

***BIBLICAL TERRANOMICS***  
***ESSAYS IN CHRISTIAN DOMINION***

**DECEMBER, 1999**  
**NO. 24**

**CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION:  
WHICH PARADIGM?**

by James Wesley Stivers

**CHAPTER HEADINGS**

**WHAT IS CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION?**  
**WHY AM I A RECONSTRUCTIONIST?**  
**REVIVALISM & THE CHARISMATICS**  
**FINNEY'S FAILURE**  
**WHERE IS ORIGINAL DESIGN?**  
**IS CHRIST THE STANDARD?**  
**THE CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTIONISTS**  
**GOTHARDISM**  
**BRITISH ISRAELISM**  
**THE NEW FEUDALISM**  
**CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION: A DEAD END**  
**RECONSTRUCTIONISM & THE CELTIC SOUTH**  
**WYCLIFFE**  
**FAMILY VALUES**  
**THE JAMESIAN MODEL**

*To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*

- Isaiah 8:20

*And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.*

- Ezekiel 36:27

*Now these are the judgments which thou shalt set before them. . .*

- Exodus 21:1

*Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, just and good. . . For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.*

- Romans 7:12 & 14

*I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him*

- Ezekiel 21:27

*But the judgment shall sit . . . And . . . the kingdom shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High. . .*

- Daniel 7:26-27

## INTRODUCTION

Video games fascinate me. I do not play them, but my young sons do. I am fascinated by their teleology: their design for repetition, progression, and consummation.

History is much like a video game. The course is predestined. Failure requires starting over. Learning from past mistakes becomes imperative to success. Memory is important and repetition becomes the key to remembering past failures. Progression through the course is based upon the ability to remember past mistakes and avoid them.

Progression, however, is complicated by the fact that each repetition is slightly different. It is different because the player changes - free will. Consequently, success and consummation are predicated upon the ability of the player to understand himself, as well as the course of the game. He must change to conform to reality.

The Law of God is reality. Its sanctions are real and do not change. Men cannot suspend obedience, thinking that the Law is outdated. God enforces it, although that may occur over the period of many lifetimes. When men are ignorant of history, it becomes easy to forget the causal link between disobedience and judgment.

Intergenerational instruction is critical. Success and consummation in history is predicated upon the ability of one generation to identify and evaluate its own successes and failures, and then to pass that information on to the next generation. Failure to do so dooms the new generation to repeat the same mistakes.

In the history of mankind, there have been many movements promoting the Law of God. These movements have argued with each other over what the Law says and what it means. Most of the time, these respective movements favor some of God's laws and not others. So, they devise methods of interpretation (hermeneutics) to sort out the ones they like from the ones they don't like.

This essay is about such movements - what I call "theonomic movements" - and particularly those of our own time. My purpose is simple: to identify the hermeneutical principles these movements use to negate the laws they do not like. You might say that I am a purist for Biblical law. Yes, I am. But why? Because I believe that Paradise will not come until humanity is finally willing to trust and obey God's revealed will. I don't have an ax to grind. I am not trying to promote myself or someone's movement. I am just tired of the grind of history repeating itself. I am frustrated to watch my generation make the same mistakes of the past.

Christianity has had 2000 years to change the world. The Protestant Reformation has had 500 years to do it. Why have they failed? They have failed because they have been disobedient. They are disobedient today.

One of their favorite lines to justify their disobedience is this one: "God does not want us to change the world." These people are the stewards who bury their talent (Matthew 25:24-28). They won't do well on Judgment Day.

Now, I am a Christian, of course, and Christians make one major exception to Biblical law which distinguishes them from Jews. They do not believe in the ceremonial laws. They believe that everything which pertains to circumcision, the priesthood, atonement for sin, and so on, has been fulfilled and is being fulfilled by Christ in Heaven. There is nothing in the ritual laws which we are to obey today.

