasonry, which will be entrusted to me, except to a good and legitimate brother, or in a regularly constituted store; never write, record, trace, print or use other means by which you can disseminate them. I swear more to help and defend my brothers in everything I can and is necessary, and to recognize as the only legal and legitimate power in Brazil the Grand Orient and Supreme Council of Brazil, to which I will pay full obedience. If I violate this oath, my tongue will be torn out, my neck cut off and my body buried in the sands of the sea, where the ebb and flow will plunge me into perpetual oblivion, being declared sacrilegious to God and dishonored to men. Amen.

Here is a formula of diabolical oath, which can only express and hide diabolical things. Such an oath is worthless before conscience, because it is against nature, dignity, faith and common sense.

And why so many blasphemies? Is it to do good?

Never! ... We can hide the good we do, but without oaths and blasphemies. It can only be to do evil.

The Freemason must hide from his parents, his wife, his children, his friends, what perpetrates in these dark dens, where murder, poisoning, theft, dishonor, disgrace, loss of homes and of the nations. All of this must be kept secret, because it is horrible, it is abject.

From such an oath it can be concluded, without further examination, that Freemasonry is an abject, filthy, disgusting society for any person of dignity and dignity.

There may be ignorant and foolish Freemasons, but they belong to a nefarious, abject association, which only deserves revulsion.

Reasonable people meditate on this oath and tell me if it is worthy of a man to surrender, with linked hands, feet and tongue, to bosses he doesn't even know, to secrets he doesn't know, to make commitments that conscience and honor repel ?

They will obey, whatever the cost. Freemasonry can order them to murder their own wife, to stab their own children, and the Freemason, made a miserable slave, is obliged to obey. It is slavery ... it is abjection, it is the degradation of the human race.

Poor Freemasons, open your eyes! ... And you, free men, break the infamous handcuffs with which they want to chain you!

## VII. Brazilian Freemasonry

Some say that Brazilian Freemasonry is not hostile to Christianity and the Catholic Church. Let us see what the official documents say: The Masonic Congress in Rio Grande do Sul from 22 to 26 June 1902 says, among other things: “Freemasonry will try to combat clericalism in the State, denying priests resources of any kind. - Freemasonry will try to demonstrate that the Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church is not the executor of the principles of Christianity”. What about?

Among the theses voted by the Brazilian Masonic Congress of Lavradio in 1909, are the following provisions: “Freemasonry will endeavor to suppress the legation before the Holy See; that the precedence of civil marriage becomes mandatory; that a divorce is enacted; to deny special competence to representatives of religions for catechesis and civilization of the savages; that the existence of religious corporations that segregate human beings from society and the family be condemned as contrary to morals, retrograde and antisocial”.

These are the pious aspirations of Brazilian Christian Freemasonry. Whoever wants to believe, consult the archives of that congress, or similar ones.

I ask whether the man who denies the effectiveness of baptism can be said to be Christian or even Catholic; that advocates the moral and social calamity of divorce; who does not know the Catholic Church founded by our Lord; that invective against the pope; who speaks ill of Religious Orders and Congregations, which constitute the fine flower of evangelical perfection? ...

I ask if the Freemason who refuses baptism is a Christian? can one call himself a Catholic who does not recognize the Catholic Church, as founded by our Lord Jesus Christ?

### **VIII. The Church and Freemasonry**

All we have just said are human arguments, able to enlighten a man of goodwill; but we have more than that: we have a divine argument.

This argument is the decision of the supreme authority of the Church. *Roma locuta est, quaestio finita est*, said Saint Ambrose: Rome spoke, the issue is resolved. Freemasonry is a society condemned and even excommunicated by the Church. It is not today that the Catholic Church is opposed to Freemasonry. The following popes condemned her: Clement XII, in the “*In eminenti*” constitution, of April 28, 1758.

Benedict XIV, in the constitution “*Providas*”, of 18 of May of 1751.

Leão XII, in the constitution “*Quo graviora*”, of March 13, 1825.

Pius VIII, in the encyclical “*Tradit*”, of May 24, 1829,

Pius IX, in the constitution “*Apostolicae Sedis*”, of October 12, 1869.

Leo XIII, in the “*Humanum genus*” constitution, of April 20, 1884.

Finally, Benedict XV, in the Code of Canon Law. Under the provisions of the code, canon 2,335, all those who enroll in Freemasonry incur the penalty of excommunication, reserved to the Holy See.

Vicars cannot make commissions and funeral services in favor of notorious Freemasons, unless they have shown signs of repentance before death (canon 1.240, 8 1º).

Clerics are prohibited from placing religious orders on corpses that are conducted with Masonic emblems (S. Penitenciaria, 20 March 1885).

Freemasons cannot attend official religious acts, nor can the clergy celebrate masses or religious services at the invitation of Freemasonry (SCS Officii “ad Ordinarios Brasiliae”, July 5, 1875).

Notorious Freemasons cannot be admitted to godparents of baptism or confirmation (SCSO 5 of July of 1878; Code, canon 766, 2º and 769).

Freemasons cannot be admitted to the sacrament of marriage with Catholic solemnities (SC do S. O. ,, already. Cited, and Cons. Plen, A. Lat. N. 175).

People affiliated to Freemasonry cannot be validly accepted into Catholic associations (Code, canon 693).

People who take part in Masonic parties and dances or promoted by Freemasonry are seriously sinful (SC de Prop. Fide, 15 July 1876).

So alert Catholics! Let us watch over our belief, making the Masonic counter-propaganda. Let us be Catholics to the death. We detest Freemasonry, which seeks to place its dominion above God Himself and His holy Church.

### **IX. Consciousness and Freemasonry**

After these points, let us ask ourselves, sincerely, if a Catholic can be a Mason, and if a Mason can be a Catholic. The answers are already given; we summarize them to better record it in the mind.

Some years ago, Monsignor Ketteler, bishop of Mogunça, one of the wisest prelates in Germany, with a vast spirit, was asked this question about which he published a work of his, with the title: Can a Catholic be a Freemason? Your answer will make me mine, and after the brief study that precedes, I answer: no, no, a Catholic cannot be a Mason! It's because? Because Freemasonry is an irreconcilable enemy of Catholicism.

Let's go ahead and ask: Can a serious man be a Mason? No, it is impossible, because Freemasonry is perverse in its end and in its means. The incompatibility is so radical and so blatant that Freemasonry itself confesses its antagonism.

This is what the Grand Orient of Brazil bulletin, March 1915, p. 172: “Can a Mason be a Roman Catholic? Can the Roman Catholic be a Mason? ” - It cannot: the incompatibility is radical. No; the Freemason cannot be a Catholic, nor can the Catholic be a Freemason. This one even has an urgent need to fight the Catholic Church, the biggest obstacle to the ends of Freemasonry. No; the Roman Catholic cannot be a Freemason, nor can the Freemason be Catholic ... To admit the opposite would be to glorify Janus, the god who was two-faced but who nevertheless had no two hearts to vibrate according to opposing feelings. For us or against us. Or Catholic or Mason ”. This is clear and needs no comment. Or God or the demo. Or the church or the store. Or the Christ or the black goat. Either heaven or hell.

You cannot serve two masters, said the divine Master. Here, in this case, these two gentlemen are completely excluded, and cannot have the slightest contact. The Catholic must be God's friend. Freemason is an enemy of God.

Society rejects the cursed sect of Freemasonry, the Church excommunicates it; our conscience must therefore despise it, flee from it and fight it.

### **X. Freemasonry and the clergy**

Until recently, Freemasonry in Brazil endeavored to show itself as an institution totally uninterested in the religious problem. It welcomed supporters from all sides in the

secret guild. Its propaganda among the Catholic elements was made, surreptitiously, under the guise that, in the countryside, there was no question of pursuing the sacred ideal of our faith. When the Church's infallible voice proclaimed that Freemasonry is the enemy of God and religion, protests from the "lodges" arose, classifying the attitude of ecclesiastical authorities as intolerant.

Fortunately, we have reached a time when Freemasonry can no longer hide its secret and comes to the public, through the press at its service, to reveal itself as it is, as the Church has always considered it, the organization of all the forces of evil to combat the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ. Catholics, even the most naive, can no longer be deceived about their dark designs.

Also in our land, the master's degree follows the slogan of the international congress in Paris, which states: "It is not enough to fight the influence of the clergy; what must be destroyed is rather the instrument that the clergy use to subdue the masses, - it is religion itself".

Why does Freemasonry, in this land of believers, whose traditions are the most alive and ingrained, unmask themselves and come, by their publicity organs, to threaten Catholics of a campaign of insults against the guards of the heritage of the faith? It is that Freemasonry, seized by intense irritation against the government, which enacted the decree of April 30, 1931, instituting optional religious education in schools in the country, fails to overcome its spite, thus betraying its hatred of the faith professed from birth by the Brazilian people.

He prophesies, then, that religion will die and is already dying ... He did not die in Russia, where he has been persecuted with iron and fire. Even now, on the occasion of Christmas, it was officially regretted by the Moscow government that countless churches were still open, despite the enormous efforts to establish atheism in all classes. Legislation of war against the spirituality of the individual and the family has succeeded in sinking, in the most nefarious moral misery, entire generations of "Godless". Even so, it was not yet possible, in the republic of the soviets, to extirpate the love of Christ in souls that did not allow themselves to be clouded by widespread corruption. Many churches are still frequented in the homeland of Bolshevism.

In Mexico, while Calles joined the list of monsters, appearing alongside Nero and Diocletian, the Church, which he tried to annihilate with martyrs, has the same strength as in the past.

The Masonic laws of Portugal and France, oppressing the thinking of the people, today lie in the number of retrograde and archaic things ... In Paris and Lisbon, there are the most beautiful and moving demonstrations by the youth of our days, in favor of religion, whose death the poor Freemasons are proclaiming soon ...

Even recently, General Carmona's dictatorship was closing a Masonic stronghold, from which the inspiration of a seditious movement against the authorities had come. The most senior chiefs of Portuguese Freemasonry were placed at the border, as incompatible with the order regime in the country.

In France, the unfortunate late President of the Republic, Mr. Doumer leaves the stores, dusting his sandals, with these discouraging truths, spoken loudly for everyone to hear: "I broke with Freemasonry in order to get rid of a clientele who dishonors me". And he adds: "Freemasonry has become, and is, a *corrillo*, a caste, whence the plea, the low regime of espionage, favoritism, internationalism". It should be noted that this

President of the Republic of France was not even a Catholic ... we can already see that our Pontiffs in the Church are right to condemn Freemasonry as an irreconcilable enemy of religion. The black sect's animosity against the clergy is strong.

## **XI. Conclusion**

In reply to my worthy consultant, I have only to say that he cannot, in any way and for any reason, enter the horrendous, cursed and criminal sect that is Freemasonry.

And not only can you not join their ranks, but you cannot, in any way, attend your meetings, not even out of mere curiosity, not even at your parties; they cannot compete with money for their fake charity establishments; they cannot teach, let alone put their children in their colleges or schools; they cannot render their services to the sect or its meetings, as artists or even as simple workers.

Asking whether the Church has the right to prohibit Freemasonry from Catholics is like asking whether a father has the right to prohibit his son from entering a particular house, or taking part in a certain society or meeting. Thus, Freemasonry being, as it is, condemned by the Church, the Catholic cannot have any relationship with it. To want to be both a Mason and a Catholic, in addition to not being allowed, is not serious, it is not decorous - it is absurd.

The Freemason is completely separated from the Church, although, due to his ignorance, he thinks he can be Catholic and Freemason at the same time. It cannot in any way; and such Catholics are completely deluded. Catholicism is one, and Protestantism, Spiritism, Bolshevism, Freemasonism, are condemned, perverse sects, in struggle against this same Church.

How, then, could a Catholic be both a son, an enemy and a persecutor of the same religion? Catholics should not, under any circumstances, give their children to godchildren. The Freemason is completely separated from the Church, although by his ignorance he thinks he can be Catholic and Freemason at the same time. Catholics, therefore, be alert and do not be seduced by the insinuations of the children of the cheerful widow.

Come on, Catholics, let us be God ... far away from us the devil and his followers!

NON FLASH

## **Masonic clowning**

### **Can a serious man be a Mason?**

I received another consultation, which gives me the opportunity to complete the exposition made of the ends of Freemasonry, by exposing their initiations, which constitute the childish, senile side, or rather, the clown of their secrets.

### **I. The consultation**

Father Julio Maria. I read your doctrinal exposition on Freemasonry with interest, and frankly, I really liked it. A few years ago I had the misfortune to enter this sect; I turned away from her, at the request of my virtuous wife, who always repeated that Freemasonry is a perverse society. It was your request that decided to break this filth completely; however, my conscience as a Catholic was disgusted and disgusted by the

few meetings I attended. Masonry, practically considered, is an infamous den, where only those who need protection against human justice remain.

Only criminals in business life, explorers without conscience, and selling the honor of their families and children, can remain Freemasons. Unfortunately, like V. Revma. he said, after entering and being bound by the abominable oaths they take, they are afraid to retreat ... and so they are, against their conviction and conscience, out of cowardice and human respect. But there is a side that V, Revma. it should also reveal: the ritual side, which is the most extravagant thing imaginable. An exhibition of this rite will show the sect's childishness, or, if you like, its baseness. Grateful, for the new service that V. Revma. will provide to Catholic society, I subscribe to V. Revma. RV

My worthy consultant is right, and I gladly respond to your wish.

The doctrinal side is more for people of a certain intellectual culture, while the ritual side is within everyone's reach, and reveals admirably the lowliness of the Masonic sect.

I proved that a Catholic cannot be a Mason; I want to prove now that a serious man, be he indifferent, Protestant, Spiritist, or atheist, cannot be massive, because such a sect, if it is perverse in its ends, is extremely degrading and ridiculous in its initiations. I will invent nothing; I will reproduce exactly the manuals and rituals used in Freemasonry. Brief information is needed to make the mysteries of Hiram's triangle understand.

## II. Masonic Dignities or Degrees

It is in the public domain that there are many Maconic rites: the Egyptian, the Scottish, the French, the York and the blue rites. Each of these has three fundamental degrees: apprentices, companions and teachers. Who is not a Freemason is called profane. Furthermore, each rite has its high degrees and mysteries. The Grand Orient of Brazil follows the Scottish rite, which they call old and accepted, in Masonic language: Rit. ' . Esc. ' Prev. ' and Ac. ' . This rite is composed of 33 degrees that are (Risum teneatis):

- 1) Apprentice.
- 2) Companion.
- 3) Master.
- 4) Secret master.
- 5) Perfect teacher.
- 6) Intimate secretary.
- 7) Prove.
- 8) Quartermaster.
- 9) Master of the nine.
- 10) Chosen of the fifteen.
- 11) Elected knight.
- 12) Master gas.
- 13) Real bow.
- 14) Great elected.
- 15) Knight of the Orient.
- 16) Prince of Jerusalem.
- 17) Knight of the West.
- 18) Knight Rosa-Cruz.
- 19) Great pontiff.
- 20) Master ad vitam.

- 21) Prussian knight.
- 22) Prince of Lebanon.
- 23) Head of the tabernacle.
- 24) Prince of the tabernacle.
- 25) Snake rider.
- 26) Prince of mercy.
- 27) Sovereign Commander.
- 28) Knight of the sun.
- 29) Great Scotsman.
- 30) Knight Kadosch.
- 31) Great inquisitor.
- 32) Sovereign prince of secrecy.
- 33) Sovereign great inspector.

Reading such ridiculous, ridiculous names, one immediately feels the childishness or, better, the senility of the Masonic sect ... All of this is nothing more than a theater play, where certain people intend to represent a comic play, in a scene of clowning.

## II. Masonic language

Each degree has puzzles and badges. It has the apron, the trowel, the gavel, the compass, the square, the harp strings, with golden sun, and other ridiculous emblems. For men who want to profess theories of equality, this whole hierarchy of trifles, of petty vanities, is a ridiculous contradiction.

The Freemasons themselves, a little serious, recognize it, but do not fail to respect it.

But, let's go ahead; it is useful to know the sect's grotesque vocabulary.

The different Masonic associations are called workshops: Loja is the workshop that confers the first three degrees. Chapter is the workshop that confers from grade four to eighteen. Council is the workshop that gives degrees nineteen to thirty. Supreme advice is the workshop that gives degrees thirty-one to thirty-three.

Only the latter, called large workshops, are privy to Freemasonry's intimate secrets.

The dignitaries of the stores are more or less numerous: The venerable; the most respectable; the sacrificing brother; the terrible brother; the watchmen; the big smart; the great speaker; the coverer; the master of ceremonies, etc.

These are the pompous and grotesque names, which are found daily in the Masonic newspapers and narrations of the sessions of the lodges. Are there really people who take this seriously? It's clowning!

But the play continues. Freemasons have a peculiar language, to express things differently from the profane.

For example: The Freemason speaker at the lodge does not deliver a speech: this is too common; - he composes a piece of architecture. At a banquet, the Freemason does not eat, he chews. The Mason glass is called a cannon.

The dish is called tile. The knife becomes a sword. To fill the glasses is to load the cannon. To interrupt the session is to fall asleep. A Masonic circular is a plank.

A report is a trace. The applause is batteries.

Banquets are table work.

And serious people must necessarily complete this vocabulary, saying that a Mason is a clown or an unbalanced one, at the level of ordinary Cangerians, pagans, hysterics or madmen of spiritism.

#### **IV. Is all this serious?**

Is all this serious? ... and can a serious and sensible man submit to such senile, childish and ridiculous acrobatics? It is possible that serious men, family members, honorable businessmen, lawyers, magistrates, doctors, men of letters, science and responsibility, subject themselves, without batting an eye, to using such terms, which can only be used by children's games, or to kids games?

Ceremonies, signs, marches, counter-marches, funeral honors, table work, batteries, everything is regulated by Masonic rituals, with meticulousness, and requires a real study by the initiates.

And if it were still a scientific study, but it is a study to lose the seriousness and seriousness of an educated man, to become a real circus clown, who seeks terms and expressions to avoid calling objects and things by the names they they are their own ... Isn't that a joke?

Men of society and responsibility who are proud, perhaps, of not believing, neither in religion, nor in morals, nor in the future life, nor in the sacraments or ceremonies of the Catholic Church, are obliged to spend hours studying the notebooks of their degrees, the prescriptions of their rituals, the false mysticism of their emblems, and everything that makes up the ridiculous futility of Masonic sessions.

Is it serious? ... or is it a play, to have fun with each other?

These men, who want to clarify the human race, free it from what they call superstitions, have temples, altars, sacrificers, baptisms, sacraments and mysteries on their side, a thousand times more complicated than those who reject and disapprove. These men, who do not want the voice of 20 centuries of Christianity and civilization ... who believe neither in the Gospel, nor in Catholic sages, nor in the authority of the Church founded by Jesus Christ; these men listen to the dictates of wicked, wanton, Bolshevik, murderers and others who preside and govern the Masonic sect! ...

They accept their ridiculous rituals: as a voice from heaven, and enlist in their criminal record, as if it were an honor to belong to an association execrated by the voice of the people and the voice of God.

No, this is not all serious! It is childishness, senility, or clowning. I prefer to adopt the latter term ... and I think it best expresses the disposition of Freemasonry, as an institution.

The serious man has his weaknesses, but he must not be bashful. The serious man may forget his dignity, but he must never abdicate it. The serious man can sometimes lose his social culture for an instant, but he must never make this decay a rule of life and composure.

This is unworthy of a serious man. And if the Freemason reflects, he must understand that he does all this: he falls into baseness, abdicates his dignity, and makes social decomposition a rule of life. All of this is nothing more than clowning, lack of education, or understanding!

Everything would be extremely sad, if it were not extremely ridiculous.

## V. The work of the table

The table's work is the banquet. According to the vocabulary already exposed, the reader can get an idea of what such a Masonic banquet should be. It is priceless of grotesque and ridiculous, and deserves to be known. Everything there obeys the ritual, which is why in the small stores in the interior such banquets are not offered to the venerable Freemasons; they are content to do table work, at home or in the privacy, where they can eat at will, while, at the Masonic banquet, one can only chew.

I don't want to say anything by myself; I am content to copy the ritual. This is how the Ragon crew members describe their work at the table. ' and Clavel. ", great lights of the sect. Listen well. They are the ones who will speak:

"The chewing room must, like the store, be covered with profane views.

The venerable says: Brother Vig.:. I prevented the II. ' .

to suspend the work and we will take care of the chewing.

I.: 1st and 2nd Vig.:. invite the II. ' . under your command, get ready to load and go online for the first obligation gift.

During the banquet, there are seven mandatory gifts.

When they are done, the chewing ceases, the brothers ... get up, put themselves in order, and throw their banner (napkin) over their left shoulder.

At the invitation of Ven. \*. IT. ' (read: Venerable manned, brothers manned) carry the cannons (the glasses) and when everything is ready, tell them:

- My brothers, let's do a health ...

We will make fire, good fire, the most alive and sparkling of all fires.

- My brothers! Right hand to the sword! (it's the knife).

- Sword up!

Sword continence!

- Sword in the left hand!

All the knives rise and greet each other.

After this brilliant movement, they take their hands to the arms (they are the glasses).

- Weapons up!

- The face!

The brothers.' . the glass reaches the mouth.

- Fire!

Part of the content is drunk.

- Good fire!

Drink the rest.

- The most alive and sparkling of fires!

Pour the glass.

## VI. Masonic toasts

On with the music !.we are in the middle of the theater ...

comical ... and each Mason, wearing a tie and varnish shoes, is an actor in a comic play ... he lacks only the circus clowns' own clothing. I remember again that I am not making anything up; I reproduce verbatim the Masonic ritual and the interpretations of the ritual performed by the leaders of the sect. Let us now watch the Masonic toasts ceremony. And new clowning!

To announce the first health, Ven. ' . commands the army like this::

- Attention, my II.-. right hand to arms!
  - Weapons up! The face!
  - First fire: The health of ...
  - Second fire: The health of ...
  - Third fire: The health of ...
- Empty the glass. The exercise continues:
- Brothers. \*. rest weapons!
- They take the glasses to the right shoulder.
- Weapons ahead! Let us mark our weapons!
  - A!
- They take the glasses to the left shoulder.
- Two!
- They take us to the law.
- Three!
- They take us forward.
- A! two! three!

At each of these times, Freemasons gradually lower the cannon (cup) to the table. On the third, they drop the glass with a sound and simultaneously, so that a single knock is heard. The same thing is done with the sword (knife).

Here are some texts copied verbatim from the apprentice's manual. Such a quote does not dispense with a brief comment. As serious as you want to keep this study, it is difficult to stop laughing. And when we remember certain well-known Freemasons, who look like serious, honest, educated men, putting them in the scenes described, indulging in real farces, pantomimes, one cannot fail to experience a feeling of compassion. That a circus clown does pantomime, grimaces and acrobatics, nobody is surprised by the fact, it's his job. Let the youth, in their pleasures and pagodeiras, make you laugh at the farces that they invent, nobody is scandalized, because the youth, dominated by the ardor of life, wants to play and laugh.

That there are madmen in asylums, who imagine themselves to be emperor, king, general, nobody is surprised: because he is unbalanced. But that a serious man, a man of society, of instruction, of responsibility, enter one of these Masonic dens, and play there the role that the ritual imposes on him, is the height of degradation.

A parchment man, a fortune dealer, a family man, who in public becomes serious, serious, majestic, and, in the store, plays the role of fool, clown, pagodeiro, madman: it is the height of baseness .

Children have their games, they are childish. Old age has its ways, it is senility. All of this cannot be attributed to them badly; but a mayor of the municipality, a doctor, a lawyer, a man of position, who loses his balance, to the point of getting into children, in senility, to the point of pretending war at the table, of presenting weapons with a fork; to take out the knife, like a sword; to prepare cannon fire with a glass of beer; to present the napkin, like a flag, to make a fire, emptying a glass ... it's too much: it's not just childishness, senility, it's idiotism.

And these men can look at each other, without bursting out laughing, without feeling the contempt, the baseness of such a pagodeira.

What a divine punishment! They are not subject to the doctrine of the Catholic Church; they do not want to obey God's ministers, and they obey, like children, a clown

who imposes on them the most grotesque ceremonies that madness can invent. I think that in insane asylums the madness of the unbalanced has not yet reached the degradation of such unbalanced ones.

Just being a punishment from God. Poor Freemasons ... you are condemned to serve as clowns, to make a pagodeira, which lowers and demeans you, below the most grotesque creatures.

The clown makes a living with his mimics, and you lose your dignity and your faith. Poor masses, you are worthy of pity, rather than contempt.

### **VII. The apprentice's oath**

To be a Mason, you have to be an idiot, a fool, or a madman. An idiot, because he joins an association he doesn't know, and swears to keep secrets that he still doesn't know. A fool, because he seriously executes truisms and grits that can only be done by any buffoon. A madman, because he thinks he is what he is not, gives importance to what he does not have, performs ceremonies that are bashful, and deems high actions that are ridiculous.

What I have exposed from the banquets already fully proves these titles, given to the Freemasons.

But let's go ahead ... everything is ridiculous and depressing in the cult's ceremonies. It seems that they were made to demean as much as possible the idiot, the fool or the madman who enters there.

To be a Freemason, and to receive the Masonic light, an initiation is required. How is such initiation done? Let us consult the apprentice's ritual. It will be another act of theater comedy. Here is what the fellow postulant must swear: I swear not to reveal Masonic secrets, signs, touches, words, doctrines or uses ... when I fail to speak, burn my lips with red-hot irons, cut my hand, rip out my tongue, behead me, and let my corpse hang in the store during the admission of a new brother, so that the iron of my infidelity and the terror of others will be printed; then burn my corpse, and cast my ashes in the wind.

