

THE FAMILY SPOKESMAN

A STIVERS NEWSLETTER

July 15, 1989

(c) Copyright

No.28

"THE SEPARATIST PAPERS"

Between the years of 1982 and 1987, I wrote about eleven essays entitled The Separatist Papers. They were the result of research I did on early American theology and social order. The essays were so-named because the Pilgrims were known in England as "Separatists". This was a name which distinguished them from the "Puritans" who came to America later. My research led me to the conclusion that America had a Separatist origin and not a Puritan one as claimed by our Reformed brethren. Nor did it have a secular origin as argued by Humanists of our day.

To understand what Separatism was, and is, I focused my research on the Pilgrims and their influence as "first comers" to America. But the more I studied their beliefs, the more I realized that they were a product of a yet unrecognized source. They could not be fitted neatly into any of the commonly recognized branches of the Protestant Reformation. I found the roots of Separatism to be deeper than I at the first suspected. Separatism was not an off-shoot of the Protestant Reformation, but was really its antecedent in the person of John Wycliffe. That Wycliffe and his Lollard dissenters constitute a distinct branch of Protestantism and that America was its fruit I later found out was not a new thesis, although it may seem so. It was argued by Thomas Cuming Hall in 1930. New England Theology from Jonathan Edwards through Charles Finney simply cannot be classified as Calvinist or Arminian, but Evangelical in the tradition of Wycliffe. And America's social order was unlike any that were advocated by the major branches of the Reformation. Indeed, some of the positions in the Declaration of Independence find no defenders in Protestantism except Wycliffe and his theological heirs. It may be good to add that the Puritans were from England, and were more influenced by Wycliffe than they ever realized.

In all the literature of recent years on America's roots, none have ascribed to Wycliffe his just due. It seems to me that a disproportionate share of attention has been given to Calvin. This I find to be unfortunate. For it is guiding many toward a system of theology and philosophy of social order which our Founding Fathers regarded to be unbiblical and unjust. However great Calvin's legacy in America might be, Wycliffe's is far greater. And besides myself, it has been only recently that Wycliffe's legacy has been seriously joined to the American Revolution (see Ben Hart's Faith & Freedom).

If through the labyrinth of research, scholars have found my essays or have by some other means been awakened to my thesis, then my labor was worthwhile. Wycliffe deserves a greater voice than mine.

The Separatist Papers were to end with two additional essays: "Separatism and Dominion Theology" and "Terranomics: A Separatist Manifesto". As I worked on these essays, I found them growing to unmanagable proportions. Ten or twelve-page essays would not do. They were theses which required books - books that cost money to publish, books that will not sell (as I have discovered in the past) because they are not written with a popular audience in mind.

It was then that I came upon a solution. I was working on a book for Campus Action Ministries on sex and morality (pathbreaking material) that could draw a lot of interest. Since "Separatism and Dominion Theology" actually provides the theological foundations to the book's thesis - material that I would have to repeat anyway - I decided to join the two.

The family as an institutional power in society was the topic of a book I wanted to write for Stivers Home Institute. Since the ruling place of the family is the land - terranomics - I decided my final essay would be developed best in that volume.

These two books will be my contributions to the renaissance of the Christian Home during the final years of this century.

Since some time will pass before these two books are available (1990 & 1991), I thought an outline and summary of these two essays in the "Family Spokesman" would be appropriate. That is why this issue is Copyrighted.

Before I do, let me briefly describe the Papers which have preceded them:

#1 - "A Metaphysics for Christian Separatism" (1982)

In this essay, I follow Rushdoony's lead and identify the ontological Trinity as the organizing principle of true society. Civilization is measured by its ability to create and enforce distinctions in society. Paganism

results in the extremes of static or anarchistic cultures. Trinitarianism results in a balance between unity and diversity, since man always images the God he worships. Separatism challenges the drift of society toward absorption into a single institution. Separatism is predicated by Trinitarian theology.

#2 - "The Kingdom of God" (1982)

This is an expanded version of Rev. Gordon C. Olson's chart of "The Moral Government of God". Separatism is concerned about marking boundaries between the various institutions of society (church, state, school, etc.) That is best done by identifying their distinct missions in society. This chart serves as a useful teaching tool for that purpose.

#3 - "The Divine Mandate for Christian Separatism" (1983)

This essay is primarily a topical study on the doctrine of sanctification, which means "separated". A discussion of the Biblical passages which recur frequently in Separatist literature is presented.

#4 - "An Eschatology for Christian Separatism" (1983)

In this essay I attempt to distinguish Separatism from Escapism. Separatism is correctly identified with the historic and orthodox views of Bible prophecy, as opposed to modern, dispensational ones. Separatism teaches an eschatology of victory in history. A shorter essay on the Cultural Mandate is included with it.

#5 - "Separatism and the Biblical Family" (1983)

"At one time, Separatists insisted on the separation of church and state as two separate law-spheres. This was done to protect the integrity of both. Today, Separatists demand the separation of family and state, to protect the family's integrity as a law-sphere under God."

