

# *The Idea of an American Catholicity*

- Paul K. Hubbard

Almost a thousand years of Papal peace had slipped into the mists of history with the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Likewise, the “Pax Britannica” has similarly disappeared, and the “Pax Americana” is rapidly coming to an inconspicuous close upon the stage of a new, secular, global village of modernity. As these political unities have dissolved, so too have the ecclesiastical unities, which have, so often, been coterminous and codependent upon mere human political patronage, foundered upon the shoals of secular science and modern mores. Ideas of catholicity – indeed, of Christendom itself, have become unrealistic, romantic excursions into nostalgic myths of medieval universalisms.

The American Episcopal Church - the Church of George Washington himself - once stood upon the pre-eminent pinnacle of Protestant respectability and Catholic pedigree. Now she has tumbled, as all the mainline denominations in America have tumbled, to a place of disgrace, having succumbed to the unrelenting siege of theological Liberalism and cultural secularization. But unlike the Southern Baptists, Pentecostals, Lutherans, Presbyterians and Methodists, who still post very respectable numbers in every census, even in an age of unfaith, American Catholicism seems hopelessly and irreparably shattered to a place from which it seems impossible to recover – smitten to the place of dragons, as the Psalmist himself once lamented.<sup>1</sup>

The thesis of this paper is that Anglicanism in the United States, which represents a distinctly American Catholicism, despite its bewilderingly diverse fragmentation into irreconcilable sectarian jurisdictions, is nevertheless poised upon an ideal, ideational promontory from which to survey the ecclesiastical wreckages of past Christendoms and to thoughtfully, if not dispassionately envision a new, American Catholic consensus which both conforms and transforms the socio-political contexts of the future.

Never before has the religious potential of Anglicanism been so starkly juxtapositioned against its most foolish and glaring inadequacy. Anglicanism, at least as it has been inherited from Britain, has always been irrevocably caught between potential and pride, to be sure. Anglicanism’s potential was that she could preserve that which was true and honest, just and pure of medieval Catholicism and modern Protestantism. Yet in England, she vacillated bitterly between these two poles until the Elizabethan Religious Settlement,<sup>2</sup> then again under the Stuart Kings, James I and Charles I, until the Pax

---

<sup>1</sup> Psalm 44:19 “... thou hast sore broken us in the place of dragons, and covered us with the shadow of death.”

<sup>2</sup> i.e., The Act of Supremacy (1558) and the Act of Uniformity (1559).

Britannica of the Victorian Age itself muted the relevancy, severity and political volatility of religious dissention.

Though the portal through which pagans, pantheists, and pragmatists must enter the Kingdom of Heaven is as narrow as a needle's eye,<sup>3</sup> the vast expanse within the house of God is as wide as it can be. Anglicanism once possessed the charter to this vast expanse of highland, theological territory - from which she might have transcended the culturally limiting Eastern Orthodox, the dangerously inventive Roman Catholic and the reckless Protestant Evangelical. But Anglicanism - seemingly in one hour - has collapsed in spiritual corruption, schism and humiliating irrelevancy. Her children now stand upon a wasteland, scorched by Liberalism, piteously huddled into tiny tribal units of esoteric traditionalists, unconnected with Canterbury, unnoticed by Constantinople and condemned by Rome. And like a flightless bird, trapped upon an isolated island - so does Anglicanism appear to the relative Protestant behemoths of Evangelicalism, Pentecostalism and Fundamentalism that now struggle as titans upon the tortured religious and political landscape of post-modern America.

Nevertheless, the idea of an American Catholicity remains. And the means to achieve it remains. And the mandate that it be achieved remains. And the promise remains that on any given Sunday a shepherd boy may topple a giant if he but believe that there is a God in Israel. And a blind and chained warrior may bring down the entire superstructure of Philistia if he but perform his last, existential act of combat to the glory of God and not his own. And one farmer, with sticks and clay pots and with one discerning fleece can drive away the overwhelming hosts of Midian.