Such an oath is made by someone who knows nothing and ignores what will be revealed to him.

If, afterwards, the venerable tripignate orders the Freemason to kill his own parents, to murder his wife, to hang the little children, he has to obey ... or he thinks he is bound by a macabre, ridiculous oath that only the devil can invent. Such an oath obliges nothing to God and to conscience is certain, because it is a horrendous blasphemy, it is a cannibalistic oath, crazy, but the postulant, frightened by the promises made and the consequences entailed, does not have the courage to break the handcuffs in that he himself put his fists in, and he was made a criminal, a murderer, a thief and even a parricide without wanting to ... by orders from the Masonic lodge. It would be extremely grotesque if it weren't horribly macabre. And whoever takes such oaths, who takes on such unknown responsibilities, whoever ties hands, feet, conscience in this way, language and life ... cease to be a free man ... he is a slave, a vile slave, unless, as I said, he must be an idiot, a fool or a madman.

### **VII. The apprentice's initiation**

The apprentice is on the threshold of Freemasonry. Little is required of him, only to be cut off his neck, before he reveals the secrets. The cut neck: it's something! And now the poor apprentice goes through the tests of the four elements: earth, air, water and fire. It is a new grotesque antics and at the same time funereal.

First the apprentice enters the reflections room, an obscure place, lit by a sepulchral lamp, the walls lined with black, and full of funeral emblems.

It is the first act of clowning. It already makes the fool's hair stand on end, But onward; it's just the first step. You must then go through the four elements.

It must pass through the earth, in whose bosom it is supposed to be ... A skeleton lies beside it in an open coffin. If there is no skeleton, a skull must be placed on the table (Ragon Ritual). It is easy for them to have any skulls of the victims they had murdered. The apprentice remains there for some time. You must answer three questions in writing and then make your will. Blindfold him, and so he must present himself at the store, from the strap up in a shirt, his arm and left side uncovered, his bare knee, his left shoe heeled (Apprentice's lan).

It is the second act of clowning; the journey across the land.

The apprentice must then make other simulated trips by air, water and fire. Such journeys are nothing more than grotesque imaginations, in order to terrify the apprentice and to close his mouth, so as not to reveal the crimes and insults he could witness.

For the first trip they simulate difficulties and obstacles, (which do not exist). The venerable screams: Jump, to cross a ditch that only exists in your brains.

- Lift your right foot to climb a high. - Get down again. - Go up the stairs. - Pass over the redouca. And during this time assistant masons must produce the sound of numerous assistants (who are not) and imitate the noise of hail and thunder, just like a bottle of Leide. (Mand. Of apr. Ragon..).

Here's air purification. It is the third act of clowning!

On the second trip, the water is purified; during this trip the candidate only hears a deafening noise, and the clash of swords (knives).

The smart one. ∴ immerse the candidate's left wrist three times in a vase of water.

The third trip is a trial by fire and is done quickly and in silence. The candidate is followed, involving him three times and cautiously, in the flames until he reaches his place.

They then present the bitter drink and ven. \*. tells him gravely: "The profane who is received a Mason, ceases to have himself; it doesn't belong to itself anymore."

It is the fourth act of clowning.

### **IX. Admission to Freemasonry**

It's the new antics. The candidate must take an oath. Until now, the candidate was blindfolded; they take the blindfold off. It is led to the altar; they place an open compass on his left hand, put his right hand on the sword (knife), the left leg squarely, and thus take the oath already mentioned.

The venerable gives him the goatskin apron and teaches him the words, signs and touches.

The word possession is T ... son of Lamé.

The order word is: we will do everything squarely. The order is to stand, the right hand extended under the throat, the four fingers together and the thumb turned at right angles to the others.

The guttural signal is to withdraw your hand horizontally and drop it perpendicularly. The touch is made, simultaneously taking the four fingers of the right hand; placing his thumb on the index phalanx, and by an invisible movement, hit the apprentice three times.

This is how Freemasons receive the light, It is the fifth act of clowning.

The profane becomes initiated; the candidate is a Freemason, a freemason, or a freemason, it matters little. He is another man ... the man of light ... but of the infernal light! ...

## **X. Conclusion**

It is time to conclude ... Laughing too much gives pain in the cheeks ... and here everything is to laugh. Let us finish by repeating just the question: Can a serious man enter Freemasonry ???

The reader will give the answer. It seems impossible. To submit to scenes so burlesque, so grotesque, senile or childish ... To consent to so many mimics and charlatanic grimaces, is not a serious man. So serious men, of value, of position, of responsibilities, who pride themselves on honor, dignity and pride, will lend themselves to an idiotic comedy, to gestures, words and passages of a senility of madmen ... these men , who call themselves male drivers, will be subjected to acts of comedians, jugglers, gangsters, bohemians, pagodeiros who make you laugh and cry with compassion and shame ?!

Oh! it's too much! There is no common sense person who can admit it or believe it.

There are comic theaters ... there are circuses of clowns ... to have fun ... they will watch these acts ... but that men of society, serious men, descend from the throne of their education to lower themselves and make themselves- if clowns ...

to take oaths to lose their dignity as free men, to become miserable slaves to strangers, that goes beyond common sense ...

It's too much: No, no, never! A Freemason is necessarily an idiot, a fool, or a madman. Poor masons, deluded, get up and shake the handcuffs of slavery, to regain dignity and freedom!

And you, men of common sense, flee from the shameful and degrading sect that is Freemasonry. It is a degrading antics. It's a demon antics. It is a dangerous antics.

## TENTH FLASH

### **Freemasonry and Rotarism**

The information about Freemasonry would be incomplete without mentioning an organization that, outwardly, presents itself with friendly airs and gestures, to better gain confidence, but that within it is a hidden enemy of the Church, an enemy the more dangerous, the more carefully Hides. It is the Rotary club.

Today's youth see Rotary as just an innocuous, recreational society that has nothing to do with religion, and even shows itself to be a friend of religion.

Watch out for wolves in sheep's clothing! Rotary, still poorly known, is innocuous, as Freemasonry was, before taking off the mask that hid its plans.

In Brazil, Rotary is harmless, for now, because, being in a Catholic country, it would be the height of recklessness to immediately reveal its plan and its connections. Rotary is thinner; first, it entices the youth of all creeds, and then, at the right time, it will show what it is, what it wants, just like Freemasonry of the early days. No illusion! Read what follows here about it.

### **I. What is Rotarism**

Rotarism must be judged by the purpose it proposes and the means it employs to achieve that end.

Now, its motto is “to make good men in a good society”.

Such a currency, at first glance, looks excellent; but if you examine it closely, you can see it. a fundamental mistake: - “Making good men is an excellent end; by making good men, we will constitute a good society, the former being the cause of the latter. There can be no good society, without good men, because the group of men, which forms society, will necessarily be what its components are, men ”.

And what are the means that Rotarians employ to achieve this end? For that, he proposes a natural morality, which, in the best of cases, will be nothing more than the fulfillment of natural laws, inscribed in the conscience, by nature. Here's what is already an aberration!

But there is more than that. Rotarism declares that it does not interfere in the sanctuary of conscience, so that in the observance of natural laws, social relations are limited to it. This is the most serious.

Man is composed of an immortal body and soul, and as such he has duties to God, to his neighbor and to himself.

To want to reject your duties towards God, in order to preserve your duties towards society, is to reject divine law and to want to establish a purely pagan civilization. Pagans adopted the same rule of life: be kind to one another.

In this case, Rotarians reject God and any religion, so they are nothing but atheists; replacing God with society, they fall into miserable pantheism.

Making good men, without religion, is a utopia, it is a fundamental mistake. After original sin, man is inclined to evil, and cannot resist this evil without divine grace. To want to do it well, without religion, is just a gross illusion, already denied by the 19 centuries of Christian civilization, and (still) collapsed by the daily experiences of nations and individuals.

Rotarism therefore sins at the base. Its ideal is a utopia. Their means of achieving this ideal are another utopia. The motto “Making good men in a good society” is just an illusionist cover, to hide crude ends and feed the great cancer of today's society: indifferentism.

Rotarism is therefore reprehensible in its means, as it is reprehensible in the end it seeks to achieve.

### **II. Origin of Rotary**

The first Rotarian club was founded on February 23, 1905, in Chicago, by Paulo P. Harris, a lawyer in that city. The second was established by the same Harris, in San Francisco, in 1908. Soon many other clubs appeared in several cities in the United States and abroad. In 1910, Rotary became an international association, with limited funds

and in accordance with the laws of the State of Illinois. Chesly Perry succeeded Harris, being replaced by Artur Sapp. And after this, other chiefs came.

The Rotary emblem, from which the name comes from, is a cogwheel, with five spokes, with the words: Rotary International. There are several explanations for this emblem.

The various Rotarian groupings are autonomously organized, under the leadership of an inter-provincial steering committee, with the international leadership in Chicago, from where the general guidelines emanate secretly.

All political interference is excluded. Rotary intends to have a moral and social mission, consisting mainly of “serving” society. From all fields of human activity - industrial, commercial, agricultural, intellectual, technical, professional - Rotary recruits an aristocracy, the fruit of the severe discipline that governs membership.

The spirit of this association is, in fact, nothing but a deft masking of Masonic secularism.

On the pretext of tolerance, of broadness of ideas, Rotarian philosophy puts all religions on an equal footing. The Rotarian, as such, whatever his religion, must adopt a special moral code (Rotary Code of Ethic), which abstracts from all positive religions and places himself above all of them. The fundamental principle - whoever serves best makes the most of it - is taken from the Masonic Code: "You work for yourself, when you prefer everything to the usefulness of your brother".

Rotary brings an original vice from the cradle: founded by a Freemason, its first members were Freemasons, several of its directors are Freemasons. In addition, it has points of affinity with other similar institutions, born, in recent years, by American Freemasonry, which sees a set of companies created in order to effectively propagate, under its inspiration, its ideal and its interests. In the whole world. Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung provides interesting clarifications. This magazine defines such organizations as “sprouts of American Freemasonry”, whose purpose is to place, directly or indirectly, the various states and classes of society - young men and women, men and women of all conditions - under the influence of Freemasonry. :

### **III. Freemasonry and Rotarism**

This original vice of Rotary is widely revealed in the manifestations of society and in its relations with Freemasonry. In Mexico, Rotary endeavored to help, when it could, the work of sectarianism and persecution by the Calles government, closely linking itself to the “YMCA”, which, in that unhappy nation, does active Protestant propaganda.

Brother Robert A. Greenfield, in a memoir published on The Religious Question in Mexico, explicitly states that Freemasonry makes use of the “YMCA” and Rotary to combat Catholicism, destroy all religious sentiment and strengthen the Pan American influence.

The Masonic magazine "Alpina", an organ of the Swiss Grand Lodge, announcing a conference held in a store on Rotary, confesses with satisfaction that Rotarian clubs count many Freemasons and adds: "What, moreover, considering the general principles, it is easy to understand".

The Official Bulletin of the Great Spanish East gives valuable information about the very cordial relations between Rotary and Freemasonry in Venezuela.

Wiener Freimaurer Zeitung, an organ of the Grand Lodge of Vienna, says that in London there is a special store, very flourishing, reserved for members of Rotary (May 1928, p. 20).

Elsewhere, where certain approaches would make a bad impression, Rotary is more reserved; it even seeks to attract good Catholics to its bosom, highlighting, by the press, acts and ways of deference towards religion. This is especially true in Spain.

In face of the serious suspicions that, from a Catholic point of view, weigh on Rotary, he declared, more than once, through the mouths of its leaders, that it is free from Masonic interference, without, however, proving it clearly.

Let us add to this what we said above, that is, that Rotary, together, is of Masonic inspiration. Just read the aforementioned Rotarian moral code to see how your conception of the moral life is very far from the spiritualist and Christian conception. Everything, in it, is reduced, purely and simply, to individual utilitarianism, masked by a vague ideal of humanity. Certain maxims contained in the Rotarian code are absolutely false. Freemasonry does not cease to proclaim that it is necessary to replace all positive religions with the religion of humanity, and the morality founded on religion by the lay morality of Masonic equality and fraternity. From this point of view, the Rotarian code is most closely related to the Masonic code and the "Declarations of Principle" deliberated at the Congress of the International Masonic Association in 1921. The common foundations are none other than the classic errors of naturalism condemned by Leo XIII in the encyclical *Humanum Genus*, with religious indifferentism coming first.

It seems, on the other hand, that Rotary wants to take advantage of the depression in Freemasonry today, in most of the European continent, to place Anglo-Saxon Freemasonry in the positions lost by Latin Freemasonry.

Conclusions:

1. Rotary has Masonic origins.
2. In many countries marching hand in hand with Freemasonry.
3. In certain places he assumed openly anti-Catholic attitudes.
4. Rotarian morality is nothing but a cover-up for Masonic lay morality.

#### **IV. Rotarian morality**

Rotarian morals are all natural morals; in other words: it is just an animal morality. Virtues are necessarily the flowering of morals, so that supernatural virtues blossom on supernatural morals, and natural virtues can blossom only on natural virtues.

That is why, being logical with itself, rotarism only advocates mutual respect, philanthropy, beneficence, literacy, sports, entertainment, etc.

Now, such virtues have no virtue; they are just customs of mutual respect, or sociability; philanthropy or external actions, which excite men's approval; sports, or hygienic, athletic, or social distractions.

There is no shadow of virtue in all of this, so Rotarian morality is not about making men intrinsically good, but only socially good.

It is a varnish that intends to pass over the blackened walls of vice, levity, futility, so that what religion disapproves of as indifference, society approves of it as a social virtue. It is a mistake, and a fundamental mistake.

Morality is the fruit of dogma. By dogma we believe what God teaches us. Morally, we do what He tells us.

Rotarism goes the other way. It intends to form happy men, freeing them of all belief and all morals. It considers public honesty as the great, the only dogma and the only moral. Now, public honesty, while necessary, is nevertheless the least expression of our duties. Man does not simply have duties to society; they have us above all, it is first of all, towards God. Rotarism does not admit any religion, because it wants to be able to admit in its bosom all men, whatever the religion they profess. And to be able to admit them, without any clash of ideas, internal struggles, it is necessary to suppress the embarrassments. Now, the first embarrassment is necessarily that which comes from ideas, and among ideas, the most intolerant, which presents itself as the most prone to dissension and conflict, is the religious idea.

Therefore, they intend to reject such an idea ... Rotarism declares itself neutral, without any religion. Its members, as Rotarians, are simply men, but men of nature, who have only one purpose: to be good to society. The Catholic can be Catholic in his church. The Protestant will be Protestant in his house of prayer, The Spiritist will be a Spiritist in his macumba. The Mason will be a Mason in his triangle shop. The Buddhist will worship Buddha in his pagodas. But each of them, who passes the threshold of the Rotary Club, is simply a man with no idea of their own, a Rotarian, a friend of society ... nothing more.

In the club there is neither Christ, nor Luther, nor Alan Kardec, nor Hiram, nor Buddha; there is exclusively the Rotarian, the man without ideas. Now, a man without ideas is an idiot. If the Rotarian fulfilled his club's ideal, he would be nothing more than an idiot. Fortunately, for such an achievement is impossible.

Man necessarily preserves his acquired ideas, so that one of the Roman senators responded to the proposal of another senator, who proposed to place a statue of Jesus Christ in the midst of the gods of his Pantheon: Christ does not share the your kingdom with anyone; he wants everything, or accepts nothing. Raising a statue, it is necessary to remove the statues of the other gods.

Rotarism aims to exclude everything. It's impossible!

None of these men who enter there will renounce their religious idea. The Catholic, being without conviction, may become Protestant, Spiritist, Buddhist, that is: he will not resign, but he will change his religious idea, while the Protestant, the Spiritist, the Freemason will become fervent propagandists of their condemned sects, trying to impose their ideas.

Any human god can reign in rotarism, whether it be Judas, Barabbas, Caiaphas, Lenin, Trotsky or any other person, but the divine God, Jesus Christ, will not reign there.

### **V. Rotarian neutrality**

Rotarism therefore intends to establish religious neutrality as the basis of its association. Now, such neutrality is absolutely impossible. The religious idea is innate in man. Homo naturaliter christianus, said Tertullian.

Someone may cease to belong to such or such a determined religion, he may adopt error and even absurdity, but he must lean towards any religious idea.

Not being Catholic, you will be Protestant, Spiritist, fetishist, if you like; and not professing any religion, he will profess the religion of superstition. Superstition is like the religion of those who claim to have no religion.

Those swashbucklers who boast, by mouth, of not believing, neither in God nor in a devil, will never accept to sit at a table 13, start a trip on the 13th of the month; they do not believe in God, they say, but they believe in a spider, an owl, a black butterfly, ghosts, visions, and even the words of any sorcerer, pagé or healer in the country.

No! no! Rotarian friends, your alleged neutrality is impossible, and that is why the Masonic idea, the Protestant idea dominates among you as dogma, and, as a moral, unrestrained debauchery, surrounded by attractive formulas of philanthropy, sports, entertainment.

Here's why there are three categories of members in the Rotary Club:

1. Foolish Catholics.
2. The enjoyers of life.
3. The enemies of the Catholic religion.

Foolish Catholics let themselves be deceived by beautiful words, promises, appearances, there they are dragged into the abyss, without the courage to react or break the shackles of their involuntary slavery.

Life-seekers find Rotary an open field for their inclinations. There is no religion, there is no morality ... so, onward, let's enjoy, they say, while we have time.

The enemies of religion find support in Rotary for their plans to fight the Church, because in an environment without religion, it will be easy for them to recruit companions, to whom they will be able to transmit their hatred, their desires for revenge and persecution. . Many Rotary members are well-known Freemasons, while others are fanatical Protestants.

The press cites, at every moment, gestures, words and writings that compromise the Rotary mentality, and proves that their favors are always for the Macon or Protestant, and never for the Church or Catholic institutions.

## **VI. The Catholic demand**

Neutrality in religion is impossible, as is the neutrality of a son with respect to his father. A son owes his father respect and obedience and cannot, even if he wants to, stop being his father's son, cannot fail to pay him the respect he owes him.

The Catholic is a son of God, through baptism, and whether he likes it or not, he will remain, in life, in death, and even in the depths of hell, if he loses his soul. It is an unappealable character that baptism imprints on the Christian's soul.

Through baptism the Christian leaves the natural order and rises to the supernatural order.

And once constituted in that order, he can no longer retreat. He is a Christian, and will be so throughout eternity. Addiction, mud, rot can cover up its title, like mud can cover up a diamond fallen on the ground, but in the mud like outdoors the diamond exists, and it shines, although in the mud its shine is invisible to our eyes .

The Christian's uplift is a dogma, not simply a fact. Christianity therefore requires that man is not simply good. Being good is a necessity for every man; being a good Christian is a necessity for every Christian. Now, to be a good Christian, you must be, not simply

in your private, intimate life, but everywhere, accommodating your social life as your intimate life to the norms of the Catholic Church.

The Christian can never do without his character as a Christian. There is no purely natural kindness for the Christian, such as the one he intends to make practicing Rotary; there is only Christian goodness; this alone has merit in life and a reward in heaven.

Any association that deviates from dogma and Christian morality, to adopt another dogma and another moral law, is unlawful for the Christian and constitutes a danger to his faith, and a denial of his belief.

Associations must necessarily adopt one of three positions regarding religion: 1) Positively in opposition to it; 2) Declaring itself neutral; 3) Declaring itself favorable.

In the first position, frankly hostile to religion, are Freemasonry, Protestantism, Spiritism and Communism, not to mention other isms. These associations, formally condemned by the Church, inspire disgust on the part of all Catholics of dignity and dignity.

In the second position, we intend to place Rotary.

Such is your public intention. This is not, however, his particular intention, as demonstrated by hundreds of facts reported by Catholic newspapers.

Rotary, even if it admits that it has a loyal intention of perfect neutrality, cannot sustain it, and the association has to preferentially lean towards one or another doomed sect.

It was in this way that Freemasonry began. In the beginning it was a simple association of masons, with the purpose of supporting each other, in the execution of construction works. Freemasonry intended to remain neutral, outside of all religious matters, in order to be able to accept people of all cults and creeds into its union; well, we know how soon it fell into Protestantism and, soon after, adopting Protestant fanaticism, it became the great enemy of the Catholic Church.

The same fate is reserved for Rotarism, sooner or later, and it is a matter of a few years, Rotary will be a branch of Freemasonry, and will become completely hostile to Catholic teaching.

The third position is that of those who openly declare themselves in favor of the Catholic religion. Such associations, fortunately, are in large numbers, almost all.

Catholics, in order to obey the law of the Church, as well as the laws of their conscience, cannot in any way join the first two associations.

The first is condemned by the Church. The second is not yet, but continuing to follow the path taken, it will one day ... and even if it were not publicly, it always constitutes a serious danger to the faith of Catholics, and as such it must be strictly removed.

A Catholic cannot be a Rotarian!

## **VII. Another argument**

We found a decisive argument against the Rotary Club in its origin. It is above all an American, Protestant-Masonic institution.

Now, it is difficult, if not impossible, to believe that Protestants will come to build social institutions in Brazil that have no Protestant purpose.

They found schools and gyms in Brazil, shouting and writing in all the newspapers in the country, that religious opinions will be respected there, and that each one will be free to practice their own religion. In the beginning, there was no lack of foolish parents

who believed in such promises; today it is in the public domain that such freedom does not exist. It is not for the love of Brazil that Americans found schools in Brazil. In addition to financial profit, as the crisis currently tightens American finances like those of other countries, there is Protestant propaganda, which aims to sow among Brazilians, united by the same faith, doubt and discord, for the free interpretation of the Bible and for slander against the Church, the Pope and the Fathers.

There is not a single Protestant college that makes an exception to this proselytizing orientation, from the Grambery, in Juiz de Fora, to the gym simulacrum, in Jequitibá.

What these pastors want is to spread their ideas ... it is to remove the children of Catholics from the belief of their parents ... it is to infiltrate the poison of their errors and their hatreds in the intelligence of youth, forcing students to assist their students. cults.

This proselytic fanaticism is now widely known, and that is why, in places still sincerely Catholic, Protestant colleges are deserted and scorned.

Rotary changed its cover, but under the new cover the same enemy is hidden. It is an American and Protestant tree. And this tree wants to be planted on the same land, to produce the same fruit, under a different name.

Formerly it was the love of civilization, the teaching that such Protestants preached. Today is social education, sports, entertainment, athletics, etc. that they advertise.

They just became the label ... behind it is always Protestant propaganda.

Formerly the shepherds came to Brazil, as civilizers in the middle of a country of savages; as doctors in the middle of a huge hospital, to bring Brazilians light, health and progress. I do not exaggerate anything, as they are the words of several Protestant emissaries.

Rotary, seeing the efforts of such would-be evangelists frustrated, took another name and a different direction.

Seeing that Brazil has nothing to envy American Protestants, in terms of civilization and education, they decided to come and have fun, cheer us up, organizing American clubs, American sports, American games; but all with Protestant-Masonic ideas, guidance and end.

The Brazilian youth, who did not allow themselves to be captivated by Protestant science, may be caught by the Protestant amusements ...

The medium does not matter; what is essential is to gain the confidence of the Brazilian youth and instill religious indifference,

Once indifferent, such youth will naturally depart from their parents' religion ... and once helpless, it will not be difficult to instill, with the admiration of Americanism, a love of Protestantism.

Brazilian youth ... I opened my eyes ... both ...  
because the worst enemy is the one who hides!

### **VIII. Conclusion**

Let us draw the conclusion from the above principles.

What should you think about rotarism? Which is a very dangerous association; and the more dangerous it is, the better it hides.

Such an association, by the motto or coat of arms that guides it: Making good men in a good society, is deficient, as it is limited to a social formation, excluding religious formation, which is and will always be the preponderant element in all formation.

Rotary intends to form indifferent people. Now, indifferentism is the wound of our time ... it is the chronic evil of our modern society. Man cannot be indifferent to God, just as he cannot be indifferent to his country and his family. Rotary therefore sins from the bottom in its educational organization.

In addition, Rotary, although it hides and presents itself for philanthropic purposes, has a sin of origin, which only Christian baptism could erase: “It is an American-Protestant society”. Being an American is not an evil; but what is an evil is to be of Protestant origin; and experience shows us every day that every Protestant association aims to proselytize, propaganda against the Catholic Church.

If rotarism was for altruistic purposes only, it “could be Protestant, in Protestant lands; but he must be Catholic in Catholic lands. In this case, yes; it would show that its neutrality is a reality, and that such neutrality aims to adapt to the environment where it penetrates and intends to take up residence.

But that doesn't happen! Rotarism is, remains, and wants to remain neutral externally everywhere, but remains, internally, Protestant everywhere. It is enough to show what he is and what he wants!

So, can a Catholic boy be a member of Rotary? No, no, no! not three times! because rotarism is flawed in its end, it is false in its proclaimed ideal, it is perverse in its results.

Perhaps they will say that the Church is uncompromising! It is not! ... It is the truth that it is, and it must be! The truth is what I have just exposed ... The lie is what Rotary presents to us ... Can the lie be true? ... or the truth be a lie? ... No! It's impossible.

Brazilians, we are a Catholic people. We have an end, an ideal, a faith, a doctrine, a moral and means chosen by God Himself, to achieve this end and to realize this ideal, both as Christians and as members of the society in which we live. These means are not mere advice, they are essential duties! The Christian's life cannot be partial, eclectic; it must be integral, complete. Jesus Christ has already said it: You cannot serve two masters (Mt 6:24). He also said: Whoever is not for me is against me. - Qui non est mecum, against me (Mt 12, 30).

Catholic boys, organize Catholic associations, and do not join foreign, dangerous and perverse associations. Do not be deceived by appearances or promises, but put above all your faith and your religious pride. I ran away from Rotary because it is contrary to this faith and pride. It can serve Protestants; it's not for Catholics!