Jews think Christians are antinomians for this reason. But if they stopped to think about it, Christians really do not believe the ceremonial laws have been done away. They are still in force. But there is only one person who is qualified to fulfill the true meaning of these laws, both in the spirit and letter, and that is Jesus Christ.

We celebrate the Feasts of Israel, for example, but not in the same way as do the Jews. We celebrate a New Passover. It is not centered around the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, but the deliverance from sin through the Atonement of Christ. We celebrate a New Pentecost, not merely the giving of the law, but the writing of it upon our hearts through the Holy Spirit. We celebrate a New Tabernacles in Thanksgiving, not just the harvest of fruits in the Land of Promise, but the fruitfulness of our regenerate bodies (see *BT22*).

Are these celebrations a part of Moral Law?

Among Christians, a debate centers around the boundaries between ceremonial law and moral law. Christians believe in moral law, and they generally regard the Ten Commandments as the accurate codification of it. Unfortunately, we find ritual aspects to the Ten Commandments. The 4th Commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" is an example. People have been killed over the enforcement of this Commandment.

Civil law in the Bible, with its enforcement, is the other area of debate. The last half of the Decalogue is civil in nature. Adultery is forbidden, but we have no definition of what adultery is unless we look to the civil laws (i.e. the judgments). Without the judgments, the Ten Commandments have no real meaning.

Some say that Christ gave us a higher law. He said, for instance, that lust was adultery in the heart. We are told that the Old Testament was not concerned with the heart, only with actions. So Christ's law is higher because it deals with motives.

What does the 10th Commandment have to do with, if not motives? "Thou shalt not covet". The Apostle Paul used the term "lust" in the place of "covet" (Romans 7:7). Lusting is coveting. If a man lusts for another man's wife, is that not coveting? Coveting is breaking the Ten Commandments.

There is nothing new, here. Christ was ratifying Old Testament law in contradistinction from people, like the Pharisees, who picked and chose what laws they wanted to keep.

The application of the Law is no small task. It is the work of the mature (Hebrews 5), not of the novice. **Obviously, people who think Christ has set aside the Law because He has put something better in its place are immature by Biblical standards. They cannot be trusted**

**with the interpretation of Scripture, with leadership in the Church, or with the care of Christian civilization. Always remember, do not trust them. They are not competent.**

Who has the authority to speak God's judgment upon the sins of men, to interpret the law of God, to apply it, and enforce it? A civil society is not possible without someone in charge. That is another hotly debated issue.

Many believe that Christians have no business in the exercise of temporal power. Yet, what is the purpose of ethics? It is the guidance we receive in living-out our daily lives. What is the sum of our lives on this earth, if not the exercise of temporal power? We go to work, guide our families, obey the laws, and so on. By doing such things, we have already cast a vote for a kind of social order. People who think like this are confused and useless in dealing with the larger questions of civilization.

The Kingdom of God is not a democracy. It is a monarchy. Democracy is worse than mob rule; it is an open rebellion against Christian civilization.

When Jesus left this world, He did not leave the disciples to fend for themselves. He did not leave a governmental void. He left behind a Messianic government. He left behind a doctrine of succession. He left behind a law and a covenant. We have all that we need to manifest the Kingdom of God in this world. We can know God's will and practice it.

### **WHAT IS CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION?**

Christian Reconstruction - a term few in the Christian world have heard of before and a doctrine which most of them will not believe in, even if it were explained to them. What motivates most Christians is a simple, three-part plan: have a good life, save a few souls, and make it to Heaven. That's it. They do not believe their mission extends beyond that. The Kingdom of God is only about the hereafter. Nothing else really matters.

Is this mentality supportable in the Scriptures? I do not think so. Although, I discuss it at length in *Biblical Terranomics #22*, let me quote Justin Martyr, from the 2nd Century Church, on this point and then summarize my views:

*If you meet some who say that their souls go to heaven when they die, do not believe they are Christians.*

- *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, v. 1, p. 241 (Alexander edition)

If Heaven is not the goal for the Christian, then what is? Simple. **The fulfillment of our created design.** We need to ask, "What was our original design? What were we originally made to do?"