It is God who has forged an American Catholicism. If he has not, than he has done nothing at all. He has not visited us, he has not delivered us from the hands of the oppressor, he has not led us across the sea and through dark ages of wandering in the deserts. He has not led us into the land of destiny and sent us prophets and Episcopal Judges. But if he has done any of these things, he has done all of these things. And we can depend upon it. Because he has said that he has. And because he now says that he is. And because he will always say, "I will, be thou clean."<sup>4</sup> We know not what may become of temporal America. But we know that the Catholicism that is forged here, whether it be in penury or plenty, will tend to permanence and glory.

It is here maintained, then, that Anglicanism, despite her present condition, bears primary responsibility for building a distinctly American Religious Consensus - an American Catholicity. She has the potential, she has the mandate, and she has the historical and theological perspective and experience to achieve such an American

---

<sup>3</sup> Matthew 7:14 "Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Also Matthew 19:24 "And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."

<sup>4</sup> Matthew 8:3.

Church. Yet there is one thing she lacks. And that's vision. She must have a prophetically adventurist song about what she is attempting, not a curmudgeonly historical lament over what she has lost. Humpty Dumpty cannot be put back together again. A sub-thesis of this paper is that unity between the continuing Anglican Churches cannot be achieved by any known process. Nor should it be hoped for. The mosaic of theological parties of the past cannot – *and should not be reassembled*. It is instructive to observe such a mosaic, in which every conceivable form of Christianity co-existed, if only for a moment, in unstable coalition, but it is foolish to recreate a mosaic-like coalition when the mandate from Christ is for true, organic unity.

What would such an organic unity look like? Francis A. Schaeffer, an influential theologian of the mid 1900's argued for a palpable unity of the Christian Church on the basis of two principles. The first principle is, of course, orthodoxy. We must be true to the Apostolic witness which has been given to us in the New Testament materials. The second is love. He says: "The Christian has a double task. He has to practice both God's holiness and God's love. The Christian is to exhibit that God exists as the infinite personal God; and then he is to exhibit simultaneously God's character of holiness and love."<sup>5</sup> The mark of Christian is love, Schaeffer says. Not sentimental, humanistic, romantic oneness - but love in deed and in truth. Schaeffer is adamant about this point. And he quantifies this love in inescapable terms.

In Jesus' "high-priestly prayer" in John 17, Schaeffer focuses his exegesis: "Now comes the sobering part. Jesus goes on in this 21<sup>st</sup> verse to say something that always causes me to cringe. If as Christians we do not cringe, it seems to me that we are not very sensitive or not very honest, because Jesus here gives us the final apologetic" ...*that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me....* Here Jesus is stating something...which is...profound: we cannot expect the world to believe that the Father sent the Son, that Jesus' claims are true, and that Christianity is true, unless the world sees some reality of the oneness of true Christians."<sup>6</sup>

Thus uniformity of worship and organizational unity are not the most important kind of unity that Christ expects of us. The mark of a Christian is love, Jesus says. The Mohammedan and Mormon may have love, but it will be temporary and partial, based upon the image of the true God in their souls and not upon their false theological constructs. It will not last and it will not hold up under pressure. But the love of a Christian will be defined not by worldly metaphors, but by the criteria of God's love for us.

John's first epistle constantly emphasizes this point of Christian authenticity: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation

---

<sup>5</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Mark of the Christian* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), 21.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 15.

for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."<sup>7</sup> And all John's words concerning unity among Christians, particularly as it bears upon the project of achieving oneness with the father through Christ, is derived from this love. If we keep his word, we love him.<sup>8</sup> God may love the world, but we may not. If we love the world, the love of the Father is not in us.<sup>9</sup>

In John's theology, the epistemological dilemma of the soul's sure knowledge of anything resolves itself, ironically, not in the mere existence of thinking thoughts<sup>10</sup> but in the mere existence of loving the brethren.<sup>11</sup> Yes, we must have our heresy trials. But they must begin and proceed and end in love. We must use tough language, because we must use tough love. But it must be love. Yes, we must establish our parish and regional identities, but it must be in love. Yes, we must establish some semblance of uniformity in worship, but it must be in love. Everything that we do must be tested at the bar of this high and beautiful thing; that is, the love of God for the world, the love of God for our souls, and the love between the Father and the Son.