The Spanish episcopate has recently published a circular declaring that it is illegal for Catholics to affiliate with Rotarism. This implicit condemnation, made by the episcopate of several countries, is justified ...

and only religious ignorance can excuse the end and the means of this association.

Rotary is nothing more than a Protestant-Masonic institution, having the same purpose as these two organizations, taking on just another appearance! Let us not be deceived by it. The Rotary Club is an enemy of the religion of Jesus Christ. Let us therefore treat it as such!

#### **Fourth angel of darkness**

## THE DIVORCISM

- 1) Divorcism and disease.
- 2) Marriage and divorce in the face of reason, society and religion.

### ELEVENTH FLASH

#### **Divorcism and illness from mr. Hector Lima**

Several Catholics sent me a series of articles from the now sadly celebrated Heitor Lima, about divorce, asking me to give him an answer. I went through a couple of these articles, and I was hesitant. Such a collection of nonsense does not deserve an answer. What suits them is water, creolina and broom. Drool, gibberish, mud, are not refuted; sweep up.

I don't know that Heitor Lima; I believe I know him better than what appears in his articles; However, if it is true that man is what his ideas are, Mr. Heitor Lima is a patient, and he is, above all, an ignorant: - ignorant of psychology, religion and history. It even makes the impression of a schoolboy, who knows a little about algebra, geometry and history, thinks he is the know-it-all of this world, capable of dogmatizing, and directing the world, the moon and the stars ... and does not know still run your own life.

I do not intend to refute all of Mr. Heitor Lima. Such articles are refuted by the reader's common sense, who immediately notes atheism, the lack of a sense of morality, patriotism and history, in order to - at least what it seems - to please some flattering ladies, of Bolshevik ideas. and free love ...

It is only this that presents itself to a reader with clear, not preconceived ideas, desirous of truth and good.

#### **I. The divorce disease**

Divorce is a disease: - disease of intelligence, disease of will and disease of heart.

In the first case, it is what medicine calls monomania, the fixed idea about a point, which only sees this point, and becomes unable to reason about everything that goes against this point. It seems to me to be Mr. Heitor Lima. - He's a monomaniac.

Such an illness of the spirit, developing, becomes mania, which is already partial madness ... and often ends in dementia. It is the great modern disease. Spiritism is the gradual development of this disease.

Spiritism as a doctrine, or as a science, does not exist, as divorce does not exist; what exists is the disease, and divorce is a consequence of this disease. It is monomania, in the beginning; it is the mania afterwards, or spiritism, which ends in the asylum, due to dementia. Poor Heitor Lima is on a dangerous, slippery road.

But there is not only the disease of intelligence; the others of will and heart are no less dangerous in this case. The truth has its extremes: it is exaggerated optimism, or clumsy pessimism. The divorcist or pessimist sees everything through the black prism of his morbid tendencies.

For him, marriage is not a sacred act, in search of joyful happiness; it is the pleasure of the animal, the sensual neurosis, it is rot of the mud.

And the heart? Poor heart! He has countless diseases, he has, above all, the pleasure, the delirium of passion ...

It is not love, because love is noble and passion is demeaning ... Passion is a disease. The divorcee suffers from this disease; he is a sick triple ... everything is sick in him.

Catholic writers do not remember this enough; they refute these people, accumulate arguments, elevate the will, excite love to the purity of marriage, but they do not remember that the divorcee is unable to understand one of these arguments, because he is a patient. He's a monomaniac, he's a pessimist, he's an addict.

I don't have the courage to apply all this to Mr. Heitor Lima; it cannot be applicable to you; however, a little bit of logic, a little bit of psychology and a little bit of life experience, compel attributing it all to divorcees.

We are facing a pathological or psychic case, or else of malice. Mr. Heitor Lima must be a boy, judging by his articles, who has not yet had time to create hair on the chin, nor judgment on the brain. Let him get to where the white beard of "The Fighter" has already arrived and he will change his opinions and ideas, because he will better understand the reality of life. And if it doesn't change, then it is because the disease was incurable.

But let's go to the divorcee's article.

## **II. Weightings without weight**

The first of Mr. Heitor Lima, who comes to my hands, is the one of "ponderings". Let us examine these considerations, which seem to constitute the battle army of the illustrious, but sickly divorcist, while the other articles seem to be the reserve.

The first impression, which leaves in the reader's mind, as indeed all articles by the same author, is the realization of Voltaire's word:

A deluge of mots, sur désert d'idées.

"A deluge of words, over a desert of ideas".

The man speaks, always speaks, does not stop, affirms, denies, but does not prove anything of everything he says. No proof, no serious and solid argument that supports a little analysis of common sense, history, or positive science.

The man intends to discuss, refute and attack the illustrious doctors Clóvis Bevilaqua, Miguel Couto and others; he shouts that they are wrong, but he cites no proof of the error, no argument that destroys the arguments of those sums.

The man begins in a dogmatic tone, assuming that what he asserts is already proven: A social renewal of Brazil will not be possible without the adoption of a binding divorce.

A child can write such an assertion; a man of thought and judgment would not dismantle such sophistry, unless he were ill from the three faculties indicated above.

Everyone understands that a renovation is a positive thing, a statement. But a statement is not made by negation, as a positive effect cannot be produced by a negative cause.

Now, divorce is a denial, it is a defect. It is the denial of the contracted marriage, it is a defect arising from an unsuccessful marriage. How can such a negative effect now be a positive instrument of social renewal? How can society be renewed by introducing a cut, a stab? What relationship can there be between social renewal and divorce? It is more than a mystery, it is absurd.

The renewal of a country depends on the combined and orderly effort of all its members: - on the leading side, for clairvoyance, for justice and for the opportunity of the laws it makes; on the part directed by cooperation and docility to these laws.

Now, divorce can only reach the smallest minority, and the minority without judgment, because, finally, it is necessary to exclude all singles, widowers and the happily married, leaving only a dozen bohemians, another dozen addicts, and half a dozen crazy, who married without knowing why and with whom. And are these two and a half dozen without quality going to renew Brazilian society? ...

Then the thinking, prudent and prudent men will be the reformed ones, while the bohemians and enjoyers of life will be the reformers ...:

The tempora, the mores ... usquedum, would exclaim old Cicero. I believe in Mr. Heitor Lima, in his monomania, but I cannot believe in his talents as a social renovator. This is impossible!

### **III. The earthly paradise**

Brazil, thus reformed by the method of mr. Heitor Lima, would be the earthly paradise of the divorced, the beatific Jerusalem of the women merchants. Gentlemen!

take off your hat! And you ladies, throw flowers on the naked skull and the hollow brains of divorcee Heitor Lima and ... along with the music! ...

“Allons, however, the jour de gloire est arrivé”.

The Brazil of today and yesterday, of the Republic and of the Empire, is in darkness and idiocy, because there was no light or lamp, which is Heitor Lima, Such the colossus of Rhodes, having a lighthouse in one hand and throwing mud with the other, he would have made Brazil what the Brazilian genius did not yet know how to do: “a tribe of Indians or Africans”, because among them divorce is accepted and widely practiced.

Why did mr. Didn't Heitor Lima take up residence among the Indians and Africans? Their theories, among them, would be crowned with full success.

The Brazilian society is in danger, dissolves, dies, because the union between the spouses is sacred, indissoluble, loving each other in hardships and happiness, and separating only at the edge of the tomb.

“And this is from Zulu,” cries the new reformer. the man must not connect with the woman, nor the woman with the man. This is wild ... The man must love today, hate tomorrow and then separate, or put a bullet in the head of the consort. This, yes, breaks the monotony of life, gives satisfaction, prosperity and happiness; this is earthly paradise! ... O all of you who suffer, says the divorcist master mellifluously, come to me, and I will give you, instead of Voronoff's rejuvenating pills, the laxative capsules of divorce.

All that is missing is to bring happiness to every home and every hollow mind. With this regime, the husband will love his wife with passionate love ... and after the honeymoon, he will put her on the street, in prostitution, for the golden divorce.

The wife, on the other hand, knowing that she has only a few days to spend in the new house, will be of kindness, of a kindness, of an unparalleled affection, living in hugs and kisses, until one day the divorcee husband, for having slept badly, he becomes lunatic, nervous, and he sends his half-brother out to the street, planting broad beans, for the golden divorce!

And the children ... they will receive in return so much love on the one hand, and so much indifference on the other that, between tears and smiles, today having a father and tomorrow losing their mother, they will be educated as citizens of a new life, more or less as in the Soviet Russian paradise.

And all this will be done so naturally, that it will neither disturb the seraphic peace of the married, nor the angelic sleep of the children; all this will be done with a seraph smile, like a cherub kiss, and a Russian candy, under the supreme pontificate of the reform pontiff - Heitor Lima.

Congratulations, patrician, for your thoughts. The moving and grateful future will raise you a symbolic statue: a man with a woman under his feet; in one hand he holds a flaming heart, and in the other, a smoking revolver, with the statue by the inscription below: "Paraíso terrenal de Heitor Lima!"

#### **IV. The Roman concept**

Mr. Heitor Lima perhaps professes the religion of Epicurus, or of Muhammad. It is not known: what is certain is that he is angry with Rome. Will it be the Rome of the Caesars, or the Rome of the Popes? I don't know; but I suppose it belongs to the second, because the first was a divorcee, and Heitor Lima becomes the copyist of the morality of fallen Rome in the time of pagan emperors.

Listen to the poor man's Ciceronian word: The Roman concept that the intimate structure of the state depends on the way in which the family is constituted, remains standing. Happy state presupposes happy individuals. The State is an abstraction and the other end is aimed only at the happiness of individuals.

All of this is true, and at the same time the formal condemnation of mournfully grotesque errors. Heitor Lima.

The Catholic Church, following natural, social and divine law, which should serve as a basis for every institution that seeks to improve society, declares that marriage is not a simple contract for the purchase and sale of human flesh, as the divorcists practically teach, but, rather, a law of nature, a social law and a divine law.

If it were just a social law, governments could vote for divorce, since, in this case, it was just a simple bilateral contract, born of the consent of the parties, this contract could end for the causes that gave it existence.

But marriage is not a contract like the others: Its end is determined by nature, as is the regime necessary to achieve this end. We will briefly study this regime, as well as the divine law that governs it.

We can already say that marriage, as the Church teaches, or according to the Roman concept, as Heitor Lima says, although it is not a concept, but a fundamental law, marriage, I mean, is indissoluble, by the law of nature, social law and divine law, so that divorce is an aberration, a violence against these three laws, and as such it is an aberration against common sense, morals, progress and happiness. It is a crime against humanity, against society and against divinity.

Heitor Lima must not be so foolish as to not understand this; but there is no worse fool than he who is evil, as there is no worse fool than he who is not, but he becomes crazy, out of addiction or out of interest.

Let us follow Mr. Heitor Lima, destroying his own arguments. The Roman concept, or the religion of Jesus Christ, teaches that the state must be like the extension of the

family. Good families form good states. Indissoluble families, form indissoluble states, like nomadic, vacillating, versatile families, form vacillating states, without firmness and without duration. This is a principle of simple sociology. And Heitor Lima must grant this principle.

Happy state presupposes happy individuals, he says.

And he adds that the State is an abstraction.

Now, an abstraction cannot have happiness. The State, as such, needs firmness, justice, and this firmness and justice must be the guarantee, the protector of the individual happiness of its components.

## **V. The happiness of the people**

A happy state is one whose people are happy. And what is the happiness of the people, of the individuals? For the healthy man it is the stable satisfaction of his faculties and rational tendencies. For the unbalanced it is pleasure, which is always more or less elusive and superficial.

Happiness is therefore very different from pleasure. Even the animal feels the pleasure; only man is capable of happiness,

Here, again, mr. Heitor Lima reveals an incredible ignorance, in notions of psychology and sociology. The happiness of the individual does not depend on the pleasure he experiences, but on the lasting and permanent satisfaction of his faculties. And the higher these faculties, the greater the happiness that your exercise gives you.

In man there is a happiness of the spirit: it is that of the wise. There is a happiness of the will in him: he is the virtuous man, the saint. There is a happiness of the heart in it: it is rational, pure and honest love. There is also pleasure in man: licit pleasure and infamous pleasure; the first comes from the spirit, the will and the heart; the second comes from muddy addiction.

What does a man look for in marriage? Is it just the pleasure of the senses? In this case, it's just an animal.

Is it happiness? In this case, he is a rational man.

But happiness essentially requires that the state in which it seeks this happiness be stable, permanent, indissoluble, as long as it lives. Now, divorce is the separation, disunity, cessation, or foreseen, or unforeseen, or accomplished, of this state. It is, therefore, essentially opposite to man's happiness.

I do not speak now of the things that can influence its execution; we will see this later, incidentally, such things are accidental, particular, limited, and an accidental cause cannot change the essence of the facts; how the exception to a law does not prejudice this law; on the contrary, it confirms the law.

Happiness and divorce are two opposing elements and that is essentially it. Divorce, for almost always fictitious reasons, breaking the bond of union, breaks the bond of happiness, because there is no happiness in a precarious, temporary union; there can only be pleasure.

Mr. Heitor Lima, unconscious, formed the syllogism, but, ignorant as it is in logical notions, he did not know how to draw the conclusion contained in them from the premises.

Excuse me for the master to give you this little lesson.

I do it for your good, as it is a work of spiritual mercy to teach the ignorant, whether they are unconscious or voluntary ignorants.

Happy individuals, not jokers, form a happy family. Happy families form a justiceiro state, firm, progressive, which maintains and ensures the happiness of its members.

Here's how mr. Heitor Lima condemns his own principles and theories, and intends with his contradictions to renew Brazilian society! The poor man does not understand himself; how and how can it be understood by others? He sows a mess; it can only reap disunity. He wants to sow winds, and winds only produce storms, and never a calm.

Ignorance, fanaticism or annoyance? We gave him time to solve the problem.

## **VI. Moral culture and divorce**

Let us listen to a few more excerpts from the incomparable Heitor Lima: “There are those who say, he says, (it is so easy to disparage!), There are those who say that Brazilian society does not yet have the moral culture necessary to understand and use the divorce law with discretion. The phrase is almost meaningless.

I admit that moral culture is necessary to get married; not to peel, no. In Brazil, only twenty percent of couples are married”.

Some say! ... It's mr. Heitor Lima who says so.

The phrase is almost meaningless! ... It has the meaning of annoyance or perversity. The divorcist master admits the moral culture to marry; not to peel, no!

A little further, he continues: “What is intended with her (such a phrase)? That moral culture limits divorce?

The opposite is true.”

Let us comment on these expressions for a moment. Mr. Heitor Lima puts it as a principle that moral culture favors divorce. But, man of God, would you like to tell us what moral culture is? Mr. speaks without understanding the meaning of the words. Enough of so many sophisms, paradoxes and puns. What is culture? What is moral?

For us, culture is the development of the faculties of the soul. Wise men cultivate intelligence. Men of character cultivate the will. Honest men cultivate the heart. This triple culture constitutes the complete culture. As for bohemians, they cultivate nothing; they only destroy, pervert.

Monomania is a destroyer of intelligence. Hypocrisy is destructive of the will. Libertinism destroys love. And how did mr. do you intend to build with destructive elements? This is phenomenal! This is just an explanation of its sophistical culture.

And the moral? ... the moral sense, what is it? For us, it is the notion we have of good and evil. For mr. as I will show, it is the opposite: it is the struggle of evil against good.

Morality refers to the faculties of the soul, and as such encompasses intelligence, the will and the heart.

There is morality and immorality for the spirit, the will and the heart, that is, in thoughts, desires and actions. Divorcists' thoughts, by the materialistic theories they profess, are immoral. Their wishes for the propaganda of the divorce plague are immoral. Their illicit loves, which they seek to erect in principle and rule, are immoral. It is the realm of immorality, while indissoluble marriage is the realm of morality.

This is what culture is and what is moral.

## **VII. Marriage and divorce**

Let us now approach these two terms of the word - divorce - and we will see the antagonism, the radical opposition in the idea and the expression. These terms are as opposed to each other, as are the words: white and black, build and destroy, unite and separate.

Marriage is the union of man and woman, in order to achieve the purpose of this act, which is mutual love and procreation.

Divorce is the separation of man and woman, to launch the first in crime and the second in prostitution: without love and without procreation.

And mr. Heitor Lima calls this moral culture. No, sir: it is immoral destruction. Culture is a development; divorce is a decrease. Culture comes from union; divorce is disunity. Morality is an act that brings man to his end; Divorce keeps you from this end. Morality is an act that elevates man; divorce lowers him to the level of animals.

**Conclusion:** Marriage is a free act, however, once accepted, it must be indissoluble both by virtue of natural law, social law and divine law; while divorce, destroying the bond of this indissolubility, offends the law of nature, social law and divine law: it is, therefore, an immoral act.

Moral culture or virtue, therefore, limits divorce and strives for indissoluble marriage. Moral culture is progress: divorce is a return to pagan and savage customs.

How, then, can mr. Heitor Lima to link these two completely contradictory assertions: "Is it necessary to have a moral culture to marry, not to mismatch"? And this other one: "Does moral culture extend divorce"?

It's impossible! The approximation would form the argument of a primary school student, who sees only words, without understanding their meaning.

Yes, it takes moral culture to get married: the proof is in history, which shows us the uncultured, wild and rotten people to avoid marriage, to launch themselves into free love.

It is the lack of this culture that makes the rest, as the life and aberrations of bohemians of all times show us. Such is the meaning of mr. Heitor Lima.

But, how does mr. then says the opposite: "does moral culture extend divorce"? and "the opposite ...

mr. just said it. The moral culture makes man marry and the lack of this culture makes him divorce. Mr. does not understand or remember what he said or is saying.

So true is it that man cannot lie or counterfeit himself forever: the truth sometimes escapes his downfall.

Mr. Lima preaches divorce, but confesses that such a divorce is a lack of moral culture. It is a moral decay, it is an immoral act, This is certain: *Habemus reum contitentem*. And so on.

Mr. Lima writes kilometric articles, stating at the beginning and denying at the end; putting affirmative principles and drawing negative conclusions. It is, according to the word of Jesus Christ, the kingdom of Satan divided against itself, cannot survive. That's why the divorce doesn't exist ...

It is only a sign of decay; it is the denial of natural, social and divine law; but such denial denotes the existence of the law, like ignorance, which is the denial of science, denotes the existence of the latter. Decay by divorce ... restoration by indissoluble marriage.



### **VIII. Divorce benefits**

To make an innovation accept, it is necessary to show its benefits. Mr. Heitor Lima will seek - but in vain - to present us with the benefits of divorce. Unfortunately, these benefits are nothing but chimerical promises, openly contradicting common sense and the experience of life.

Listen to the divorcist master: “First of all, and this is the psychological advantage of divorce, it would tighten the nuptial bond, paradoxical as the statement seems. Coercion predisposes badly, because it predisposes to reaction. The indissoluble character of the marital bond, the thought that freedom has been alienated forever, act as elements of irritation. There is only true morality in spontaneous connections. Cohabiting for love is moral; out of obligation it is immoral, it constitutes even the greatest of immoralities”.

How many paradoxes, sophisms and falsehoods of this first quixotic advantage.

Let's take a closer look, as Mr. Heitor Lima forms a torrent, to hide, by the abundance of words, the vacuum of ideas. Upon hearing the noise, it is thought to be thunder, when it is just the cough of a tuberculous person. Do not be surprised, as there will be no storms.

The first benefit, says mr. Hector, is to tighten the bridal bond. The brave man saw this advantage so grotesque in his theory, that he himself warns as soon as it seems paradoxical. And it not only looks like it, but it is completely. Marriage makes the union - indissolubility tightens this union, making it mandatory for life.

Divorce makes the separation - the idea of divorce predisposes and prepares the separation, and due to the obsessive idea of the possibility of this separation, it irritates at the slightest annoyance, exasperates and finally cuts the bond, either by abandonment or by the bullet.

Mr. Hector intends to tighten the bonds of love, promising him separation; promises love to married people, showing hate; it presents them with happiness, making them the picture of doom. It's the culmination! It is promising kisses and kicking. Only the logic of mr. Hector Lima!

### **IX. Free marriage or love**

And how did mr. master will prove such a paradoxical assertion? It is very simple for him; as everything is simple for those who do not reason. Just say, and that's it: it's done.

The proof, says the divorcist, is that: "coercion predisposes to reaction". Marriage is a constraint for him.

For those who marry thanks by the police, it is really a constraint. But then mr. Heitor Lima believes that most Brazilians are married forced by the police? And he writes that in Rio de Janeiro! ...

As I said, marriage is not a simple bilateral contract, it is a natural, social and divine law. But our Heitor Lima seems to be a Buddhist: for him there is no law, because every law is coercive, and as such, it is irritating. There must be only one law for him: the law of divorce.

So, O man, if marriage is not law, why should divorce be? Law against law, yes, but law against free contract, this is ridiculous. Mr. is in a dilemma here.

Either marriage is law, and as such, perpetual, indissoluble, or else free love must be admitted, destroying the institution of marriage.

The divorcist must adhere to indissolubility, or he must go to the end and abolish marriage, allowing each one to walk with the companion he likes, when and how he likes. :

If there is no law to order, there can be no law to prohibit. If there is no law that unites, there can be no law that separates. If mr. he does not admit the law of marriage, how then does he want the law of divorce? If it is only a bilateral contract, in this case, the marriage must follow the legislation of such contracts, and be extinguished by the free will of both contractors.

Your theory, dear Hector, sins at the base, is a grotesque paradox. Why demolish what doesn't exist? If mr. wants free love, then run across Brazil, renting a retinue of lost women. Mr. it's free; but the good, the honest, the serious men are also free to found their home as a sanctuary, where love, faithfulness and virtue reign until death.

Only the divorcist thinks so; common sense, religion and common sense think differently. And the truth is with them.

## **X. Coercion and reaction**

"Coercion predisposes to reaction", dogmatizes mr. Heitor Lima, Is it because of the rhyme that the man took advantage of both terms? Mr. he was not happy with his choice, he looked too much at the rhyme, and not at the meaning.

In philosophy, (it is true that Mr. Heitor Lima did not study this science guide), in philosophy it is said that every action produces a reaction; this, yes; but coercion produces only sadness, unease.

Besides being a bad thinker, a bad moralist, a bad sociologist, Mr. he is still a terrible philologist.

This highly recommends the burlesque theories of divorce.

According to the interpretation of divorce, man is continually led to reaction towards revolt, because life is a continuous, perpetual and uninterrupted coercion.

Mr. Heitor Lima writes silliness about divorce; he is subject to coercion and has to endure the somewhat heavy licks of the uncompromising "The Fighter".

Mr. Hector intended to be elected to the constituency by the divorcist element; he fell miserably at the bottom of the basket, and with him his Bolshevik theories; he is subject to coercion, having to endure the laughter and laughter of his opponents.

Mr. Heitor Lima thought he would reform Brazil, be the father of novelty, the author of the heyday of the debauchery and debauchery that the divorce would raise; he is subject to coercion as a demoralized man, which Brazil, en masse, despises.

So much coercion should it produce in mr. not the reaction, but the shame, the sadness of having been foolish, pretentious, extravagant and immoral in his ideas.

Such a reaction would be logical ... and it would be worthy, deserving, in addition to the forgiveness of its faults, the esteem of the nation, which would see a sincere, repentant man, who portrays himself and takes another direction.

Such an effect would be produced in a man who is sensible, proud and sincere; it just won't produce in a poor patient, attacked by monomania; the latter, (poor man), will

feel the return, the hatred, and will respond to his antagonists with stones and rudeness, who will act as arguments.

If this were not the case, man's life, which is a continuous constraint, would be a life of revolt and hatred. Fortunately, mr. Heitor Lima will not avenge in our beloved Brazil, which is doomed to a brighter and more noble future, than to throw itself into the stinking mud of divorce or free love.

## **XI. Obligation is immorality**

We forgive poor Mr. Heitor Lima the heresy of common sense; he is a patient, and the sickness that escapes him must not be attributed to a “patient. In fact, we are already used to the paradox of the divorcee.

Here is another one from the master: “Cohabiting, for love, is moral; out of obligation, it is immoral, immoral”.

What a phrase to gawk at fools and shake heads of common sense.

Let us study well this great principle of divorce, formulated by its grand master.

Poor Heitor Lima! We even have compassion for so much verbiage and so little understanding! Mr. it would do well to make an appointment with some distinguished clinician, about his pathological state; another with Dr. Clóvis Bevilacqua, on his social status; and a third with Father Gastão da Veiga, on the state of his soul; these friends of yours, while fighting your morbid ideas, could help you achieve your healing.

I, too, dear Hector, could be useful to you, for in my long life I was chaplain to an insane asylum; I acquired a certain experience of nervous and brain disorders. I'm at your service!

But, let's go to the analysis of the phrase divorce divorce: Cohabiting out of love is moral, out of obligation it is immoral.

My Hector does not yet know how to distinguish between the brute's instinct and man's rational love.

Mr. don't you know what love is? There is a threefold love in man: natural love, - as between parents and children; supernatural love, by divine grace - as between men and God; bestial love - as among animals: it is the brutal instinct.

To marry, at least, natural love is necessary; for the Catholic, the supernatural love of grace is required to receive the sacrament of marriage. Bohemians and divorcees know only bestial love, the instinct of fallen nature.

For them, to love is to enjoy ... it is the love of mud. For us, to love is to give, it is to love the loved one more than you. Why do we marry? Because of mutual love.

Why do they want to cohabit? To love each other more and give proof of this love.

Now, to love is to give, and even suffering, if necessary.

Ubi amatur non laboratur, says Saint Augustine very well; when two people love each other, nothing costs them, because love softens everything.