#6 - "Economics and Christian Separatism" (1983)

This essay presents a view of economics and private property which distinguishes Separatism from Christian communism (Anabaptist). Separatism also calls for family capitalism and opposes corporate capitalism.

#7 - "Christian Separatism: The Source of American Liberty (1983)

Faith in God's providential grace enables one to separate from a wicked society and set up a godly order. Unbelief creates dependence upon collective and institutional remedies to earthly problems. A somewhat sentimental look at the Pilgrims is also presented.

#8 - "The Separatism of the Pilgrim Fathers" (1986)

A historical study into the Separatist theology of the Pilgrims, and how it resulted in the two great systems of American society: congregationalism and localism.

#9 - "The Church According to Separatist Doctrine" (1986)

Distinguishing between the Church Universal and the church as an institution in society is the first purpose of this essay. Secondly, it describes the institutional church as it is organized according to congregational principles. This form of polity became dominant in American society through, of all people, the Puritans, who converted to the Plymouth pattern.

#10 - "Separatism and America's Christian Foundations" (1987)

This essay is a closer study of the Anglo-American branch of the Protestant Reformation as headed by John Wycliffe. A short account of Wycliffe's work and theology and its impact upon Protestantism in England and America is presented.

#11 - "Separatism and the American Nation" (1987)

The final published essay. A historical study describing how Separatism transformed itself into the Americanism of the 19th century. The 20th century has been the setting of a contest for the soul of the American people between Separatism (Americanism) and a pagan internationalism. The essay ends on an uncertain note, mirroring the uncertainty of America's present condition.

I might mention that several issues of The Separatist Review were published:

#1 - November, 1982 - "The Return of the Pilgrims" (Stivers)

"The Election Year Blues" (R.J. Thiry)

#2 - March, 1983 - "Christian Reconstruction & County Politics" (Thiry)
(Excellent article)

"The Battle for Christian Education in Wyoming" (Stivers)

#3 - August, 1983 - "The Dying Gasps of American Civilization" (Stivers)
(An evaluation of the "Reagan recovery"; its failure to reverse the decline of family capital; growing statism, etc.)

The remaining issues were written by me.

#4 - November, 1983 - "The Signposts of National Reprobation, Pt. 1"
(A point-by-point indictment of American society based upon the covenantal lawsuit found in Ezekiel 22)

#5 - May, 1984 - "Signposts, Part 2" (America's "Abomination of Desolation")

Republished, May, 1985 with "Wyoming Update: Major Legislative Victory" (Independence of parochial and home education codified into statutory law.)

#6 - June, 1987 - "The Plague" (AIDS in historical context)
"The Signposts of National Reprobation, Pt. 3" (the dangerous compromise of churches with state charters)

#7 - November, 1987 - "The Coming Great Decepcion" (The controlled destruction and grinding down of the American economy amidst the efflorescence of prosperity)

All the above are available in quantity and are free of charge.

continued on p. 14

SEPARATISM AND DOMINION THEOLOGY

(Summary & Study Notes)

The need for structure is a fact which permeates all of reality. Since God is a God of order, all of creation contains and reflects that order. For instance, science has learned only recently, through the aid of computers, that the fundamental randomness of nature (I.e. subatomic particles) is really an elaborate order inconceivable and imperceptible to the human mind. What may seem disorderly to us, to a greater mind than ours, it is a basic order. This basic order makes knowledge and dominion by man possible. Man's developed order would not be possible without the fundamental order created by God.

Theology is an attempt to put the teachings of the Bible in a form in which man can use them in his particular dominion task. That theology does this is not to say that there is no order to the Scriptures. Indeed, like nature, there is a basic order in them, although not always perceived by us. Like nature, the basic order of the Scriptures is developed by man to become usable. The earth does not naturally have houses, roads, and croplands. These must be built by man. The earth has potential usability. Nevertheless, man must develop that potential for it to become truly usable.

Likewise with the Bible, its truth must be searched out and developed intellectually. Its teachings must be simplified by organizing them into a structure so that they can be efficiently taught and understood. This is the goal of theology.

Very recently, there has arisen to prominence among Evangelicals a movement in theology and social action. The leaders of this movement have been called "Dominion theologians" (because they promote a Christianized version of the Mosaic system), and sometimes "Christian Reconstructionists" (because of their efforts to restore America's Christian heritage). They are self-professed Calvinists, with sometimes a charismatic background, although the two leading figures - R. J. Rushdoony and Gary North - are Presbyterian and Reformed.

Christian Reconstructionists draw heavily from America's Puritan legacy, and to a large degree, seek to return to the "Holy Commonwealths" of early

New England. I am both a Dominion theologian and a Christian Reconstructionist. I have been tutored by the writings of such men as Rushdoony and North since 1978. But I am not a Puritan or a Calvinist. I am a Separatist, adhering consciously to the Anglo-American branch of Protestantism as founded by John Wycliffe.

I do not see it necessary to be Puritan or Calvinist in order to be a Dominion theologian or a Christian Reconstructionist. North identifies the Five Points of Dominion theology: 1) the Absolute Sovereignty of God, 2) Presuppositional Apologetics, 3) Postmillennialism, 4) Theonomy in Christian Ethics, and 5) Covenantalism. Having thoroughly studied their works on these five points, I have no problems with them. Let me describe them briefly.

