
Seppo Juhani Sinervä

The Theocracy

1. Introduction

This research examines the relations between the temporal and the ecclesiastical sphere by the method of systematic analysis. It focuses on the distinction of these spheres: whether they should be kept separate or not; what Christianity's relation has been to Theocracy, what kind of doctrines the realized praxis has risen from and how the modern forms of Theocracy fit in.

In Europe the enthusiasm for Theocratic formulations has declined since monarchies turned into democracies, but surprisingly in USA the recent development has been the opposite. Although the US Constitution holds Church and State separated, the American Christians' political activity has had drifts to State Theocratic formulations several times in the nation's history. Usually it has been a Church driven effort. Since the 1970s with the rise of the Christian Right the observers have characterized that drift with the term "Christianizing the Nation / Society" – this time a politically driven enterprise through political means. The Evangelicals claim that their doctrines are based on the Bible and their Christianity represents that of the Apostolic and Early Church Era. Still they have a vast opposition not only in the US but also in other parts of the world claiming that State Theocracy doesn't belong to the Christian covenant, but to the Mosaic covenant, and that history shows how dangerous that model has been in the hands of popes or kings and emperors giving no room to freedom of conscience, freedom of speech or other democratic values.

In my research I shall examine what State Theocracy actually is and how it fits Christianity and the political actions of Christians. According to my present hypothesis, the State Theocracy which US Evangelicals advocate is not Christian, because Christian State Theocracy is a doctrinal impossibility before the *parousia*. The difficulties related to Christian Theocracy have been pondered in various researches in American context but either through the lenses of Reformation or of Augustine. How-

ever, it is quite natural to go back to the beginning of the New Covenant, where the matching ecclesiology was shaped by the Revealing Prophets. But because one of them, St. Paul, states that this ecclesiology follows the order of Melchisedec, it is necessary to extend the research to apply also to the Old Testament times. Besides the Mosaic Covenant State Theocracy, as it was ordained and carried out in the guidance of Revealing Prophets of the Bible, it reveals us characteristic features of God instituted State Theocracy. I shall examine how this was understood in the Apostolic Era and the Early Church Era documents. Finally I shall compare these insights to those of the modern day American Evangelicals.

TERMS

The Bible speaks about two swords: the sword of iron is used by the (temporal) authority (Rom 13:4) and the sword of Spirit, i.e. the word of God (Ef 6:17, Hebr 4:12), is used by the church of Christ and its (ecclesiastical) authority. Thus there are two different *regiments*, i.e. mandates of administration with a regime appointed by God. He has appointed the Temporal Authority to rule the Temporal Regiment (Rom 13:1,4-6; Tit 3:1) and the Ecclesiastical Authority to rule the Spiritual Regiment (1Cor 12:28, Ef 4:11-12).

In this purpose I shall be using the term “regiment”, which is of Lutheran origin in German. It is necessary to begin with that term instead of going straight to using the term “kingdom” for Earthly Kingdom and the Kingdom of God, because especially the Kingdom of God is defined differently among the different groups. For example the more the Evangelicals tend to incline towards Broad Church conception and Social Gospel, the less they want to limit the Kingdom of God only to Spiritual Regiment. On the other hand, one could think that using the term “sphere” for Spiritual and Temporal Spheres would do the same as using the term regiment, but actually the term sphere doesn’t emphasize enough the object’s administrative nature, which is needed here.

When the two regiments have been mixed together in administration, the term *State Theocracy* is used in this research to depict it. The often used term “theocracy” is not alone enough because a monotheistic religion is supposed to be lead by God, i.e. to be theocratic anyway in its Spiritual Regiment, so in a case where it has been mixed with Temporal

Regiment, in one way or another, it is more distinctive to add there the temporal term “state”.

There have been also State Theocratic systems with pagan religions dominating the Spiritual Sphere. Naturally, none of these have been according to God’s will, because their *theos* is a false god, i.e. either a demon like the Bible and Justin Martyr witness, or an imaginative character whose attributes have been fabricated by carnal minds and images by carnal hands. To discern these from the God instituted State Theocracy systems revealed in the Bible, I shall call the latter Revealed State Theocracy, which then includes both Mosaic State Theocracy and Melchisedequian State Theocracy.

I shall use the term *Civil Righteousness* in relation with the Temporal Regiment as the opposite of the term *Spiritual Righteousness* in relation with the Spiritual Regiment. Of course the Civil Righteousness is not righteousness at all in the spiritual sense, but just lesser destructiveness of sin. For example, if a man changes his violent behavior to a greedy business activity, the Civil Righteousness in the society has increased although that man’s Spiritual Righteousness has remained the same for he has just changed from one sin to another – he may even be more possessed by the greed than he was by violence. However, the consequences to the civil society seem to be less destructive, because violent behavior causes exclusively harm while business activities are likely to increase economical welfare. Civil Righteousness is indifferent to the motives behind any human activity as long as its functions stay within the civil law. If the law is broken, the civil society may recognize the apparent wrong motive behind it, but will give only outward sentences like fine, jailing or capital punishment due to the external deed. So, God has put up the Temporal Authority to improve the Civil Righteousness with its sword and the fear of sword in order to limit the more destructive forms of sin, but nobody can be made holy and cured from sin with its methods. Anyway, so sin is hindered from destroying humankind and room is left for Christian mission to fulfill God’s good plan for salvation.

DEFINITION OF STATE THEOCRACY

Here I shall give the definition of State Theocracy for the frames of this research.

2. Pagan state theocracies

I shall examine shortly, what form had been given to State Theocracy in the ancient pagan world, for example among Central American Indians, in China, in Mesopotamia, in Egypt and in Rome. These pagan systems are likely to give valuable information of how a sinner comprehends these things and that, in its part, could give some guidance to the matter, whether some similar conceptions of the American Evangelicals were merely reflections of a carnal mind.

Then I shall examine, how those systems appear in the light of the Bible and in the eyes of some Early Church Fathers.

Besides that, especially the Chinese ancient monotheistic religion of God of Heaven comes quite close to Judeo-Christian religion, but naturally with the restrictions of General Revelation. Because there were existing other religions in China at the same time, the setting in a way resembled a spiritual scenery of a post-Christian nation with a small minority of active Christians. As China's former State Theocracy had in the Spiritual Regiment only the Emperor's religion, this setting can reveal some views at least to the European operative environment of Christianity.

Of course every pagan State Theocracy is impossible in the eyes of God, because it is patterned by a false *theos*. It is also dangerous to man's freedom of conscience, because **every** State Theocracy can give the ruling sinners an unlimited authority to act arbitrarily and gives no option to objection, because it enslaves the consciences of its subordinates. Then every state policy has the status of being the will of god/s and every religious doctrine can be defended by the physical sword. The system becomes an instrument of oppression. In the pagan religious context the effect of State Theocracy is even worse and unchangeable, when the rulers and their subordinates don't have any access to God's Special Revelation. There is, of course, the General Revelation, but because it is not written down, the rulers can "interpret" it to the itching of their ears and in their states the existing religion has already done so, and thus there can be like a hermetically sealed system with no room for real change. Naturally, there can be revolutions, but more or less as manifestations of sinners' willingness to oppose the institution of Authority instituted by God – and thus the succeeding system will be again similar to its predecessor.

3. Revealed state theocracy

I shall examine here, what are the State Theocracies which God has instituted in the Bible. And, more generally, what are the (minimum) characteristic features of Revealed State Theocracy so that a certain system would be entitled to bear that name. I shall focus on the features especially significant for the interests of this examination.

Under the following subtitles I shall present my present hypothesis for the research process.