All voluntary cohabitation supposes love, it is natural; out of obligation, it is not immoral, but it can be the consequence of immorality, as, for example, the libertine who was married in the police. Such cohabitation is obligatory, without being of love. It is the exception.

But what is the logic behind the exception to the rule? Only the divorce logic.

Love is the necessary condition for a good marriage; and love has two essential components: it must be reciprocal and it must be permanent. Without that, there can only be parody of love.

Reciprocity and permanence of love constitute indissolubility. Marriage, by the laws of nature, must be indissoluble, as the love between parents and children is indissoluble.

Indissolubility forces you to love out of obligation, so that cohabiting out of obligation, far from being immoral, is the necessary consequence of love. If this were not the case, it

could be said, following the same principle, that any obligation is immoral. Eating, drinking, sleeping, digesting, speaking, listening, walking, all of this, then, would be immoral, since all this is done out of obligation. The boy, who studies, would be immoral.

And Heitor Lima himself, who walks, who says asnicies, would be immoral. He is, in fact, already enough for his ideas and his ignorance; it is not worth carrying more than it is.

## **XII. Divorce and divorce**

Let us appreciate a little bit more of the divorce corifeu, who becomes the enemy of divorce: Another huge advantage of divorce: provide regularization of it reconstituted outside the law, constituted by divorced people, who are not allowed to convolute in new nuptials; the legitimacy of children that the infamous deceit stigmatizes with the adulterous club is still a very high advantage of divorce. Thus, divorce would have a beneficial influence on customs, as it would raise the level of morality, so lowered among us by the divorce ”.

New principles, new sophisms of mr. Hector Lima!

The divorce or legal separation of the spouses, in case it is impossible to support each other, is a legal means of preventing disasters, hatred, among those who did not know how to understand and exercise conjugal love.

It is an honest way, and even, sometimes, honorable. Whatever the reason for the lack of combination, or the bitterness that poisons cohabitation, the two separate, remaining faithful to the word given, to sworn fidelity.

It is an honest way ... and if one of the parties is unfaithful, it can be an honorable way of solving complicated problems, preserving love for children and giving them the education they owe. The law of nature, social law and divine law are respected.

But divorcees don't want to be divorced; they want complete freedom, they want free love and free separation; they want the love of today, the infidelity of tomorrow, the separation on the third day and the debauchery of the fourth: and all this is legalized. In two words, divorcers want licentiousness, debauchery, immorality sanctioned by the law.

In this case, thieves, drunks and murderers could seek to sanction their crimes by law. Some are well worth the others! I don't see that the libertine is superior to the drunkard, the thief or the murderer. He's a drunk of bestial pleasure. He is a thief of honor from others. He's a killer of woman's modesty.

A divorcee is all that, and more, because, in addition to being perverse, it destroys not only the good, the honor or the life of others, but the family and the entire country.

Mr. Heitor Lima, in his Bolshevik doctrine, thinks that the divorce is infamous and the divorce is honorable. It is the opposite: the split is honored, when justified; divorce is infamous and infamous.

The reason for this aberration is that the divorce forces married couples to stay faithful to the word of fidelity, while divorce, destroying everything, that is, the word, the oath, the mutual honor and the honor of the children, allows them to surrender to the complete debauchery, under the protective shadow of the laws.

The divorcist doesn't mind becoming a pig, but he wants to be a legal pig.

## **XII. Medicine and amputation**

Mr. Heitor Lima thinks that divorce is the great remedy against the infamous divorce, because the divorced person can convolve in new nuptials. It is always sensuality that dominates; never good or love. So divorce is the way to avoid illness. The split was a remedy; divorce is amputation. This is true, but it is to replace a medicine, which is sufficient and effective, for amputation of the limb.

It is absolutely as if someone were saying: Let's end the pharmacies and pharmacists, leaving only the medical operators. It will no longer be a disease; the member is immediately cut, as it is more radical.

In this country, there are so many people suffering from wounds on their feet, on their legs; no more medicines; knife in sick feet and legs.

Many people have been complaining of a disease of the “kidneys, liver, stomach; no medicines; pluck out the kidneys, cut the liver, scrape the stomach, and there you go: jaundice, hepatitis, nephritis and diabetes will be cured forever.

Others suffer from the eyes and ears; Heitor Lima's medicine is ready: cut off your head, “pierce your eyes, pluck your ears. The time for the Allopaths principle has passed; “Contra contrariis curantur”. Today the principle is: Omnia mala cultello curantur: evils are cured by the knife.

And those who suffer from the head? The divorcist master has the answer ready: “Cut off your head: the medicine is radical”. Try, O master!

And all of this is called a clincher. It is not exact: it is a sharp argument.

This is what divorce teaches us. There are bad marriages, badly assorted, without union, without love.

That's right ... But whose fault is it? Those who marry without thinking, without inquiring, without examining the genius and inclinations of the bride.

In case of need there is a remedy: it is desquite. - It is a medicine, and like all medicine, it is bitter.

Divorce wants the knife, wants to cut everything, destroy, annihilate, demoralize women and children, to satisfy the debauchery of the man, who wants a second woman, to whom he will be unfaithful like the first, and then a third, a fourth ...

“Die the woman, die the children! ... the divorcist cries, it doesn't matter; what matters to me is that I am free from any commitment”.

Brave Bolshevik morals!

## **XIV. The level of morality**

Readers already understand how far divorce morality goes ... There is no more morality, it is beyond all morals ... it is pure instinct.

This does not prevent the master divorcist from exclaiming, as a conclusion of the advantages that I have reproduced and commented: And so, he exclaims, emphatically, the divorce will beneficially influence customs, as it will raise the level of morality (sic!).

Beautiful morality built on immorality!

Admirable acquired health, cutting the sick limb instead of curing it.

Stupendous progress, which makes a tribe of Indians, Africans, and Chinese out of a civilized and cultured people, as all of them practice divorce and free love.

Intoxicating happiness, where the heart is excluded, to give way to the most abject and shameful passions.

Heavenly life, in which a man and a woman unite to separate briefly; in which they generate children to throw them on the street, as exposed or orphans; in which lovers kiss with their lips, holding the revolver of divorce; when they love each other today to hate each other tomorrow; where they swear allegiance to swear vengeance the next day. All of this is the level of the new divorce morality! It's horrible! And yet it is true. And to say that there are people who applaud such perspectives! It is, of course, that the divorce terribly propagates immorality.

The fear of divorce and its effects, or the passion that has occasion to be satisfied, will seek a thousand means and excuses to break the marriage and, at the same time, not to be in a harmful situation when it breaks.

It cannot be denied that divorce was invented in favor of those who want to surrender themselves to immorality.

This, moreover, is proved by the statistical data of the courts. Where divorce grows, suicide grows, family division grows, spouses increase infidelity, the number of illegitimate individuals grows, the number of exposed children grows, infanticide grows, and the number of marriages decreases.

This is the level of morality that divorcists aim to achieve - level below all human level - the level of mud and mud.

#### **XV. The examples of others**

To be complete in listing the immoral advantages of divorce, mr. Heitor Lima could not fail to mention the example of other countries; but it should be noted that he cites only the good that exists in these countries, without mentioning the disastrous effects of divorce.

He does, as did a certain northern mayor, showing the advance and progress of the city, after a terrible administration that forced the government to have the facts examined. The mayor showed everything: there were two schools, fifteen commercial houses, a Public garden, two football clubs, three municipal carts for the garbage service and thirty contos in a box.

The government envoy found this splendid, and at a popular meeting he expressed his contentment about the administration, saying he did not understand the reasons for the complaints. A colonel from the country, with the frankness of Ceará, replied simply: "Yes, sir, all this exists, but Mr. mayor did not show what no longer exists, but only what exists today. Three years ago there were 6 schools, 40 shops, 5 public gardens, 5 games clubs, 12 municipal carts, a large farm, 10,000 rubber trees and 200 contos in a box".

This is the case with mr. Heitor Lima. He wants to show us the good that still exists in other countries, despite the divorce, but it does not indicate the good that existed there before the divorce.

It also says that many other countries have adopted it; it may be, but unfortunately for them.

Take, for example, France, the country of news and progress. At the time of the Revolution, divorce was introduced by the law of 1792. Now, three years later, the government was forced to restrict the facility of divorce, which happened from 1797 to 1798.

In his *Étude démographique du divorce*, Jacques Bertillon says: “In 24 months after the promulgation of the 1792 divorce law, the courts of Paris pronounced 5,994 divorces, increasing until the number of divorces exceeded the number of marriages”

In 1795, Malche, one of the promoters of the law, exclaimed: “You cannot stop the chain of immoralities that carry these disastrous laws too soon.

The divorce law is a usurious speculation fee rather than a law”.

Regnault de "Orne designated in the divorce a prize for the levity and the inconstancy of the spouses, transforming the sanctity of the marriage into a shameful and disgusting concubinage.

Glasson, at first favorable to divorce, later exclaimed: “Civil marriage, descending to the order of a temporary contract, revocable at will, tends to cease to exist, falling into the category of what is now called free union” (Phil. du droit civil, p.69).

Delleville, in turn, asks: "How long will this infamous human meat market be seen to triumph? ..."

Immorality penetrated all social classes in such a frightening way that the abolition of absolute divorce became a necessity, having been decreed, almost unanimously, by the Chamber of Deputies, confirmed by that of the Peers and sanctioned on May 8, 1816, based on natural legislation, on nature and things, on considerations taken from the essence of the conjugal bond.

Suppressed in 1816, the divorce was reestablished in 1884. And what were the results? In 1885, the number of divorces was 1,640. In 1901 it was 10,539.

In 1908 it increased from 577 over the previous year.

In 1909 it increased from 1,539 over the year 1908; that is, 12,874 divorces.

In Paris, the fourth civil chamber once issued 159 divorce trials in one day; another time, in a single day, it reached 249 cases; a third time it reached an almost incredible number of 294, think about it: 294 divorce trials in one day, on December 15, 1908.

Such figures are formidable, taken in themselves; but they seem to increase the horror they inspire, remembering that the divorce existed only 28 years ago, and that he had encountered immense difficulties, due to religious education, public and Christian morality for more than 15 centuries, remembering that only there was a divorce where there had been real marriage and that the number of free unions, increasing day by day, removes the need for divorce.

Where there is a divorce, without meeting Christian customs, as in France, divorce or immoral progress is even more astonishing. We could make a statistic that would look great, but it's not worth it. Father Leonel Franca published them in his book on divorce.

Here's what mr. Heitor Lima calls the example of other nations. Nice example ... not of progress, but of return to the barbershop.

## **XVI. Divorce in history**

Let us quote yet another excerpt from mr. Heitor Lima. The man is as extensive as he is hollow. A poor person is someone who does not know how to promise, says the adage; while mr. Heitor Lima exclaims: quite an idiot is he who does not know how to lie!

Savor the following little piece more; if it is not sausage, it is at least gut, as the Germans say: “Divorce contributes to the moral improvement of peoples like no other law. The

most advanced and most civilized countries in the world are divorcists, and someone will suggest removing the divorce institute.”

It's admirable, but it's gut! And to show that such a gut is capable of making many people hang, just mention the ancient, but always instructive, example of the great Roman people: “What spectacle does the Roman people present, where divorce and repudiation reigned? There we see the divorce recognized and justified by the most futile pretexts, practiced by men the most celebrated and degenerated by a fatal corruption to free love, which is the denial of marriage and its dignity.

Paulo Emílio expels his wife from his home because he considers her to be an old fret. Sulpício Galo, because she left with her head uncovered. Antístius Veter, because he saw her engaged in conversation with a freed. P. Semphronius, because she had gone to watch the games, without her license. Cicero repudiates Terência, after thirty years of marriage, because he needed a new dowry to pay his debts. Publius fired his wife because she rejoiced at Tuliola's death. Terencia successively married four husbands. Tuliola, with three, and the last, Dolabelo, repudiated her close to giving birth. Bruto left Claudia to join Porcia.

Tintínus, from Minturnos, married the impudent Fãnia, intending to expel her, for the misconduct, to keep her dowry, an exploitation very common in ancient Rome. Separation with or without agreement was frequent, for whatever reason, to contract new unions. Caesar had three women; Augusto, four; other family members, five or six. Certain women counted years for their husbands and not for consuls. Suetonius, Tacitus, Juvenal and other notable writers of the Roman Empire recount to what degree of abjection the people fell, signaling the Roman decay, their moral debasement in the last days of their history, having as a preponderant cause the criminal contempt for unity and indissolubility of the marital bond. The Roman people knew how to maintain their greatness, when they respected the high conception of marriage, which is constant in Roman law, which defined it this way: It is the reciprocal gift of their total life, *consortium omnis vitae*; it is a mutual gift of all that is human and divine, *juris humani et divini communicatio*.

The emperors, senators, knights and commoners, rich and poor, dominated by insatiable passions, the most shameful, gave themselves up to the practice of absolute divorce, of easy and cruel repudiation, in such a way that they lost all patriotic value, all devotion to national grandeur, stumbling in the most terrible moral and social degradation. And the Roman Empire, falling apart by the depravity of its customs, was crushed by the hordes of the barbarians”.

## **XVII. The rehabilitation of women**

We have finally reached the conclusion of Mr. Heitor Lima's article. It is time to conclude; in fact, man's lying imagination must be exhausted from so much running and flying after evidence that he cannot discover.

Now listen to the worthy conclusion of the premises: “Divorce rehabilitates a woman, he says, frees her from a lot of cruel prejudices, gives her more guarantees and makes her happier. And the more morally perfect a people is the better the treatment of their legislation for women”.

Hat down ... and go with the music! Mr. Heitor Lima finished his reflections. Some commentary reflections on the master's words are necessary.

FIRST SILLINESS: Divorce rehabilitates a woman, he says. And how is that? Rehabilitating someone means: restoring lost rights, credits or esteem. What did the woman lose? The honest and dignified woman is honored, esteemed, whether as a girl, as a wife, as a mother or as a housewife. In this country, nobody thought or thought of depressing women; she is queen in her own role, she holds the scepter of her fidelity and girds the crown of her love. As for the fallen, lost woman, let us not speak of her; this, yes, would need rehabilitation.

But it is not divorce that can do it, it is only religion, for regeneration. The Brazilian woman is still on her throne, O Heitor, and does not need her rehabilitation; it is qualified for all that is great, noble and virtuous.

SECOND SILLINESS: "Divorce frees women from a lot of cruel prejudices"! And what are these prejudices? Fidelity to her husband, the affection of love, the care of her children. These prejudices are beautiful, they are holy, and not cruel. Heitor Lima wants to make his tender wife, his loving mother, a woman without dignity, without a heart, who goes through the mud of the fall, offering her lips to filthy profaners and her body to the infamous divorcists. oh horror! ...

Ashes of our grandparents, encourage yourselves to spit on the traitor of your pride, your glory and your traditions.

## **XVII. Conclusion**

It is time to end this controversy. The subject was extended to the extent of the refutations. When I started it, I said, for not knowing Mr. Heitor Lima, who, judging by his articles, must have been a young man who has not yet had time to create a beard and judgment; or else he was a patient, a monomaniac.

The first part of the statement falls, only the second, according to a news item from "União" that has just reached my hands.

Mr. Heitor Lima is not a boy, he is a sick old man, but he has already expired; but he is a patient ... very sick ... in addition to being an unfortunate poor person, both because he is a man without faith and because of the strangeness of his life. He suffers from spite ... he is a loser ... and there is no worse disease than spite.

It seems that he is a madman; he did not know how to live in peace with his wife ... or married without knowing who ... the effect of levity. And being crazy to get married again, he becomes a herald of divorce. It is logical! Having no faith, he has no conscience; without conscience there is no morality; without morals there is no happiness. I begin to understand the thing, or rather, the source of so much fanaticism and blindness.

Instead of thinking about getting married again, my old man, it would be better to prepare to die ... and end, at least, a good death, a life as miserable as yours, and deserving divine mercy.

In addition to this first disgrace, in addition to spite, according to the article in "União", of which I reproduce only the following, very significant passage: "Mr. Heitor Lima suffers from the disease of spite. He did not win in the May 3 elections as "such" representative of the intellectual classes, and that is why he now attacks prof. Miguel Couto, who is going to enter "Tiradentes", please Mr. Heitor Lima or not. What are

mr. Hector Lima? Perhaps the sad fact, when delegated to the Hermes da Fonseca government?! SS must remember the reason for the dismissal itself, which was the consequence of the aforementioned "fact". SS look for other victims for his attacks. This song is very worn. Turn on a light, sir. Heitor Lima, because mr. walk in the dark! Mr. Heitor Lima writes weekly in the columns of "Correio da Manhã". Divorce is your Trojan horse. But it doesn't stay there; no, it attacks God and the world. Since he cannot write anything more about the divorce itself, he begins to attack men who, for reasons worthy of praise, oppose the introduction of divorce in Brazil. Have the columnist for the defense of divorce, in the "Correio da Manhã", the kindness to expose to everyone the value and advantages of divorce, with statistics and unmistakable documents! We can offer abundant data to prove the nefarious purpose of divorce; mr. Heitor Lima will never convince us that divorce has already produced good results in any country, in which he has intruded like a thief".

Beginning, I thought of refuting only Mr. Heitor Lima; but seeing the truth so ignored, distorted, I found it necessary, to make ideas clear in the mind of the reader, to make a complete exposition of the truth. This presentation will be the subject of the article that follows.

It is not enough to destroy: it is necessary to build. It is not enough to know the error: it is necessary to know the truth, because there are many errors and the truth is one.

If I have escaped, in the fire of controversy, expressions harder and heavier than it was necessary, I apologize to the charitable reader. I do not, however, ask Mr. Heitor Lima, who needed a vigorous lesson, for having attacked, vilified, blasphemed the laws of nature, social laws and religious laws.

To such nullities, which intend to astonish the people with sophisms, slander and falsehoods, religion rises up with dignity, more firmly, with its head raised to counter the attacks, and to teach a little elementary catechism to those who intend to erect masters and conductors without having the ability or the knowledge.

I have responded to mr. Heitor Lima, whose person I respect, but whose perversity I repel, and whose ignorant pretense revolts our panache. On the battlefield, it is not with smiles and hugs that the soldier intends to win, but by fearing arms with the opponent. Our weapons are, from mr. Heitor Lima: ignorance, bad faith, perversity, lies and hypocrisy; for my part, it is sincerity, loyalty, truth, fearlessness and sincere faith based on the doctrine of Jesus Christ and his holy Church.

The reader will judge the result of this controversy, and will say whether the infamous divorce is not a horrendous plague; - and if marriage should not be indissoluble as reason, society and divine law proclaim!

Marriage and divorce in the face of reason, society and religion

After refuting the Bolshevik ideas of Mr. Heitor Lima, on divorce, it is necessary to briefly expose the rational, social and divine doctrine on the subject.

The Church fights divorce, because it is an attack on natural, social and religious law, although such an attack does not directly affect Catholics.

The latter, in fact, are not content with the civil contract, which has only civil effects, but receive the sacrament of marriage. Now, this sacrament is indissoluble, and it is not within the purview of civil power, so that the Catholic always considers marriage indissoluble, whatever the attitude of the civil legislators.

However, it is certain that the sacrament receives from the civil contract a new security, a support, although it has nothing in common with him in the field of religion. A Catholic cannot be content with the civil contract; he must marry before God.

Thus, the exclusive civil contract is only the marriage of those who are not Catholics, and does nothing to the divine institution of the sacrament.

The Church must, however, fight divorce, as men of pride must fight it, because the Church must defend for everyone the natural law and the social law, indirectly linked with the divine law.

Protestants themselves, who do not have the sacrament of marriage, are obliged to recognize the indissolubility of marriage; so that divorce is, as it always has been, the ideal, the great aspiration of the enjoyers, the bohemians, the libertines, and the revulsion of all good men. This, indeed, is the undeniable truth.

Let us examine here the various theses, in order, in the midst of confusion, to highlight the only thesis of truth.

### **I. The divorce theory**

Basically, despite all the paradoxical chatter of divorcists, divorce can be summed up in the following theory: The purpose of marriage is to seek sensations, it is pleasure and enjoyment.

On the day when, for whatever reason, such sensations cease to exist, marriage will no longer have a reason to be. The absolute and definitive rupture between the spouses will become the most logical thing in the world.

And the children? Your education? The scandal? There are so many prejudices! I am looking for another companion and I am right.

The mud? ... The mud doesn't get dirty anymore, since divorce was invented, so that people can get back in the mud, without getting dirty. According to the divorce law, there is no marriage that cannot be dissolved.

Did your wife stop pleasing you? Do not bother yourself; the legislator reserves all the means of separation: you just have to choose.

Genie mismatch ... early wrinkles ...

adultery with verification of the offense, are the responsibility of all the weaknesses, of all the cowards, of all the betrayals.

Will it be necessary to notify the consort of its repudiation?

For what?! just tell him by a servant: - "Madame, gather the bundle and get out, I don't want you at home anymore, get out quickly, because I'm waiting for someone else to come and take your place".

Among pagan Romans, this was customary, it was law as divorcees want it to be for us.

Listen to what Strabo says from those times: "The Roman patricians exchange women among themselves. Cato gave his wife to Hortensio; this is customary. "

People get married in the hope of getting a divorce; divorce is like the fruit of marriage. They change the law and can do nothing but adultery.

With nuptial religion, modesty disappears; and the same men, the same women who excited the admiration of the world for its purity, now excite amazement at lust: these ghosts of fleeting unions, all of pleasure and interest, dislike marriage and exhaust the source of life.

The population declined, and Rome had no more soldiers to defend itself against the invasion of the barbarians. Here is the progress, the happiness that the divorce brought to Rome, Greece, and other countries, and that it would bring to Brazil, if the perversity of divorce came to be implanted among us.

The sanctity of marriage is sacrificed to passion, before which every knee must bow in the 20th century.

Light, civilization, progress, science itself, seem to demonstrate that the solidity of social institutions is subordinated to the whims, fantasies, and low appetites of men.

In the past, the opposite was thought. It was taught that the salvation and stability of society should dominate the impulses of nature, and that marriage, in particular, was designed to put a brake on the furor of the waves, as the poet says.

But all this, cries the modern divorcist, was prejudice, was idiocy, was slavery ... No more socks, no breakwaters ... Let it all be submerged, engulfed: - such is the new law.

The divorcist, to legitimize the dirt of the divorce, reasons as follows: The mud can only get dirty if it is clean; revolving in the mud ... there is no more dirt: it is dirty on dirty, mud on mud; everything gets dirty ... and the contrast between clean and dirty no longer exists, it remains just a matter of words: the dirty no longer exists, everything is cleaning; the mud itself is cleaning ...

## **II. The matrimonial institution**

In order to fully understand the evil of divorce, it is necessary to have a clear idea of what marriage is in the Christian sense. Before the Catholic Church, marriage is established in a threefold essence:

a) Natural institution; b) Social institution; c) Religious institution.

### **a) Natural institution**

It is a natural institution, because the original constitution of humanity requires it to complete each individual, giving him the help similar to him, of which the Bible speaks; and then to ensure the nutrition of the species in sufficient or happy conditions.

The indissolubility of marriage is a natural right, because the family is prior to society, as man is prior to the citizen.

Before belonging to the State by a civil right, man already belongs to the family, by a natural right.

This is not about facts, but about the nature of things.

Now, marriage is a conjugal contract. This contract consists of three essential parts: the union, the beginning and the end.

The union - it is the most perfect one can imagine: it is the connection of two bodies in one body, of two souls in one soul.

The principle - is the constitution of the family, or inseparable link between the father, the mother, the children.

The end - is a human person: the son.

And there is no power, human or divine, that can prevent the child from having a parent relationship with his parents and neither can the parents from having a parent relationship with the child. However, such relationships only have a reality in the

indissolubility of the conjugal bond. The dissolution of the union between the father and the mother implies the dissolution of the union with the son.

In the family, the union of the son with the father and mother does not refer to two beings, but to one.

The son wants his father and mother in personal unity. She doesn't want her mother with a second husband; nor does he want his father with a second wife.

### **b) Social institution**

Because marriage is established as a point of origin, it becomes a social institution.

In fact, if it is natural for a man to contract a lasting union with a woman, it is necessary that the consorts harmonize, and that a family regime ensures, on the one hand, the right of the individual: and on the other hand, give satisfaction to the collective demands.

Divorce is radically contrary to social law, because it wants to undo what cannot be undone, that is, paternity, filiation, blood ties that unite individuals from the same household and the same strain.

All of this is indestructible, as the tree with its roots, trunk and branches is indestructible. To cut one is to kill the other.

The family is a true tree of life, whose roots are the parents, whose children form the trunk, whose branches are the descendants.

Separating the roots, the trunk dies, and the death of the trunk destroys the branches.

### **c) Religious institution**

Anyway, the same reasons will make marriage a religious institution, because religion, bequeathing man its primary origin, it is impossible for religion not to take care of the individual right and the social right of man, to confirm both, by your authority.

Now, from this threefold fact, the following consequences result: Since marriage is a natural institution, it follows that married individuals cannot bend it to their disposition. They may enter it or they may not, but, once inside, they have to respect the way imposed by nature, for their development.

Because marriage is a social institution, it follows that the laws must know an institution, in which society finds its first foundation.

And because marriage is a religious society, it is understandable that religion imposes on its children, during and after marriage, certain conditions that may seem harsh to the flesh, but which are justified by higher reasons.

Such is the Christian conception of marriage. It is enough to understand it, to have a clear and peremptory answer to all the sophisms and errors of those who make marriage a simple instrument of pleasure or perversity.

It is understood that this triple institution cannot in any way be modified, not even by individual, civil or religious power; only the author of these three parts, only God could derogate from this threefold institution.