The Absolute Sovereignty of God

Here, the Dominion theologians have argued for what I consider to be semi-Augustinianism (the orthodoxy embraced by the Early Church), but what they continue to insist is out-right Augustinianism (and Calvinism). The key is in their description of Divine Predestination. They argue against a false dualism pitting the will of man against the will of God (i.e. predestination and free moral agency). Metaphysically (or should I say ontologically?), man's will is dependent upon God's predestination of all things. In other words, man would not be able to make a choice at all were it not for the fact that God created the objects of choice and the power to choose. Thus, predestination and human action run parallel to each other, never against each other. Man is not metaphysically self-dependent, although he may rebel in a moral sense.

I argued for this position in 1982 in an ostensibly Arminian publication. No one seemed to have any problems with it. It was my position that God predestines options which make man's free will possible. If there are no options, there are no choices. Yet man is not sovereign; for he cannot create options autonomously. Man may have the ability to resist the created order, but he cannot overcome it, nor does he have the right. "Free will", in the original meaning, does not mean autonomy.

Where I disagree with the Augustinians is in the area where the Early Church disagreed with them: double election and irresistible grace. The Early Church refused to embrace the latter, and openly condemned the former. Double election teaches that God predestines, particularly, the saved and the damned.

Coupled with the doctrine of irresistible grace, it means that these results come from God's perfect will, not His permissive will. It makes God the author of sin and misery. Reconstructionists have not openly argued for these positions in any of their prominent writings. So, I conclude that it is not necessary to Dominion theology.

The importance of predestination, of course, is the predictability of consequences and the assurance that history will inevitably end up, in its particulars, at the conclusion foreordained by God. No group can exercise dominion, exert influence, or build a civilization without a predestinating God. The Marxists have the State. Humanists have Nature. Christians have the God of the Bible. A predestinating God is a God who is sovereign. The power to create is the power to judge and to destroy. Only a sovereign can claim the right to rule. Every apostasy begins with a compromise of God's sovereignty.

Presuppositional Apologetics

Dominion theologians (DTs) advocate a rigorously Trinitarian philosophy on the order of Van Til's presuppositional apologetics. Philosophically, there is no common ground between Christians and the world. The presupposition of secular philosophy is atheistic. Therefore, it is impossible to begin with secular philosophy - a universe without God - and end up finding the God of the Bible, the ontological Trinity. Atheism begets atheism. Trinitarianism is not attainable by open-minded philosophy. Man always thinks with a bias, because reason, by its very nature, always begins with a presupposition which immediately determines the conclusion. The God of the Bible must be accepted by faith. It can never be proven, for it is a presupposition.

Christianity must begin with the assumption of the Triune Godhead as the basis of all human thought in any academic discipline. If it does not, it will at some point cease to be Christian and end up with atheism. Only Trinitarian Theism begets Trinitarian Theism.

A theological example of this compromise is the Governmental View of the Atonement. The Satisfaction Theory teaches that God consulted His own happiness alone when He determined to make Atonement for sins. According to this Theory, God had to satisfy His sense of retributive justice: the penalty must equal the crime. The Governmental Theory rejects that concept of justice, saying that there is nothing gained in reducing suffering in the universe if the exact equivalence in suffering were merely transferred from one person (the sinner) to another (Christ). God did not have to answer to retributive justice, but to public justice (a symbolic vindication of God's pardon of sin).

Really, both theories are in error for they are not Trinitarian. The Satisfaction Theory depicts a vengeful and tyrannical God. The Governmental View reduces God to a middle level, corporate manager. God must answer to all the moral agents of the universe, including the creatures He has made. In this sense, the idea of Public Justice is a preposterous humanism. A Trinitarian View of the Atonement would depict a Public Justice derived from the ethical sense of the Three Persons of the Trinity. The Trinity satisfied their own sense of justice. It was not a lone decision of the Father, requiring appeasement from the Son. Nor was it God pressed by moral obligation to His creation. It was a satisfaction of public justice, but the "public" was the Holy Trinity.

Because the Governmental View compromised on this essential prerogative of Deity - the right to dispose of creation as He saw fit - it has surrendered already to humanism. The Grotian view gave-way to Socinianism, and Socinianism to Liberalism.

The Governmental View began as a theodicy, a vindication of God's justice. It did not accomplish its intended objective because it accepted common ground with the atheists: a human sense of justice.

Postmillennialism

This is nothing new in American theology. In fact, it is the unique feature of American theology: an eschatology of victory and conquest. It is in line with historic Christianity because it denies that the Kingdom of God will triumph by a cataclysmic end to history, but that it already triumphed by the re-introduction of the Holy Spirit into the lives of men. This fundamental change of reality was made possible by the Atonement. Since previous Papers have addressed the subject of Bible prophecy, I will not discuss it here, except to note: humanists have publicly acknowledged that the resurgence of postmillennialism among evangelicals is the driving force behind the Christian New Right.

Theonomy

Theonomy, meaning "God's law", is a doctrine which asserts that the Old Testament must be incorporated in the process of forming Christian ethics.