TWO SYSTEMS

The Old Testament introduces us two State Theocratic systems with two partly succeeding ways of salvation. The older one is according to the order of Melchisedec, and the younger one is according to the Mosaic Law.

The Old Testament tells that Melchisedec was “king of Salem” and “the priest of the most high God” and he offered Abraham bread and wine while Abraham gave him tithes. Melchisedec also blessed Abraham. (1Mos 14:18-20)

Hebrew Malki-Tzedek means “my king is righteousness” or “king of righteousness”. It is not only worth noticing that Hebrew names may characterize the person who has it, but also to realize that in a Revealed Prophecy names signify something. As according to the Psalms no man is righteous in front of God (Ps 130:3, 143:2), there is no doubt that the only person to match this characterizing as “king of righteousness” is the Triune God. Melchisedec was also mentioned to be king of Salem, which means King of Peace – like Hebr 7:2 so clearly translates – which was then exposed through Isaiah’s prophecy, which called the Messiah “Prince of Peace” (Is 9:5). – And not a Prince of any place called Salem.

Same things were repeated in Paul’s Letter to Hebrews, although in other words: “To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor and of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually.” (Hebr 7:2-3) – There are some beings without parents, like angels or even the first people, but

the very only being without beginning is again the Triune God – like the Creed of Athanasios defines, that all the persons of Trinity are equally without beginning. All the other beings have been created and thus their existence has begun at a certain moment of time.

So, Melchisedec, Messiah and God were the same being. Messiah's i. e. Christ's pre-existence and theophanies were well recognized in the Early Church. Justin Martyr writes clearly, that Melchisedec was the same kind of theophany of Christ as the Heavenly messengers appearing to Abraham (1Mos 18:1-33), Jacob (1Mos 32:24-30) and Moses (2Mos 3:4).¹

In Psalm 110 there is a Messiah-prophecy – according to Mat 22:44 – and part of it is a verse, where God swore: “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.” (Ps 110:4) And according to Paul this Melchisedec “abideth a priest continually” (Hebr 7:3) – i.e. not only forever, but also continually.

So, even during the Mosaic Covenant there co-existed along the Aaronic priesthood another much older priesthood according to the order of Melchisedec and God had announced that its priesthood is for Messiah forever (Hebr 5:4-6). However, it seems that the order of this priesthood didn't act as an exclusive way of salvation before there would be a matching sacrifice. Aaronic priesthood required a continuous chain of animal sacrifices, which still had only allegorical or “shadowy” status of mediator (Hebr 10:1) “for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins” (Hebr 10:4) of humans – that would require a perfect sinless human being for sacrifice. Well, Melchisedequian priesthood introduced only one perfect human sacrifice for ever (Hebr 7:26-28; 9:25-26; 10:10). So, as the Bible tells, Aaronic priesthood was only meant to be a temporary allegoric mediator of Melchisedecian priesthood (Hebr 7:17-18; 8:7,13; 9:10-12; 10:9-17), which possessed the priesthood's real substance (Hebr 8; 9:10-15; 10:4) But the Law attached with Aaronic priesthood was the “schoolmaster” to bring sinners to Christ (Gal 3:19-26). It didn't only prove to each man that he was sinful himself, but proved also that the State Theocratic system didn't work as it should have been – most

¹ Dialogue of Justin, Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, a Jew LVI-LX, LXXV, CXIII. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Volume I. Ed. Roberts & Donaldson (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, USA, 1985) pp. 223-227, 236, 255.

of the time. Even though it probably worked all the time better than the corresponding pagan systems, it still had the same fundamental weakness as they had, too: all the State Theocracies were run by sinners. And thus God was forced to punish the Israelites time to time by driving them to exile and letting the foreign forces to ruin their Temple.

As Paul puts it: "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place been sought for the second." (Hebr 8:7) Paul testifies that there really took place the changing of Covenant: "For he testified, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." (Hebr 7:17-18)

"And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." (Hebr 5:4-6) "Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec." (Hebr 5:10)

DIFFERENT SYSTEMS

The office of king and ministry of high priest were distinct in the Mosaic Covenant. The kings – except Saul – descended from David whereas the high priests from Aaron. Hence when king Uzziah tried to minister priestly duties in the Temple, the Lord smote him with leprosy until his death (2Chron 26:16-21). Whereas Psalm 110 points out that kingship and high priesthood will be united in Messiah. However, that can't be Aaronic priesthood, because according to prophecy, the Messiah would be David's descendant; thus what is left is Melchisedequian priesthood.

The same setting can be seen in Zechariah's Messiah-prophecy, where Messiah is characterized by a man called the Branch. That prophecy, too, makes it clear that in His ministry high priesthood and kingship would be united (Zech 6:12-13).

Among the Jews at least the Essenes understood this clearly. This was exposed when their texts written between 75-50 B.C. were found in Qumran caves. In manuscript 11Q13 the Essene writer brings forth an interpretation of Melchisedequian rule by describing it different from

Mosaic State Theocracy, where kingship and high priesthood are possessed by different persons and both of them are humans and not Heavenly figures. The 11Q13 brings forth the idea of a visible rule in both regiments by the heavenly ruler and his ministers – the saints – on the Earth in the situation, where they have destroyed the Devil – while that, moreover, has taken place after the justification of the faithful ones. This shows that among the pious Jews it was understood that the post-justification eschatological State Theocracy presupposes at least three things: 1) the unmediated visible rule of the heavenly figure called Melchisedec; 2) the destruction of the Devil's ability to act; 3) the saints taken part in the visible rule of Melchisedec. – And thus also according to 11Q13, the rule of Melchisedec is not a similar State Theocracy than that of Mosaic Law, where the ministries of king and high priest were held by different persons and those persons were not heavenly figures but humans.²

I shall make here proper analysis of both above mentioned Bible verses and 11Q13; the latter would give valuable information of how the Jew apprehended these things. I shall also see other Biblical and other sources, which are dealing with the same subject.

TIMING

I shall examine whether there could be found any hints of timing to place Melchisedec's State Theocracy in a certain place in history or eschatology. The best one seems to be in the Book of Revelation in chapter 20 – where is needed an analysis of eschatological chronology of this book. The result of this analysis defines, when one is able to speak of a Revealed State Theocracy in the first place.

EPISTEMOLOGY

First, I shall examine whether there are common features or not in the epistemology of the Apostles, the Apostolic Fathers and the Early

² 11Q13 (11QMelchizedek); ed. J. J. M. Roberts. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 6B.* Ed. James H. Charlesworth etc. (Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, BRD, 2002) 264-273.

Church Fathers, who didn't have any State Theocratic formulations. Secondly, I shall examine another group, Augustine and the Reformers, who did have State Theocratic formulations whether or not they had common features in their epistemology differing from those of the first group. Thirdly I shall compare the results with the epistemology of two other groups in contemporary USA, the Evangelicals and the Fundamentalists, which have the same difference in their relationship to State Theocracy as the groups one and two.

DE REVELATIONE

I shall examine what was Jesus', the Apostles', Apostolic Fathers' and Early Church Fathers' relationship to the Special Revelation of the Bible. Did they accept the inerrancy or infallibility of the Bible? This is a fundamental question when one is trying to find out whether someone else actually follows Christ and Apostolic Word or not.

At the same time I shall clear out, what the distinction is between Revealed Prophecy and a prophecy through the Gift of Prophecy. That is very essential, because only then we possess the tools to compare between the Apostolic or Early Church Era and the movements of new revelation among American Evangelicals.

