THE THUC CONSECRATIONS (Cont'd) — Part 247
THE DENTAL STATE OF ARCHBISHOP THUC

I apologize that this Easter Bulletin is so late. Please accept my best wishes for a happy Fourth of July. I hope that your Easter was filled with the peace, charity, and supernatural joy that belong only to those unpolluted by the slightest connection with the Thuc "consecrations" and/or "clergy."

INTRODUCTION
There is a more urgent matter that demands our attention now. It is more urgent than such pleasant Easter wishes. It is not insignificant. It is not mere theoretical debate. It is not trifling. It is an issue where much is at stake. It is the subject of Bulletin after Bulletin. It is always introduced with a paragraph of "it is" sentences. It is our monthly attack on Abp. Thuc.

There are many serious problems with Abp. Thuc and the Thuc consecrations. We have dealt with these problems in some degree in past. There is this 285-part series. There was my book Fifty Anti-Thuc Sermons for Weddings, First Communions and Patriotic Occasions.

THE DENTAL STATE OF ARCHBISHOP THUC
This month we are going to deal with an issue in greater depth. It is on the minds of both opponents of the validity of the Thuc consecrations (me and one other priest, to be exact) and those who accept their validity (everyone else in the world): What was the dental state of Archbishop Thuc?

The truth must be told. And the truth is this: there are serious doubts about the dental state of Archbishop Thuc.

We will show here that at the time of the consecrations Archbishop Thuc's dental state was probably decayed. We will show that this made Archbishop Thuc only doubtfully capable of correctly pronouncing the essential 16-word sacramental form. We will also show that there is no certificate to disprove this doubt. As you can see, this case against the validity of the Thuc consecrations is airtight.

Doubt #1: What Did Thuc Really Use?
Archbishop Thuc was from Vietnam. People there do not use toothbrushes and toothpaste on their teeth. They use small bamboo shoots and water. Most of this water comes from the Mekong or the Red River. Mekong or Red River water contains no fluoride. Without fluoride, there is doubt that tooth decay can be effectively prevented. Where there is doubt that tooth decay was prevented, there is the impossibility that it existed. Where tooth decay existed, it could have been serious. It could have loosened Archbishop Thuc's teeth. He could also have suffered from gingivitis. All this could have interfered with Archbishop Thuc's pronunciation of the essential 16-word formula for episcopal consecration.

The issue is simple. Then. No fluoridated water in Vietnam equals doubtful episcopal consecrations. Defenders of the consecrations have still not answered this powerful argument. The doubt therefore still exists.

Doubt #2: Absence of a Certificate
No certificate has ever been produced demonstrating that when Archbishop Thuc cleaned his teeth, he used anything which

"has been shown to be an effective decay-preventive dentifrice that can be of significant value when used as directed in a conscientiously applied program of oral hygiene and regular professional care." (COUNCIL ON DENTAL THERAPEUTICS, American Dental Association.)

This certificate is the ordinary means of proof. It is prescribed by the canons of the American Dental Association.
Without this certificate, you must have a dental exam. You must have witnesses. But these witnesses must be qualified witnesses. They must not merely be able to state that a dental examination took place. They must know exactly at what point a decay-preventive dentifrice is "effective." They must be able to define the term "significant value."

I travelled to Germany to examine the supposed witnesses for the Thuc "dental examinations." I closely questioned them under oath. Neither of them could tell me the exact point at which a dentifrice became "effective" or acquired "significant value."

Nor could they give me specifics of any "conscientiously applied program" on Archbishop Thuc's part. Now, the minister of a sacrament must conscientiously apply correct matter and form for a sacrament to be valid. If Archbishop Thuc did not follow a "conscientiously applied program" prescribed by the canons of the American Dental Association, why should we believe he conscientiously applied correct matter and form when he conferred the sacraments?

Those who believe the consecrations were valid are dumb-founded by this question.

LIES FROM THUC APOLOGIST REFUTED

In Part #242 of this series I reproduced the following words of Archbishop Thuc to show his sacramental intention could not be trusted:

"When I headed a diocese in Vietnam, I regularly withheld my intention at ordination. At that time, I was also completely crazy."

Thuc apologists have accused me of inventing this quote, just as they accused me of inventing phony quotes from the Code of Canon Law, Fr. Noël Barbara and others. To refute their bold lies, here is the exact context of the passage:

"When I headed a diocese in Vietnam I regularly withheld my diocesan employees' taxes. My intention at the time was to show proper subordination to civil authority. At that time I was also convinced that it would have been completely crazy to do otherwise."

Can the Thuc apologists deny that the words I quoted actually appear in the above passage? Of course not. Once again, the Thuc-ites have slandered me. They have called my honesty into question. They are unscrupulous. They stop at nothing. But I will not be silenced. I will not be intimidated. The truth must be told.

A FINAL SLANDER ANSWERED

The Thuc-ites have also spread other lies against those who oppose them. They say the laity no longer take these Bulletins seriously. They say I have an ax to grind. They say my only apostolate is attacking Archbishop Thuc, the Thuc bishops, and the Thuc consecrations. They say I use the demagogue's trick of stringing together "they-say" sentences to portray myself as "persecuted." They say Abp. Thuc and the Thuc consecrations are all I can write about. They say this is all I can think about.

But the Thuc-ites have no proof for this whatsoever. They have no certificates in triplicate. They have no qualified witnesses. Lay people everywhere are eager to hear nothing but attacks on Archbishop Thuc every month. When we condensed our mailing list, we asked people to let us know if they still wanted to receive this Bulletin. Tens, even dozens, of you replied.

Those who follow this Bulletin can also attest (under oath) that the "Thuc-on-the-brain" accusation against me is false. Several months ago, for example, I interrupted this series to write about God, country and American holidays (Fourth of July, Viet Veterans' Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving, etc.)

So don't believe those who slander our work. And please be generous in supporting my wonderful apostolate here and with the good Sisters at Round Thuc.

Next Month: Thuc Consecrations (cont'd), Part 248.
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