The Russian Tolstoy wrote, everywhere, this great truth: "Outside of death, there is nothing more important, nor more irremediable than marriage".

He said it well. One and the other, in fact, each in its own way, fixes its destiny; and if marriage fixes you less than death, it fixes you better, because, as Pascal writes, the man of terrible words: - "We die alone, but we marry two".

With two, and it is not enough, because this marriage is linked to children, grandchildren and perhaps entire generations, who are fixed in this tremendous moment.

That is why only the Church of Jesus Christ, only she, against all sects and all passions, took a firm and decisive attitude, launching her “non licet” to the legislators and the people who proclaim the divorce.

It teaches, it unwaveringly upholds the indissolubility of marriage, as being the principle of unity, happiness, progress and love.

### **III. The sociological thesis**

The sociological thesis covers the constitutive elements of marriage, which are the bonds that bind the spouses between themselves and their children. These ties are of six species:

- 1) the natural lace.
- 2) the psychedelic lake.
- 3) the biological bond.
- 4) the social bond.
- 5) the moral bond.
- 6) the physiological bond.

#### **1) The natural lace**

The natural regime of heterosexual relations is that of a stable society, comprising a measure of stability to be determined by religious law.

This is what is called the matrimony regime, or contract by which men and women are associated, giving each other rights, in view of determined acts, capable of spreading the human species.

Here is the thesis; let us demonstrate it and prove it now: A certain accidental evolution can be admitted in the form of the marriage contract, but the nature of the regime must remain intangible.

In order to formulate the laws and regime that must govern sexual relations, it is necessary to determine the natural character and purpose of these relations; these laws and this regime must participate in the necessity and the intangibility of its own character and purpose.

Why is this inseparable union between these two elements? Because this regime is the necessary means to achieve this end, and because the means must adapt to the end.

The normal relationship regime would therefore be one that requires the intimate character and purpose of this regime. Now, both (regime and end) demand a stable union, a life of society - marriage.

The relations between man and woman tend to a natural term: - sexual approximation, a union whose intimacy is expressed in the Bible: - there will be two in the same flesh (Gn 2,24).

Can such a union exist, not being durable?

Do you not feel an instinctive disgust in admitting that such intimacy is granted to the first to arrive?

#### **2) The psychological bond**

Considering the psychological and affective bond that accompanies this union, it is understood that souls and hearts give and merge in this approach, with all the strength of their freedom and their exalted passion.

Now, this affective element has as its natural corollary exclusivity and jealousy, the desire to keep the loved one for himself, that is, to form a lasting union with him, a society.

The natural fruit of the union of the sexes is the production of a new living being. Now, the conditions in which this production takes place show that, in nature, the union of the parents must be stable.

Men and women are principles of life, but they are incomplete principles, which must come together to complete and exercise their power.

### **3) The biological bond**

Thus united, they form a new, unique principle, sufficient to produce a common effect: the child.

Two lives come together to produce a third that, in its unity, accomplishes and prolongs the fusion of the progenitor lives.

Parents are united and identified in their fruit, and therefore they must be united outside this fruit.

### **4) The social bond**

The child is the living symbol of the society created between parents, through their relationships. This symbol corresponds to a state of soul, in harmony with physical realities.

When the child is born, a particular feeling is manifested in the parents: the feeling of fatherhood and motherhood. The soul and heart of the parents are linked to the child, in which they find and love the continuation of their own lives.

In this way, each parent forms a partnership with their child. And they find themselves in this son, associates to educate him, as they were associates to generate him. Generating and educating are two elements that complement each other in the synthesis of these two lives.

### **5) The moral bond**

A moral bond comes to join this biological bond.

Generating a being unable to live without your help, they commit themselves to meeting your needs, they take responsibility for this life.

A very serious duty links the life of the parents to the life of their children, and, having obligations to the same child, they are linked together, to educate him.

And this is not only because of physiological and psychological laws, but, above all, in the name of moral laws, in the name of the child's life, in the name of the existence of the human species; and the generative act establishes a stable society between man and woman, condemning, without restriction, free love.

### **6) Physiological bond**

And it is not only the interest of the human species that demands social form in the relationships of men and women; they are also the interests of the same individuals;

man and woman are physically and morally two beings complementary to each other, and, as a result, demand life in society.

The "adjutórium simile sibi", of Genesis, "the auxiliary similar to him" is, therefore, in general and under normal circumstances, a necessity and a law of nature. In this regard, free union is anti-human.

### **Resume**

These are irrefutable sociological principles that no one can deny and that prove the need for indissoluble, indestructible marriage, forming a stable, lasting society between spouses.

Such a society is required by the nature and purpose of sexual relations between spouses, which is the normal consequence of these relationships.

What proves that reason, which demands this society, is not a matter of fact: the actual birth of the child; no, it is in the rights and duties, which form the essential laws of these relations and the normal consequences, which are capable of producing for themselves.

The regime that these relations demand comes from its nature. These arguments clearly prove the social and stable character between man and woman, thus condemning the disorder of free union or promiscuity. These two plagues do not have an essential or principle difference between them, but a simple step difference, more or less.

The normal regime is, therefore, the society of indefinite duration, or marriage. This regime is imposed by the psychological character of man and woman, by their deep instincts, by the need of the human race, by the social character of man in general, and by the complementary character of the sexes. The free union is in opposition to and is condemned by the rational demands of man.

### **IV. The exceptional divorce**

What I have just said is the formal, radical and absolute condemnation of free union. The free union, while involving heterosexual relations without marriage, is a true fornication, of which Saint Paul said: Know that no fornicator will inherit the kingdom of Christ and of God (Eph 5,5).

Another question arises here. Assuming that marriage is necessary, in certain cases, is it not possible to admit divorce?

The answer is already included in the preceding principles, but since such a divorce is the great goal, the ideal of divorcists, it is appropriate to study the subject here at its base, and to put the solid and unshakable principles of truth. That's what I'm going to do here.

The regime, according to the aforementioned evidence, is therefore absolutely necessary; it is necessary to prove now that the perpetuity of this regime is equally so. Everyone agrees to say that such a regime must be perpetual, in practice, but some - and these are the divorcists - intend that, in certain abnormal circumstances, such perpetuity entails a right of rupture or divorce,

Let us examine this thesis, and solve the problem, not simply by stating it, but by proving it.

What is certain is that the two theses, being opposed to each other, cannot both be true: one is false, the other is true.

And here I immediately point out the discrepancy between Catholics and divorcists; for this point of disagreement, being basic, necessarily leads to two different conclusions. For divorcists, marriage is a bilateral contract, born of the consent of the parties; and by this title, they conclude, it can, like any bilateral contract, end by the causes that caused it.

Such reasoning is legally accurate, but the basis of the reasoning is false ...

Marriage, as I said in the refutation of Mr. Heitor Lima, it is not a simple contract; it is more than a contract: it is a law of nature, a social law and a divine law. The regime of marriage is determined by determining its purpose.

The perfect regime does not exist in this world, where everything is contingent and imperfect; we must, therefore, adopt the normal regime, established by the author of nature; and this normal regime constitutes a general law that governs the institution of marriage.

But can this general law admit an exception, for certain serious reasons? Yes; whether such exceptions are compatible with the good pursued by the law; - No, if such exceptions cannot, in practice, be admitted without ruining the law itself.

We therefore have before us the double thesis of indissolubility and that of divorce.

## **V. The indissolubility thesis**

Let us first examine the thesis of indissolubility, in order to oppose it afterwards that of divorce, so that, by comparison, we can see what may prevail as the normal, if not perfect, thesis that must be adopted.

As I have already said, the normal term of matrimonial relationships being children, it can be said that such relationships exist above all for the human species, whose general interest supersedes any particular interest.

Everything in marriage must be directed in order to favor this interest: birth, conservation and education of the offspring.

Here is proof of the right and irrefutable premise. Now listen to the second premise, no less indisputable: Now, in general, indissolubility, ensuring the stability of the family society, favors the procreation without restriction of the offspring, and ensures the best conditions to educate it, since it is the combined work of the father and mother.

The conclusion is certain: Indissolubility must be adopted as the normal norm of marriage.

On the contrary, under the fear of divorce, as long as it can be predicted as probable, married couples will systematically prevent the birth of their offspring, which, in the event of a breakup, would constitute a serious embarrassment.

When divorce takes place, there will generally be serious harm to the offspring; education will be crippled by the absence of one parent. It is useless to insist on truths as simple as they are capital.

The secondary ends of marriage also demand indissolubility.

Without it, the joints will be made lightly, in order to be able to be undone without difficulty.

Without it, the jokers will join provisionally, giving in with reserve, with a view to a future separation.

There can be no partnership between children and divorced parents, children being condemned to live apart from their parents or to live as parasites in the new families founded by the father or mother, married for the second or third time.

Anyway, divorce will almost always be an injustice, because as long as one of the two divorced people comes to a new life, the other, and the woman above all, will be condemned to the most irreparable loneliness.

Reflect well on this thesis, simple, but profound, certain and irretrievable, and then see the divorce thesis.

## **VI. The divorcist thesis**

Let us now look at the divorce thesis, not the thesis of bohemians who want only divorce, to better satisfy their carnal inclinations; but of those who believe that divorce has a rational, social basis.

They reason as follows: “The agreement of two wills, born of love, is the *raison d'être* of the conjugal bond, both of its creation and of its persistence. Now, love no longer exists, so that the two wills are no longer in agreement, the bond must disappear”.

And why should it disappear? Because, they say, everyone has the right to happiness, the right to live their life.

Let us examine this felicist and divorcist thesis ... They say you have the right to live your life. For them, it is the final word of all morality between man and woman; it is to say that they depart from the beginning of the primary purpose of marriage, in order to want only the secondary purpose. They don't want the burden, they just want the pleasure; they reject duties in order to preserve rights only; they despise rational law, to insure only animal law. Such a principle is monstrous, and yet it is the only one that serves as the basis for divorce.

To understand the false and even ridiculous side of such a principle, it is enough to apply it to the other means of happiness that the world presents us, such as fortune, honors, health, etc.

If man has this absolute right to happiness through divorce, he has the same right to fortune for theft, to honor for murder, to health for idleness.

What more sacred right does man have than the right to life? However, this right is often subordinated to imperative duties that expose you to lose your life; for example: the children taking care of their parents, the doctor taking care of epidemics, the soldier defending the country in danger.

And do unmarried spouses, since love or sympathy disappear, would they have the right to separate, to divorce? But then the son, losing sympathy to his parents, can also abandon them; the doctor, not sympathizing with the patient, can let him die; the soldier, not being in current politics, can he betray his homeland?

The principle is the same, it can be applied just as well in these cases, as in the case of divorce. Man has the right to happiness, yes; however, this right is relative, it is subordinated to the impositions of the contracted duty, The duty of the married is to support each other, to forgive each other's faults, and to take care of the children, to educate them, to guide them in life; and all this must be done, even if love disappears.

Love, in fact, is an auxiliary, not a principle.

The specific principle of individual and social life is the divine and human law, and not the often blind whim of love.

Divorce therefore sins at the base; part of a false principle, it denatures the fundamental law, and as such has no right to a legal existence.

### **VII. The great objection**

Here we have the great objection of divorcers before us. Let us formulate it and give you the exact answer.

Due to the indissolubility of the marriage bond, a number of unfortunates, who do not agree with the consort, are condemned to a regrettable life, with no other hope of liberation, except death.

Such is, in its brutality, sometimes true, the pessimistic objection, and such an objection at first sight is impressive; but let us examine the case well, without exaggerating or diminishing anything.

It is true: indissolubility sacrifices the lives of unhappy couples. It is sad, it is hard, it is almost desperate for a man to live beside a frowning, angry, tongue-tied woman, without affection, without love, even more, without guts.

It is no less horrible for a woman to live alongside a brutal, gambling, drunk, rude, materialistic, bohemian, unfaithful, angry man. One of these vices is enough to poison a wife's life and make her a slow-fire and devouring martyr. It's horrible! ...

It is a purgatory !.

And when they get to the point where they can't even look at each other? who feel chills when they hear the consort's voice ... who feel cold when approaching each other ... then it's hell! ... All of this is horrible! But ... but ... is this feeling, this mood, this character truly invincible, indomitable?

I think not, because: In this world there is a remedy for everything, says the proverb, except for death. Correct yourselves, therefore, control the bad mood, transform the character, soften the genius! ...

The sanctity of marriage is not at the disposal of its perversity: but it is its perversity that must give way and disappear to leave the stability of marriage intact. Is this not, in fact, the language of reason and common sense?

Should military service, mandatory for everyone, give in to the cowardice of the deserter?

The tax is vexing to the poor, who are sometimes forced to starve in order to be able to pay what they owe.

Should the tax be removed, because of the poor? ...

No; every law has its exceptions; every law is hard for some; that's what he said to the Romans: - *Dura lex, sed lex!* ... - The law is hard, but it is law.

Marriage can be tough for some; but it is marriage and indissoluble marriage, by its nature, must not and cannot conform to the inclinations or dispositions of each one. It is a law, and the law must not bend.

Why are there unhappy homes? Because in these homes there is an absence of virtues; Among the spouses, the excessive desire for sensual enjoyment dominates.

But let's face it: there must be unhappy homes.

The reason is very simple. What is the condition of human life where there is no suffering? It is impossible to suppress pain, heartbreak, afflictions, but it is not for that reason allowed to transgress or violate social laws ...

Theft cannot be allowed because there are poor people.

You cannot ban travel because there are disasters. One cannot stop eating because there is indigestion.

You can't stop sleeping because there are instant deaths.  
So, too, it is not allowed to destroy the family, because there are unhappy couples.

### **VIII. Medicine, cure and death**

What I have just said is true; such situations exist, few, but they exist. Indissolubility sacrifices married lives, but will divorce be exempt from these misfortunes? Divorce must be a remedy, in the opinion of the divorcers themselves; - but, there is medicine and medicine; there is medicine that does nothing, there is medicine that cures and there is medicine that kills ... Strychnine is a medicine: Taken in the dose of about 5 milligrams, it sometimes cures paralysis; taken at a dose of 25 milligrams, causes instant death. Divorce is a medicine, but it is a medicine that kills. Instead of curing a bad marriage, it kills the marriage. The medicine is worse than the evil.

It kills, I say, and note that it does not kill the guilty, but the innocent. In fact, it is the innocent who are sacrificed for divorce; among them the first innocent is the offspring. If divorce is born out of spouses' absences, - absences animated by the hope of divorce - a new marriage will be the reward of their addiction. It is addiction rewarded in the person of the parents, it is the innocence sacrificed, in the person of the children.

If one of the spouses is guilty, the divorce will reward his guilt, allowing him to marry the accomplice of his disorders. Who is the sacrifice? The innocent wife and son.

It is true that, in certain cases, the innocent asks to be released. In the regime of indissolubility he would be, for lack of the other, a victim, without hope; in the divorce regime, he could remake his life.

I do not deny this consequence, I note that the victims, the most interested, the most innocent, are usually those who, after such a catastrophe, think less of restarting their lives.

Those who first consider this are those who ruined their first home.

And then, this sacrifice is made for the common good of humanity, which has a major interest in seeing the marriage union protected and the destiny of the offspring ensured. For the rest, innocent for innocent, the divorce regime sacrifices more of them than indissolubility, because, as a general rule, it sacrifices children.

Finally, assuming that indissolubility does not offer a radical remedy, it grants, at least, the only palliative, against the great evil of separation, while the divorce, instead of presenting a remedy or a palliative, presents rather an encouragement to the guilty and a stimulus to the development of passion.

Indissolubility will soften the unhappiness of the innocent party and safeguard the offspring, if any, much better than a new marriage for the parents.

In short, indissolubility ensures, rather than divorce, the interests of children, to which everything must be subordinated in marriage.

It also protects honest spouses better against the guilty, although it can sometimes be the case that some innocent person is sacrificed. Note, however, that such an innocent, who is the exception to the law, is not sacrificed by the law of indissolubility, but by the perversity of the guilty.

Divorce, on the other hand, sacrifices children and parents, thereby violating the essential order of marriage.

Among the consorts, in practice, if not in theory, it is rather the woman, being the weakest, who is sacrificed by the man, whether he is innocent or guilty; and then it is the evil that is rewarded.





  
  
  
  
t  
r  
i  
e  
s

U  
U  
L  
U  
U  
U  
y  
U  
U  
U  
L  
U  
n  
d  
A  
u  
s  
t  
o  
r  
i  
a  
B  
L  
U  
U  
i  
c  
a  
B  
U  
U  
U  
a  
s  
k  
U  
U  
o  
n  
i  
a  
F  
i  
n  
l

a  
n  
d  
2  
7  
3  
6  
7  
o  
6  
7  
2  
7  
3  
4  
8  
5  
5  
f  
r  
a  
n  
c  
e  
r  
y  
a  
a  
r

w  
a  
y  
H  
E  
H  
A  
r  
l  
a  
n  
d  
s  
P  
E  
C  
C  
A  
T  
I  
A  
S  
W  
E  
R  
T  
E  
S  
E  
R  
I  
A  
L  
S  
S  
I



Among the large number of people who committed suicide in the United States last year, 52% were divorced; 26% widowed; 12% married and 10% single.

If we think that throughout the country the number of married people is much higher than the number of people from other states of life, the conclusion that we must draw from this statistic becomes even clearer.

Divorce does not bring the satisfaction or happiness that divorcers expect or present, it is not a basis for happiness, but the destruction of happiness.

It is the destruction of affection and union that constitute the great ideal and the great fortune of youth, it is the breaking of the alliance signed with so many protests and oaths; it is the most cruel blow to the feelings of fatherly love.

The fruit cannot be a new happiness, but remorse, isolation, boredom, despair.

On the contrary, indissoluble marriage holds spouses and parents to the faithful and dedicated fulfillment of their duties and in this dedication they find true happiness and the courage to fight against all difficulties and endure all the trials of life. Indissoluble marriage is, therefore, the solid basis of the social order and the homeland, whereas divorce is the dissolution of the mother cell of society, that is, of the family, and it will bring about the decay of the country and of the nation.

## **XI. Divorce and the old law**

For the Catholic everything is there. God commands: therefore, it must be obeyed. There was neither natural law nor social law to compel him, divine law would be enough to guide him in life.

“It matters little, said St. John Chrysostom, the laws of divorce voted by secular powers. It is not these laws that will judge us, but the divine law” (Hom. 2 of Matrim).

God's law is positive. Let us listen to it. Do you know the first page of the Bible? God has just created the sidereal, mineral, vegetable and animal world, and as these splendid works come out of his hands, the divine artist applauds himself, and says: Well done! Vidit Deus quod esset bonum (Gen 1:25).

He then creates man in his image and likeness.

FAITH the most perfect of his works, however he is not satisfied. Look and say: It is not good that the man is alone; let us make him an adjunct similar to him (Gn 2, 18).

He sent a deep sleep to Adam, and created a companion for him, indicating him and making him promulgate himself the law that should preside over the union of the spouses: The man will leave his father and mother and will join his wife and will be two in one meat (Gn 2, 24).

It is the indissolubility of marriage solemnly affirmed, and by the same law is divorce formally condemned. It is condemned, not because it is intrinsically bad, but extrinsically. Theologians say: malum quia vétitum, and not vétitum quia malum.

God forbade it, and that is why it is evil. If God lifted the ban, divorce would no longer be an evil before God.

Over the centuries, in the old law, due to the corruption of paganism, the sovereign Legislator came to momentarily attenuate the rigor of his law. He tolerated divorce for a time, albeit with a lot of reservations, to limit it.

It could do so, since the divorce was extrinsically bad, the divine Lawgiver could dispense with this law; what I couldn't do if it was inherently bad.

## **XII. Divorce and the gospel**

One day the Pharisees approached Jesus to tempt him, and asked him if it was permitted to divorce for any reason (Mt 19: 3). The question raised was one of the most ardent in Jewish morality.

The two famous schools of Hillel and Schammai struggled with acrimony over the meaning of a text from Deuteronomy (Deut 24, 1-4). Some claimed that Moses authorized the divorce, and others that he was limited to the case of adultery.

The Savior does not allow himself to be caught in the malicious trap. See farther and higher. - Then he replies: Did you not read that who created man in the beginning created them man and woman? And he said, Therefore the man will leave the father and mother, and will join with his wife, and the two will be one flesh. Therefore, let not man separate what God has brought together (Mt 19, 4-6).

To this unexpected response, the auditors, surprised, try to oppose human weakness: If such is the condition of the man regarding his wife, it is not advisable to marry.

In vain they reminded him of the law of Moses authorizing divorce. Jesus Christ, increasingly clear and affirmative, shows them the exaggeration in which they work, “judging to be ordained what had only been tolerated because of the hardness of their hearts, and, as such, to avoid a greater evil, imposing limits their passions, allowing divorce under certain more or less onerous conditions; however, the Savior continues, in the beginning it was not so - ab initio autem non fuit sic (Mt 19.8).

From now on, it is necessary to return to the primitive indissolubility: I, therefore, tell you that everyone who repudiates his wife, except because of fornication, and marries another, commits adultery; and whoever marries a repudiated commits adultery (Mt 19, 9).

This is what is clear and decisive. Either we must tear up the gospel or recognize that the divine law, restored by Jesus Christ, proclaims the indissolubility of marriage.

Even if reason did not prescribe divorce, we would still have to condemn it, because a divine prohibition resolves any doubt.

One could refuse the discussion on moral, individual, family and social grounds, as there is an inescapable argument: - it is the command of Jesus Christ: “Let no man separate what God has joined” (Mt 19, 6).

## **XIII. Divorce and the Church**

This truth is so categorical and absolute that, from St. Peter to Pope Pius XI, doctrine and practice never varied. To married people, São Paulo said since the dawn of Christianity: Those who are united in marriage, I command - not me, but the Lord - that the woman should not be separated from her husband; and, if she separates, go unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And the husband also does not repudiate his wife (1 Cor 7, 10, 11).

When the Apostle spoke in this way, he was not unaware that the civil laws of his time were intended to legitimize the marriage of divorced spouses.

However, he who preached, in such energetic terms, obedience to the constituted powers, did not hesitate to proclaim null and void, in conscience, all laws authorizing divorce, because they are contrary to divine law: I order, not me, he says, but the Lord.

It is useless to quote the solemn affirmations of the Holy Fathers, Doctors, Popes and Councils, defending the same doctrine through the centuries.

Let us limit ourselves to a couple of excerpts from the encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI, of nostalgic memory. For us Catholics, the Pope's voice is the voice of Christ. Before the throne of Christ, infallible in himself and in his representative on earth, all opinions and passions must remain silent. If there were no other law, the Pope's voice would be enough to settle all discussions and make the truth he taught triumph.

And this truth is the one that I have just exposed, and which finds in its encyclicals the father of Christendom its basis and its confirmation.

Listen to this passage from the encyclical "Divinae Sapientiae consilium", by Leo XIII: "Divorce destroys mutual affection; provides dangerous stimuli to infidelity; it is an embarrassment to the education and procreation of children; it is an occasion for the dissolution of domestic societies; spills germs of discord among families; depresses the dignity of women. And as there is nothing more effective in destroying the family and breaking the forces of the states than the corruption of customs, it is also seen that there is nothing more contrary to the prosperity of families and states than divorce, which is born out of the perversion of the customs of the peoples. Families perish, not because of the indissolubility of the conjugal bond, but when they consider marriage as enjoyment and not a duty; when they cease to develop the moral strength that resists passions; when they forget that man's ultimate end is not on earth and that it is necessary to seek higher the satisfaction of his desires".

All Popes express themselves with the same firmness, because such is the doctrine of the Church of Jesus Christ. Read this hesitant masterpiece, a doctrinal monument, by Pope Pius XI, in the admirable encyclical on Christian marriage. All errors are refuted there, and the truth exposed with dazzling clarity.

After quoting the various alleged excuses in favor of divorce, the Holy Father concludes: "Against all these insanities, the law of God, widely confirmed by Christ, stands and cannot be shaken by any decree of men, opinions or will of the legislators: Let man not separate what God has united (Mt 19: 6). If a man insultingly tries to separate him, his act is completely null, because Christ himself says: Everyone who rejects his wife and marries another commits adultery, and whoever marries the repudiated is an adulterer (Lk 16:18). These words of Christ refer to any marriage, even only natural and legitimate; for, in fact, that indissolubility is inherent in any true marriage, by virtue of which it is completely removed, as to the dissolution of the bond, the discretion of the parties and all civil power. It should also be remembered here the solemn judgment with which the Tridentine Council (session 24, canon 5) anathematically wounded these things: Whoever says that the bond of marriage can be dissolved by the spouse, for reasons of heresy, of annoying cohabitation or simulated absence, be anathema"

Such is the divine language of Christ and his Church, the Councils and the Popes. Noble, majestic, eternal language that dominates spaces and times and against which the gates of hell will never prevail.

#### **XIV. Catholic layoffs**

We have to resolve one last objection; and this is decisive for the mind of divorcers. They accused the Catholic Church of canceling marriages for money.

Slowly! To accuse someone, you need at least any evidence. Now, divorcees will not find in the true story a single case in which the Catholic Church has annulled a legitimately contracted and consummated marriage. The falsified stories mention these facts, but they are pure inventions of evil, they are baseless calumnies.

The annulment of a marriage should not be confused with a declaration of nullity.

A doctor, finding a patient, diagnosing him, does not cancel the patient's health, but only declares the existence of the disease.

So does the Church. Examines the fact of marriage; and as there can be null marriages for lack of consent, which must be prior, free, manifest, absolute, simultaneous, legitimate and current, it may happen that one of these substantial qualities of consent is missing.

After a rigorous examination, finding any essential fault, the Church authentically declares that the marriage did not exist, that the contract was never valid.