Man's created design was to live on this earth according to a certain pattern for individual and social conduct. He was not designed to live in Heaven. He was made to glorify God on Earth by making it into a Paradise like Heaven. That is what the Lord's Prayer is all about, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven". That is what happens at the end of Revelation: Heaven comes down to Earth and God dwells with men.

Salvation does not have to do with our eternal destinies, directly, but with a deliverance from sin and restoring us to a right relationship with God and man. Jesus came to save His people, not from Hell, not from the devil, but from their sins (Matthew 1:21). What is sin? "The transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4). The wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23). Eternal life is the *result* of salvation. It is not salvation in itself. Hell is not the enemy. Sin is.

Biblical law is important on this point, because it teaches us what kind of conduct and social arrangements our Creator expects from us. Most of the Christian world have rejected Biblical law, or to use the Reconstructionist term, "theonomy" (*theos* - God, *nomia* - law). Some groups have even gone so far as to say that Biblical law is primitive, immoral, and barbaric (e.g. capital punishment, slavery, polygamy, etc.). Others just say it is the work of an evil god.

### WHY AM I A RECONSTRUCTIONIST?

I have mentioned this before, but I want to say it again in this context. I became a Christian Reconstructionist in 1968 at the age of 9. I had just finished reading "The Last Call", by Jack Chick, a comic book version of Charles Finney's **Revival Lectures** for the third time. I became convinced that it was possible to fulfill the Great Commission: to see the triumph of the Gospel, not just in the world on an individual basis, but to see the world change in a societal sense. I had never heard of "Christian Reconstruction"; the term did not even exist then. But I believed in it.

Operating within a Revivalist model for Reconstruction, I became a boy preacher in the little Pentecostal denomination I belonged to at the time. I started a Bible club at my Junior High School. I wanted to change the world. I wanted to see a revival among my classmates.

I preached my first sermon at age 13. But it was in a little, black Pentecostal church in southern, Missouri where I learned to preach hard like a Southern preacher. Those people had church every night. They were enthusiastic coaches. From them, I learned how to work a meeting. Although I have mellowed over the years, every once in a while, the flame flickers.

When I was 15, I preached my first sermon on the Law of God. I argued for the abiding validity of the Mosaic Law. I still have my sermon notes. After I read R.J. Rushdoony's *Institutes of Biblical Law* in 1978, I looked at my notes and realized why I loved his massive study: I was already a theonomist.

I was surprised to learn, however, that the Reconstructionists came from the Presbyterian and Reformed movement. I had always thought Calvinists were antinomians. Funny thing, they thought Arminians and revivalists were the antinomians. I wondered why.

Arminians claim that Calvinists are antinomians because they teach man's inability to keep the moral law. Did you get that? Let me put it another way. Because Calvinists do not believe in man's free will, they don't believe that man is able to obey God's commandments. So why bother trying? Arminians claim that viewpoint leads to antinomianism.

Now, the Calvinists claim the Arminians are antinomians because they teach that man's free will nullifies God's sovereignty, at least in matters of salvation. Meaning this: if man can choose his destiny, then he doesn't really need God. If he doesn't need God, then God is not sovereign. If God is not sovereign, then neither is His law.

With all of their talk about the moral law, you would think Arminians and Calvinists to be scrupulous theonomists. The irony is that most of them are not theonomic. They are simply partisans for their respective theological camps. Accusing one another of "antinomianism" is just an acceptable form of name calling. It's not effective anymore, of course, because no modernist wants to be caught defending Biblical law. "Cult" has become the new pejorative nomenclature. But for our arcane circles, "antinomian" still stings.

A recent example of this finger pointing was a conference on Celtic Christianity sponsored by a prominent Reformed minister who is often regarded as a Reconstructionist leader [Now there's an irony for you. Celtic Christianity is Pelagian. Here was a Calvinist promoting it!]. He blamed Charles Finney for the antinomianism among Evangelicals, and of course, the consequent humanism. I knew he spoke from ignorance. Calvinists never read Finney. They rely upon partisan polemics, such as B. B. Warfield's *Perfectionism*, a painfully biased and disjointed critique of Finney's theology.