To obtain to a high idea of organic unity within the Church we must see catholicity, primarily, as an act of loving leadership. Grass-roots efforts produce many things, but they cannot produce this leadership. Leadership is an appointment from above: "And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron."<sup>12</sup> The people cannot achieve unity without leadership; thus, a failure of unity must be placed squarely upon the shoulders of the clergy, not the laity. Oft-times, leaders bemoan the lack of catholic unity as a failure of lay obedience. But Christ characterizes the project of the unity and security of his flock as acts of loving leadership: "Lovest thou me?" Jesus says. Then "feed my lambs."<sup>13</sup> By leadership we feed the very lambs of Christ. We do not achieve unity; but by his help we form the precursors of a final unity that is achieved by Christ himself.

Unity of command is the bailiwick of Christ. Yes, we are a visible organization, but only partially so. The commander in chief is physically absent, yes. But he is spiritually present. If we elevate any one leader to this absolute vicarage, we send a message to the world: 'Christ is not present.'<sup>14</sup> No matter how much we clamor to the world that Christ is present in our sacramental bread, if we behave as if Christ is not present - by our

---

<sup>7</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> John 4:10-11.

<sup>8</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> John 2:5.

<sup>9</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> John 2:15.

<sup>10</sup> For example: Descartes': "I think, therefore I am."

<sup>11</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> John 3:14.

<sup>12</sup> Hebrews 5:4. In context, this refers, specifically, to the calling of priests. But in the New Covenant, the Israel of God is considered a nation of Kings and Priests (cf. Revelation 5:10). Hence a leader is, by definition a high priest.

<sup>13</sup> John 21:15.

<sup>14</sup> And this is not the only message. We also send an implicit message that the Church does not truly respect the idea of the nation-state and its parochial culture.

worldly, humanistic schemes of fiefdoms and coalitions and church government, the world will not listen. And not may catholic Christians will listen either. Our bread will be flat, false and unfit to feed anyone. It is Christ that existentially, continually recreates a new catholic Consensus *through* our leadership - and not we ourselves.

What Christ wants from us is not humanistic power struggles.<sup>15</sup> What he wants from us - from the highest Bishop to the lay bystander - is the fruits of our beliefs: love, obedience, vision, evangelism, devotion. Then our leadership will, in turn, bear fruit. Then the unity will come. Mary's submission is the template for our leadership. If we, like Mary, yield to the divine process of individual and corporate transformation, individually we will have joy, virtue, stable relationships and fulfilling vocations; and corporately we will dominate in every sphere of human culture. If we are to lead, as faithful shepherds, the flock of Christ - we must first follow.

The creation of a true expression of American catholicity depends first upon obedient, orthodox love. Secondly, American catholicity depends upon our confidence and trust in the moment by moment leadership of our invisible vicar, who is charismatically present in everything we undertake. But what of the *physical* lineaments of such an undertaking? Love requires action. James says: "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit?"<sup>16</sup> Likewise, ecumenical discussions and public displays of inter-communion affection will not suffice as the barest bread of catholicity to the sheep of Christ. If clergy do not work for catholicity, no one will eat its bread.<sup>17</sup> But what does such a work look like?

Just over 150 years ago, William Reed Huntington penned an essay, "The Church Idea: An Essay Toward Unity,"<sup>18</sup> which became the theological and theoretical basis of what is now called the Lambeth Quadrilateral - four unequivocal foundational points of Anglicanism. This is what such a work of American catholicity looks like. Every clerical and lay leader should read this essay. It is still the sine qua non for conceptualizing the project of achieving a unifying catholicity in any practical sense.

Perhaps this essay has been read by generations of Protestants as yet another arrogant Episcopal proclamation as terms for surrender, or perhaps generations of Roman Catholics have disdainfully read this essay as yet another unnecessary, worldly concession to ecumenical reductionism. Yet Anglicans even today may profitably read this essay as a bold but thoughtful statement of Anglican identity. But Huntington's

---

<sup>15</sup> Matthew 20:25-26.

<sup>16</sup> James 2:16.

<sup>17</sup> A permutation of 2<sup>nd</sup> Thessalonians 3:10.

