

# Was Vatican II Infallible?

By Robert J. Siscoe

## Part II

*“Conformity to Tradition is thus the ultimate condition of the infallibility of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium.” (Canon Rene’ Berthod)*

In his Apologetic and Dogmatic Treatise, *The Church of Christ*, Fr. Sylvester Berry lists the conditions required for Conciliar infallibility. He wrote:

“Certain conditions are necessary for the exercise of infallible teaching authority by the bishops assembled in council, namely: a) the council must be summoned by the Roman Pontiff, or at least with his consent and approval... b) The council must be truly ecumenical by celebration, i.e., the whole body of bishops must be represented. ... c) Bishops assembled in a council are infallible only when exercising supreme authority as teachers of faith or morals *by a definite and irrevocable decree that a doctrine is revealed...* But since the bishops need not intend such an irrevocable decision at all times, *it is necessary that an infallible definition be so worded as to indicate clearly its definitive character.*” (1)

He goes on to explain how the definitive character of the doctrine is clearly indicated. He begins by noting that no specific formula is required, and then adds: “it is sufficient [for the council] to mention the doctrine as *an article of faith, a dogma of faith, a Catholic dogma, a doctrine always believed in the Church, or a doctrine handed down by the Fathers.* Anathema pronounced against those who deny a doctrine is also sufficient evidence of a dogmatic definition.” Then, quoting St. Robert Bellarmine, he explains that not everything in a council is infallible:

“A large majority of the acts of councils are not infallible definitions, because they are not *intended* as such. ‘Neither the discussions which precede a dogmatic decree, nor the reasons alleged to prove and explain it, are to be accepted as infallibly true. Nothing but the actual decrees are of faith, and these *only if they are intended as such*.’” (2)

Now, Vatican II met the first two conditions mention above by Fr. Berry, since it was a) summoned by the Pope, and b) truly ecumenical by celebration. But since Vatican II “defined no dogmas at all” (3) it failed to meet the third condition. We can be sure it did not meet the third condition because of the testimony of Paul VI himself, who said: “In view of the pastoral nature of the Council, it *avoided* proclaiming in an extraordinary manner any dogmas carrying the mark of infallibility.” (4)

Yet, in spite of the fact that Vatican II *intentionally* avoided defining any dogmas (a condition required for Conciliar infallibility), John Daly claims that, if Paul VI was a true Pope, the documents of Vatican II should have been covered by the Church’s infallibility *in toto*, since they came from the Bishops, representing the entire world, teaching in union with the Pope (the Ordinary and Universal

Magisterium). Now on the face of it, it should be evident that there is a problem with Mr. Daly's reasoning, since his conclusion renders absolutely null *condition C* (mentioned above), due exclusively to the presence of *condition B*. Yet in spite of what should be a quite obvious error with his reasoning, Mr. Daly doesn't hesitate to declare publicly, not only that Vatican II violated the Church's promise of infallibility, but that this alleged violation proves that Paul VI was not a true Pope. From Daly's article:

"It is all we need to make good the claim that Vatican II fulfilled the conditions for infallibility... if Paul VI was a true pope. For it was certainly an occasion on which, in all appearance, pope and bishops united [condition B] in transmitting to the faithful a substantial body of religious tenets presented as being authentic Catholic doctrine. Thus, even if the Council did not issue those solemn judgments known as acts of the Extraordinary Magisterium [Condition C], its doctrines necessarily belong to the infallible teaching of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium... always provided that they were promulgated by a true pope, for the bishops without their head have no such protection."

Mr. Daly's error is based on an incomplete understanding of the infallibility of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium. What he doesn't understand is that, in order for the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium to teach infallibly, it has to meet the same conditions as the Extraordinary Magisterium, since the conditions discussed in Part I apply to both the Extraordinary Magisterium and the Ordinary Magisterium. According to the teaching of Vatican I, upon which Mr. Daly bases his position, the doctrine must be *definitively proposed* as a *revealed truth*. The difference between the Extraordinary Magisterium, and the Ordinary Magisterium, is the way in which these conditions are satisfied.