I shall also examine the role of Revealing Prophets in Revealed State Theocracy. Can a Revealed State Theocracy exist without them? My hypothesis is that it can't. A Revealing Prophet is a firm part of Revealed State Theocracy, because it is too difficult a constitution to do without.

The Revealing Prophets' role is most significant in Revealed State Theocracy. As State Theocracy was so difficult constitution for a sinner, who tends to incline to all kinds of corruptions, God had given the Israelites the written Law and Revealing Prophets to supervise the existing State Theocratic administration. That seems to be one fundamental feature in Revealed State Theocracy. In order to succeed, there must be Revealing Prophet(s) or at least an option to them. Hence in Israel there were sometimes no Revealing Prophets, sometimes there were more than one: for example Elijah and Elisha and in David's kingdom also the king was a Revealing Prophet – according to God's thoughts. Sometimes Revealed Prophets were there to preach against the sins of

the people, sometimes God simply denied Revealed Prophets from the people of Israel because they were spiritually too dry and indifferent even to rebuke – like they were during the 400 years between Malachi and John the Baptist.

The same task the Revealing Prophet has in Christian State Theocracy – after the *parousia*. The Revealing Prophet therein will be Christ himself.

In ancient Israel, revealing Prophets were also to tell the king when God wanted to use his army to carry out His judgements over a nation, which had filled up their sins (3Mos 18:24-28, 5Mos 7:1-5). Normally God uses other nations' sinful motives to achieve the same effect, but then he has to punish that nation as well for its sinful deeds. A Revealed State Theocracy needs a Revealing Prophet for this procedure to prevent itself from wars due to wrong motives.

Also in the Melchisedecian State Theocracy the sinners will be ruled “with a rod of iron” by the King and his co-rulers are the resurrected saints (Rev 2:25-27, 12:5, 19:15). In Biblical allegorical language iron signifies an unyielding will (Jer 1:18, Is 48:4) and power (Job 40:13) and to rule with a rod of iron signifies the rule with completely irresistible power, which will destroy all resistance (Ps 2:9, Mic 4:13). To fulfill this difficult task according to God's righteousness, the King has to be a Revealing Prophet – the most advanced of them, the Son Himself.

What is a Revealing Prophet? In recent decades some major groups of American Evangelists have claimed their own leaders to be prophets with a new revelation. That has been the case for example in the *Latter Rain movement*; its doctrines have also lived in different names like *Kindom Theology*, *Triumphalism* and *Dominion Theology* etc. Therefore, it is significant to analyze what kind of discernment the Bible shows between Revealed Prophecy or a Revealing Prophet and those who claim to have the spiritual gift of prophecy (1Cor 12), and how that has been notified in the writings of Apostolic Fathers and Church Fathers – and later among American Evangelicals.

Revealed State Theocracy has a certain order given by God. The Old Testament clears up the order of Mosaic State Theocracy by careful details. The New Covenant is prophesied with many details in the Old Testament (Jer 31:31-34, Jes 53), but there is not a single word of

New Covenant State Theocracy in the Old Testament without a straight and visible Messianic rule together with the saints (Zach 14:5,9,16-18; Is 32:1) and fundamental changes in the hamartiological status of creation (Is 11:6-9, 32:3-5, 35:5-10, 65:20-24). Neither does the New Testament tell anything of a State Theocracy before the *parousia*, although the Christian State Theocracy is supposed to be different from the Mosaic one in many parts. If State Theocracy had to be established in the present Christian Era, there should have been some markings of it. Only when the *parousia* is dealt with, there are notions of post-Mosaic State Theocracy both in the Old and New Testament. Detailed regulations such as in the Mosaic State Theocracy are not needed, because the Christian State Theocracy will be ruled visibly by the Source of Revelation Himself.

But before the *parousia* there can be no Christian State Theocracy; no country can have any rights to use God's name to legitimate its own opportunistic imperialistic policy, like 19th century Britain, Prussia or Russia. Just therefore the very Son of the Living God has to be the King, the High Priest and the Revealing Prophet.

ECCLESIOLOGICAL AND ESCHATOLOGICAL CONTEXT

First I shall examine from the ecclesiological and eschatological point of view on what terms the Christian State Theocracy would be possible. Secondly, I shall use the analysis of the chronological structure of the Book of Revelation to clear up the chronological order and when in that order the Christian State Theocracy would take place according to God given prophecies. Thirdly, I shall examine what doctrines have been used to neglect these facts – there I expect to find a) postmillenianism or a-millenianism, which allow State Theocracy before *parousia*; b) Replacement Theology, which would allow the Christians to take the place of Jews with their State Theocracy. I shall examine, why those doctrines are being used – and I expect to find, that mostly because of opportunistic will to power and dislike of getting to the cross; State Theocracy seems to give the Christians a short cut to Millennium rule, but being against God's Special Revelation it is actually same kind of short cut without cross what Satan offered to Christ in the wilderness (Mat 4:8-9, Luke 4:5-7).

Before *parousia* the New Covenant's Melchisedequian system has not yet spread and actualized and become visible in the Temporal Regiment, for the Kingdom of God is still only within the believers; only in Spiritual Regiment there are some visible structures like administration, Holy Communion, the changed lives of new believers etc., but even there everything is incompleting. For Christ is not yet visibly present on Earth as the High Priest and the Prophet of the Christian Theocracy according to the order of Melchisedec, the believers are not yet resurrected but are still in flesh or actually they are divided to those, who are in flesh and those who have already moved to Christ. So there cannot be any Christian State Theocracy, because all the essentials of it stated in the Bible are lacking. And according to the Book of Revelation 19th and 20th chapter the Christian State Theocracy will be carried out only after *parousia*.

The Church has identified itself to the kenotic Christ in Apostolic times and in Early Church times. There has not been any triumphalism, but martyrs and suffering. Even nowadays most of the Churches consider triumphalism before the *parousia* as a false doctrine. – But at the same time they fail to notice that the essence of State Theocracy is triumphalistic in all the prophecies in both Old and New Testament.

Finally I will examine particularly one of the features in Revealed State Theocracy. In the Old Testament can be seen that in Revealed State Theocracy the army has the duty to fulfill God's judgments on those nations, which have filled up the measure of their sins (1Sam 15:17-18, 3Mos 18:24-29; cf. Dan 8:23, 1Tess 2:16). In Revealed State Theocracy this is a religious act. But Jesus, the Apostles and Early Church Fathers refused to use violence to contribute to religious action (definition).

According to my hypothesis, even if Revealed State Theocratic administration performs physical violence as a religious act to contribute to God's judgments, it still differs from pagan State Theocracies, which actually try to contribute to their Faith through violence. Christian Faith can only be contributed to through the Word.

MILLENNIALISM

I shall examine Millennial theories, because they determine, what kind of relation one has to State Theocracy. There has to be a distinction

whether some of these theories are actually possible in the light of Biblical timing and Greek vocabulary.

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

The Millennial State Theocracy requires the Second Coming of Christ. I shall examine the texts of the Bible and how it was understood in the texts of the Apostolic Fathers, Early Church Fathers and the Reformers. Especially interesting are their arguments and how those differ from the arguments of present day American Evangelists.

SOTERIOLOGICAL CONTEXT

I shall analyze the possibility to form a Christian State Theocracy in a soteriological context.

My present hypothesis is the following:

In the Book of Revelation 20 we can see, that the Christian State Theocracy will be carried out when the believers' soteriological status is Christ-like, not *in spe* but *in re*. That means that they have to be resurrected bodily, gone through Heavens and returned on Earth as conquerors with Jesus.