<sup>18</sup> William Reed Huntington, *The Church Idea: An Essay Toward Unity* (New York: E P Dutton and Company, 1870).

essay is much, much more than a mere articulation of the four physical laws of Anglican identity and unity. This is just the beginning. Throughout the entire essay, Huntington articulates not only the church idea, but the idea of catholicity itself.

According to Huntington, the four points of Anglicanism are the Scriptures, the Creeds, the two Sacraments, and the Apostolic Succession. He likens them to the four fortresses of Lombardy, which is a military metaphor, defensive in nature.<sup>19</sup> Thus the Lambeth Quadrilateral is a structure to which Anglicans may retreat for consolation, or a structure from which Anglicans may boldly launch out upon a world in conquest, confident and fully conscious of its irreducible identity. For Anglicanism should have an identity, and it should be a particularly American one, Huntington says.<sup>20</sup>

And an identity is applicable to a body – just like the body of man. The Church is not a piece of granite, it is a living organism whose identity “must, somehow, be consistent with perpetual change.”<sup>21</sup> Thus an embodied church also has four main characteristics: ‘visibility, the indwelling spirit of the Lord, unity, and the capability of perpetual renewal.’<sup>22</sup> Perhaps the most valuable service of Huntington’s strategic plan for a future “Church of The Reconciliation,” as he often calls it, is that he stakes out the visionary territory upon which we have necessarily lingered - in terms of its position relative to the Roman exaggeration, the Puritan diminishment and the Liberal distortion of the church idea.

Beyond the quadrilateral form in which the Anglican Church idea resides, and beyond the four basic generalities presented above, what is the unified and catholic Church idea? Firstly, the church is a *broad* church. it is not, or should not be, a church of identifiable parties. To be broad is not a party. It is not even an option. It is a minimum requirement for the Church idea.<sup>23</sup> Secondly, the transformed American Catholic Church will be set free, finally of the state. The Church is now challenged to sink or to swim on its own – without the assistance of the pitiful, fleshly arm of state coercion or reward.

Thirdly, the “Church-Idea presupposes a whole world redeemed, - not necessarily a whole world finally saved, - rather a whole world put in the way of salvation. In a

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. 157.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. 141.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. 46.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. 46.

<sup>23</sup> Huntington makes some specific comments about the nature of this broadness. He argues, for example, that a formal assent to every singular proposition in the Nicene Creed should not be, and never was, demanded as a condition of communion (p. 170) He also argues for a non-inquisitory standard of interpretation for the 39 articles. Standards of interpretation then careened very widely between Browne and Pusey. (p. 173) Furthermore, Huntington argues that an Anglican is not pledged to any particular theory of the operation of the sacraments. (p. 179) Nor is he pledged to any particular theory of the mechanics of how the Scriptures are inspired (pp. 157-159).

word, the Church treats redemption as a universal fact, and Baptism as a universal privilege.”<sup>24</sup> This is a very powerful idea. It obviates the Church from distinguishing what she has no right and no competence to decide; that is, who are damned and who are saved. It must *treat* all men as if they will be saved. And if they appear to have placed themselves out of the way by some unpardonable sin, we may discipline them, but we may never damn them. Only God may judge. And with this third point, Huntington has moved us from the defensive considerations of the Quadrilateral to the offensive nature of the Church militant. He gives the Church its necessary vision. And its universal scope. Leadership, yes. Unity, yes. But without this mission of universal salvation; without this vision of universal scope and without a mandate from the Lord himself, our work in the world is without ultimate significance. And we can have no church idea at all.

The Church idea which may be built upon Huntington’s quadrilateral, then, is theologically broad, separated from the state, universal in scope, and zealous to fulfill the Lord’s mandate to teach a sin-sick world the way of salvation. This was the ideal 150 years ago. How does this ideal translate into the practical challenges of re-unifying Anglicanism and preaching the Gospel in today’s world? It is clear that we cannot go to war with the world if we are ourselves divided. It has been argued in this paper that any attempt to overtly and directly attempt to reconcile the disparate continuing churches of Anglicanism is futile and counterproductive to the mandate to build a truly national, American Catholic Church. This seems like a counter-intuitive assertion. Yet every ounce of energy spent on futile ecumenical projects which pay only paper dividends (that is, administrative), is an ounce of energy taken away from the project of building the American Catholic Church – of feeding the flock and seeking to save the lost and scattered sheep. We are not cobbling together a fragile coalition. We are building a new creature; or rather, like Mary, yielding to the process of having a new creature built in us.