When a dogma is defined by a pope or council, it is proposed by *a single and definitive act*, to which the charism of infallibility is applied. The definitive character of the doctrines of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, however, are not known by a single act, but by a multitude of acts, which, when taken together, clearly and unmistakably confirm that the doctrine has been clearly proposed by the Church as a *revealed truth*. Such teachings are *de fide* (of the Faith), but, since they have not been *solemnly* defined, they are not *de fide definite* (defined as a matter of faith). (5)

### **Unmistakably Definitive**

The 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia taught that "the *magisterium ordinarium*, is liable to be somewhat indefinite in its pronouncements", and as a result can be "practically ineffective as an organ" of infallibility. (6) Since the doctrines of the Ordinary Magisterium lack the clarity of those proposed infallibly by a solemn decree, they are known to belong to the Faith by their conformity to Tradition: by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, the agreement of the Scholastic Theologians, and the constant belief of the faithful. (7) Msgr. Van Noort explains that for a teaching to be infallible by the force of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, it must be absolutely clear that the doctrine is taught as a *revealed truth*. He wrote:

"Clearly if a truth is capable of being declared an object of divine-catholic faith through the force of this ordinary and universal teaching, there is required such a proposal as is *unmistakably definitive*. The proposal must be of such a nature that *without any misgivings* it is proven that the doctrine in question is taught throughout the entire world *as revealed* and, consequently, as something necessarily to be believed by every Catholic." (8)

An unmistakably definitive proposal is precisely what was lacking at Vatican II. If any revealed truths had been proposed in an *unmistakably definitive* manner, they would have constituted a solemn decree,

and therefore would have been infallible by virtue of the Extraordinary Magisterium, since an ecumenical council is itself an extraordinary event, during which the charism of infallibility is exercised in an extraordinary way (when the necessary conditions are met).

Van Noort goes on to explain that the definitive character of the doctrines of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium is known, not by a single definitive act, but by “countless activities” – a multitude of non-infallible acts – which, when taken together, make it clear that the particular doctrine has been clearly proposed as a revealed truth. He admits, however – echoing the words of the Catholic Encyclopedia cited above - that this “is frequently enough not too obvious”. He also notes that one of the major *signs* that a doctrine has been sufficiently proposed, as a revealed truth, is the universal and constant agreement of the Theologians that the doctrine is a matter of divine faith. In his own words:

"Now since a definitive proposal of this sort must blossom forth from countless activities which individually are neither definitive nor infallible, the existence of such a proposal (with the exception of some fundamental truth) is frequently enough not too obvious. The major signs of such a proposal are these: that the truth be taught throughout the world in popular catechisms, or, even more importantly, be taught by *the universal and constant agreement* of theologians as a matter belonging to faith.

“The reason we prefer the agreement of theologians to the agreement of catechisms is that the latter, by the very fact of being intended for popular instruction, usually make no distinction between matters which must be held by divine-catholic faith and those which must be held by ecclesiastical faith, or simply as theologically certain. Furthermore, a papal document designates, as we have, the agreement of theologians as a sign of a definitive proposal by the Church. Listen to Pius IX: *‘By divine faith are to be believed those things which, through the ordinary teaching of the whole Church throughout the world, are proposed as divinely revealed and, as a result, by the universal and constant consent of Catholic theologians are held to be matters of faith.’*” (9)

### **Agreement of Theologians**

The universal and constant consent of the Theologians in relation to the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium is a constant theme in the writings of the theological manuals. They teach that the universal agreement of Theologians serves as one of the clearest signs that a doctrine, which has not been solemnly defined, is indeed of the faith. It should also be noted that the term Theologians (with a capital T), does not refer to theologians in the general sense of the word, but to a specific group of men, namely, the scholastic theologians and doctors of the various scholastic schools from the twelfth century until the middle of the eighteenth century. (10) Msgr. Van Noort observes that there is “an intimate bond which unites the theological schools to the Church’s Magisterium”, and then adds that as a consequence of this bond “it is altogether to be presumed that the agreement of the theological schools expresses the mind of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium”. (11) The eminent theologian, Msgr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, went so far as to say: “the unanimous teaching of the scholastic theologians in any area relating to faith or morals *is* the teaching of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium of the Church.” (12) In his lengthy teaching on this subject, Fr. Tanquerey includes the unanimous agreement of the Theologians, along with the unanimous consent of the Fathers, as a *part* of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium. (13)

In *Tuas Libenter*, (14) Pope Pius IX also mentions the universal and common consent of the theologians in relation to the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium. It is interesting to note that Mr. Daly quoted

*Tuas Libentur* twice in his article. In fact, he even quoted the very sentence in which Pius IX mentions the common consent of the theologians, *yet both times Mr. Daly left that part off*. Here is the quote from Pius IX. The italicized portion at the end is what Mr. Daly chose not to include.