There are other interpretations of His *parousia* and the Millennium. But interpretations which don't accept the above mentioned things don't fit in the essence of Christian life which is to participate in Jesus' life as a Man.

"...by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature..." (2Pet 1:4)
The doctrine of participation was highly appreciated by both Calvin and Luther. Through Christ's incarnation, cross and resurrection a believer is able to participate in His life as a Man, which continues eternally. Man's only way to eternal life is He. Christ will reign in a Christian State Theocracy as a resurrected man in His new heavenly body. He will not do that until His *parousia*. Those who participate in His life as born again Christians cannot do that either in any other soteriological state. A Christian cannot participate in something, which hasn't yet been actualized in Christ – like a visible State Theocratic rule on Earth. For although Christ has earned His total victory, He hasn't yet extended it to apply also to the visible governing of the world.

A believer is **in** Christ. Thus he can be in Him only as He is. A believer has been called to follow Christ (*imitatio Christi*). That cannot be anything else than what has already been actualized in Him and what He has reached. He has not yet reached the visible state Theocratic rule on Earth and thus neither can the Christian who follow Him. A Christian doesn't precede Him, but follow. Actually He is the one who precedes; He is the believer's forerunner (Hebr 6:20). He has not yet founded God's visible Kingdom on Earth, but will do it in His eschatological *parousia*, when His followers will have the same *anastasis*-status as He has.

DE TRINITATE

Jesus' mission on Earth was throughout Trinitarian (John 5:19-24,30,32; 6:38; 17:1-12,14,18-26). He proclaimed that His doctrine was not His but His Fathers (John 7:16). He spoke only the words, which God gave Him (John 12:49-50) and Christ did the mission deeds – which were actually God's (John 14:10) – through the Holy Spirit (John 1:32-34, 3:34). These deeds were supposed to create Faith in Him (John 14:10-11). His followers were supposed to participate with the Father in Son through the Holy Spirit (John 3:30; 14:20; 17:21,23,25-26), the latter being sent by the Father in the Son's name (John 14:26). Therefore their mission was to be Trinitarian, too, to glorify the Son, Messiah (Mark 16:20, John 13:20, 14:10-14). The Apostles showed a good example of that in their mission both in deeds and in proclamation (Acts 3:1-26; 2:4,14-39; 4:8-12).

As a part of God's revealed will and another phase of God's plan of Salvation – not anymore in *spe*, but in *re* – the Christian State Theocracy has to be as Trinitarian as Christianity always is. It is unthinkable that Christian State Theocracy in its function is not trinitarian in one way or another.

If there is any proclamation about it, it has to be within the redemptive task, which God gave to Christ and which has been revealed by the Holy Spirit and which therefore glorifies Christ and God's love through Him. That is the aim of the Kingdom of God in Christian State Theocracy. The Holy Spirit is there to glorify Christ and that is why there cannot be any "new revelation" about Christian State Theocracy aiming to something else, like philanthropy. That is false and un-Christian proclamation. (see IV Chapter 2. Untrinitarian features: Latter Rain movement)

MISSIOLOGICAL CONTEXT

There is also the example of Jesus and the Apostles: they did not found any State Theocracies, neither did they tell their followers to do so. The only references to Christian State Theocracy are actually pointing at the *parousia*. Until then, Christians are supposed to do their mission according to Jesus' commandment and the Apostles' example and reside in more or less anti-Christian countries with its separate Temporal Authority and found their distinct spiritual organizations, congregations, with their separate Ecclesiastical Authority.

It is worth noting the difference between religious activity and political activity: the first doesn't compromise because it has to go on according to the uniformity of the Bible while the latter goes on through compromises. A civil society has to accommodate all the different people with their different opinions and a democratic society has to take these opinions seriously considering their success in elections.

Because the Apostles and early Church Fathers represented Ecclesiastical Authority, they knew their place in the separate Spiritual Regiment and didn't take part in Temporal Authority's work. On the other hand, they didn't try to hinder ordinary congregation members from doing so – not as a part of their religious mission, but as part of their temporal mission, merely as citizens. Thus Jesus made no move to make the captain of the Roman army to resign from his office; neither did His followers in the Bible, the writings of Apostolic Fathers and the early Church Fathers. There can be only one explanation to that: there wasn't going to be any rival organization for a long, long time. As Paul writes: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained by God." "For he is the minister of God to thee for good." (Rom 13:1,4) etc.

Can the Kingdom of God now be spread to become a Temporal Regiment? – The Bible clearly states that the Kingdom is still only inside the believers (Luke 17:21). So it can be spread only through new birth of the spirit. It can dominate their soul and body and influence their deeds, which the world doesn't understand, because it sees only what is visible. The Creation is under the sin and it will not be freed until in the *parousia* (Rom 8:17-23), which can be seen also in the messianic

prophecy of Isaiah (Is 11:1-9). Then the Kingdom of God can genuinely be within creation ruled by Christ and in people who have risen again, whose soul and body are something else than flesh. Flesh and blood cannot get in the Kingdom of God (John 3:5) or inherit the Kingdom of God (1Cor 15:50).

Thus the Evangelicals must be asked a revealing and soteriological question: 1) Is it at all according to *sola scriptura* Christianity to speak of spreading the Kingdom of God to an outward Temporal rule before the *parousia*? 2) If the Kingdom of God is spreading without the Law and Gospel and without men being born again, aren't the Bible and the redemptive work of Christ in vain?

It seems that in the Apostolic and Early Church Era Christians were contributing to the welfare of their temporal societies they were living in, but merely as citizens. If we compare it to the Old Covenant Jews, we could say that they were not contributing to society as part of their religious activity in the way that the Jews took part in the State Theocratic system in Israel, but as the Jews in exile: "And seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace." (Jer 29:7) – Here "peace" is the Hebrew word *shalom*, which means all kinds of welfare – in this context to the heathen people. Also a Christian is a kind of captive of the Lord for the benefit of unbelievers when he is residing in the midst of them as a stranger because of his real citizenship in the Kingdom of God and his true capacity as an evangelist in the Spiritual Sphere. But for that very capacity as a prisoner of *agapé* he has to be there to fulfill his task – although he would like to get away from there and move to the Glory of Heaven, which is his real home (2Cor 5). As Paul writes of himself to the Ephesians: "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles" (Eph 3:1) for the benefit of Ephesians and: "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith you are called" (Eph 4:1) i.e. lead a life worthy of your divine calling for the benefit of God's service. – At that time Paul's imprisonment had actualized physically as he was imprisoned either in Rome in 62 A.D. (Eph 3:1, 4:1, 6:20) or in Caesarea (Acts 24:27) because of his mission, which was so greatly motivated by the *agapé* of his Master now shed abroad in his heart

(2Cor 5:14-15,19-21; Rom 5:5). Paul did not consider that he lived in the visible Kingdom of God although he was ready to do good deeds to his neighbor. Vice versa, he considered that the Kingdom of God to which he belonged was visible elsewhere and he would like to get there.

In the Apostolic Era this strangeness was clear. For example Clement, the Bishop of Rome, began the salutation of his letter to the Corinthians ca. 95 A.D. by saying: "The church of God that sojourns in Rome to the church of God that sojourns in Corinth..."³ The verbal form "sojourns" is originally Greek *paroikous* which means "to live as a stranger"; in Luke 24:18, Act 7:29, Ef 2:19 and 1Pet 2:11 the substantive form *paroikos* as translated by "stranger" in KJV.