The fragmentation of Rome flowed directly from her refusal to be reformed and renewed. Protestant cultic behaviors, thus, are merely the fragments of that pride and arrogance. Since Huntington penned “The Church Idea,” no significant reunification of the mainline denominations has occurred. The Shepherd has been struck and the children have scattered. As in the old drama, so in the new: “And when all Israel saw that the king would not hearken unto them, the people answered the king, saying, What portion have we in David? and we have none inheritance in the son of Jesse: every man to your tents, O Israel: and now, David, see to thine own house. So all Israel went to their tents.”<sup>25</sup> The monarchy in ancient Israel failed because it was never intended.<sup>26</sup> The

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. 184.

<sup>25</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> Chronicles 10:16.

<sup>26</sup> “But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the LORD. And the LORD said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say

monarchy in Christendom failed because it too was never intended. Yet God is always bringing good out of evil because our fiercest rebellion always plays right into his hands.

Anglicanism began as a spiritual attempt to yield to reformation and renewal. And it slowly, albeit haltingly, rose to a position of power and influence the world will not soon forget. We of the Anglican tradition will never forget it. Because it provides the inspiration and the template for a renewal, a reformation and a renaissance by which we may be delivered from our seemingly hopeless state of humiliating fragmentation – the very antithesis of catholicism and unity – a deliverance which the world will not soon expect. We do not imitate the glories of Canterbury. We re-create them. When a tree tumbles, crashing to the ground, there is no process in nature that reassembles such a tree. The seeds of its replacement are already planted in the ground, waiting for the light of day which is procured by the darkness of death of the parent tree.

Likewise, there is no process in nature that re-assembles a fallen egg. In physics it is called the arrow of time. Time is irreversible. There is no known process by which time or history might be reversed. There is only the onward, teleological march of time. Yes, history is cyclic, as the Eastern religions say. But in the Christian religion, history is also teleological. This means that we are going somewhere. Every fallen tree and every broken egg and every historical humiliation means something in the mind of God. History is “progress”, but only in the progress of bringing eternal glory to God and to his Christ. This is the drama. All the cosmos is a stage. Once we understand this historical-drama construct, we will be like a performer who brings out of his repertoire things new and old.<sup>27</sup> We can learn from the old mistakes and expect to see them again. But we must also be prepared for future challenges which the Church has never seen.

Anglicanism attempted to yield, with considerable success, to theological reformation and renewal of that which had been lost or had decayed or had been corrupted. She also attempted to adapt to the emergence of the modern nation state. The Greek city state was its precursor, but no medieval Pope would have prophesied the emergence of the Magna Carta or the rise of the middle class, or the emergence of the industrial revolution. Because these are teleological phenomena. The preacher asks: “Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? It hath been already of old time, which was before us.”<sup>28</sup> Isaiah seems to suggest an answer: “Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it? I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert.”<sup>29</sup> St. Paul gives unequivocal dogma: “Therefore if any man be

---

unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.”

1<sup>st</sup> Samuel 8:6-7.

<sup>27</sup> Matthew 13:52.

<sup>28</sup> Ecclesiastes 1:10.

<sup>29</sup> Isaiah 43:19.



in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."<sup>30</sup>

God is always making new things. And since we are made in his image, so are we. In this sense, Marxism can only be seen as a teleological, Christian heresy. The various materialistic cosmological theories of chance, commonly lumped under the heading of Darwin's biological evolution, are teleological, Christian heresies. The modern language theories of Martin Heidegger, Bertrand Russell, and B.F. Skinner are only in part a resurgence of the old Epicurean materialism – but they are articulated in an entirely new way and have evolved to an entirely new, logical extreme. They are new things. They are new challenges.