“Even limiting oneself to the submission made by the act of divine faith, this could not be restricted to those things that have been defined by the express decrees of ecumenical councils and by the decrees of this See, but must be extended also to what is passed on as divinely revealed by the Ordinary Magisterium of the whole Church spread over the world, *and therefore, by universal and common consent are held by Catholic theologians to belong to the faith.*” (15)

Now, why would Mr. Daly have removed that last part – twice! - if not because the novelties of Vatican II do not meet that criterion?

### **Conformity to Tradition**

Another point that Mr. Daly’s private interpretation of *Dei Filius* (the document from Vatican I upon which he bases his thesis – see Part I) fails to take into account, is that for a teaching of the Ordinary Magisterium to be infallible, it must be truly *universal* – that is, in conformity to what the Church has always taught and believed.

In his article on the infallibility of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, Canon Rene’ Berthod, a distinguished Professor of theology who served as the theological advisor to Archbishop Lefebvre during Vatican II, explained that, in order for a teaching of the Ordinary Magisterium to be infallible, it must be in conformity with the constant teaching of the Church. He wrote:

“For the authenticity of the Ordinary Magisterium to be guaranteed, it is necessary that its teaching be universal in scope, that is, in conformity to the constant teaching of the Church throughout the centuries. In other words, it must agree with Tradition.... For the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church to be infallible, it must be universal in the full sense of the word, *including both space and time.*” (16)

### **The Rule of Faith**

The word “rule” comes from the Latin word “*regula*” (Greek word Kanon) which means a standard by which something is measured. The *primary rule* of faith is the First Truth (God the Revealer), (17) the *remote rule* is the truth revealed in Scripture and Tradition, and the *proximate rule* is the preaching of the Magisterium, which was established to hand down and explain the teachings of Christ. (18) Now, since the proximate rule of faith was instituted to teach and explain the remote rule, there must be a congruity between the two (19), with the former being subordinate to the latter. In his *Manual of Dogmatic Theology*, Fr. Tanquerey taught that the Corporate Body of Bishops (the proximate rule) enjoys infallibility as long as it is handing down the teachings of Christ (the remote rule). He wrote:

“The corporate Body of Bishops, as the heir and successors to the Apostolic College, enjoys infallibility *as long as it is handing down or transmitting the teachings of Christ.*” (20)

Since public revelation ended with the death of the last Apostle, not even the Extraordinary Magisterium can infallibly propose a novelty, with no foundation in Scripture or Tradition, as a dogma that must be believed with Divine and Catholic Faith.

It should be reiterated that none of the novelties of Vatican II were definitively proposed as revealed truths during the Council. The closest Mr. Daly could come was to cite the phrase “made known by

divine revelation” found in *Dignitatis Humanae*. The specific statement in which this phrase was used, however, was merely an explanation and not intended to be definitive; furthermore, when read “in light of Tradition”, it can easily be reconciled with the Faith.

Regarding Vatican II’s teaching on ecumenism, which is one of the foundational errors of the post-Conciliar Church, and the one responsible for the greatest damage to the Faith, Fr. Ratzinger himself (the future Pope Benedict XVI) admitted that it has no foundation in the New Testament. In his 1966 book, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, he wrote:

"The ecumenical movement grew out of a situation unknown to the New Testament and for which the New Testament can therefore offer no guidelines." (21)

Novelties, such as ecumenism (which Fr. Ratzinger sufficiently defines a few paragraphs after the above citation), will never be infallible by the force of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, since they have no foundation in Tradition, and in fact are contrary thereto.

### **Material Dogma**

Before the Church can define a doctrine as a *revealed truth* it must establish that the doctrine is a *material dogma* (a definable truth). (22) Material dogmas are truths contained within the sources of revelation, and therefore definable, but which have not yet been clearly and definitively proposed by the Church. (23) When a *material dogma* is defined, it is raised to the status of a *formal dogma*, (24) which is a dogma in the true sense of the word: a *revealed truth* that has been *definitively proposed* as such by the Church.

It is not necessary for each and every dogma to have been taught *explicitly* from the time of the Apostles for it to be defined at a later time by the Church, but it must have been believed at least *implicitly*, even if somewhat obscurely, and it must be in conformity to that which *was* clearly and explicitly taught from the beginning.