This has nothing in common with a break in the existing bond or divorce.

In fact, will there really be wedding annulments? No. There is, first of all, the Pauline privilege, named after the apostle who promulgated it (1 Cor 7: 12-15).

Marriage among infidels, even if consummated, is declared null and void when one spouse converts, the other remaining in infidelity and refusing peaceful cohabitation.

There would also be a declaration of nullity when, after a marriage between the faithful, before the consummation, one of the spouses solemnly consecrates himself to God; however, such a case is theoretical rather than practical.

Last case: the unfulfilled marriage of the faithful can, for serious reasons, be declared null and void by the supreme authority of the Church. It is a power received from Jesus Christ.

But let us note well, even such exceptions are not strictly speaking an annulment, but the manifestation of nullity, or even a separation, a kind of disqualification.

Indissolubility, in fact, is not altered by the separation of union and housing, but only by the annulment of the matrimonial bond, which is divorce.

The Church declares only that there was no sacrament of marriage, and since there was no sacrament on both sides, it is but a natural contract; on the other hand, such a contract may, in certain cases, be canceled in favor of the party who received the sacrament, but this is only by religious authority, never by civil authority.

Once the sacrament has been validly received, and the spouses having had a conjugal union, no authority, religious or civil, can break this bond, Roma never disconnects someone in these conditions.

## **XV. Historical examples**

Numerous are the slanders of Protestants, especially against the Catholic Church's firmness in maintaining the sanctity of the marriage bond ... but it should be noted: they are slanders, they quote Popes, they quote dates, they quote facts, but without any proof; they are all mere inventions without foundation and without appearance of truth.

We have many examples of the popes' resistance to the demands of power; we have no example of weakness or criminal concession.

Let us mention just the following facts: In the 9th century, Pope Nicholas I resisted Lothario, king of Lorraine, who had repudiated his wife, Teutberga, in order to marry

Waldrada. And nothing did the Pope's firmness go down; neither the threats nor the siege of Rome by Emperor Louis II, Lothario's brother.

Later, it is Popes Celestino III and Innocent III who rise up against King Philippe Augusto, who repudiated his legitimate wife, Ingelburga, to marry Inês de Meran. Pope Celestine publicly declares the sentence of rupture illegal, null and void; while Pope Innocent III, his successor, launched the ban on the kingdom of France. In vain Filipe Augusto promises to do a crusade to obtain a divorce. God's law first of all, replied the Pontiff.

King Philip I gave his subjects the example of all vices. He rejected Queen Berta, his wife, intending to marry Bertrada, who kidnapped her husband Fulco.

He thought he would extort the Pope's license at the cost of promises and threats, but the sovereign Pontiff upheld the rights of marriage and justice.

After having paternally warned Philip, the Pope threatened him with excommunication, threats that were later carried out by Pope Urban II at the council of Clermont.

The same abuse on the part of Germany's emperor, Henry IV, and the same firmness on the part of Pope Gregory VII.

And who does not know the firmness of Pope Clement VII with Henry VIII of England?

If the Pope had consented to the repudiation of Catherine of Aragon and the marriage of Anne Boleyn, perhaps the whole of England would have become Catholic instead of heresy Protestant separation. There was maximum interest at stake here. It matters little: God's law first of all. The Pope did not give in.

Some object to Napoleon's divorce with Josefina, and his marriage to Maria Luísa. It's fake. The Church has never ratified this act. When Pope Pius VII learned of the fact, he protested strongly against the legality of the divorce sentence, pronounced by the Paris registry officers. And this protest was so well understood that thirteen cardinals present in Paris refused to attend the said wedding at the Louvre.

And so on. In the face of the passions of princes as in the face of peoples, the Church stood firm, affirming divine law. This divine law, promulgated from the origin of the world and restored by Jesus Christ, proclaims the absolute indissolubility of marriage and condemns divorce.

## **XVI. Conclusion**

Great questions passed before our eyes, during the exposition of the treated truths. I have tried to be clear, intelligible, accessible to all, because I am convinced that divorcees sin more through ignorance than through wickedness. It is not enough to have superficial ideas about these great subjects today; you need to get to know them in depth.

Catholic doctrine does not fear the light of science and common sense, nor the philosophers' reasoning; she fears only ignorance and addiction.

If divorcers are not addicted, but only ignorant, the evidence cited in defense of the thesis must convince them that they are wrong and that the ideas they spread are contrary to nature, society and the law of God.

Simple common sense shows us divorce as a shameful leprosy that has dishonored history, and that perverts society and the family,

When studying the lives of the ancient peoples who adopted a divorce, a feeling of disgust cannot be prevented, in view of the excesses they have fallen into.

The marriage contract was discovered on certain papyruses in Egypt, stipulating a one-year union.

Among the Jews, the Talmud even allowed the husband to repudiate his wife because she had let her meal burn.

In Greece, husbands were seen to give their wives to friends and even slaves: such Pericles, Socrates, and others.

That is why this depressing cry was heard in the midst of popular theater: Among all living beings, we women are the most miserable race!

So it was in pagan Rome, and so it is in all countries where divorce is entering. The two sexes competed in debauchery and inconstancy ... Husbands repudiated their wives, as if someone were freed from a shoe that hurt or bothered them.

And modern divorcists call it progress, freedom, emancipation of women, when it is simply and brutally a return to stupid paganism, slavery, prostitution and public adultery.

No! no! divorce does not correspond to the aspirations of the human heart; it is nothing but disgusting leprosy, a horrendous plague.

Marriage must be the mutual, loving donation that makes you two human beings. Now, experience testifies to it: the hearts of these two beings cannot be satisfied if this donation is not total and perpetual.

Giving in half, renting yourself for a while, this is what goes against the just demands of love. Only indissoluble marriage corresponds to the deep aspirations of the human heart.

It may be that these are not, under the influence of passions, the feelings of such or such an individual; however, they are the feelings of the soul and the true human nature. Now it is human nature that makes the law here, and not isolated individuals, who must submit to the general law.

To want to regulate society in view of a minority of degenerates, is to look for the rule in what should be the object. And they call it progress! Science calls this a return! And don't come to talk about other countries. Each country has good things, but it also has bad things. Let us imitate what is good; let's leave the bad. Man does not live by imitation; he is not a monkey; he lives on principles: - he is a rational being.

In some countries, there is also alcoholism, gambling, prostitution, crime, Bolshevism. So is it necessary to imitate all this?

There are also savages: Polynesians, Africans, Hottentots, Zulus, and they all practice divorce.

A nation must live on principle. Brazil must be Brazilian, not American, Russian or African.

We have our civilization, our progress, our race, our glories and our ideals, and all of this is well worth what other countries have.

It is eternal patriotic pessimism. Everything from abroad is beautiful and good, and what is Brazilian is no good.

And this is said by Brazilians! Mania to despise what is ours, to magnify what is of others. They are the antipodes of patriotism.

Today Italy is not inferior to any nation, and it does not allow divorce.

Divorce, says an Italian lawyer, E. Cenni, is an absolute evil. By itself it has no entity, being nothing more than the death of marriage ...

It is not a good, and it can never be. It is born from the corruption of customs. It is not possible to justify it in the eyes of religion, morals, philosophy, law and reason.

Divorce cannot be admitted as a civil institution, because it is contrary to nature and is anti-legal.

I kept as much as possible, in this controversy about the infamous divorce, from the point of view of simple observation, to demonstrate better, and how to make touch with the finger the identity between Church law and reality; between the teaching of experience and that of divine revelation.

In its effort to preserve itself, social nature ends precisely the rule that religion has made a dogma: - the dogma of the indissolubility of marriage. Therefore, do not separate men from what God has gathered. Such is the intangible law of Christ; and she is deeply wise, just and rational.

Man does not have the power to reform the divine plan ... and wanting to reform it, he deforms and destroys it, and this for his disgrace and for the disgrace of society; and this is the reason why the family is shaken today and society falters.

Let us end these considerations by the solemn protest against divorce, which must be the unanimous cry of all men of good and ideal.

### **XVII. The “Catholic cry”**

I should say the cry of nature, the cry of society, the cry of divine law, because all this is united in one cry to protest against decay, immorality, the abuse of divorce. Catholics from all over Brazil, protest against the infamy of divorce, because:

### **II. Adam and Eve**

Our illustrious esculápio went to put the no until in the earthly paradise, to discover there serious errors in the person of our first parents. It is a pity that the eternal Father did not consult the great dr. José de Albuquerque - before raising our first parents ... ah! then, yes, it would have been something else: the doctor's fulminating intelligence would have given formidable lessons to God himself.

With an air of exegeta, the empirical Doctor writes: “In the Bible, a fact is very demonstrative of its moral empirical; it is what is found in Genesis, with the name of original sin ”.

And the illustrious doctor makes believe that the sin of Adam and Eve was a sensual sin, and that for having performed an act according to biological laws, they were punished by God.

Poor Doctor, it looks like he never saw a Bible! Any child in our schools will tell you that the sin of Adam and Eve was a sin of disobedience to the prohibition on eating the fruit of a forbidden tree (Gn3) and nothing more.

It was a sin of pride, not a sin of sensuality, which is very different.

This is a great pleasure, dear doctor, for a man who claims to write only after studying hard. I am doubting your studies a lot, and a little of your ability.

Excuse me, yes, frankness; but lies must be opposed to truth and ignorance, instruction.

### III. Sodom and Gomorrah

Our esculápio absolutely wants to support his erroneous ideas about the Bible and for that he messed up everything, without understanding anything.

Another interesting bit: “Lot in his old age lived with his two daughters. The latter committed a double incest - it was a crime against religion, and against morality”.

The Bible cites the fact, not to approve it, but to show the corruption of the human race.

And our doctor to exclaim that God blessed this crime! Where did he see this? I don't know ... it must have been in a dream!

No, my dear doctor, the Bible does not approve of these facts; he counts them as an example of perversity, but without approving them: - he condemns them as incestuous for the two reasons that his sexual morality cites: for inbreeding and drunkenness. His sexual morals did not invent anything, but he copied only what religion condemns in this fact.

Your morale came too late, doctor; for eight thousand years, men have known and practiced what mr. he wants to teach them today, as a novelty of his invention ... He doesn't deserve an invention award, no!

### IV. Laban and Jacob

From astonishment to asnice, the doctor wants to prove his thesis, and proves only his religious ignorance.

It is the Bible, which he does not understand, that must pay for the duck and the wine. Jacob intended to marry Rachel, the daughter of Laban. - The father deceived the suitor and made him marry Lia, the eldest daughter, under the pretext that it was customary to marry the elders first.

Jacob spent seven more years working to earn Raquel's hand, which he loved so much; and after this time, he had also received Rachel as his wife. It is a scene of patriarchal customs from the early days.

Our doctor is scandalized and exclaims: "How immoral this page summarizes!" Immorality in the head of an ignorant, doctor, not in a sensible spirit and in tune with the history of those times. Monogamy is primordial doctrine, modified after the flood by simple tolerance and restored by Jesus Christ.

Polygamy therefore existed in the Old Testament; it was tolerated, not prescribed; as we read in Exodus, the text the doctor should have read before shouting for the immoralities of the Bible. Read it well, doctor: "If you take another (woman), you will not reduce the maintenance of this (the first) nor your dress, nor your marital obligation" (Ex 21,10).

And we still read in Deuteronomy: When a man has two women, etc. (Deut 21.15).

Such was the law of the Jews; it is not the law of Christians, for Christ abolished this point, restored marriage to primitive unity and indissolubility.

Aware of these principles, the doctor will understand (if he wants to understand) that there was no immorality on Jacob's part in marrying the youngest daughter (Rachel) of his father-in-law Laban.

There was no point in shouting so loudly for so little. Just to express your ignorance of the old law.

The Doctor. Albuquerque is unaware, of course, that David and Solomon had a large number of wives and concubines, otherwise he would have shouted no more power over the immorality of these kings. It is that he judges ancient society by modern, and ancient law, patriarchal, by the law of Jesus Christ.

The first was the figure of the second, imperfect, incomplete and incomparably inferior to the law of charity, promulgated by Jesus Christ.

But we have another scandal. Our doctor is a candid and pure soul that scandalizes everything. Each of Jacob's two wives wants to have more children than the other, and hence new scenes; concubines or wives' servants come into play.

For us all this would be scandalous, it is true; however, facts must be judged according to times and customs; and, as I said, it is necessary to judge the ancient facts, not by the modern microscope, but by the law and the tolerance of those primitive times.

Such tolerance, in order to facilitate and accelerate the population of the universe, tolerated bigamy and polygamy, as we see in the law of Moses and in the customs of the patriarchs.

Therefore, being tolerated, there is no immorality; for there is no discrepancy with divine moral law.

## V. Falsification of texts

So far dr. José de Albuquerque poured, at will, the bile of his religious ignorance, wrapped in the drool of his wickedness, on the pages of the Old Testament. It seems that he should at least have spared the holy and immaculate Mother of Jesus! ...

But not; "The slug dirty everything it touches", this is how the apostle of "morals without morality" wants to defile the very Mother of God.

It is useless, doctor: "Whoever spits into the sky, the spit falls on his nose".

Listen to what he writes, or rather, what he drools (p. 54): "Another passage in the Bible, also riddled with immorality, is that which refers to the birth of Jesus Christ".

The passage is well known: The Holy Virgin was to give birth to the Son of God, conceived in her pure bosom by the Holy Spirit. Saint Joseph, unaware of the miracle performed by God in favor of his holy wife, seeing her pregnant, and not wanting to defame her, he decided to leave her secretly; but he kept it by order of God, who revealed to him that what was generated in it was the work of the Holy Spirit.

a All of this is clear, and known to all. Now "our doctor is going to pour on this admirable mystery the double poison of his ignorance and his impiety. Note the conclusion well. He continues: "And José," waking up from sleep, received his wife, but he didn't know her until after he gave birth to his son".

Why, my dear doctor, in addition to not understanding the text quoted, falsify it, and make it say the opposite of what it says? This is counterfeit! ... This is unworthy of a man of parchment, who intends to direct and instruct others. If he had consulted at least one Catholic gospel, he would have found the following text, the meaning of which is radically contrary to that of his counterfeit text: "And Joseph, awakening from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had commanded him, and received his wife. . . And I didn't know her until she gave birth to her son (Mt 1.25).

VS can read and write; he only lacks sincerity and religious instruction. So tell me what the difference is between these two quotes:

1) He didn't know her until after she gave birth to her son.

2) Didn't you know her until she gave birth to your son?

It is the literal translation from Latin: Et non cognoscebat eam donec peperit filium suum.

The opposition is complete. The first quote denies a first fact and states a second. The second quote absolutely denies the first fact and says nothing about the second.

## VI. Illustrative examples

It is as if someone says: I didn't drink coffee until after noon: - and another: I didn't drink coffee until noon.

The first claims to have had coffee after noon. The second denies having had breakfast, from morning until noon, without claiming to have had it later; - says only what you didn't do.

In ordinary language, such expressions are found at every step. For example: dr. José de Albuquerque wrote asnicies before studying. This does not prove that he studied later.

Even more: This man died before getting married: - Will this prove that he got married after he died?

Or: The patient was cured before the medicine was applied. "Does this mean that I applied it after he was cured?"

Only dr. José de Albuquerque can support such absurdities. Well, this is the meaning of the passage quoted.

The aforementioned phrase: José did not know her until (before) she gave birth to her son (Mt 1.25). This phrase indicates that an effect has taken place, without the intervention of its natural and ordinary cause.

The evangelist shows us that Jesus Christ was generated in a unique and prodigious way, without the two spouses having cohabited, from which it cannot be inferred that they cohabited afterwards.

Here is what is clear, and what is extremely moral ... infinitely above our "immoral morality". José de Albuguerque.

## VII. Puerza and virginity

Our priceless doctor wants even more immorality, to prove his incomparable modern morality, Let us listen to what he writes, in other words, what blasphemous: refers to Maria having remained a virgin, before giving birth, giving birth and after giving birth

And the incomparable doctor, made a theologian, asks:

"Would Mary stop being pure if she gave birth to Jesus, like all other women?"

And as a conclusion, the man writes: "It seems that the Bible wanted to demonstrate with this passage, considering impure, and, perhaps, immoral, the act of childbirth, as it is, and even, as its corollary, all motherhood, let it be processed, the way the Virgin Mary was processed! " This is phenomenal! My dear doctor, what a beautiful logic, what a syllogism, what a dialectic! ... and this was invented in 1930, in Rio de Janeiro!

It's amazing! But, in short, the Bible has already said it: doctrina stultorum fatuitas (Prov 16,22).

First, dear doctor, stop falsifying the texts.

- This is unworthy of an educated man. This is not just about purity; it is virginity, which is quite another thing.

Most Holy Mary is a virgin before childbirth, in childbirth and after childbirth, as Mr. said lines above.

And after talking about a virgin, vs starts talking about purity. Is it ignorance or evil?

A pure girl is a virgin, as a virgin is pure; - however, being married, it is different: a married lady, faithful to her husband, mother of a family, is pure, but is no longer a virgin. - Did you understand this difference?

Virginity is an absolute quality; purity is relative; so that the purity of a virgin is different from the purity of a married lady; each can be pure in its own state.

It is not a question, therefore, of despising marriage, which is a sacrament, called by St. Paul “great sacrament”, but of emphasizing the perpetual virginity of the Mother of Jesus.

Let us draw the conclusion: Mary most holy could have given birth to her son, like all other women, and be pure, for she was married, but she would no longer be a virgin, she would no longer be the virgin Mary.

The Bible, therefore, does not want to teach that other mothers are unclean but that Mary most holy, in addition to being pure, is a virgin, and that the fruit of her most pure bosom is the work of God and a miracle above human works.

We are, therefore, facing a great miracle.

Now, dear doctor, the miracle is an exception to the laws of nature ... How do you want to explain a fact, above nature, by the laws of nature?

This is impossible! You would want to compare the living human organism to a dead mechanical device.

The mechanical device necessarily follows the automatic march of its parts; - the living organism, being voluntary, follows the imposition of the will, which is superior to the laws of matter.

A gramophone, under normal conditions, must transmit the voice recorded on its disc.  
- The man's voice will reproduce the sound, if you want and in the way you want.

### **VIII. Conclusion**

If you had studied a little better, and that is in medicine, psychology and physiology, you would not write such gibberish, unworthy of a man of study and knowledge.

He sees that his new moral without morals, which is nothing more than ignorance and blasphemy, does not reach the throne of pure and immaculate Virgin Mary; and to all its efforts, to seek the shining sun that illuminates it, it produces no other effect than that which would produce a bat, when it wanted to intercept the sunlight.

Ignorance, dear doctor, makes you smile and evokes compassion and does not convince anyone! His alleged biblical immoralities are nothing more than a subjective description of himself, which shows the morbid state of his soul and the ignorant state of his spirit.

Medice, teipsum cure (Lk 6:23). Be careful ... that the immoralities discovered are not the reflection of the soul that discovered them! In quo enim judicas, teipsum condemns us, and enim agis quae judicas (Rom 2,1). Read this well, sir. doctor.

## FOURTEENTH FLASH Continnence and morals

Our dr. José de Albuquerque, wearing the theologian's tunic, undoubtedly believed that he adorned himself with peacock feathers; unfortunately he let the rook's plumes be seen, making a very sad figure under this borrowed plumage. The old Phaedrus used to say:

Contentus nostris si fuisset sedibus, Nec hanc repulses your Sentar calamites.

The doctor was a very sad theologian. Let's see if the theologian is not going to be a better doctor ... at least with “common sense” and dignity.

In the past discussion I countered one of the thousand asnices, ignorances and impiety, contained in the book Moral Sexual.

For this very pure esculápíio like the angels of heaven, everything is immoral, from our first parents, to the pure and immaculate Mother of Jesus; the moralistic fanatic finds stains and clouds in everyone and everywhere. In believing it, only he, and he only, among mortals, is the privileged being, ignoring sin, as he ignores virtue, ignoring evil, as he ignores good; versed in all branches of human science, as it seems, by the titles of his books, versed in all that is rot and filth.

Everything is relative in this world; the vulture makes its feast on what scares other birds away; there are birds that suck honey from the flowers and there are others that suck the rot of manure.

### I. New attacks by the ignorant

Thus, there are doctors for whom medicine is a true priesthood, a holy thing; and there are others who regard it as a means of corruption and revenge.

After what I have refuted in the preceding article, concerning Sacred Scripture and the holy Mother of God, no one will be surprised that the same doctor attacks the continence and celibacy of Catholic priests. This was to be expected. He thought he had found a new carrion ... and showed once again his stupendous ignorance, no longer of the Bible, but even of the laws and biological functions, which he intends to study and teach to others.

That a doctor is a terrible theologian and a horrible exegete, still passes; but if you are ignorant of physiological, psychological, and even pathological laws, this is not an excuse.

Well, not only do I affirm this, but I want to prove it here scientifically, showing that, in the entire exposition of your book, there is nothing but fanaticism, hatred and preconceived ideas, ignoring even the most basic principles of a science that you intend to reveal to others.

I silently pass through many points of your disgusting book and refute only the passages indicated by the friend, who sent the book, asking for the refutation of the annotated passages.

### II. Continnence in the face of morals

It is the title of a subject that Dr. empirical intends to deal with the great knowledge. The chapter opens with lightning and thunder; only the electric spark is missing. It looks like Moses from the top of Sinai, shouting the law of God to the idolatrous people, prostrate before the golden calf. There is only one difference: it is here that the calf is crying out against God and against men.

Let us listen to the great “principle of all wisdom” dictated by the doctor: “Whenever an individual, in full enjoyment of his health, surrenders to the continence regime, he incurs a great crime of sexual morality”,

From such a principle one can immediately see where the furious empiricist wants to end. What is certain, my dear doctor, is that vs you do not fall into this crime, - there is no danger - calm down your flashes ... Whoever writes such moral principles immediately shows that he is not in full health ... mental. The principle is therefore not applicable to vs, which is out of action at this point.

Now listen to the continuation. You have to take your hat off!

“Bringing continence to the individual's physical, moral and mental degradation ... it becomes an unspeakable attack on biology (attention to the home of the exposed, doctor) that a healthy individual of body and spirit voluntarily submits, offering his organism to so nefarious a work of degradation, or, as they say, with a lot of pride and pride, of mortification ”.

Such an explosion of indignation ends, of course, by the priests ... not by dr. José de Albuquerque, who, perhaps, never knew how to resist the brilliance of rot. He continues: “One of the reasons that lead the priests of the Church to voluntarily vote for continence, and even the mortification to which they seek to subject the body ... is ... intolerable, aberrant of all ethics, it is unjustified, it is immoral, immoral ”.

Attention, doctor, to the asylum! Such an effort can seriously shake your already weak nerves. There are very few priests in asylums, but there are many who did not like, nor do they like, continence!

After such a big effort, our dr. he must keep his shirt soaked with sweat. Go, doctor, take a shower to freshen your head ... then we'll reason.

### **III. Continence and chastity**

An error is refuted, an ignorant is taught, an affront is repelled, a madman is despised. I don't know what to do in the case ... I think it is better to teach the ignorant, because the case is for this, and vs is more foolish than bad.

What our dr. he denies, I must say, showing that continence is a virtue that libertines do not know how to practice, of course, that such a virtue is possible, and even useful; which favors man's full physical, moral and intellectual development.

It is one thing: I will try to be brief on such a long subject. To avoid misunderstandings, which our dr. it should be said that the Catholic Church understands continence to completely abstain, in the normal individual, from exercising sexual functions.

For us, continence implies chastity, and without it we think of it as a utopia. It is clear, therefore, that, by continent, we do not take an individual who, depriving himself of the normal exercise of genital functions, indulges in solitary addiction or other worse ones.

The continence thus defined, in its theological significance, which includes the removal of bad thoughts, bad intentions, desecration of life, of the sexual act, this continence

has never brought and will never bring any inconvenience to those who practice it. "I never saw a disease caused by chastity," says sage Mantegazza (Hygiene of Love).

"This continence is a sublime virtue that elevates man above his selfishness, giving him the strength to moderate and regulate his natural appetite", says dr. Mario de Vilhena (Continência and its Eugenic Factor).

"Yes, says Foerster, in Sexual Problem, chastity is now the privilege of those who are driven by a heroic love for their offspring or by virtue of religious and philosophical convictions."

Undoubtedly, it would be instructive to deal with the details, the physical and moral hygiene necessary for the practice of continence ... one could even say, absolutely necessary hygiene, but such a subject is delicate and for some very understandable. Our dr. he will understand us, as he will perhaps understand that it is because of the occasions of danger, temptations and excitations to which certain people are exposed, that continence is morally impossible. The divine Master said it: Whoever exposes himself to danger, perishes in him.

We are therefore going to the authorities to prove the possibility of continence or chastity.

#### **IV. Chastity is possible and useful**

No one can quote a single serious and well-founded evidence against this claim. The contrary statement is an unscientific, irreverent and blasphemous prejudice.

"Don't say, says Gibergues, that chastity is against nature. Also obedience, patience, charity, work, brotherhood, all these admirable virtues are contrary to nature, contrary to the selfishness of each one. But they are beautiful, convenient, necessary; they fight vicious germs and the principles of death, which are ingrained in poor human nature; and develop all noble and generous aspirations. So chastity. "

The Doctor. Luís Antunes Serra, a professor at the University of Coimbra, said: "I can tell you that there is no reading of medical literature, authentically scientific, nothing that absolutely meets chastity"

And such is the opinion of all serious and conscientious doctors who listen to the voice of science instead of listening to the voice of debauchery. It is so true that in some countries, for example in the Netherlands, primary school teachers are obliged to be celibate. And, even now, the London city council has decided that doctors are not to be admitted to hospitals in England, as long as they get married.