The Church's response to the challenges of modern science itself has largely, so far, been a failure. The fragmentation of Rome at the Reformation was simply an extension of the hubris of the Great Schism of 1054, but the fragmentation of Anglicanism, and of Christendom in general in the modern age, has been by means of a Thomistic-like schism between nature and grace, reason and faith, empiricism and revelation, science and religion. Just as the Roman Church retreated from the scientific investigation of the Donation of Constantine, the Latin Vulgate and the Heliocentric theory, so Anglicanism retreated from the literary investigation into the formation of the New Testament materials, the biological investigation into the formation of species and the cosmological investigation into the formation of the universe – retreated into various reactionary parties: a Romanist traditionalism, a fundamentalistic evangelicalism, and a charismatic pietism, which still plagues the modern church unto this day. Therefore, before we go on to preach the Gospel in an age of old and new theological challenges, old and new political challenges, old and new cultural challenges, we must face the challenge of modern science and the bifurcated, Cartesian world which it has produced.

Anglicanism should have been a broad, unintimidated Church – nay, Anglicanism should have been making the discoveries of today's science and not leaving it to the unchurched, or even to infidels. We should not have been intimidated by evolution, for example. G.K. Chesterton said: "...evolution is stingless for the most orthodox."<sup>31</sup> When "modern" science was born, many of the early scientists and theorists were Christian, or nominally so.<sup>32</sup> But by the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the priest-scientist was a relatively rare thing. Instead, clerics fought internally. The nasty dissensions and the competition over ecclesiastical turf, unencumbered with the mandate of love and leadership, split the

---

<sup>30</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> Corinthians 5:17. Also, Revelation 21:5 "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful."

<sup>31</sup> G. K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995), 39-40.

<sup>32</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer makes this point very clear in his book, *Escape From Reason* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968), 30. "What we have to realize is that early modern science was started by those who lived in the consensus and setting of Christianity. A man like J. Robert Oppenheimer, for example, who was not a Christian, nevertheless understood this. He has said that Christianity was needed to give birth to modern science."

Church. The identity of Anglicanism itself became unstable and she again vacillated wildly between Romanism and Reformation. Each party re-interpreted the 39 Articles, the Bible, and tradition with creative eccentricity. And viral, pathogenic Liberalism crept into the body of Christ. To be sure, this epidemic of unbelief was not confined to Anglicanism. Every Christian denomination was beset with this virulent, theological mutation.<sup>33</sup>

Liberalism, as an offset to conservatism, is a good thing to have in a broad church. The creative minority<sup>34</sup> within the Church is then free to engage the salient challenges of the day and the Church goes on from strength to strength. But with the loss of symbiotic unity within Anglicanism, Liberalism, always and everywhere opportunistic to assert its skepticism - to the very point of unbelief, found itself suddenly unfettered to feast upon a leaderless and faltering flock. Progressively, each party eventually left the Church - Evangelicals to the Reformed Episcopal Church, Anglo-Catholics to the Anglican Catholic Church, and eventually conservatives, finally taking a stand, left for the Anglican Church of North America. And Anglicanism in America continues to fracture into ever smaller shards - a thousand here, a thousand there - a frenetic fragmentation that rivals the most frantic, Baptist separatist spirit.

We must again face off against our old nemesis, science. This time we must take captivity captive. We must face off again against Liberalism, and cut away the necrotic flesh that has been destroyed and is incapable of rehabilitation. But most of all, we must face ourselves. We must face the fact that it is we ourselves that have cost us this tremendous loss of ideational territory - the loss of the Church idea itself. We have not lived up to our heritage, our vision, and our mandate. And we have squabbled with our brothers over non-essentials. We have not loved the brethren as Christ directed us to do. Most of all, we have not loved the lost and dying souls in the world for whom Christ died. Through elitist ideas of predestination we have expected the lost to find

---

<sup>33</sup> See for example J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1923) as it addresses the inroads of Liberalism among the Presbyterians. But it must be noted that in his introduction, before launching into an almost exclusively theological evaluation of Liberalism, Machen gives a very sparse answer for *how* Liberalism could have gotten such a hold upon an otherwise faithful, believing part of the body of Christ. If Liberalism is some unwelcome creature who rose unbidden from the depths of hell to terrorize the children of Christ, why then did Christ permit its entry into his schoolyard of innocent children playing unmindful of this sophisticated predator? A cancer patient needs to know the nature of cancer, but even more importantly, he needs to know what environmental or nutritional environments have weakened the body's defenses to such an extent that cancer was permitted entry - if from without - or permitted to metastasize - if from within. The real polemic against Liberalism must first explain what has weakened the body to such a state as to permit the body to be overrun by its cancerous growth. In the case of Anglicanism, it could easily be argued that among other things, the failure of its response to questions of modern science and its subsequent descent into sectarianism significantly weakened and laid its body open.