The New Testament is primarily concerned with the issues of personal salvation. Alone, it does not provide an adequate base to build a civilization. Unless we are willing to live in a civilization created by sinful men (for example, communism), then we must look to the Old Testament for guidance in social ethics and governmental structures. Liberals have tended to view the entire Bible as archaic and unworthy as a basis for modern civilization. Fundamentalists cling to the New Testament, but view the Old Testament (over two-thirds of the Bible) as outmoded (sometimes barbaric) in the modern setting. Of course, as scholars have shown (e.g. Philip J. Lee), Christianity eventually becomes Gnosticism without the Old Testament.

Dominion theologians have challenged these compromises with the world. They favor a return to the early American tradition of using the entire Bible as a blueprint for all areas of life.

Covenantalism

This is a new development within the Christian Reconstruction movement, and not all branches of the movement accept it. Although all Dominion theologians teach a covenantal view of the Bible, not all see a five-point structure as do the "Tyler branch" (North, Sutton, Jordan)

The five points are the following: 1) Transcendence (Who is in charge?), 2) Hierarchy (To whom do I report?), 3) Stipulations (What are the rules?), 4) Sanctions (What happens if I break the rules?), 5) Succession (Is there a future to this outfit?)

The Covenantal aspect of Dominion theology has given definition to a very, amorphous topic. You cannot perpetuate a doctrine you cannot define. The Puritans, for instance, taught the covenant idea, but could not define the thing itself. Consequently, the doctrine fell out of favor in the rising popularity of dispensationalism. This aspect of Dominion theology promises to re-establish the covenant idea because of its pedagogical value.

Christian Reconstructionists represent a new advance in Christian theology. They signal a new stage in the Protestant Reformation. Separatism embraces Dominion theology, because it is orthodox and it is a branch of the Protestant Reformation. All the above doctrines were believed and taught by American theologians through the 19th century, with the exception of Van Tillian apologetics. Van Til's Trinitarian philosophy has served as a milestone in the quest of purging pagan thought out of Christian doctrine. Reconstructionists have taken Van Til's system and used it like a search light in other areas of doctrine. Dominion theology has been the result. And there is much more to come.

Theological Trojan Horses

The two doctrines which are rising in influence among Christian Reconstructionists, yet which are not integral to Dominion theology and yet are objectionable to Separatists are these: the resurrection of Calvin's view of social order, and Calvin's doctrine on the immortality of the soul.

Before proceeding to explain these issues of debate, let me point out that Calvin is not the originator of these doctrines. Both of them were inherited from medieval Catholicism. To a large degree Calvin was not so much a Protestant as he was a "Reformed Catholic". The reason I single him out is because he was the channel through which two pagan doctrines received from the Roman Catholics, entered Protestant theology.

First, the authoritarianism of the Roman Emperors which was carried over into the bishoprics of the early Catholic Church established a pagan view of government among Christians. This idea said that rulers in church and state were ordained by God, and that their rule was the extension of God's rule. Unlike Wycliffe's view of authority, which saw it as a line directly from God to the people, who in turn delegated, but never surrendered, their authority to temporal rulers, this view of government created an independent class of rulers accountable only to their peers (other rulers) and to God.

I will distinguish these two systems of social order by calling the one "Ruler's Law" and the other "People's Law".

Although Calvin did not approve of popes, bishops, or kings, he did adopt this authoritarian system. Calvin's system was decentralized (presbyterian), but it still created a class of rulers in distinction from the ruled. Calvin's unique contribution to the Protestant cause was his defense of a theocratic order mediated by an ordained clergy and magistracy.

This system was established in Puritan New England, but it was soon abandoned because it created a stagnant society. While Calvin's legacy in America has many positive features, in its essential character, American social order resulted from the rejection of Calvinism, not by its adoption.

Wycliffe's Anglo-American Protestantism is responsible for American civilization. But this is not altogether good. For Wycliffe's system tended toward an individualistic society based upon voluntarism. We see this strongly in America's greatest theologian - Jonathan Edwards. In a sense, Separatism has no social order. Historically, it has vascillated between Anabaptist/libertarian concepts and Presbyterian/republican ones. In good times, the extended family provided the social structure to society. And astute American thinkers have recognized the importance of the family. But because Americans have been unwilling to pursue a Biblical familism, modeled after the Hebrew patriarchies of the Old Testament, American society has drifted into a dualism between individuals and the state, with the state winning in the long-run because of its collective power.

The other of Calvin's doctrines which has plagued evangelical theology and which has had cancerous effect upon Anglo-American civilization, has been his defense of the immortality of the soul. That Popish doctrine, condemned by Luther and Tyndale (a theological heir of Wycliffe), was smuggled into Protestantism through Calvin's book, Psychopania ("soul-sleep"). Permit me to quote Rushdoony at length for us to see how the Reconstructionists have handled this issue:

"Another example of speculative theology is the argument about the birth of the soul, an argument which comes down to us from the early church. How is the soul of the baby in the mother's womb brought into being? First, the Pre-existents held that, at the beginning of creation, God created the souls of all men, which are only united to bodies at the time of their conception or birth. Justin Martyr and Origen espoused this doctrine, which was later condemned in A.D. 540 by the Council of Constantinople. Its pagan origin was obvious, and its condemnation deserved. The poet William Wordsworth, in his ode, 'Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood', espoused it, as did other Romantics.