Had this speaker read the first page of Finney's *Revival Lectures*, he would have known that Finney was no antinomian. Finney defined revival as simply "**a renewed obedience to God**". It was that sentence which I read, at age 17, which convinced me for all time that theonomy was the way to Christian victory.

Later generations of Arminian revivalists, as ignorant of Finney's theology as the Calvinists have been, wrapped their dubious crusades in the mantle of Finney. They have done so because they have confused the *effects* of revival with the *cause*. **It is obedience which produces the blessings of revival.** Like the Pharisees of old, Arminian-leaning Evangelicals and Fundamentalists (which rely upon a religion centered around the revival preacher), engage in feats of asceticism, like fasting, to reverse the effects of covenant breaking. These may produce temporary revivals. But Finney always taught that if, during a revival, the Church refuses to deal with known disobedience to the Law of God, the revival will stop.

At Oberlin College, Finney taught the Moral Government of God. He also taught that the moral law was contained in Old Testament law. He used Old Testament law to condemn the money-credit system, Southern slavery (the Fugitive Slave laws in particular), intemperance, Sabbath-breaking and so on.

In our generation, the revival of Moral Government Reconstructionism occurred under the ministries of Gordon C. Olson and Harry Conn during the 1960s and 1970s. Olson was a seminal writer and Conn a world-traveling lecturer. It was Olson's works which restored the term "moral law" to the Evangelical lexicon. "A right relationship with God" was another phrase which was added to common vernacular.

These men heavily influenced the early recruits of Youth With A Mission (Y-WAM), a spin-off charismatic organization, and Bethany Publishing House, which republished most of Finney's works. The movement crested ideologically at the short-lived Minneapolis School of Theology and as a spiritual movement with the ministry of the musician-evangelist, Keith Green. Since the mid-80s, it has ceased to be a trend-setting movement. Instead, it follows the general direction of conservative evangelicalism.

## REVIVALISM & THE CHARISMATICS

Later generations of revivalists, such as the Charismatics, have focused on psychological techniques to achieve spiritual fulfillment, music in particular. One of the reasons I failed in the ministry was because I stopped preaching like a Southern preacher and refused to use music to produce a revival "atmosphere", even though I could have: I am a gifted musician and vocalist and come from a family gifted in music.

Music is a form of mass hypnosis. So is the cadence of an evangelistic sermon. Psychiatrists and professional hypnotists can tell you the exact mechanisms used in a revival crusade to achieve the physiological changes which induce conversion. It is not the Spirit of God. Revivals produced in this manner do not result in obedience. They produce enthusiasm. When the enthusiasm fades, the convert looks for something else to get a rush. It works like a drug. Sure, maybe your music has great lyrics. But it gets lost in the sound and rhythm. The people are not responding to a conscious understanding of truth. They are responding to subconscious stimuli. That is why they forgot your sermon, Reverend, as soon as they walked out the door. They were hearers of the Word; but they were not doers of the Word. There was no one there to discipline them in the Word. (Now, you know why I believe in father priests and home churches. And you now know why I have turned to Psalm singing.)

Most American churches use this drug to keep things going. The necessary dosage is different for different groups. Charismatics need it all the time. Well-creased Presbyterians need it once in a while, maybe at the next city-wide crusade.

Church, for these people, is group therapy. Revivals are meant to "fill a need". I have often been told by Christian friends how a great revival is sweeping through their church. Usually, they have confused revival with the excitement about their church. Maybe, the church across town had a split and some of the members started coming to their church. Or perhaps, they enjoy the pastor's moving sermons. But all of this is beside the point. The question I put to such enthusiasts is not what it takes to start a revival. That is a simple equation. My question is "why do revivals stop?" People can never answer that question. And they are not interested in answering that question, either. Revivals in their theological paradigm cannot continue. Otherwise the world might get converted and we would have a Paradise. That is not supposed to happen until after the Second Coming.