Before a material dogma is defined, it sometimes happens that there are disputes concerning the doctrine amongst theologians. During a time of such confusion, the doctrine would not possess the definitive character necessary to be infallible by the force of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium. One example of this is the Immaculate Conception, which was indeed a material dogma from the beginning, but, due to the obscurity of the doctrine, it was not clearly and definitively proposed until it was solemnly defined by Pius IX. But this is different than a teaching contrary to Tradition (or one previously condemned by the Church), which later spreads throughout the human element of the Church during a time of crisis, such as the Arian heresy of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century, which denied the Divinity of Christ - an error that was embraced by the vast majority of Bishops at the time. (25) Such teachings will never possess the definitive character necessary to be infallible by virtue of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium.

### **Acts of the Magisterium**

Earlier we saw that the definitive character of the teachings of the Ordinary Magisterium are not manifest by a single definitive act, as with the Extraordinary Magisterium, but by countless activities which are not themselves definitive, but, when considered as a whole, make it clear that a particular doctrine is a matter of faith. But what about individual acts of the Magisterium, which are not in themselves infallible? Canon Berthod explained that the promise of infallibility is not necessarily

attached to each act individually, unless the act in question is consonant with the totality of Church teaching.

“Ordinary acts of the Magisterium also received the guarantee of divine assistance in what they propose to be believed as *revealed truth*. Unlike the acts of the solemn Magisterium, though, they do not have the same definitive character, nor do they carry the anathemas by which recusants are formally excluded from the Catholic Faith. But for them to be considered as belonging to the Church’s teaching, to which the divine promise is attached, they cannot be taken separately, but must be consonant with the body of the Church’s teaching: they are infallible only insofar as they fit into the *constant teaching*, only insofar as they reflect or echo the *permanent teaching* and unchanging Faith of the Church. In short, they are only infallible insofar as they agree with Catholic Tradition. Two conditions, then, are required: 1) the teaching must be proposed as a *revealed truth*; 2) it must be in accord with the universality of Catholic Tradition.” (26)

### Universal in Space and Time

Canon Berthod goes on to explain that the term ‘universal’ comprises two dimensions, namely, extension in space and duration in time. He wrote:

“It would be an abuse to declare irreformable all the acts of the ordinary Magisterium. In order for them to be preserved from error according to the divine promise, they must be universal, which means that they must teach what the Church has always believed and always taught since the time of the Apostles, since the revealed deposit was closed. The Magisterium is universal when it proclaims the Faith of the Church unaltered throughout history. *The notion of universality comprises two dimensions: extension in space and duration in time.* ... This is how the theologians have always understood it.” (27)

Even if one were to argue that the novelties of Vatican II have been taught universally in space, which would be a difficult case to make due to the confusion and division within the Church today, they have certainly not been taught universally in time.

Arnaldo De Silveira, the author of the monumental work on the New Mass and the hypothesis of a heretical Pope (“La Nouvelle Messe de Paul VI, Qu’en Penser) wrote:

“According to Vatican I, the ‘ordinary and universal Magisterium’ is also infallible. In order for it to be so, in her daily teaching the Church must impose a truth as having to be believed not only throughout the world but also with continuity in time so that it becomes patent to every one of the faithful that that truth was revealed and must be professed under pain of abandoning the Faith.

“In this context, the concept of “universal” is not always interpreted correctly, as some understand it merely as indicating universality in space, that is, in the whole world. According to this view, all the teachings of Vatican II are infallible because they were solemnly approved by the Pope with the moral unanimity of the Bishops. *In reality, individual magisterial acts by the Pope and Council as they occurred in Vatican II cannot define dogmas of the ordinary Magisterium because they lack continuity in time* and the consequent binding character that would impose them absolutely on the consciences of the faithful.”

A little further on he adds:

“In short, traditional theology affirms that, according to Revelation, assistance from the Holy Spirit was not promised and therefore not guaranteed in all cases and circumstances in such an unrestricted way. The assistance guaranteed by Our Lord covers all extraordinary definitions without exception, both papal and conciliar. But monumental theological works, especially in the silver age of Scholasticism, show that it is possible for errors and even heresies to exist in papal and conciliar pronouncements not guaranteed by infallibility.” (Mons. Müller: *Tradicionalistas são hereges*, by Arnaldo De Silveira)

To conclude, none of the novelties or apparent errors of Vatican II were definitively proposed as *revealed truths* during the Council, (which would have been an act of the Extraordinary Magisterium), and none have been taught and believed universally in space and time. Therefore, the novelties of Vatican II do not possess the definitive character necessary to be infallible by the force of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, which means, of course, that Vatican II did not violate the Church’s promise of infallibility.