"Second, the Creationists insisted that every rational soul is from God by an immediate act of creation. Pelagius and others adopted this view, because it separated the soul of man from the fall of Adam and left only the body as an heir to the fall. As a result, while seemingly exalting

the creative power of God, this view actually exalted man and made him innocent and capable of self-salvation. In modern philosophy, Leibniz had creationist ideas.

"Third, Traducianism held that both soul and body were generated by the parents through the normal process of sexual reproduction. The Augustinians; Lutherans, and Calvinists have been Traducianists in the main and have given the doctrine the flavor of orthodoxy. Clearly, Traducianism does not have the glaring defects of the other two positions, but this is not enough to give it a clean bill of health.

"The argument about the generation of the soul rests, first, on presumption. Man professes to know the details of God's creative method and speaks with confidence about the mind of God when he cannot express his own will and mind with clarity or certainty. The argument is illegitimate and presumptuous.

"Second, the argument rests on an alien religion, Hellenism, and its view of mind and body as two separate and alien substances. Traducianism comes closer to bringing them together, but it has not challenged the premise of the argument, the presupposition of two differing substances. The difference in being for Scripture is not between mind and body, or soul and matter, idea and form, but between the uncreated being of God and all created being. . . "

- The Necessity for Systematic Theology (p.14)

Rushdoony might have substituted the word "Hellenism" for "Platonism" or "Gnosticism", for the adoption of Creationism by the early church constituted a compromise between the Gnostic fathers (Origen) and anti-Gnostic fathers (Tertullian). The result was the acceptance of pagan thought into Christian doctrine, which has been a leaven leavening the whole lump of the Christian witness ever since.

Notice also in the final paragraph how Rushdoony identifies the spirit/body dualism in Christian doctrine with the pagan Greek dualism between the mind and matter. They are the same error in different contexts. Rushdoony discusses directly the "immortality of the soul" question in his book on the Creeds and Councils of the Early Church, The Foundations of Social Order, which I cite, again at length:

"For the pagans, life was haunted by an eternal recurrence, by change and decay in an unending and meaningless cycle. For them, the horror of flesh was its inevitable decay. Flesh was thus a kind of trap for humanity. Very early Greek thought also turned to the transmigration of souls, as with Pythagorus. It was held, by some, "that, on account of this, they

should even abstain from eating animal food? May any one have the persuasion that he should abstain, lest by chance in his beef he eats of some ancestor of his?" All these absurd opinions are given intellectual respectability, "But if a Christian promises the return of a man from a man, and the very actual Gaius from Gaius, the cry of the people will be to have him stoned; they will not even so much as grant him a hearing." [quoting Tertullian]

"This point is a significant one: the world of antiquity, committed to humanism, tolerated any absurdity concerning the future life but rejected, without a hearing often, or with demands that the preacher be killed, the doctrine of the resurrection. The answer is obvious. Every one of these other beliefs, i.e., the immortality of the soul, reincarnation or transmigration, etc., all affirmed the basic divinity of man and his self-salvation. The Biblical doctrine made man a creature and God sovereign. It placed man's total life under a total God, and this was and is the offense of the doctrine of the resurrection. The immortality of the soul, in its every form, is a doctrine which makes man his own god and savior; it gives man an 'open' universe, i.e., free from God, which is man's to explore in time and eternity. [emphasis mine] p. 205-206

"This is the Christian faith, the resurrection. Pagan antiquity, as well as 'primitive' cultures, hold to a belief in a supernatural, immortal soul. Whether in its Hellenic form, or as animism, this view is alien to the Biblical perspective. 'Immortality' is ascribed in Scripture to God alone [1 Timothy 6:16 cf. 1:17]. . . , and when the word is applied to man, in 1 Corinthians 15:53,54, it is not declared to be a natural condition of man but a miracle of grace . . . Immortality is seen by Paul not as a condition of man but as an aspect of Christ's grace to the sanctified (Romans 2:6,7). . . The Hellenic perspective saw the soul as immortal, basically divine, and in essence under restraint because of its mixture with the earth of the body. In neo-platonism, this body was viewed as the prison of the soul, which the soul had a positive duty to renounce and transcend. Whenever and whatever the soul is seen as of another substance than the body, then contempt of the body is inevitable. The body, as of lower substance, is a baser element, and the soul either actually or potentially divine. But, this perspective, which has extensively polluted the church, and influenced many of the church fathers, Tertullian included, is not Biblical. It is hostile to a respect for the body, although conducive to license. Greek culture was congenial to license but hostile to a true materialism."

p. 210-211

Evidence of this infection is widespread. One obvious example is the evangelical position on the state of the dead, which believes that the body is lifeless

because the soul (or spirit for trichotomists) has departed for a conscious existence in heaven or hell. It is this doctrine which has allowed this Gnostic dualism to live on in the Church. And the consequences are manifold. First is the obvious asceticism and monastic lifestyle. Second is the contempt for sex and its purpose. Since sex and reproduction are acts of the flesh, then it is evil by nature. Consequently, men either abstain from it altogether, or they indulge in it perversely as a denial of its legitimacy. Third, it leads to either a contempt or a romantic view of women. Either men avoid them because association with them involves sex, or they adore them as the "purer" sex, and untouched by the baser emotions of lust, wrath, and greed which men are so susceptible to.