Justin Martyr writes ca. 150 A.D. that when the Christians look for the Kingdom, it doesn't mean any human kingdom, but that which is with God. Justin points out that this can also be seen in the behavior of martyrs. "For if we looked for a human kingdom, we should also deny our Christ, that we might not be slain... But since our thoughts are not fixed on the present, we are not concerned when men cut us off..."⁴

Another example is the Epistle to Diognetus in the latter part of the second Christian century. As an exception, I shall refer an unusual long part of it, because it also serves as a significant characterization of the age:

"For Christians are not distinguished from the rest of humanity by country, language, or custom. For nowhere do they live in cities of their own, nor do they speak some unusual dialect, nor do they practice an eccentric way of life. This teaching of theirs has not been discovered by the thought and reflection of ingenious people, nor do they promote any human doctrine, as some do. But while they live in both Greek and barbarian cities, as each one's lot was cast, and follow the local customs in dress and food and other aspects of life, at the same time they demonstrate the remarkable and admittedly unusual character of their own citizenship. They live in their own countries, but only as nonresidents; they participate in everything as citizens,

³ First Clement. Salutation. The Apostolic Fathers. Greek Texts and English Translations. 3rd edition (Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI, USA, 2009) p. 45.

⁴ The First Apology of Justin Chap. XI. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Volume I. Ed. Roberts & Donaldson (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, USA, 1985) p. 166.

and endure everything as foreigners. Every foreign country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is foreign. --- They live on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven. They obey the established laws; indeed in their private lives they transcend the laws. They love everyone, and by everyone they are persecuted. --- In a word, what the soul is to the body, Christians are to the world. --- The soul dwells in the body, but is not of the body; likewise Christians dwell in the world, but are not of the world. --- The soul, which is immortal, lives in a mortal dwelling; similarly Christians live as strangers amid perishable things, while waiting for the imperishable in heaven. The soul, when poorly treated with respect to food and drink, becomes all the better; and so Christians when punished daily increase more and more. Such is the important position to which God has appointed them, and it is not right for them to decline it.”⁵

Of course when the gospel has spread and many people respect God, there will be less physical persecution, but still the strangeness will remain – for the Kingdom and the King are elsewhere and it is the King’s task to create it on Earth, when the time is due.

4. Christianity and state theocracy

During the first three centuries the persecuted Christian Church preserved well its distinction from the Temporal Authority – being forced to it by the circumstances. But, as it was noted before, Christian state Theocracy simply didn’t belong to its mission given by Jesus in His Great Commission. That was seen clearly, when there was a Christian Emperor in the 3rd century and he was treated just as another member of a congregation. As Emperor Philippus (244-249) had fallen into many sins, the bishop didn’t allow him to enter the church until he confessed his sins and sat in a certain bench for the fallen, who were willing to repent. They told that he obeyed willingly.⁶

⁵ The Epistle to Diognetus 5-6. The Apostolic Fathers. Greek Texts and English Translations. 3rd edition. Ed. Michael W. Holmes (Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI, USA, 2009) pp. 700-705.

⁶ Eusebius History of Church VI, 34.

In the fourth century the so called *Constantinian turn* took place, when Emperor Constantinus the Great began to favor Christianity. Finally, in 390 Emperor Theodosius made Christianity to become the State Religion. After the *Constantinian turn* the Temporal and Spiritual Regiments began to mix – contributed by Augustine.⁷

PATRISTIC ERA HERESIES

I shall examine first whether there were or not any State Theocratic formulations in Patristic Era heresies and how they were justified. The focus will be on Gnosticism since the 2nd century, on Arianism and Donatism in early 4th century and on Pelagianism in early 5th century. In 7th century also Islam was considered as a heresy.

It would be interesting to see whether State Theocratic formulations affected mainstream Christianity. At least the Donatists had such formulations which challenged Augustine, who was at the time the Bishop of Hippo and his ministry covered the Donatists' residing areas. It seems that the Donatist insight had at least an indirect effect on Augustine, because he used the Emperors' combat forces to change the Donatists' doctrinal opinions. Augustine did that partly against his own explicit doctrinal insights.

MEDIEVAL FORMULATIONS

In the major spreading area of Christianity, the two archetypes of State Theocracy began to take shape. In the eastern part of the Empire was formed the *Caesaropapistic* system dominated by its Temporal Authority, the Emperor. In the western part of the Empire – or its former territory – was formed a *Papistic* system dominated by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Bishop of Rome. These State Theocratic formulations were claimed to be Christian although they didn't fulfill the terms stipulated above neither with reference to time nor to the qualifications of their rulers.

⁷ Herbert A. Deane: *The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine* (Columbia University Press, USA, 1963) pp. 200-201, 202, 206, 213-215. Augustine (ed. & transl. R.W. Dyson): *The City of God Against the Pagans* XXII, 9 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1998) pp. 987, 989.

Here I shall examine how these formulations were justified and what kind of implications they had in each system in the Middle Ages and after the Reformation in its sphere of influence.

In the eastern part of the Roman Empire Constantinus the Great himself took the role of the supreme governor of the Church. With few exceptions from thereof, the Emperors reserved the chair of the Church Synods to themselves and used pressure to make them favorable to their doctrinal opinions. Also between the Synod Meetings the Emperors removed from ministries those representatives of Ecclesiastical Authority who didn't agree with them. Emperor Justinianus I (in office 527-565) took it even further and created the absolute form of caesaropapism with the monarch's dictatorship in the Church. Thus the Emperors appointed bishops and patriarchs to their ministries and removed them again according to their liking and supervised the doctrines and life of the clergy. Constantinus II had a strife with the Pope and didn't hesitate to jail him and bring him to Constantinople, where he was treated shamefully. "I am Emperor and priest", said Leo III. to Pope Gregory II. Leo VI (866-) gave orders among others about Holy Communion, Sunday celebration and ecclesiastical feasts without even convening the Synod. Isaac II (1185-) even used at his dinner table the jewel decorated Communion vessels of the Church, due to his proclamation that he equaled the Apostles and that with him there wasn't any distinction between temporal and divine. The emperors' ecclesiastical status had swelled so unreasonable that still in 1389 – only 64 years before the fall of Constantinople – Antonius, the patriarch of Constantinople, wrote a reproaching letter to Vasil, the grand duke of Russia, who had not acknowledged the Byzantine emperor as the supreme governor of the Russian Church! "A Christian cannot have a Church without the Emperor" explained patriarch Antonius!⁸ – Later the same composition was established in Russia.

At the same time the clergy itself became very corrupted and the higher clergy gathered in East Roman metropolises trying to imitate the lifestyle of princes and take part in power struggles of Temporal

⁸ John Shelton Curtiss: *Church and State in Russia* (Columbia University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1940) pp. 4-8.

Authority. At times people like Chrysostomos made vain attempts to oppose those habits.⁹ Later on, in the Russian empire the church was administrated through government office, which reached its peak in the totalitarian caesaropapistic system of the Soviet Empire, which tried to increase the Temporal Regiment's religious power to emaciate Christianity totally and rule the people through their consciences. – The present system resembles much more that of Czarist times.

In the western part of the Roman Empire and among its succeeding empires prevailed the Papist system until the Reformation. That system was characterized by the abuse of political power, violence, moral corruption of every kind, ignorance of operational clergy and total ignorance of the peasants. They didn't understand Latin, which was the only language of the Bible, the liturgy and the sermons, and therefore they remained ignorant and tried to keep up their own superstitious insights. That was easy, because the Papal Church had already brought a foreign spirit into the church by selling indulgences and worshipping statues of saints, old relics and the Virgin Mary as the Queen of Heaven – and giving the Pope exclusive powers, which according to the Bible should belong to every congregation.¹⁰

POST REFORMATION

Although the Reformation was in great part an objection against *Papist State Theocracy*,¹¹ it soon changed its course due to the same kind of opportunism as Augustine.