And no one is scandalized, as the wise physician Georges Surbled is not afraid to write: "Celibacy, being necessary, cannot be either impossible or dangerous".

At the same time, he says: "The ills of incontinence are known, undisputed, but the bad results of chastity are imaginary, they are invented" (Celibacy and Marriage). »

And Fonsagrives confirms, writing: "The statistics stripped of all prevention show that voluntary continence, instead of being dangerous, is rather the source of great physical vigor and great moral energy".

And so on, dear doctor. It is useless to prolong these quotes. Continence is the scarecrow of libertines ... and the glory of men of character and dignity. For me, I think that a doctor who attacks continence gives unmistakable proof of its nullity and its corruption.

The Doctor. Paulo Good says more or less the same thing. He writes: Those who say otherwise do medical pornography, but are unworthy of the name of servants of science.

### **V. Continnence and common sense**

Intelligence is not adorned with talc or powder, as the face is adorned; we need a little reasoning, and not hollow and loud talk, especially in a work that aims to be scientific, like that of dr. José de Albuquerque.

We have in the human body several physiological functions, some necessary, others useful. Among the necessary ones are digestion, absorption, breathing, blood and lymph circulation. Among the useful ones are the function of the senses and that of generation.

We do not discuss the former; its non-functioning is a certain cause of illness and even death, because they are all essential to life.

As for the simply useful functions, I wanted the illustrious clinician to prove to me that the man is obliged to use them.

I see what I want to see, and my sight suffers nothing, nor does it act against visual science, if I look down at what I don't want to see.

Listening to pleasant music, I listen; - an unnerving noise hits the eardrum: I cover the ears; and the hears lose nothing with this.

A pleasant smell caresses the olfactory pituitary, smell; but a sickening smell hits the nose: I cover my nose; and the olfactory organism suffers nothing from it.

And so on with taste and touch: they suffer nothing from abstaining or not exercising their respective organs.

The functions of the generation are necessary for procreation, like eyes for sight, but they are not necessary for life, as eyes are not necessary for living.

Now, if they are not necessary for personal life, no inconvenience can arise from their non-functioning, as nothing comes from the malfunction of other organs, simply useful.

Married and honest people can, at will, use or refrain from using marriage, and thus have children or not (by complete abstention). Why then should there be an obligation to use a function that is simply useful, but not necessary?

Why, O doctor? There is no danger that the world will perish for want of children. There will always be enough married couples who take care of the population of the world, so that those who are not attracted to marriage can live in peace, or who for the love of God renounce sensual pleasures in order to give themselves entirely to God and souls.

This is not for everyone, dear doctor. Nor did mr. would be capable of that; because it lacks the faith and love of God: - indispensable bases to remain continent and chaste.

### **VI. Degradation and immorality**

After the simple reasoning of “common sense”, without resorting yet to pathological evidence, the above reasoning would be enough to bring down the walls of your castle of errors and aberrations, and show, clearly, that continence is a sublime virtue, instead of being, according to his words, an intolerable degradation, aberrating from all ethics, unjustifiable and immoral!

What is intolerable, inexplicable degradation are his erotic, lucid and frankly immoral, immoral opinions. What could be more “immoral than stimulating the perverse instincts of humanity, caressing sensual inclinations, and making people believe that man is nothing but an animal? The animal follows the instinct of its nature; man must follow the laws of his Creator and not the disordered appetites for enjoyment and pleasure.

What is immoral, doctor, is to want to remove from man what is most noble, what is most sublime: the ideal of a spiritual life. The man without an ideal is a retrograde! the man without religion is a monster - the man without morals is an animal.

And vs, as a doctor, he has the sad courage to want to demean man in the name of science; and to make the public believe that a virtue that mr. does not know how to practice is impractical for others.

Not that, doctor! Mr. you cannot judge others for yourself. his moral meter described in his book is too short to measure the virtue of men of pride and faith. You can groan about personal corruption, but don't deny the virtue of others!

As a conclusion of this test, I just ask you to prove to us, scientifically, that man is not free to use the organs that the Creator gave him for use, and not for necessity. Prove to us that we have an obligation to see everything, to hear everything, to smell everything, to like everything, to touch everything. Proving this, we can conclude that we have an obligation to procreate.

Avoiding evil? This is just the negative side of our life: Declina a malo et fac bonum (SI 36,27).

The positive side is: doing good. This good is the struggle against our perverse inclinations, the fruit of original sin; it is, above all, continence, chastity, the practice of a heavenly virtue that makes man an angel, while the opposite vice makes him a demon. The book in question - making us believe in the impossibility of chastity - teaches immorality, because man, losing the ideal of improvement, necessarily falls into the abyss of addiction. It doesn't stop: it either goes up or down; he either goes to God or falls into the devil's clutches.

This understood, the third part of the refutation and its final conclusion will be more understandable.

## FIFTEENTH FLASH

### **Celibacy and chastity**

The refutation to the book “Moral Sexual” is done.

I have proved that the book in question is an unworthy and frankly immoral work. None of your clumsy opinions about religion stand: it is a complete cleanse.

What remains now is to build, on the ruins of the imaginary castle of the empirical clinician, the building of Catholic truth. It is the main part, it is the conclusion of these discussions. We will see how doctors and theologians are in full agreement on the case of continence. Let us first prove that continence is possible.

## **X. Possibility of continence**

Is it possible to keep continence? Yes, yes and yes; and not only is it possible, but it is healthy, and it does no harm to anyone: it only damages the head of dr. José de Albuquerque. I would like the illustrious doctor to prove to me that there is a sexual need! Prove it, doctor. The physiological teaching is that there is only one sexual stimulus.

There are physical and hygienic needs in man, which absolutely must be met.

You can delay them for a few hours, but not for long. There is a need to eat, drink, defecate, urinate, sleep. These are needs created by the vacuum or the repletion of the organ itself, and these needs have to be met.

But experience proves it and medicine confirms that sexual desire can disappear, although the ampoules remain full; and it can even persist, after they have been emptied, by simple psychic influence.

What does this prove? It proves, of course, that there is no need, but simply sexual stimulation. There being no need, man is free to do or to omit; and being free he is driven by his will.

And will this stimulus be so strong that man cannot resist? No, never! Not to mention the divine grace that is achieved by prayer, it can be drowned out by derivative processes, by moral considerations, by reasoning, by work.

To deny this would be to deny the first and maximum medical authorities that our doctor should know.

Years ago, there was an appeal from twenty German universities (Germany, Austria and Switzerland), confirmed by the Brussels International Prophylaxis Conference, which recognized and proclaimed to the four winds, not only harmlessness, but also the need for continence.

A top authority, such as James Forster Scott, writes: “Continence is in perfect harmony with good health. The belief, so widely publicized, that the conservation of health requires the exercise of sensual functions as an essential condition is erroneous” (Sexual instinct, p.95).

## **XI. Medical opinions**

Illustrious clinicians, world famous, and by hundreds, repeat the same opinions. Let us name just a few, to embarrass our empirical immoral doctrine.

The Doctor. Hericourt says it is a prejudice to find chastity difficult.

The Doctor. Surbled says celibacy is neither difficult nor dangerous.

The Doctor. Francotte protests against what they say in the name of science (like our doctor) that continence is impossible and harmful.

The great German neurologist Gower declares: “With all the strength of my knowledge, the authority of my experience, I maintain and affirm that there is no man, nor has there ever been, that in the most insignificant degree he has suffered for keeping chastity or has improved some suffering for failing to observe it”.

Sir James Paget wrote: “Chastity is neither harmful to the body nor to the soul. Your discipline is preferable to any other. Nothing is more harmful to longevity, nor does it diminish the vigor of life so surely, nor does it favor exhaustion as much as the lack of chastity in youth”.

Mantegazza, professor of anthropology, says: “I have never seen a single disease produced by chastity. All men, and particularly young people, can experience the

immediate benefits of chastity: Memory is quick and persistent, thinking lively and fertile, energetic will and firm character ”.

Napheys exclaims: “We strongly condemn it as a very pernicious doctrine, established to serve evil and encourage addiction, the theory that believes that there is some damage to chastistically observed celibacy. No condition of life is more completely in accordance with physical and mental vigor like absolute continence ”.

Perier, from Paris, puts it this way: “It is a singularly false idea and one that needs to be tackled, because it resides not only in the minds of teenagers, but also in the minds of their parents, to the point of authorizing them to take part in the misconduct of their children: it is the idea of the imaginary dangers of an absolute continence. The virginity of young people is a physical, moral and intellectual safeguard ”.

Jullien, from Paris: “The famous diseases of continence were definitely buried. Purity has never hurt anyone; it preserves healthy beings, full of vigor, to whom marriage will lavish its sweet joys ”.

Hospital doctors and professors from the Faculty of Medicine, New York, unanimously proclaimed: “Checking the extent of suffering, physical illnesses, the results of a deplorable heredity and moral evil, inseparable from an impure life, we we unite to declare that chastity - that is, a pure and continent life for both sexes - is in accordance with the best conditions of physical, moral and mental health ”.

This same conclusion was reached by the “German society for the fight against venereal diseases”.

The Faculty of Medicine of the University of Cristiânia, in Norway, had the opportunity to publish this magnificent statement, which gives so much emphasis to those who signed it: moralized and a perfect continence are harmful to health, it is absolutely false according to our experience, which we unanimously affirm; we do not know of any cases of disease or any kind of damage that we can attribute to a perfectly pure and moralized conduct ”.

In 1902, the International Conference on Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis met in Brussels for the second time, which unanimously approved the following vote: “It is necessary to teach male youth that not only chastity and continence are not harmful, but even though these virtues are the most recommendable from a purely medical and hygienic point of view ”. This beautiful proposal was signed by all the representatives of the 14 nations gathered in congress, which were: Germany, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, United States, France, Italy, Japan, Norway, Holland, Romania, Russia and Switzerland. There were notables like Lassar, Wolf, Neisser, Gailleton, Landouzy, Halloupeau, Tiberghien, Bertarelli, Peroni, Pawoloff, and our delegate was the late patrician and doctor dr. Bruno Chaves.

The Doctor. Leonel Besle, professor of pathological anatomy at the University of London, writes in turn: “It never hurts to repeat that abstinence and the most absolute purity are perfectly compatible with physiological and moral laws, and that the satisfaction of genital desires cannot be justified. in physiology and psychology, as neither is it approved by morals and religion ”.

Dr. Nopheys says: it is to be seen that no condition of life is as consistent with physical and mental vigor as absolute continence.

Dr. Seved Rebbeng, a university professor in Switzerland with 20 years of medical practice, did not find an individual for whom continence was impossible.

Dr. Faré writes: Those who are capable of psychic chastity, can keep continence.

Dr. Maegné: Continence can always be observed.

Dr. Isch Wall, Paris: To avoid the dangers of weaning, continence is the only effective condom.

Dr. Querat: It is necessary to repeat a lot that chastity is not harmful at all ... for youth, on the contrary.

Dr. Fourier, a specialist in syphilitic diseases, says: There has been talk, without criteria and lightly, of the dangers of continence for young people. I confess to you that, if these dangers exist, I was not able to know them, and that I, the doctor, have not yet been able to verify them, even though I have not missed observation cases, where I could easily verify.

Dr. Guibert makes this judicious observation: “Do you want personal observations (of the use of continence)?

Has your chastity ever ruined your health or hindered your work? In the circle of your knowledge you will have observed people whose good conduct is beyond any doubt; was there any one whose vital vigor would, by reason of chastity, suffer? Have you not heard of the purity of the monks' strength and longevity? Look at the lower category, for domestic animals, to which man imposes continence; do they therefore become less robust or less useful?”

Dr. Naphez: We strongly condemn, as a pernicious doctrine, put at the service of evil, and to encourage the worst form of addiction, the theory that suggests that a celibacy, chastely preserved, can result in any damage (Transmission of Life).

Dr. Good: Let us end this quote with a vehement reply, at the height of our dr. José de Albuquerque, from the illustrious dr. Good: “I often have, because of my profession, relationships with missionaries and priests and I was able to convince myself that the absolute observance of the vow of chastity does not bring any inconvenience. I challenge you to find, in the whole history of medicine, in any people, a disease, one, I heard well, caused by continence. I went through the libraries, I consulted all the doctors, worthy of the name, in both hemispheres, and if you present me a testimony signed by an accredited man, a page from a serious book, with authority in the matter, mentioning a single disease, motivated by continence, I, at the same time, will burn these pages ... It is not without reason that I say: serious books and doctors worthy of the name. A pseudo-medical literature explores the morbid curiosity of certain young people and repeats aphorisms more or less equivalent to the common prejudice: “It is necessary to let the youth pass”, all this to flatter the readers' secret passions, to increase the number of editions of their books. It is medical pornography, however, it will never deserve the honorable title of service or glory of science ”(Hygiene and Morals).he will deserve the honorable title of service or glory of science ”(Hygiene and Morals).he will deserve the honorable title of service or glory of science ”(Hygiene and Morals).

And so on, hundreds and hundreds of medical claims can be cited in favor of continence in relation to health; only the wanton and libertines who, judging others by themselves, try to hide under the cover of science the filth of their lives, and try to convince themselves that all others do as they do; what can the author of the immoral libel object: “A Moral Sexual”? Nothing but lies and frantic assertions without proof.

### **III. The advantages of continence**

Not only does continence not harm health, but it is even immensely advantageous, both for intelligence and for the body. Let us quote here the answer given by dr. Tanner de Abreu LPM attacking celibacy: “From the observance of chastity, he writes, there are bodily and intellectual benefits. Bodily benefits are health protection, especially against syphilitic and blenorrhagic infection, both of which have dire consequences, and the saving of nervous strength; because, as is known, the reproductive function is the one that most consumes and consumes these forces. - The intellectual benefits can be demonstrated, practically, by exemplification. And myself, having been consulted on this delicate subject, I had the opportunity to follow the observation closely, among others, of two cases exuberantly proving the great intellectual advantages that two distinguished young men reaped from the virtuous observation of continence. Of each of them I can say that it was primus inter Pares in academic studies. Today both occupy an eminent position in the Brazilian intellectual world ”.

Many examples could be cited of longevity and conservation of intelligence, through the practice of chastity; and no example is found of prolonged conservation among those who indulge in the famous sexual morality, already described.

It is a fact known to all: the men who best preserve their health, strength and intelligence are the priests and monks, because they keep chastity. In the convents of Europe, of very strict Orders, like the Trappists, there are continually robust, strong, healthy religious, in full possession of a lucid intelligence, counting close, if not more, to a hundred years old.

Where to find them, in the world, among those who satisfy their sensual appetites? Do not exist.

These are facts of experience; - the physiological data is no less expressive and certain.

#### **IV. Physiological evidence**

We could return to the comparison already mentioned by dr. Guibert; it is a typical fact. Man is a rational animal, say the philosophers. In fact, we have all the needs of animals in the animal part of our being.

Now - excuse me, dear Dr., the common man of comparison - when a farmer wants to have a strong, robust, resistant animal, be it ox or horse, what does he do? ... By castration, he condemns the animal to continence.

And this animal, in fact, becomes more robust, more resistant and even more long-lived.

Now, on the side of the body, man participates in the dispositions of animals. How does continence strengthen, fatten and fortify the lower animal and become harmful to man? Explain this, dear doctor ...

So is continence good for animals and harmful for men? The animal suffers the same sexual inclinations as the man. Taking away the possibility of satisfying them, it considerably improves its existence - while the man with the will, doing voluntarily what is imposed on this animal, would ruin his health?

Poor doctor! It's a lot of blindness! too much obsession, or too much ignorance! ... Such a science cannot be accepted even by an ignorant peasant, who would present you with the example of any of your oxen or horses!

- And the farmer would be right ... He seems to understand more medicine than mr. doctor. Its medicine is backward from four thousand years. It is easy to prove, physiologically, the advantages of continence:

Dr. Gley, in his studies (p. 696), notes that sperm contains 20 percent calcium. The use of marriage therefore loses the amount of calcium, gradually producing the decalcification of the organism, thus preparing the way for the invasion of tuberculosis. The conservation of this calcium can only benefit the body.

The Doctor. Roger points out in turn that the non-functioning of the exocrine glands causes the endocrine to function, which gives the nerves vigor and agility (Intr. À P Etude de la Médecine, p. 276). It is the reason why boxer fighters, or runners and even footballers, keep continents under a regulation that prohibits all intemperance.

If the physicist takes advantage of the preservation of chastity, much more does the moral take advantage of it.

#### **V. The clerical celibacy**

The foregoing is enough to refute the other scientific follies (poor science! ... he has a broad back!) Of such a "sexual morality" of a fanatical man, who sees everything through the multicolored prism, corruption and impiety.

In the chapter: "Celibacy in the face of morals", the sad scientist emphatically exclaims: "Mandatory celibacy, imposed by religion on priests, is not justified by any moral fact, which arises from it, both for clergy and for faithful, not small losses: to the former due to the ailments to which they are exposed due to the practice of these regimes, to the latter, due to the fact that the spiritual mentor of their souls is sick, the faithful "see themselves deprived of regular assistance, which was "

Thank you: Doctor, for your zeal in taking care of the existence of the faithful. It can be seen that vs. little use is made of the priest's direction, as he would observe that priests generally enjoy physical, moral and intellectual health.

Such celibacy, doctor, is not imposed by the Church; he is freely and spontaneously accepted by the clergy, since no one is obliged to be a priest; wanting to be, they already know that they must accept the practice of chastity.

As for the damage and illness of celibacy, they only exist in your head. For 56 years, dear doctor, I, your contender, have practiced chastity - and I practice it seriously and loyally - and, in the meantime, I do not suffer from any disease; I feel strong and robust; and without being of an intelligence perhaps of the brilliance of the vs, I still have quite clear ideas to refute all the blunders you write, blunders that denounce the weakness of an unbalanced brain, without perhaps reaching my age.

This, however, is contrary to all the principles of his book, which can be called childish, because it abides by all known scientific and experimental laws, and adopted by serious and discerning people.

And what I say about myself, I can say about half a million celibate priests, continents and chaste, all of them in full enjoyment of intellectual and even physical health.

Try once to oppose half a million married people, to see whose side health and longevity are on.

## **VI. Absurd contradictions**

I do not reveal all the contradictions of the infantile assertions in the perverse book in question, but there is one that should be highlighted here to show the thoughtlessness and lack of seriousness with which this book was written.

The author admits (p. 90) that the ecclesiastical world has given many brains. And he replies: "The explanation for this fact lies in the following data of regular observance: is that the clerics are very rarely subject to continence, absolute".

You are mistaken, my dear doctor. In any association there are traitors, it is true; but what is even more certain is that there is no corporation more chaste, more intelligent, healthier and longer-lived than the Catholic priesthood; and will this be the result of corruption, lack of continence?

That's admirable! Medicine shows us disastrous and horrible consequences of venereal excesses: syphilis, blenorrhagia, soft cancer, with its accidents, epidemitis, cystitis, conjunctivitis, arthritis, iritis, endocarditis, while it does not mention any disease from continence, none, none. Please, dear doctor, quote us the list of diseases, already observed, for abstaining from sexual functions; we, ignorant of the matter, are all ready to receive your admirable discoveries.

It is not enough to shout in the desert, and to shout that "religious celibacy is immoral, it goes against the laws of science and the individual and collective needs" (p. 91), "that clerics are subject to so many ailments". tavern; cite us a disease from chastity, yes? ... just one! ...

Show us a death caused by chastity, yes? ... just one ... while I will show you thousands and millions made by excess or even simple abuse of sexual morals. Bragging is not medicine, doctor ... it's silly!

Yes, there are extraordinary ceremonies in the clergy, for being the continent and chaste clergy; while among those who enjoy life there is nothing but stupidity and ignorance.

## VII. A hug from Satan

Another falsehood ... I don't tell a lie, because it is the result of ignorance. He says that celibacy was prescribed by Gregory VII, to cut the abuses of the clergy, and could only be applied at the end of the 13th century. Coming to the 13th century, you could gather a few more centuries and say that it was a 19th century invention. A little more nonsense, it did nothing to the case. What is certain is that it was not dr. José de Albuquerque, who invented celibacy, did not even practice it, as he does not recommend it ... and that is why his celebration is so small, so narrow and so contradictory.

You are sadly mistaken, dear doctor. Celibacy, continence, chastity are of divine invention; they are a moral, divine work of Jesus Christ.

Jesus Christ was celibate, he was continent, he was chaste, he was a virgin, he was spotless. Miraculously he was born to a virgin mother, surrounded himself with celibate apostles, continents, chaste, and advised others what he himself practiced.

V. s. who went to put the bedelho in the earthly paradise, to spy on the sin of Adam and Eve; ... who found Laban, Jacob, Leah, Rachel and Lot ...

who even entered the hermitage of Nazareth to slander the holy Virgin, Mother of God; who ascended to heaven to blame the omnipotent God - vs should also have gone to hell, where he would have found Lucifer, with his diabolical emissaries, all of them pure and holy, adherents of his "sexual morality" ... and there, at least, instead of the whip of "The Fighter", he would have found a friendly smile, a hug, even a kiss from Satan's lips, in reward for the perfidious lines written on the earth.

This is a fault, dear doctor, not irreparable ... but inconsequential ... But let us ... life goes on ... the demo will have enough time for this omission ... You want it so much ... VS did it so well his work! ...

## VIII. Origin of celibacy

I was getting off track. Excuse me, doctor. Celibacy, continence, chastity were practiced, advised by Jesus Christ himself, practiced in the Church, from the beginning ... and will continue until the end of the centuries.

That said, we prove it, in summary. Jesus said to the young man of the gospel: If you want to be perfect, go, sell what you have, value the poor, and you will have a treasure in heaven; then come and follow me (Mt 19,21).

Selling what we have, giving the price to the poor, this proves that you cannot have a wife or children; otherwise it would be to condemn them to death.

Elsewhere, he says: There are people who are forcibly virgins; but there are also people who voluntarily embrace this party, to arrive with more certainty to the kingdom of heaven (Mt 19, 12).

And yet: Anyone who has left houses, or brothers or sisters, or father or mother or woman, or children, or land for my name's sake, will receive a hundredfold and eternal life (Mt 19, 29).

São Paulo is the faithful interpreter of the divine Master's words: It is good that a man does not touch a woman, he says (1 Cor 7.1). But I say to singles and widows that it is good for them, if they stay like me, he continues (1 Cor 7,18). The bachelor takes care of the Lord's things; but the one who is married takes care of the things of the world (Id.

32,33). If someone marries his daughter, he doesn't sin ... but if he keeps her a virgin, he does it better (Id. 36m =, 40), he finishes.

São Paulo did not know “the sexual morality” of our modern school. - And pity is that our doctor does not know this epistle of São Paulo.

Conclusion: Getting married is allowed, if it is in the Lord, says São Paulo, but staying continent and chaste is better.

Jesus Christ, having exposed the tribulations of the married couple to the apostles, one of them exclaimed: If this is the case, there is no need to marry! The Master replied: It is not everyone who understands this word, but only those to whom it is given (Mt 19:11). It is not given to everyone: It is given to understand this to the pure, brilliant and generous souls; bohemians of life, this is not given; it is a mystery to them, as it is to the author of the book I refute.

Such is the origin of celibacy and chastity. If he opposed the origin of the “sexual morality”, already exposed, it was not in the life of Jesus Christ that it was necessary to look for it, but in the taverns, in the lupanars, in the houses of disorders, in the dens of moral, physical and intellectual rot; there, his apostles live, and it is there, in the bruising of passions, that books and pamphlets are prepared that smell too much the place of their origin.

Chastity has always existed in the Church: - it is its divine halo. It comes from Jesus Christ, for advice, and was always in honor among the altar ministers.

Tertullian, who passed away in 220, writes: "Clerics are celibate."

Origenes, who died in 254, also writes: "Offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass can only be done by those who forever and perfectly devote themselves to celibacy".

## **IX. The law of celibacy**

Our shrewd scholar discovered that Gregory VII made the law of celibacy, which was only practiced in the late 13th century. What a smart guy! We priests do not know any pope who introduced the custom of celibacy, but our doctor discovered it in the archives of any tavern ...

Congratulations! St. Gregory VII was pope from 1073 to 85 and according to our doctor, he is the author of the law of celibacy. Now, going through the decisions of the councils, I find the following decree of the African council of 390: “It is in force that the bishops, priests and deacons live in perfect continence as befits the holy antistites and priests of the Lord, and the Levites and those who they administer the sacraments ... For thus, we also observe what the apostles taught and observed all antiquity”.

This decree is from the year 390, that is, from the 4th century, and it is not a new law, but it is the maintenance of the old law.

And our doctor wants to assert that it was Pope Gregory VII who invented such a law in the eleventh century, having been applied in the thirteenth century.

The doctor deserves a gold medal for ignorance. I understand that he did not invent gunpowder, nor radio, but at least he invented the immorality of sexual morality. It is already something ... between human nullities!

## **X. Conclusion**

It is time to finish our study. The book in question was not worth so much, however. It is not for the book, but for the sake of my friend, an illustrious Catholic lawyer, who asked me for these clarifications.

Once again, upright, sincere and loyal souls will see what they are and what the opponents of Catholicism are worth. They write by lying, slandering, saying childishness, covering all this with the cover of science, and shouting their “eureka”, as if they had found what no mortal knew how to discover. We are wary of this sad anti-Catholic literature; it is always unscientific.

The Catholic Church, depository of truth, does not fear light or science; she fears only ignorance, conceit and vice.

Let us try to know our holy religion. Let us study it, and we will find in its bosom light for our intelligence, love for our heart, strength for our will and even health for our body: *Pietas autem ad omnia utilis est: piety is useful for everything*, says São Paulo (1 Tim 4,8).