It also gives rise to feminism. Women hold men in contempt for their sexual ardor. They hate men who love them for their bodies. In the Hellenic dialectic, they want to be admired and loved for their intellect - that is, their ability to think abstractly like a man, not as a woman. This is supposedly a more "spiritual", "meaningful" (read that "Platonic") relationship.

Furthermore, this doctrine has led to a depreciation of a man's seed (semen), being viewed as non-life, since it is held that life begins at conception when it is endowed with a spirit. This has allowed the sins of uncleanness to abound in the church. Gnostic arguments have been used to discourage these sins ("lust is sinful - the desire for pleasure is evil"), but a Stoic abstinence has never been the answer to the human condition.

The Gnostic doctrine of immortality still has negative effects on evangelical doctrine. The false division between flesh and spirit has led to a division between Hebrew Scriptures (carnal) and Greek Scriptures (spiritual). This false dualism has also led to a neglect of Biblical law (an Old Testament concern), since the spirit is detached from the earth. The land is of no consequence, in this system, to our spiritual existence. This neglect of Biblical terranomics has given rise to Marxism, socialism, corporate capitalism, feudalism, and many other oppressive, man-made systems of terranomics.

It also leads to a contempt for the earth and for mundane labor, since it involves the world of flesh and matter. Yet as a reaction, as in Marxism, it can lead to a glorification of labor, or the veneration of nature (as in animism). The list can go on and on. Only a Biblical faith and a Biblical theology can avoid these extremes.

Having read virtually all of Rushdoony's published works, I think it is fair to say that Rushdoony is not a Calvinist in those areas which make Calvinism distinct in Protestant theology. Rather, he is orthodox, and I am tempted at times to classify him under Wycliffe's branch of the Reformation. But Rushdoony is not consistent. While he does not pursue the extremes of the Tyler branch of Reconstructionism (which has not dealt with this issue and positively endorses an authoritarian, albeit decentralized, society), he has not met head-on the Gnostic threat among Protestants. The previous quotes come from a few pages in two of his least read books. He addresses the problem of Platonism repeatedly in his other works, but he never challenges its evangelical expression in the doctrine of immortality, the origin of the individual soul, or the state of the dead. And for that reason, I believe that Dominion theology will soon follow the demise of Separatism and evangelical theology in general.

Signs of this fact are already beginning to appear. Gary North likes Bill Gothard's "chain of command" theology, a consistent Catholicism not seen since the days of Cyprian. He also rejects the Jubilee and Biblical landlaw, believing it to be typology fulfilled in the New Covenant. He accepts artificial contraception. Rushdoony refuses to condemn it. James Jordan favors a romantic view of marriage, and embraces a moralism on sex and marriage (as do the rest of the Tyler group) along the lines of Phyllis Schlafly's (a Roman Catholic) anti-feminist group Eagle Forum.

The Tyler group also prefers the conjugal family over the extended family group (favored by Rushdoony), replacing it with the local church. Rushdoony rebukes this drift toward clericalism, but is powerless to stop it.

As for the present state of the Christian Reconstructionist movement, it is nearing its peak, theologically. With the publishing of Jordan's book on the Ceremonial laws of the Bible and North's commentary on Exodus, we will finally get to see what a Biblical society would look like according to Reconstructionist interpretations. But as things appear to be going now, I expect it to be a curious blend of Puritanism in the social realm and Libertarianism in the economic realm.

The Anglo-American branch of Protestantism (Wycliffe) in general, and Separatism in particular, find their completion, not in humanism and individualism, but in familism. That is the direction we must go. Only the extended family group, patterned after the patriarchal system of the ancient Hebrew theocracy, can provide a truly Biblical social structure to society. Theologically, it must embrace the essential points of Dominion theology, but abstain from Calvinism; for Calvinism has been the channel through which Catholicism, and ultimately Gnosticism, has entered Protestant theology.

TERRANOMICS: A SEPARATIST MANIFESTO

(Notes & Outline)

We begin this essay by pointing out that Separatism is not so much a theology as it is a doctrine of social order. Of course, it has a theology - the evangelical orthodoxy of the Early Church. And Separatists have tended to eclectically borrow from other theological systems to teach Christian doctrine. An example can be found in the New School theology of New England (Edwards through Park). It was a sophisticated blend of Arminian and Calvinist theologies, a very irenic theology. Separatists have excelled in pedagogy.

However, the doctrine of social order is what, perhaps, distinguishes Separatism from the other branches of Protestantism. Its doctrine emphasizes the individual as opposed to the institution, and voluntary action as opposed to coercion. Separatism unequivocally recognizes the right to dissent and the freedom of conscience.