In the Lutheran sphere of influence they formed several a-millennialist *Caesaropapistic State Theocracies*, which depended upon the re-

⁹ Johannes Kryszostomus (Valamon luostari, Heinävesi, Finland, 2003)

¹⁰ Desmond O'Grady: *Rome Reshaped. Jubilees 1300-2000* (2000). Jussi Hanska & Kirsi Salonen: *Kirkko, kuri ja koulutus. Hengellisen säädyn moraalihistoriaa myöhäiskeskiajalla* (SKS 968, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki, Finland, 2004) ss. 116-134.

¹¹ Martti Luther: *Maallisesta esivallasta. Martti Luther: Valitut teokset III* (WSOY, Helsinki, Finland, 1983) ss. 84, 88-89. *What Luther says. An Anthology. Volume I* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, USA, 1959) pp. 294:861, 863; 295:866.

ligious conviction of the ruling prince in each state – *cuius regio, eius religio*. The prince always had a special status in the church as “most eminent member of the Church” (*preacipuum membrum ecclesiae*), and was even given the right to act as a temporary emergency bishop (*Not-bischof*). When Lutheran reformation spread to the Northern Countries, the kings concluded that the power, which used to belong to the Pope, now belonged to them. They also confiscated Catholic Church’s property to soothe their own shaking finances. They were not interested in foreign mission until they had conquered other countries to establish their colonies. That is why there wasn’t any foreign mission in those churches for two hundred years. Whereas it was in the crown’s interest that its subjects were coherent and uniform in their religious beliefs and thus there was a so called religious coercion, which forced everybody to membership in the state church, only very few exceptions were allowed for Jewish or Muslim immigrants. Church discipline was not used to excommunicate those, who didn’t want to follow Christ, but to punish them with physical punishments, like sit in the stocks, pay fines, do the gantlet or even be jailed, which were totally unacceptable procedures in Ecclesiastical Regiment. As the crown tried to cherish this artificial uniformity, it didn’t approve revival movements like Pietism. That is why Pietist meetings were forbidden and Pietists were persecuted and jailed in Germany and in Northern Countries in the 18th century. In fact, during certain periods in Sweden, in Gävle and in Orsa prisons there was no room for ordinary criminals, because they were full of Pietists, whose only crime was that they had gathered together for a prayer meeting.¹²

On the Reformed side there were also State Theocratic formulations, lead by Calvin in Geneva and Zwingli in Zürich, but they didn’t last

¹² Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope 54. The Book of Concord. The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN, USA, 2000) p. 339. Johannes Wallmann: Totinen kääntymys ja maailmanparannus. Pietismi kirkkohistoriallisena ilmiönä (Kirjaneliö, Helsinki, Finland, 1997) ss. 16-19, 63-65. (orig. Der Pietismus, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, BRD, 1990). Aapeli Saarisalo: Rosenius, evankelisen uskon mies (WSOY, Helsinki, Finland, 1973) ss. 87-90. Pentti Taipale: Halle ja Trankebar. Pietismin lähetyskäsitöksen alkuvaihe (STKSJ, Suomen Teologinen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki, Finland, 1970) s. 74. Lähetysteologinen aikakauskirja. Volume 8, 2006. s. 14. Timo Vasko: Pietistis-luterilaisen lähetystyön alkamisesta Intian Trankebarissa.

for a long time. Paradoxically, the *Confessio Helvetica posterior* (CH II) wants to keep the Regiments distinct and rejects the possibility that the Church or its authorities could actually possess any office of Temporal Authority. However, it seems that the followers of that confession failed to follow it in real life – just like it had happened on the Lutheran side. Every inhabitant in Zürich was also a member of the Reformed Church of the region and no other denominations were allowed; dissidents were not taken for members of the civil society and they had to move away or were expelled. The right to take part in the Eucharist was a civil right and excommunication meant also the loss of other civil rights. Going to Church Services and sanctification of Sunday were civic duties. The Church's administration was part of the city state's administration, although matters of the Church were also dealt with in preachers' synods. The City Council engaged the preacher as an employee and he swore an oath to the Council, which protected him and used his expert opinions in drafting committees. The preachers also had to watch over certain duties, which normally belong to the police or other members of Temporal Authority. It seems that at first the Zürich model was *papist*, because the City Council later disclosed that at Zwingli's time the preachers' interference with political matters had lead the state almost to its destruction in the Kappel War 1531. Therefore the Council demanded the preachers to promise that they would't interfere with politics anymore.¹³ I shall examine how these things were actually justified doctrinally and what effects these formulations had on Christian life both to the individuals and to congregations and on their mission in these countries.

Augustine's real motives seemed to be opportunism in church politics to crush the dissidents and an opportunistic interpretation of the Millennium doctrine to legitimize it. Luther had the same kind of opportunism at his time, but his vindication was also against his own well grounded doctrine, which was central in his Reformation.¹⁴ Zwingli's and Calvin's explanation was more complex and it is still under my re-

¹³ Kirkko ja valtio *Confessio Helvetica posteriorin* mukaan (STKS LXXXIX, Suomalainen Teologisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki, Finland, 1973) ss. 57-68.

¹⁴ Martti Luther: Maallisesta esivallasta. Martti Luther, Valitut teokset III (WSOY, Helsinki, Finland, 1983) ss. 90, 93. Carl Fr. Wislöff: Tätä opetti Luther (Suomen Raamattuopiston kustannus Oy, Jyväskylä, Finland, 1985) ss. 189-190.

search – actually it is even more interesting how the loosening of these formulations was then justified doctrinally.

However, my hypothesis is that Christian State Theocracy can be balanced only, when the time is due. There are only two Regiments, Temporal and Spiritual. Therefore in State Theocracy always either of them is in leading position. They are in balance only in Melchisedequian order, where the same person occupies both the kingship and the high priesthood. They are just in the same order, because the King and High Priest is God the Son.

5. American evangelicals

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I shall examine shortly the mutual past of Fundamentalists and Evangelicals and their split in the 1940s and how this split widened. As the Fundamentalists have not accepted any State Theocratic enterprises there has to be some development of the Evangelical dogma among this quite heterogeneous movement and I shall analyze that. Under the following subtitle is one of them. I shall examine as well the theologians that are behind the theories of Evangelical political efforts and especially State Theocratic projects.

UN-TRINITARIAN FEATURES

Some considerable Evangelical movements think that they are getting new revelation, which they could even use to correct certain Bible verses.

LATTER RAIN MOVEMENT

Latter Rain movement is an outreach of the modern postmillennialism. In this form, that doctrine began to spread in the 1940s through the pentecostal Assemblies of God. Although in 1949 both this Church and other big Pentecostal Churches condemned the Latter Rain doctrines to be heretical, it survived in independent congregations in different modifications and in different names like *Kingdom Theology*, *Triumphalism* and *Dominion Theology* and other names. After the Revivals in the 1960s

and 1970s, the Latter Rain conceptions became general in Charismatic Movement especially in USA and Britain.

One of its special features is the producing of “new revelation” independent from the Bible. According to that new revelation, the movement was supposed to be “God’s work for the Latter Days” and its ministries were characterized by an exceptional outpouring of the Spirit and power and of charismatic gifts – even greater than in the Apostolic age. Through anew anointed apostles and prophets would appear the great revival of the end of times and the restoration of the Congregation.