Because Finney was a postmillennialist, he taught an "eschatology of victory", as did Jonathan Edwards. He believed that the Church could collectively reach such a state of spiritual growth, that Christianity could prevail throughout the world.

Many Evangelical leaders, ignorant of Church history and of the Early Fathers, have claimed that postmillennialists are heretical, a brand of religious humanists. This charge is not true, of course. The Dead Sea Scrolls have verified for us that the Jamesian Church at Jerusalem was postmillennialist. Even in the 2nd Century, when premillennialism was rapidly becoming the predominant view in the Gentile churches, its leaders acknowledged the existence of an authentically Christian, postmillennialist branch. Again, Justin Martyr can be quoted on this point. After describing his premillennial position he adds:



*[B]ut, on the other hand, I signified to you that many who belong to the pure and pious faith, and are true Christians, think otherwise.*

- ANF v. 1, p. 239

What differentiates Christian postmillennialism from religious humanism is its dedication to Biblical law. Postmillennialists believe obedience will bring blessing, and eventually Paradise. Religious humanists do not believe in Biblical law, but try to use other methods, such as education, psychology, or economic policies to achieve the perfect society.

Later Evangelicals have claimed that Finney was intoxicated by the success of his revivals, thinking that they would never stop. Again, Evangelicals still have not understood his theology. Finney knew there were apostasies, or "declensions", as he called them. He was more sophisticated in his understanding of God's Providence. He knew that God has all the time He needs. If one generation fails to achieve its destiny, it is their loss, not God's. He will raise up a future generation, someday, that will obey and enter the blessings of the Messianic reign.

### **FINNEY'S FAILURE**

Discounting the bastardized theology of the pseudo-Finneyites, what is really wrong with Finney's Moral Government Reconstructionism? There are two problems unique to his movement and one which is common to all Reconstructionist movements (which I will address later).

First, revival religion is a preacher's religion. But this is true, also, of Evangelical Protestantism, in general. It centers the work of the Kingdom in a man with oratorical skills. It takes authority away from fathers in the home by teaching Christians that they must go to a meeting house and watch this orator perform. At its core, it is anti-family.

Second, Finney's belief in "Original Design", as a hermeneutical principle, sometimes blurs with the heresy of "Progressive Revelation". The result is the typically Evangelical nullification of key Old Testament laws. Progressive Revelation says that the revelation of the character of God in the moral law was gradual, fitting the understanding and spiritual development of the people at the time.

This is not to be confused with the doctrine of Progressive Sanctification. Progressive Sanctification argues that the moral law is all there in the Old Testament Scriptures and is immutable. Progressive Sanctification allows for a process of growth in the application of that law. It does not involve a suspension of the law, but rather the suspension of its sanctions by God's mercy. That is where the efficacy of the Atonement comes in. The Atonement allows nurture to take precedence over retributive justice.

Progressive Revelation, on the other hand, excuses sin by saying that the old laws have been done away to make way for the purer laws. Later revelation is more holy than earlier revelation.

Finney taught against Progressive Revelation. He believed in the immutability of the moral law because he believed in the immutability of God. Moral law is a reflection of His Divine Nature. If the law were to change, it would mean God changes.

Nevertheless, Finney slipped on this point, as do most Evangelicals. He taught that some Old Testament laws exist as safety nets to arrest the moral decline of a society. For instance, he argued that even though polygamy was a valid Biblical custom, it reveals a society in a degraded spiritual condition. Polygamy was instituted to prevent further degradation. For the Christian, however, Finney would argue that polygamy may be lawful, "but not expedient", meaning, not promotive of holiness. And personal holiness is defined by Original Design. Because man was not originally made polygamous in the paradise of Eden, polygamy is a departure from design.