The individualism of American society, of which some Reconstructionists complain of and blame on the Baptist tradition, is really mistaken for Separatism. It is the middle-ground between the collectivism of our Puritan heritage and the individualism of the Baptist legacy. We have not had anarchy in the United States, but rather self-government under the authority of the Holy Scriptures (at least in the beginning). Between the extremes of Presbyterian and Baptist polity is Congregationalism. Between an aristocracy and democracy is a republic of townships (localism). Between corporate monopolism and the laborer is the family enterprise. Between the rich and the poor is the great middle class.

The collective aspect and the individual aspect of society are not invalid. Nor are they contradictory to each other. Reality is the ontological Trinity, both unity and diversity - collective and individualistic. The weakness of any theory of social order is an inability to balance these two aspects in

equilibrium. A rational mind is not capable of it. Nor does nature provide a sufficient guide. Man needs Divine Revelation to build a civilization. He needs the Bible, the whole Bible.

Historically, Separatism has defended the individual person in face of an ever-encroaching state. Individual liberty, as opposed to state-approved activities or organizations, has been the conviction of dissenters. But a civilization cannot be built upon the solitary person. There must be a unifying factor to society. Traditionally, Separatists have argued that the Scriptures and voluntary associations are sufficient. Here has been their weakness. Society requires an organizing principle which has an external, as well as an internal, compelling principle. If it be not the state, then what is it? As I have pointed out elsewhere, it was the family unit which filled the vacuum in American social theory. The family provided the organic thread to social unity. It alone had Divine sanction to exert coercion among its members; and it alone had the power to confer legitimacy to the enforcement of justice in society at large. Not all men will submit to the Scriptures; in a posture of self-defense, they must be dealt with coercively.

Unfortunately, Americans did not grasp the Biblical concept of the family. Instead, they inherited a mixture of romantic, pagan, and Catholic views of marriage and family life. The family, tied to the land, and from it, extending itself into civil government, was not pursued with any philosophical clarity. Also, the mobility of the population, while it did provide a homestead for every family that wanted one, also tended to fragment it. A bias against the extended family group set in very early. The result was a society consisting of conjugal family units, units not large enough to provide institutional clout in society. Thus, the state gradually took over duties once fulfilled by the larger family group. The result has been our atomistic society where the average household size is now 1.8.

The above statistic demonstrates the absurdity of family life in America. We are a nation of Lone Rangers. And if we have any needs we cannot meet ourselves, we turn to our fraternities, churches, or more frequently, the state.

My thesis states that a truly Biblical society is one in which the organizing institution is the extended family group patterned after the patriarchies of the Hebrew republic. These families are tied, by Divine allotment, to a family estate which is inalienable. The failure of the Church and of Americans to understand a doctrine of Biblical terranomics (landlaw) has produced a transient family unit. Although efforts were made in this area, from Wycliffe through Thomas Jefferson, they were obviously insufficient. This is largely due to the fact that they were reactions against the perceived injustices of their day, than any systematic development of Biblical teaching on this subject.

A lack of terranomics is the reason why we have an inadequate doctrine of the family and society. A deficient terranomics is why every doctrine of social order in the past has failed. And as a Separatist, conscious of my theological heritage, I offer to you this corrective opinion.

OUTLINE & NOTES

I. The Land and the Dominion Covenant:

The Land is the thing which is given in covenant (Genesis 1:28; Genesis 15, etc.). The land is the source of life this side of eternity ("For dust thou art"). A Covenant theology which neglects the inheritance and management of the land is impossible. A kingdom without a domain is impossible by definition.

"The two basic areas of dominion are in the family and in relation to the earth; man's duty here is binding on all men." (Rushdoony, Institutes of Biblical Law, p. 489)

"Land is a sign of the covenant. . ." (Institutes, Vol. II, p. 322)

Psalms 105 (especially v. 10-11)

II. The Land and the Redemption Covenant:

The earth (i.e. all life emanating from soil) is reclaimed in the Atonement (Colossians 1:15-21; Romans 8:18-24, etc.).

Atonement is made for the land; the land is redeemed (bought back) and the inhabitants come with it. Old Testament type: the story of Ruth. The kinsman-redeemer (Boaz) purchases the estate of the deceased; and is required to marry the widow of the estate (Ruth). Christ purchases the earth and marries the bride of the deceased Adam - the Church.

A. Satan tempts the Hebrews with an easy inheritance of the land - intermarriage with the false bride (Genesis 34:9)

- B. "Ba'al" in the Hebrew is translated "master", "marry", and "owner". It is not the same word for the idol "Baal", which has a different pronunciation.
- C. Isaiah 62:4-5 (7) teach that God is "ba'aled" to the land He chooses. God is married to the earth.
- D. Revelation 21:9-21 (12,000 furlongs X 1/8 mile = 1500² or about the size of the world known at that time). John was saying that the whole inhabited earth was the New Jerusalem, the Bride of Christ.
- E. Ephesians 5:22-23 says that the Church is the Bride of Christ.