In the name of the “new revelation” movement’s high esteemed so called prophets, they have even “corrected” the Bible text. For example in November 1989, Bob Jones spoke at Vineyard’s “School of Prophecy” in Anaheim claiming that Jesus appeared to him and gave him a new version to correct Ps 12:1. In KJV translation goes: “Help, LORD; for the godly man ceaseth; for the faithful fail from among the children of men.” Or in ASV: “Help, Lord, for the godly are no more; the faithful have vanished from among men.” While Jones wrote: “Help, Lord, release the champions, the dread champions.” – So, Jones’ version actually had a quite opposite meaning than the two of the most authoritative translations, but it suited better to his and Vineyard’s teaching of the last generation, which would experience “a powerful outpouring of the Holy Spirit of an unprecedented magnitude --- He is looking for individuals who will be ‘dread champions’ for His cause.” They would evangelize the world and subdue the nations before the *parousia*, although their evangelization would not be what it used to be. In Vineyard they taught “power evangelism” i.e. that certain chosen people would show signs and wonders in a large scale and the supernatural power would then “sweep” unbelievers into the Kingdom! ¹⁵

So, a message cannot be more un-Trinitarian. The Holy Spirit is supposed to draw sinners to God’s Kingdom without glorifying Jesus at all! According to the Bible the whole problem and its solution is throughout Trinitarian: the problem lies in the broken relationship of man to God because of sin, because man corrupted what God had created through

¹⁵ Clifford Hill (ed.): *Blessing The Church* (Eagle, Guildford, Surrey, UK, 1995) pp. 130-131.

the Son (1Cor 8:6, Col 1:16-17). This brokenness makes it impossible for a sinner to enter His Kingdom; therefore the Holy Spirit by the Law shows the condemnation to the sinner in his consciousness (John 16:8-11) and how to escape it through the Gospel (Hebr 1:2), which makes the relationship to God whole again and opens up the access to His Kingdom (Hebr 2:3-4). But how does He do that, if nobody preaches? (Rom 10:14-15) The Apostles did preach like that and look what results they had (Act 2:41). However, this Latter Rain lot thinks that no preaching of the Law and Gospel is needed; sins and forgiveness of sins have no significance any more. The cross of Christ is useless. Sinners will just watch “signs and wonders” and be happy – and then they should be called Christians! How can a sinner become a Christian through entertainment? There has to be Faith and it must be directed to the Son and His Gospel (John 3:36) – not in “signs and wonders”. That isn’t Christianity at all. Jesus clearly says that “except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.” (Joh 3:3) That can only happen through preaching of the Law and the Gospel, which can give birth to the Faith through the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom 10:13-17, John 6:63). How do they think that the Righteous King would allow a sinner come to HIS Kingdom and to HIS wedding feast without a proper garment, i.e. the righteousness of Christ as his wedding garment? (Rom 13:14; Gal 3:27; Eph 4:24; Col 3:10; Rev 3:5, 7:13) In the Kingdom one has to play on King’s rules or he will be cast out. (Mat 22:11-13) Christ is not going to marry an old Adam, an unclean bride, because He has paid a heavy ransom for her cleanness.

Well, Bob Jones’ background is actually as unconvincing as his message. His paranormal spiritual experiences began in a mental asylum, where he was treated for alcoholism, violence, fornication and drug (LSD) abuse. He told that demons visited him still in 1990 and he held conversations with them – i.e. at the same time, when he gave the false prophecies concerning revivals in England and Europe. Those prophecies were released in 1990 and he was prophesying uniformly with two other so called Kansas City prophets, which were also highly esteemed by the movement. They were Paul Cain and John Paul Jackson, who preached in several occasions that a mighty revival would break out in England 1990 and it would spread from there to Scotland and across the North Sea throughout Europe. Cain was even refining his prophecy by

claiming that the revival would begin in October at Dockland Conference Center, where the founder of Vineyard congregations John Wimber was going to lead a mission.¹⁶ – Indeed, the mission was led, but no revival appeared either in England or in Europe.

No wonder, for of course a Christian revival needs Christ i.e. the preaching of the Law and Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Spirit, who glorifies Him; sinners can be born again only of that Spirit (John 3:3,5; 6:63). While another spirit, which glorifies something else, is not His Spirit and sinners cannot be born again of it and thus there can't be any Christian revival. Of course there can be another revival of flower power or so, but that doesn't save anybody to the Kingdom of God.

A few years later Paul Cain claimed in his prophecy that the recently elected US president Bill Clinton's presidency would be the time, when the nation returned to Biblical moral and Clinton himself became the greatest president since Abraham Lincoln.¹⁷ – Actually it turned out to be the opposite. Clinton will stay in the memory of the whole world because of his light heartedly committed adulteries and his shameless lies on TV to cover them up. As a president he repealed all the abortion restrictions of the previous presidents Reagan and Bush senior. Besides those, he used his *veto* to repeal the Partial Abortion Ban Act, which had passed the US Congress in 1997. This Partial-Birth Abortion uses very cruel D&X-abortion system, where the head of a living fetus is drawn out of uterus, crushed with scissors and his brain sucked up to the hospital's waste tank by a powerful suction apparatus. To prevent the Supreme Court of getting involved, Clinton announced that he would appoint there only pro-abortion judges. One of them, Feminist Ruth Bader, was also claiming that the administration should also begin to destroy traditional roles of sexes.¹⁸

¹⁶ Clifford Hill (ed.): *Blessing The Church* (Eagle, Guildford, Surrey, UK, 1995) pp. 194, 188-189.

¹⁷ Clifford Hill (ed.): *Blessing The Church* (Eagle, Guildford, Surrey, UK, 1995) pp. 193.

¹⁸ Dallas A. Blanshard: *The Anti-Abortion Movement and the Rise of the Religious Right* (Twayne Publishers, New York, NY, USA, 1994) pp. 55-60, 118. Phyllis Schlafly: *The Supremacists. The Tyranny of Judges and How to Stop It* (Spence Publishing, Dallas, TX, USA, 2006) pp. 53-60, 88-89. Pat Robertson: *Courting Disaster* (Integrity Publishers, Nashville, Tenn, USA, 2004) pp. 219-220.

Paul Cain's judgment didn't work in temporal matters either. As he was visiting Iraq just before the First Gulf War he claimed that Saddam Hussein was a misunderstood god man and the western countries treated him unjustly.¹⁹ – What a statement of a man, who gassed to death his own citizens, had opposition members tortured in prisons and let his people starve and without medications while every now and then he had a new luxurious palace built for himself – until he had the total of 70 palaces (!) before he lost his presidency due to the Second Gulf War.

As the above mentioned persons are pretending to be Revealing Prophets they should recall that according to the Bible every single one of their prophecies should come true – otherwise they should be stoned to death. This command doesn't concern the Gift of Prophecy of the New Covenant, because the gift doesn't produce Revealed Prophecy but are meant to give actual and personal guidance within the Revealed Prophecy of the Bible. However, these persons' ministries don't fit the gift's scope either; their scope is next to demonic.

The Latter Rain movement also carries out "Biblical" proofs to legitimate its doctrines. However, these proofs are placed in arbitrary context. For example the movement's doctrine of the last overwhelming revival is justified by Joel's prophecy of latter rain (Joel 2:23) and outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Joel 2:28-32). In reality Joel's prophecies of rains are prophecies given to the people of Israel about the blessings that were meant for them, which can be seen in the context, while the prophecy of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is connected to the era that began at Pentecost. In the Bible this is proved by apostle Peter, who, filled with the Holy Spirit, said that in the first Pentecost that Joel's prophecy of outpouring of the Spirit was fulfilled (Acts 2:16-21).