### **Was Paul VI a true Pope?**

We have seen that, contrary to Mr. Daly’s claim, Vatican II did not violate the infallibility of the Church. But what is interesting to realize is that Mr. Daly’s position – that Paul VI was not a true Pope – is itself a denial of the Church’s infallibility, as we will now see.

The First Vatican Council taught that the Church speaks infallibly when it definitively proposes a *revealed truth* to be believed with Divine and Catholic Faith. Revealed truths are the primary object of infallibility. But there are also secondary objects of infallibility, which are not *revealed truths*, but instead are matters intimately connected with Revelation. The secondary object of infallibility includes such things as theological conclusions, dogmatic facts (contingent historical facts), universal disciplines, and the canonization of saints.

Although the Church herself has never defined if she speaks infallibly concerning secondary objects of infallibility, it is commonly held by theologians that the Church’s promise of infallibility embraces these matters as well. When they are presented definitively, they are accepted with ecclesiastical faith (faith in the Church teaching), rather than Divine and Catholic Faith (faith in the authority of God revealing), which is limited to *revealed truths*. (28)

Now, one of the things that falls within the category of a secondary object of infallibility is the election of a Pope, which is a “dogmatic fact”. Theologians teach that the unanimous acceptance of a Pope, by the Bishops and faithful, is an infallible sign – an “infallible effect” (29) - of his legitimacy.

I could cite dozens of theologians who teach this (30), but will limit myself to Cardinal Billot, since he makes a number of important observations. In addition to teaching that the acceptance of a Pope by the universal Church is an infallible sign of his legitimacy, Cardinal Billot also explains that the universal acceptance is an infallible sign of the existence of all the conditions required for legitimacy. Another interesting and quite relevant point he makes is that God might permit an extended vacancy of the Apostolic See, but he cannot permit the whole Church to accept a false Pope as being the true Pope (which, it should be noted, presents more problems for the “Siri Theory”). Here is Cardinal Billot’s teaching on this subject:

“The adhesion of the universal Church will always be, in itself, an *infallible sign* of the legitimacy of a determined Pontiff, and therefore also of the existence of all the conditions required for legitimacy itself. God can permit that at times a vacancy in the Apostolic See be

prolonged for a long time. He can also permit that doubt arise about the legitimacy of this or that election. He cannot however permit that the whole Church accept as Pontiff him who is not so truly and legitimately. Therefore, from the moment in which the Pope is accepted by the Church and united to her as the head to the body, *it is no longer permitted to raise doubts about a possible vice of election or a possible lack of any condition whatsoever necessary for legitimacy.* For the aforementioned adhesion of the Church *heals in the root all fault in the election and proves infallibly* the existence of all the required conditions.” (31)

Now, in anticipation of an objection raised by one who claims to have heard of a person, or perhaps knew a person, who did not accept Paul VI as Pope, Fr. Sylvester Berry explains that acceptance does not have to be absolutely unanimous, but only practically unanimous. He wrote:

“The *practically unanimous* consent of the Bishops and faithful in accepting a council as ecumenical, or a Roman Pontiff as legitimately elected, gives *absolute and infallible certainty* of the fact”. (32)

Now, since Paul VI was accepted as Pope by at least a practically unanimous consent of Catholics (if not a mathematically unanimous consent), to claim he was not a true Pope is a denial of the infallibility of the Church. And if there are any who question whether Paul VI was indeed accepted as Pope by the universal Church, the answer was provided by Fr. Francis J. Connell, CSSR, in the December 1965 issue of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*. As Providence would have it, in the same month that Paul VI brought the Second Vatican Council, the following question and answer appeared in the pages of the publication.

**“Question:** What certainty have we that the reigning Pontiff is actually the primate of the universal Church – that is, that he became a member of the Church through valid baptism, and that he was validly elected Pope?