<sup>34</sup> For a discussion of the sociological rise and function of the "creative minority," see Arnold Toynbee and Jane Caplan, *The Study of History: Revised and Abridged* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 224.

their own way home to our isolated fortress. For these things we must say we are sorry. We must do some soul searching – not only for the lost, but for our own. And it should be at the lowest and broadest level we know, or think we know, about ourselves.

The theoretical basis of our unity and our catholicity is the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The practical basis of our unity and our catholicity is not to reassemble the political and ecclesiastical algorithms of the past, but to forge ahead to meet the challenges of the present and the future. C. S. Lewis somewhere said that when you make a mistake doing sums, you may not just go on with your work and hope that things come right. You must stop, go back, see where you have made your mistake, correct that mistake and go on – more carefully. But life is not like doing a sum. We cannot go back; we cannot undue the harm that has been done. We must go on – casting all our care on him who cases for us. And we must be wiser and we must resolve not to make the mistakes that we have so often made. St. Paul said: “Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.”<sup>35</sup>

Catholicity will be achieved when our religion dominates the emotional, intellectual and cultural landscape of our nation. Our theoretical, practical and technical ideas of the form and function of our church should all derive from this. Our idea of unity must be primarily defined by the overall health of the body and the harmonious functioning of every part of the body - every order, every service, every ministry, every program must work together to bring glory to God, to teach our nation the Gospel of God, and to feed the sheep of Christ the very word of God. We are the leaders, we are the shepherds. It must begin with us. Or it will surely end with us. Every work and every prayer must begin and end in virtuous love both broad and deep. Every work and every prayer must actively presume a moment by moment relationship of obedient passivity before the Lord and present a ceaseless program of good work within the world.

We have suffered the loss of all things. Let that loss be a process in which we regain Christ and be found in him, not having our own righteousness, but his – so that we may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death, if by these means we might attain unto the resurrection of the dead for our most holy Catholic church. If we believe, if we obey and if we work, then we will subdue this earthly, political construct in which we dwell, we will confound the wisdom of the wise, and we will turn to flight the armies of the aliens.

---

<sup>35</sup> Philippians 3:13-14.

Anglicanism has so much to give to the world. It has a program of salvation that stretches from cradle to grave, leaving no age group, no gender, no race, no social class disenfranchised from that salvation. Anglicanism is catholic and it is simple. Its prayers are common, meaningful and deep. Its participative liturgy and music are beautifully integrated and theologically sound. Its sermons are intellectually challenging and emotionally engaging, enriching the soul. Anglicanism has a form and freedom that has the potential to integrate all personality types and varied spiritual gifts, male and female, young and old into a truly corporate entity.

Anglicanism also possesses an abiding sense of communion and identity with the universal church, integrating the best of Protestantism with the best of Roman Catholicism, constantly feeding its flock to substantial Scriptural content through the lectionary and the Prayer Book. Anglicanism has tremendous potential to truly reconcile to God – moment by moment, year by year – the soul of 21<sup>st</sup> century man. Anglicanism has something far beyond a credible, formal link to the traditional church of the past. It has the Gospel. A very broad Gospel. And it is has the demonstrated maturity and ability and balance to creatively re-articulate that Gospel in unusual cultural permutations without veering off into heresy. Anglicanism doesn't need to make any Faustian deals with Rationalism or Romanism, Communism or Capitalism, mysticism or myth, caste or state. Anglicanism needs only to submit, like Mary, to God and to his Christ. He will teach us how to follow, how to love and how to lead. And if we do this one thing, we will dominate every sphere of legitimate human endeavor, bringing every thought into captivity to Christ, and bring every soul to the place of admiration and praise for God and for the Kingdom of his Christ. And we will have an American catholicity that is the very image of the love between the Father and the Son.