On the contrary, Latter Rain movement quite against the Bible binds the prophecy of rains with the prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit by explaining handily that at Pentecost was fulfilled only the first rain while the latter rain has to be realized in our lifetime. That is the reason for the movement's name: Latter Rain. The movement presumes that the

¹⁹ Clifford Hill (ed.): *Blessing The Church* (Eagle, Guildford, Surrey, UK, 1995) pp. 193-194.

present day believers' spiritual power and significance are supposed to be different and greater in every aspect than those of Early Church.²⁰

EFFECT ON SPIRITUAL LIFE

The aim of the Evangelicals is the building of the Kingdom of God in political means; they think, that they will be helped by the Holy Spirit, but as a matter of fact that happens without His Biblical task (glorifying of Christ); they act as if he had an independent task: to help them in all of their efforts, which they consider to be good. The Evangelicals have just been aiming to their goal without sticking to Christ and the written Word of God. The result was finally realized among the Evangelical leaders: the spiritual life of their people had declined so much that according to statistics they differed from the average Americans only by their more active life in sin.

POLITICAL THEORIES

Much of the political activism of Evangelicals has been due to the humanist and antireligious moral, cultural and political transition in Western Countries in the 1960s and 1970s. According to that so called modernization, the society and its administration should be atheistic to avoid un-intellectual theistic beliefs, which were considered to be harmful, because they limited man's personal freedom to realize his desires. The prevailing Christian privileges especially in education should be repealed to accelerate the change towards a morally and culturally pluralistic America.²¹

The Christian values were substituted with the leftist world view, which is based on Enlightenment, Marxism, Darwinism and Freudian-

²⁰ Ks. tarkemmin Jürgen Römer: *The Toronto Blessing* (Åbo Akademi förlag, 2002). ss. 27-

²¹ Hugh Heclo: *Christianity and American Democracy* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2007) pp. 99-103. James Davison Hunter: *Culture Wars. The Struggle to Define America* (Basic Books, New York, NY, USA, 1991) pp. 69-77, 120-126. Robert N. Bellah: *Civil Religion in America*. *Daedalus* 96 (1967) pp. 1-18, Robert N. Bellah: *Beyond Belief. Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditionalist World* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, USA, 1991).

ism. A child was seen as *tabula rasa*, whose development could only be harmed by rules and moral restrictions of parents, Church and other educators. There had to be a free education; rules and moral values were taken for mental violence. People were supposed to be free from authoritarian restriction of parents, church and other educationers; that led to sexual revolution, feminism, homosexuality, drug abuse, etc.

From the 1960's until the end of the 1980s there was a 400 per cent increase of illegitimate babies, 200 per cent increase of teen suicides, 850 per cent increase of babies born in cohabitant relationships, 300 per cent increase of one parent families. There were also 560 per cent growth of violent crimes, 128 percent increase of murders, 287 per cent increase of rapes and 294 per cent increase of robberies.²²

I shall analyze some central political theories of US Evangelicals, each one under an individual heading, and compare their insights with those of the Early Church and the Reformers. The theories are as follows:

National culture war

New christian right

Christian coalition

Dominionism

Samaritan strategy (compassionate conservatism)

Kingdom now

Word of faith theology (spiritual warfare)

Constitution school of thought and operational post-millennialism

Parenthesis theory

Two covenant theology

Christian zionism.

Emerging church

The most central question is, of course, how does the Evangelical political movement state the reasons for the State Theocratic aims in different phases of their development. Actually the Evangelical's insight to

²² Charles Murray: *Losing Ground. American Social Policy 1950-1980* (Basic Books, New York, NY, USA, 1984) pp. 113-115, 126-133. Fred Schwarz: *Beating the Unbeatable Foe. One Man's Victory over Communism, Leviathan and the Last Enemy* (Regnery Publishing, Washington D.C., 1996) p. 430.

what is the Christians' role in politics has gone through a very positive development in the 1990s. The most significant revaluation must be the distinction made between the means of Christian mission and political mission. Characteristic to traditional social and political activity – or mission, if you like – of Christians are compromises. A state has to be home for all of its inhabitants with different religious and ideologies. Whereas Christian spiritual mission is characterized by unwillingness to compromise.

As a matter of fact their revaluation brought their political ethos nearer to that of the Early Christians. However, the Evangelicals didn't evaluate their aims. The Early Christians' social and political work aimed only to Temporal Righteousness, not the Spiritual one, which they considered to be reached only through spiritual means, i.e. preaching and teaching the Law and Gospel according to Jesus' command (Mat 28:19-20, Mark 16:15-16), whereas the modern day Evangelicals still consider that the spiritual righteousness can be reached through Christianizing the state by political means. The Christianized State would be a State Theocratic solution – for most of them a postmillennialist one.

THE FUNDAMENTALISTS

The Fundamentalists – Evangelicals' contemporaries – do not accept State Theocratic aims at all. Still they take part in politics. I shall examine what are their doctrinal justifications for that and what the justifications were when they still had post-millennialist thought in the 18th century.

CAPABILITY OF BEING A POLITICAL VEHICLE

My present thesis is that the genuine Christian State Theocracy cannot be any realist political vehicle without Christ's visible rule. According to the Bible in Christian State Theocracy there has to be the following features:

- the King of kings, the High Priest and Revealed Prophet is the same person, who is the omnipotent all knowing Christ, in whom God has invested all the power in Heavens and on Earth
- His co-rulers are resurrected Christian believers (Rev 20:4-5)

- because the ruler is the Word of God, who is behind the Bible, the Bible has to have the absolute authority over legislation and its Laws can't be changed
- this administration rules the whole world and the whole world has to come to Jerusalem to worship Christ – otherwise they are being punished (Zach 14:17-18).
- so, there will be physical punishments against those, who oppose the theocratic ruler and His moral point of view the possible use of army against rebels according to the description of the Second Advent in the Book of Revelation (Rev 19:14-21, 20:1-3).
- clear dictatorship
- Satan and its lot have been totally neutralized as long as the Christian State theocracy lasts on Earth (Rev 20:1-3)
- the created nature on earth has been released from sin
- people don't die until they are at least hundred years old

These conditions don't exist now and they cannot exist before the *parousia*. But even if the conditions were excluded, where is the Evangelical politician, who thinks that he would actually be elected, if his political program contained dictatorship, laws that couldn't be changed and physical punishments against heretics? But if those things were not included, there is no reason to seek after Christian State Theocracy.

“CHRISTIAN” EXTREMISTS

I shall examine such militant anti-abortion groups like Army of God, Reformation Lutheran Church, Christian Identity and Pro Life Movement to find out, whether they have been Christian or not in the first place, and can their actions considered as Christian.

The Sociologists have tried to explain the religious motivated violence with the Theory of Religious Terror. By my thesis is that their theory cannot explain the behavior of these groups, because it lacks the competencet to discern whether the violent groups actually represent the religion they claim to follow. I shall analyze the Christianity of these groups to clear it out whether they are to be taken for Christian groups at all.

In the media every religious steepness and even extremism are labeled “fundamentalist” without considering whether they follow the fundamentals of the religion they claim to represent. However, a resolute stand doesn’t make anybody a Christian Fundamentalist, if he is not standing behind the Christian fundamentals.

6. Islam

I shall examine what are the State Theocratic features of Islam. I shall define and compare the features of Islamic analogous trends of opinions to the Christian Fundamentalism, Evangelicalism and Liberalism. What is their relation to State Theocracy. Are all the Islamic groups actually acting according to the Islamic doctrines?

However, this is to show the distinction between Christianity and their doctrinal insights to violence and State Theocracy.