**“Answer:** Of course, we have human moral certainty that the reigning Pontiff was validly elected in conclave and accepted the office of Bishop of Rome, thus becoming head of the universal Church. The unanimous consensus of a large group of Cardinals composing the electoral body gave us this assurance. And we also have human moral certainty that the reigning Pontiff was validly baptized, since there is a record to that effect in the baptismal register of the church in which the sacrament was administered. We have the same type of certainty that any bishop is the true spiritual head of the particular See over which he presides. *This type of certainty excludes every prudent fear of the opposite.*

“But in the case of the Pope we have a higher grade of certainty – a certainty that excludes not merely the prudent fear of the opposite, but even the possible fear of the opposite. In other words, *we have infallible certainty that the present Sovereign Pontiff has been incorporated into the Church by a valid baptism and has been validly elected head of the universal Church.* ... This is an example of a fact that is not contained in the deposit of revelation but is so intimately connected with revelation that it must be within the scope of the Church's magisterial authority to declare it infallibly. The whole Church, teaching and believing, declares and believes this fact, and from this it follows that this fact is infallibly true. We accept it with ecclesiastical – not divine – faith, based on the authority of the infallible Church.” (33)

This puts John Daly, and the others who reject the Papacy of Paul VI for similar reasons, in quite a predicament. On the one hand, they claim infallibility would have prevented a true Pope from ratifying



the documents of Vatican II, yet, on the other hand, by rejecting the Papacy of Paul VI they themselves are forced to deny the Church's infallibility.

The solution to their dilemma is to realize that, since Vatican II *intentionally* avoided defining any dogmas, it did not engage the infallibility of the Church. Therefore, a true Pope could have, and indeed did, ratify its documents.

#### FOOTNOTES

- 1) *The Church of Christ*, E. S. Berry, 1955, pg. 260-261
- 2) *Ibid.* pg. 261
- 3) "The truth is that this particular council *defined no dogma at all*, and deliberately chose to remain on a modest level, as a merely pastoral council" (Card. Ratzinger, July 17, 1988)
- 4) Paul VI, General Audience, December 1, 1966
- 5) *The Sources of Revelation*, Van Noort (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1961), Pg 227
- 6) *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, Vol. VII, pg 800
- 7) *A Manual of Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, (Desclee, New York, 1959), pp. 176 - 182
- 8) *The Sources of Revelation*, Van Noort (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1961), Pg 222-223
- 9) *Ibid.*
- 10) *Ibid.* Pg 276
- 11) *Ibid.* Pg 277
- 12) The Teaching authority of The Theological Manuals, Fenton
- 13) *A Manual of Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, Tanquerey (Desclee, New York, 1959), pp. 176 – 182
- 14) This is the same document cited above by Van Noort
- 15) Denzinger, *Sources of Catholic Dogma*, # 1679
- 16) *Pope or Church*, Angelus Press, pg. 59
- 17) See the Binding Force of Tradition Fr. Ripperger, pg 28
- 18) *Christ's Church*, Van Noort (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1961), Pg 122
- 19) *Magisterial Authority*, Part II, Ripperger, Christian Order, Vol 55, N. 3., pg 41
- 20) *A Manual of Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, Tanquerey (Desclee, New York, 1959), pp. 117
- 21) *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, Joseph Ratzinger, (Paulist Press, New York, 1966), p. 72
- 22) *The Sources of Revelation*, Van Noort (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1961), Pg 229
- 23) *Fundamental of Catholic Dogma*, Dr. Ott, TAN, pg 6
- 24) *Ibid.* pg 7
- 25) Fr. Jurgens noted that at one point during the Arian Crisis, the percentage of Bishops in possession of Sees, who adhered to the true Faith, "was no greater than something between 1% and 3% of the total." (*The Faith of the Early Fathers*, Jurgens, Vol. 2, p. 39)
- 26) *Pope or Church*, Angelus Press, pg 58
- 27) *Ibid.*
- 28) *A Manual of Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, Tanquerey (Desclee, New York, 1959), pp. 145
- 29) Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Can.*, II. p. 520. Note 171, cited *The Theological Hypothesis of a Heretic Pope*, De Silveira, pg 185.
- 30) For Van Noort's explanation see: *The Sources of Revelation*, (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1961) pg 265
- 31) Billot, *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, Vol. I, pp. 612-613, quoted by By Rev. Dominique Boulet, in *Is That Chair Vacant? A SSPX Dossier on Sedevacantism*, Communicantes, October - December 2004, No. 21
- 32) *The Church of Christ*, E. S. Berry, 1955, pg. 290
- 33) *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. 153, Dec. 1965, page 422