We may deduce, from the above evidence, that the Church will not be completed or perfected until it takes possession of "terra firma" - the land of the earth. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth". (Beatitudes). Mark 10:29-30 promise that Christians will inherit lands. Christians are called to take possession of the earth and bring it under the rule of Jesus Christ. We are to "occupy" until He comes. Christ meant an "occupation" in the military sense of the word.

This explains why the Church must be identified with the family and not the institution. The clergy are not called to inherit the earth and temporal power. Such an interpretation would result in an oligarchy. The church is not, as an institution, the recipient of the Cultural Mandate. The family is. To equate the institutional church with the Kingdom of God results in communism and a "free love" philosophy.

III. Terranomics and the Appeals Process:

The problem of early Christendom was the settling of disputes without corporal presence of Christ. Post-Apostolic era. The result was tyranny and perpetual warfare between petty rulers. The Papacy intervened and declared itself the infallible voice of God on earth. It was the final court of appeals to settle disputes among the mighty. An ecclesiocracy was the result. One form of tyranny and source of conflict was traded for another.

Rushdoony says there is no final solution. I disagree. I believe the Bible teaches the "casting of lots" by invoking the name of God as the final court of appeals. "Lots" requires a total reliance upon the sovereignty of God. One of the Apostles was chosen by this method (Acts 1). Other supporting passages include Proverbs 16:33 and 18:18. Urim & Thummim (Lights & Perfections) were lots cast by priests into the priestly ephod (breastplate).

For those who believe this method of Divine arbitration has passed away must do so from either deistic or dispensational arguments. If prophecy and providence are valid forms of Divine illumination, so are the casting of lots. By deistic arguments, I refer to the notion that the Bible and human reason are all that is necessary to determine the will of God in a particular situation. By dispensational ones, I refer to the belief that the days of providence and miracles are over.

IV. Anglo-American Terranomics:

Wycliffe preached against a propertied church and taught against the feudal system. The English peasants revolted against the government, hoping to restore their rights to the land enjoyed by them prior to the Norman invasion of 1066 AD. Ancient, Anglo-Saxon land tenure was organized in a manner similar to the ancient Israelites. The Pilgrims brought some of these beliefs to America and set-up a democracy of free-holders. The Founding Fathers differed in the reform of land law. Hamilton favored an industrial society divided into workers and an aristocracy of money interests. Jefferson favored an agrarian society of philosopher citizens who were freeholders. The Hamiltonian system has prevailed.

V. Bi-Polar Structure of Society:

See Restoring the Foundations Part IX. Biblical terranomics assures a balance between the power of city and country, keeping them separate and self-dependent social structures. Urban values and rural values tend to counter-balance each other.

VI. The Parish Principle:

The subdivisions of the Kingdom of God should have territorial integrity. The valid basis of the parish grows from property rights. A land owner has the right and duty to determine the religion which should be practiced on his land. He should covenant with other land owners of like faith to extend their religion into the public sphere. But the jurisdiction of that religion, both in terms of faith and law, is co-extensive only with the estates of the covenanters. This was the case of Plymouth Colony.

What happens should a landowner be forced to sell his land to an outsider, one who does not adhere to his faith? Will not such a sale destroy the continuity of that parish? Yes. But surrounding landowners could redeem the land and thus preserve the parish.

If they do not redeem it, either they really do not believe in their faith enough to defend its territorial jurisdiction, or else God has judged them for having a false religion. That judgment, as it always has been, takes the form of dispossession out of the land.

VII. Post New Testament Age & Social Order:

The Preterist View of eschatology, which I believe is the true one, teaches that most of Bible prophecy was fulfilled during the 40-year period between Christ's ministry and the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD. The old order of the Old Adamic Creation was definitively replaced by the new order of the New Adamic Creation. Many of the New Testament prophecies concerning the resurrection, for instance, were fulfilled then. (The Apostles spoke of it as near at hand for them - 1 Corinthians 15:50-54; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18, etc.). Although a physical resurrection will not occur until the "last day", a spiritual resurrection of the saints has occurred already. They no longer sleep in the dust, but their spirits revive and ascend into heaven.

The "end" (telos and suntelos) which brought about Jerusalem's destruction (Matthew 24:3, 13-14; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:9; 1 Peter 4:7) is the same as "perfect" (teleios) of 1 Corinthians 13:10. The Age of Perfection has come definitively, although not as a practical reality to all in its completion. Consequently, the New Covenant era did not begin until after 70 AD, which explains why the Apostles and the early saints still worshipped at the Temple. That era faded away (Hebrews 8:13) and was replaced by the Melchizedekal priesthood of Jesus Christ.

The Apostolic era must be regarded as a transitional period. In a sense, they were still a part of the Old Covenant, and their writings a part of the Old Testament. Apostolic authority was codified into the Greek Scriptures, thus completing the foundation of the Kingdom of God in this world - Prophets (Old Testament) and Apostles (New Testament) (Ephesians 2:20).

In terms of social order, the source of authority is no longer a chain of command, but a direct link from God to the Redeemed. The Overseeing ministry and the diaconate went out with the Apostles. The Kingdom of God finds its organizational manifestation in the redeemed family.

The man is priest, prophet, and king to his own household; and he needs no covering of authority on his head except Christ (1 Corinthians 11).