We reject the works of wickedness, immorality and revolt: - They are works of Satan; and under whatever mask he hides he is always Satan and always seeks to lose souls. *Diabolus tquam leo rugiens: The demon is like the roaring lion, looking for someone who can devour* (1 Pd 5,8).

May our doctor reflect, create judgment, acknowledge his crime and his ignorance, to be reconciled with God and with true science, which he so grossly offended and insulted. It is my greatest wish and my sincere prayer.

## COMMUNISM

### SIXTEENTH FLASH

#### **Vulture vultures: Communism and secularism**

The civilized world is currently going through one of these mysterious phases, which do not allow the historian to analyze the facts or the principles. It is a labyrinth, it is an abyss, it is general darkness.

Today we feel a certain malaise, a disturbance, an illness, at the same time endemic and universal; a weakening of character, of will, of dignity, which everyone regrets, which everyone accuses and which everyone suffers, It is an epidemic wind that blows over humanity! Where does it come from? ... Nobody knows it!

Today we observe its effects, disapprove of them, and tomorrow many applaud their exploits and fall into their bonds. They are veritable vulture vultures.

Alert, Catholics! Open your eyes! ... both eyes!

See! ... and with clenched fists, fight to preserve yourselves from the vulture owls, from disgrace your person, your family and your homeland.

#### **I. False sages**

The hour is one of hope, as it is of sad apprehensions.

Impiety, corruption and hatred, represented by red communism and the black pro-state black coalition, two vultures from the low backgrounds of rot and revolt, fly over

Christian society, threatening it with their filth, to dirty the that there is more pure and disuniting what makes the charm of the homeland, the home and the individual.

The Catholic Church does not fear vultures. It has weapons to slaughter them, as it slaughtered all those who, at any time, had the audacity to want to tarnish their purity or to defile their authority.

It is not enough, however, to have the divine promises of victory: The gates of hell will not prevail against it (Mt 16:18). I will be with you until the end of the ages (Mt 28,20).

We still need to act, fight, defend our faith, make it triumph, like São Paulo, who was able to say, at the end of his life: *Bonum certamen certavi* - I fought the good fight, I ended my career, I kept the faith; for this reason the crown of justice is reserved for me (2 Tim 4: 1).

We must also fight this good fight, so that we can end our career and keep our faith in Jesus Christ and in his Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church, founded by him on Saint Peter, - the first pope: You are Peter and on this I will build my church on stone (Mt 16:18). - Whoever listens to you listens to me; he who despises you despises me (Lk 10:16).

Anti-clerical hatred, which seems to be fashionable, is in the class of false sages, who believe that all science consists of knowing the four operations of arithmetic, a couple of fingers of Brazilian history, a finger of geography and three fingers of hollow literature; with this they think they are the judges of the world, of religion and of God Himself.

These righteous choruses know nothing about philosophy, theology or even catechism; but, supported by their pride and their ignorance of the matter, they carry out literally the word of the Holy Spirit: *Doctrina stultorum fatuitas*. - The doctrine of idiots is presumption (Prov 16:22).

To presume to know and to know nothing, - to presume to be able to play the master of all and to ignore what common sense teaches, - to presume to be the supreme judge of men, of institutions and of God Himself, and to forget, that tomorrow he will descend to the grave leaving only a shovel of rot and then a hand of dust, while the soul will go before the court of the Creator to account for a life that was death, and a death that is life.

All of this is the proud presumption of the foolish man, without religion and without faith, who intends in his smallness and, in his misery, to overthrow the eternal God and the institutions established by him. *Poor fools! Vana spes et mendacium* I turn foolish! (Ecli 34.1).

## **II. Red Communism**

Much has been written about nefarious and wicked communism; you can never write enough about such a doctrine; the doctrine of destruction and many ignore what it is, what it wants, where it comes from and where it goes.

Let us try to penetrate its secrets and aspirations.

Communism is a utopia that does not admit the pronoun mine, nor yours: everything is ours.

If we were in a communist regime, no one would be able to say: - my house, my garden, my animals, houses, gardens and animals would be common, they would belong to everyone and nobody because it would be the government that would temporarily distribute these things to anyone who wanted to,

Even the word: My God, or our God is a communist heresy. For them, God does not exist: there is only government, thieves and murderers. This means that the government is God, and the henchmen are the angels of this God.

God does not exist, as communist doctrine says, men must work only to live the life of the ox, the horse, the irrational, and even in worse conditions, because one is not free to eat when one wants to, nor to wear clothes to please; and if anyone rebels, he will soon be hanged.

In fact it is logical: If God does not exist, our soul does not exist either. A soulless man is an animal, The animal is useful while working; no longer being able to, they hang and strangle him, or else they let him die of hunger and misery.

So does communism with the old, the sick, the useless, those unable to work.

Communists no longer want churches or bells. They just want the job. For them, to work is to pray.

It only serves those who work ... but those who work for others, experiencing hunger and misery. Those who do not work do not eat. Whoever does not eat, dies. This is the great communist code.

Communism knows neither home nor homeland. The land is nobody's. They annul the idea of homeland, as they want to annul maternal love, filial love, conjugal love and faith in God; it is the last blow to man's heart.

The crudest of men, like the most civilized, loves the land in which he was born, dies heroically to save it from dishonor, defends it with his blood against the foreigner's invasion. In the communist homeland there is no foreigner, there is no dishonor, because there is no honor.

Which Brazilian wants such a homeland? ...

### **III. The secularism**

Secularism, in general, is not well understood by the people, especially since it covers itself with different names, in order to better hide itself. There is a “lay pro-state coalition, anticlericalism, liberal propaganda”. All of these names express the same owlsh vulture: revolt, hatred of God.

Let us see this secularism well. The word layman, in its original etymology, does not mean anything badly; it serves to separate the two states: the clerical state of the priests and the lay state of the people of the world.

In our times, the word layman or layman expresses another idea, and it generally takes on an anti-Catholic and anti-religious significance.

It is called a lay state, or lay government, which in its organization and life ignores the Church or officially ignores any religion, seeking to exclude from its institutions the precepts, teachings and the very idea of God. Lay law is inspired by atheistic ideas and considers human society to be separate from the influence of God and free of obligation to him.

Dominated by this false conception of society, the State even instituted lay morality, regardless of the revealed religion, thus forming a rule of customs without God, with no future life, without responsibilities before the Supreme Being and without eternal sanction.

It is, therefore, possible to define secularism, saying that it is a doctrinal and political system, which proposes to eliminate God and religion from the family and society. One

immediately understands the absurdity of such a doctrine and the dire consequences, which necessarily derive from such principles.

The basis is “false, Secularism takes as its basis and ideal its doctrine this kind of axiom: man is free.

Now, such a axiom is God's complete apostasy.

Man is free, because he is a rational being; but, as it is God's creature, it depends on its Creator. If the choruses of secularism proclaimed only the freedom of man, we would have nothing to complain about; but they mean that man is independent; that there is no being superior to him; who can do whatever he wants.

Hate of all authority flows from this, hatred and revolt against God, against the Church, against revealed doctrine, against priests.

It is blind and hateful anticlericalism. It's slander, it's persecution! Secularism thus leads to communism.

What communism does brutally, secularism does it for errors of principle, spirit and pride.

The result is the same. Communism and secularism are two vulture vultures, who return over Brazil, threatening its existence, its progress and its religion.

#### **IV. Liberal Advertising Association**

Anti-clericalism, with its proper name, would not please the religious and essentially Catholic people of our dear homeland. The monster is horrendous; so that you can introduce yourself, it's best to give it another name, another cover, another face.

And what happened. Anticlericalism founded an association of liberal propaganda, with a central committee in São Paulo. The basis of such an association is the active propaganda of liberal ideas, as opposed to the performance, in society, of (textual) clericalism.

Such an association is publishing truly disgusting books and brochures, for the ideas, the lies and the ignorance that distinguishes them.

There are books like: War on the Bells. There are brochures like: The husband of the soul, confession, black danger, the Church slaves, etc.

Its code of anticlericalism is contained in the following commandments:

Do not get married in the Church.

Do not baptize your children.

Do not attend Church ceremonies.

Don't be a godfather.

Do not educate children in religious schools, etc.

It is clearly seen that it is hatred of God, the Church, and religion. It should be noted that most Protestant pastors are members of this association. This, in fact, is natural. For these heretics, rather to be Buddhist or Mohammedan, than to be Catholic. - Everything will do, aside from Catholicism.

#### **V. Communist doctrine**

But let us take a closer look at communist doctrine. Communism is the economic organization of the future society, as opposed to the current system of capitalism.

All goods must belong to all citizens, and each receives from the collective mass according to their needs. Communism is the socialization of production and consumption.

It is immediately understood that such an organism is nothing more than a utopia, absolutely unrealizable. In this world there will always be hardworking and indolent men; some intelligent, others foolish; some strong and some weak, so that society can never be equalized.

In fact, it is the word of Jesus Christ who knows situations, needs and aspirations: You will always have the poor among you, he says (Mt 26:11).

It is an inseparable condition of life, it is a necessity, arising from human nature and progress.

Communism does not admit individual property.

The individual has nothing of his own: everything is ours. So it is, theoretically, but it is practically different. Everything belongs to the heads of the government, and the people are left with ... nothing but slavery and misery. Workers are the slaves of governments.

They sometimes complain about the lack of work. This lack exists, it is certain, and it will always exist, as long as there is no more justice among men; and since justice is the result of the practice of religion, there will be no justice if there is no religion.

Lack of work is a social problem that only religion can solve, for the justice that must be practiced by all. The lack of work stems from general distrust; nobody wants to expose themselves to losing what they have; and in this way, enterprises, mineral exploration, etc. are paralyzed. Banks close their doors, transactions are paralyzed, money circulation is reduced, industries are not developing, and the worker is left without service.

But, it is not enough to see the fact, it is necessary to see the cause of this fact; and the first cause is the lack of seriousness, of honesty, of justice, arising from the lack of religion.

It is the third International Workers' Association that makes the propaganda of communism. The first was founded in 1864, for the emancipation of the working class, by the workers themselves: it dissolved shortly afterwards. The second was founded in 1889 and aimed at transforming capitalism into socialism: it dissolved in 1914. The third was reorganized by Lenin and Trotsky, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in the world.

The real purpose, however, is to establish the dictatorship of a group of Russians, eager to govern and oppress the population, to take possession of the property of others in all countries of the world.

To this end, the Russian communists preach that there is nothing but a homeland, that the land belongs to no one. To nullify the idea of homeland, as they want to nullify maternal love, filial love, conjugal love and faith in God, is the last blow to man's heart.

The crudest of men, like the most civilized, loves the land he was born in, dies inherently to save it from dishonor, defends it with his blood against foreign invasion. In the communist homeland there are no foreigners, there is no dishonor, because there is no honor.

What would be of Brazil, if communist doctrine avenged? We would be governed by Moscow dictators.

We would hand over our agricultural products to Russia, our industrial products to be sold by the Russian government at a very low price, to force down markets in non-communist countries, to ruin them, to overcome them by starvation.

To soften the idea of a universal homeland, Russian communists will change the name of their country. It will probably be an international communist confederation and Brazil would be a state of the international confederation ... Now, as it was Russia that started the communist regime, the center, the seat of the universal government will be in Moscow.

If they managed to implant the communist government in Brazil, our country would be governed by the Russians.

Therefore, the miserable people who handed over Brazil to communists without a country would be traitors to their homeland.

Another absurdity of communism is to make it believe that it is the form of government that can bring happiness to the people. It is a mistake. It is not the form of government that is the main cause of people's happiness or unhappiness, it is the people themselves who make themselves happy or unhappy.

It is true that the Republican government is often wrong. But all governments have been wrong. And the communist government will make more mistakes than the others, because it is illogical, utopian, extravagant, without conscience and without God.

## **VI. Communism image**

It is said that Trotsky, while still in the government of Russia, once went to the city of Kiev to preside over a communist rally. He said that communism saved Russia, that it freed the workers, that it brought happiness to the workers. Then he asked if anyone wanted to contradict him, because the Soviets guaranteed freedom of thought.

A worker, named Efimoff, asked for the floor.

The auditorium shivered with fear at this audacity.

But Efimoff had the floor and went up to the podium, carrying a staff.

- Comrades, began, look at this staff. He will tell you the story of the Russian revolution.

The audience poked their ears.

- Do you see the stick handle? Continued Efimoff; - an iron fist. Before the revolution the country was ruled by the aristocrats who are represented by this fist.

The auditorium stared at the fist, including Trotsky, and did not miss a syllable.

- Below this fist is the middle part of the stick, the rod. This part represents us, the workers we work for. The aristocrats had us under the wrist.

Trotsky gave an applause.

- Below the handle and the shaft is the tip, which is also iron. The fist is on the top. The tip is the prisoners, the explorers, the eaters; the bottom line is us, the workers, the peasants.

Efimoff was silent and solemnly raised his staff.

- Gentlemen, this is the revolution.

And he turned the stick, putting his fist on the floor, with the tip upwards.

- Gentlemen, the revolution is done; aristocrats were at the bottom, prisoners, eaters and explorers were at the top. And you, peasants and workers?

You have not changed places, but the fist oppressed you, now the tip oppresses you.

Trotsky roared like a tiger. Efimoff, the worker who had spoken frankly, relying on the freedom granted, was shot that same day.

## VII. The Communist Decalogue

But nothing is clearer and more positive than the communist decalogue, collected in several Russian publications, Such a decalogue needs no comment; just go through it to understand the communist system in all its hideous reality:

### I COMMANDMENT

Hate the Lord your God

Our entire system is an atheist and cannot take another course (Perri).

Religion is opium for the people and, like alcohol, it obscures intelligence (Lenine, in the book: “Socialism and Religion”).

The man who takes care of worshiping God, gets dirty on his own spit (Lenin, to his friend Lunatscharski).

We demand the complete separation of Church and State in order to have spiritual weapons in the fight against God.

It was the workers who were stupefied by religion (Lenin, “Socialism and Religion”).

### II COMMANDMENT

Curse our God and Lord

We must only curse God and remove him from society (Le Peuple).

We hate and curse Christianity and we must consider Christians, even the best, as our worst enemies. They preach, contrary to our principles, charity and the love of others. We must only hate; and through hatred, we will be able to take over the world (Kalinin).

### III COMMANDMENT

Despise the day of the Lord

Churches, convents and chapels are destroyed and transformed into public entertainment rooms, cinemas and shops (Stalin).

Sputum in your religion and in all others. (Commissioner Karylenko before the jury against D. Cieplak, Catholic archbishop of Russia).

Abolition of Sunday and institution of the week, worker (Third International).

### IV COMMANDMENT

Despise father and mother

According to communist doctrine, father, mother and children do not have mutual relations. No obedience, otherwise equality would be impossible (Mallon).

Revolution will never be possible as long as the family and the family spirit exist. The family is a bourgeois institution invented by the Church ... it is necessary to annihilate it (1925 communist feminine federation).

Comrades, yesterday my mother was alarmed to see me reading the atheist magazine “Besboschnik”. We now live separately at home. Our parents were busy with venerating the images of the saints and reading holy books; we then put Lenine’s portrait and decorated the “Besboschnik” (Letter from a 16 year old Russian girl, to her companions).

### V COMMANDMENT Kill

Violence must be the lever of the revolution.

It will be a pleasure for us to see agonized priests, bourgeois and capitalists. Dressed in their cassocks, the priests will slowly die on the streets and under our sight.

We gladly sell our place in heaven for a good bottle of wine to feel this pleasure. What do I say? Sky? No, we don't want it. What we ask for is hell, it is the pleasure that takes us there (Ratie).

- This hand is one.

This other one is two.

With these two I hang the capitalists.

Now I'm still small,

But when it's big

I will kill the capitalists.

(Children's song from the book "Moscow unmasked", by Jos. Douillet).

VI COMMANDMENT

Impurity is our pleasure

Here we save readers from unrolling a tape of nauseating scenes of bestification.

VII COMMANDMENT

Steal

We will skin the capitalists as much as possible, and this should not be qualified as theft (Vooruit, Belgian communist newspaper).

Steal as much as possible, because everything was stolen (Lenine).

VII COMMANDMENTS

I lied, if the lie seizes you

Let us avoid offending the people by telling them what we want; it would be lack of tactics (Der Vorwärts).

IX COMMANDMENT

Desire the next woman

No marriage; free love (Law on marriage 1-1-1928).

Polygamy and polyandry are not prohibited by law, and are valid for valid marriage, as far as legal effects are concerned (Gidulzeff, 1927).

In Petrograd, in one year, 2,000 marriages took place and 1,705 divorces were declared.

Lenin's friend, Communist Schwartz, got to marry 150 times. Cited before the court, the judge only declared that this was harmful to the state's prestige.

The rest was not mentioned.

X COMMANDMENT Prepare a universal revolution

The bourgeois bullet; do not spare yourself dynamite (Perrant).

The proletariat cannot accept the form of government that currently exists, annihilate this apparatus (Lenin in "State and Revolution").

### **VIII. In the domains of anthropophagy**

We collected from the newspapers some samples of the incredible misery that the unfortunate Russia reached by the communist regime.

“In an article reproduced by several newspapers, M. Vandervelde had doubted the statements about the dearth of life in Russia, published by the “ Journal de Genève ”. This responds, citing facts, including the following, from Siberia, dated September, that is, after the harvest.

“I was in a privileged situation because, as a worker, I had a food card.

But it was impossible to nourish myself with it. Since spring, wheat flour has not been distributed to me, but a mixture of flour that made the children sick. I then decided to join the remains of the starch preparation, in which I am employed, herbs and roots that we were looking for in the fields.

It was enough to cross the city to discover the bodies of starving people. A relative of mine (the letter mentions her name, address and date) was killed by her tenant, who partly devoured her.

The authorities were unable to hide this fact and the man was convicted. With great indignation from the communist judges who wanted to present the case as an isolated crime, the defendant declared that he had been fed human flesh during the winter, in fact he would have starved to death.

I personally know more than ten cases of anthropophagy, committed in the vicinity of my home.

A soldier opened a bag in front of me containing the remains of a dead child to be eaten.

No one dares to leave their children on the streets for fear that they will be stolen and cases of children abducted in remote places, dead and eaten are constantly cited. All of this looks incredible, but I don't marvel.

Relatives and friends in search of better living conditions have come to the regions of Siberia, the Caucasus, Ukraine and also in the north. It's more or less the same everywhere, except ... in Moscow, where I was able to eat bread.

I left when the harvest was largely done, but the situation did not seem to be noticeably improved.

I don't know if this is explained by the fact that the harvest was worse than expected. Soviet newspapers say that famine reigns abroad, but no one believes it, as no one else believes in the government's promises. Those in power are cursed by everyone because everyone is convinced of their responsibility in the people's extraordinary misery ”.

This letter from Siberia is very eloquent. Now there is the translation of another one, coming from the Caucasus.

### **IX. Misery everywhere**

“In Tiflis, where I was on the 5th of September (so many weeks after the harvest) I saw the bodies of children, abandoned on the roads and showing the characteristic signs of hunger: emaciated and deformed legs and a swollen belly. In the outskirts of the city I saw people eating bark from trees and roots ”.

Ensuring the authenticity of these documents, the “Journal de Genève” adds that they demonstrate that hunger is not due, as Mr. Vandervelde wants to make believe, to a bad harvest, but only and simply to the communist and Marxist system: “The Russian peasants made the revolution to valorize their lands; Staline took them away and, driven by despair, killed their capital: 85 million head of cattle. How to make the harvest abundant? And why do it if they were left without it?”

Numerous testimonies prove that in many locations harvests could not be made because the bad herbs drowned the good ones, because there was no way to collect what the land produced. Hunger is not just due to a lack of wheat, but of milk, meat, everything.

The famine in Russia will last as long as the Marxist regime lasts, because this disastrous doctrine takes away all hopes of improving life and only gives terror as an excuse for work.

In addition to these facts pointed out by the Swiss newspaper, which, by the way, is a newspaper of immense moral authority, whose lines are not sold even with the weight of all the money in the world and whose word of praise to a character is enough to give you a notable reputation, I will now refer to what the “Offinor” agency told us a few days ago about the cannibalistic hunger in Russia.

She says: “Newspapers continue to publish painful documents about the famine in Soviet Ukraine.

One of the most significant documents is a letter from a peasant to his brother in Leópolis, which was published in the newspaper “Dilo”: “My dear brother. Meet our requests. Have mercy on us and help us, for God's sake! We are all bloated because of hunger. We ask you, we beg you, dear brother, that you have pity on me and my wretched family. The end of our life is approaching. We have eaten everything we have found. We have nothing else. And if God and you, my brother, do not come to our immediate aid, we will soon all die. Our food consists of water, salt and some roots. Do not want your brother, but especially my dear children, to starve to death. An alms, for the love of our mother, for the love of God”.

## **X. Conclusion**

There is no positive fiber of heart that does not shudder in the face of facts, narrated in letters, which tell of the mortal torment of hunger, and of the cannibalistic carnage of the hungry in poor and disgraced Russia.

When we remember the siege of Paris, in the Franco-Prussian war, our compassion for Parisians is enormous, because they were forced to eat cats, dogs and mice. The inhabitants of the City of Light thus went through hardships to resist the siege of enemy troops, and the attitude inspires us with sympathy and deep sympathy. It was patriotism that animated these souls to such sacrifice.

But in Russia it is not patriotism that inspires the Soviets to starve the populations. There are no cats or mice that can serve as food for anemic and swollen populations. Everything has already disappeared. It is the wild madness of installing the doctrines of Carlos Marx all over the world, whose benign proof we have at the door within the limits of Spain with the burning of convents, the burning of churches and the easy death of paisanos or soldiers who do not have the name in communist associations.

In Russia, hunger entered the paroxysms of despair: you kill yourself so you don't die; you kill yourself to eat; he kills himself to elucidate the whole world of how criminal it is to line up alongside enemies, the borderless and the enemies of family, property and homeland.

## FINAL CONCLUSION

When reading these pages, the patient reader would have been amazed, certainly, by the title of the book: Angel of Darkness. This is the demon, the Satan, the devil. It is the Satan of darkness.

But Satan, driven out by his revolt from the kingdom of glory, although fallen from his primitive greatness, has not changed in essence, and remains always an angel; he is a fallen angel. Instead of being an angel of light, as he was in heavenly glory, he is an angel of darkness today, but he is always an angel.

It is like the man who, king of creation, by his nature, became by the original fall, and by his weakness, like the slave of creation. Man is always king, by nature, but through sin he has become a slave.

At the end of this reading, the reader will understand that the term is not exaggerated, and that truly the angel of darkness is in this world, working with tenacity to lose men.

Among many demons, it can be said that the six mentioned are the most dangerous. *Sex sunt quae odit Dominus*, says the Holy Spirit. These six demons excite, in a particular way, the hatred of God and his Church.

Catholics, beware, preserve your faith, your dignity, and your religious pride. Nobody wants friendship with the devil.

It is a fierce enemy; and whatever form he takes will always remain the same enemy. It is always the same demon that Saint Peter speaks of: Watch, because the demon, your adversary, walks around like a roaring lion, looking for whom to devour. Resist him strong in faith (1 Pet. 5,8,9).

This demon, or angel of darkness, not being able to show himself personally, as he is, puts on the skin of the little lamb, to better deceive the unwary and lose them more easily.

It is he, Satan, who hides in spiritism, to pull man's intelligence and lead him to the asylum.

It is he who acts for Protestant sects, sowing discord in souls.

It is he who fantasizes about the masonry mask, to excite hatred and persecution against the Church and its ministers.

It is he who covers himself with the veil of divorce, to launch men into free love, addiction and degradation.

It is he who hides under the disgusting but brilliant rot of sexualism, to teach evil, to develop passions, to remove innocence from hearts and bodies.

Finally, it is he who blasphemes and who kills, wrapped in the cloak of communism, to destroy the family, the homeland, and Christianity. Careful, Catholics ...

He is alert, he is the red, disgusting demo, the great rebel, the father of lies, the master of corruption, the enemy of God and man.

Caution! You don't play with fire or mud.

The angel of darkness is the fire of passion, it is the rot of addiction. Satan is far from us! *vade post me, Satana* (Mt 16, 23).

It is Satan changing into an angel of light: *Satanas transfiguratur se in angelum lucis* (2 Cor 11,14). But it is always the angel of darkness. It is always the enemy of God and man.

He is always the great liar. It is always Satan with the six crowns on his head: spiritualism, Protestantism, Freemasonry, divorce, sexualism and communism. It is all one, it is all the same Satan, pursuing the same ends, under different names. Alert, Catholics! ... May the good Lord read the foregoing, which is the simple and loyal exposure of the truth, open the eyes of the sleeping, awaken the religion of the faltering, and shake off those who may already have a foot in the door. abyss. The abyss can be surrounded by flowers and perfumes, it can have an attraction for the senses, it can have a golden sign and an inviting sign, it doesn't matter, below is always the hideous abyss, and at the bottom of this abyss is always the devil, the angel of darkness, who is.

So fight! ... and war on the eternal enemy. I hate the angel of darkness, and his representatives on earth, his institutions, which we have studied here. A first time God threw the devil out of heaven. A second time, God crushed his head on Calvary.

It is now up to us to expel him from our home, from our homeland, and from the dens in which he settled and intends to dominate, reign, as despot and as sovereign. Let us not fight for him to reign over us! We want the freedom of children of God and not the slavery of children of darkness.

We want the Christ the King, the Christ the Father, and we don't want the filthy Satan enthroned

in seances, in Protestant services, in Masonic lodges, in divorce mud, in sexualist impudence, in communist hatred!

Away from us all that is Satan, his works, his pomp, his promises.

We want God, who is our King, We want God, who is our Father!

Only god! It is enough for us!