This common approach to the Moral Law assumes that the Creation Ordinance is Original Design and not the Mosaic Law. That is the point of contention which I must now address.

### WHERE IS ORIGINAL DESIGN?

If you have read *Biblical Terranomics #22*, you know that Original Design can be found in the Creation Ordinance (Genesis 1-3, in particular 1:26-30). I will not discuss it further here, except to point out a common fallacy: it is incorrectly assumed that Original Design means Fulfilled Design. We do not find "Fulfilled Design" in the Garden of Eden. It existed in its seed. One cannot perceive all of the details of a plant in the seed. It must manifest itself through growth. Only then do we begin to see its characteristics. The infant race of Adam did not have the opportunity to fulfill the Creation Ordinance in a sinless condition. He fell soon after Creation. Consequently, we do not know what human society would have looked like. Original Design is not adequately explained in the Creation Ordinance. We need more Divine Revelation.

An example of this problem is the issue of polygamy I mentioned above. It may seem perfectly logical to say that the Creation Ordinance supports monogamy because God made only one woman for Adam. Of course, polygamophiles will not dispute that argument. They will argue in favor of monogamy, also. It is a lawful marriage custom. They just will say that polygamy is valid, too - that the Creation Ordinance does not preclude polygamy - meaning that what is not forbidden is allowed ("Of all the trees, thou mayest freely eat, except . . .")

But there is another problem with using the Creation Ordinance alone as an expression of Original Design: it leads to absurdities. For instance, Adam and Eve were created naked. Does that mean we are under moral obligation to burn our clothes and return to a state of nature? Of course, not. As humanity grew, the use of clothes as uniforms, as distinctions in rank, as expressions of taste, and so on - all of these, and more, justified wearing clothes. Perhaps, we do not need to be as uptight about public nudity as we are. Most people are inherently modest, anyway. But certainly, we are under no moral obligation to follow nudism as some kind of superior expression of Moral Law. Later revelation makes that clear. Thus, to avoid absurdities, we must say that the Creation Ordinance contains Original Design, but not in the detail of its matured form.

Is Original Design identifiable in the Scriptures, now that man has sinned and fallen from Paradise? Is it a useless exercise to pursue this question until we reach the post-resurrection world? Do we have a standard of "Restored Design" in the Scriptures?

The acid test lies in the sanctions imposed for obedience or disobedience to a respective covenant. The choice in the Adamic Covenant was life and death. If obedience is sanctioned with life and blessing, then that covenant contains Original Design. If death is the sanction for disobedience, then we know for certain it contains Original Design.

The Mosaic Law fulfills these criteria. In the final chapters of Deuteronomy we find the Blessings and the Cursings (28-29). The Israelites were promised Paradise for obedience. They failed, of course, just like Adam did, but not entirely. The generations of David and Solomon are considered a success in the Scriptures (1 Kings 8:56; 2 Chronicles 9:22-27).

Christians are promised Paradise, too. It is called the Millennium. What are they required to do to achieve it? Are the Adamic and Mosaic Covenants still in force?

Let Christ answer that question:

*Think not that I come to destroy the law or the prophets; I have not come to destroy, but to fulfill.*

- Matthew 5:17

### **IS CHRIST THE STANDARD?**

"What would Jesus do?" is the mantra of Evangelical religion. Instead of Old Testament law, they look to the life and teachings of Jesus for higher standards of Moral Law. They see Jesus as completed revelation, the epitome of Restored Design. Nothing else matters. Jesus is the one to follow.

Just like our discussion on the Creation Ordinance, separating the life of Christ from the larger of context of Biblical law leads to absurdities. Jesus was a traveling preacher and miracle-worker. Does this mean mankind's Original Design was to roam the earth preaching and working miracles? Is mankind endowed with faculties to achieve these things? Does not preaching presuppose sinners who must be preached to? Do not miracles presuppose wretches of humanity who need to be healed and delivered? If so, then we must say that sin and degradation are a part of man's Original Design; for if there were no such evil things in the world, then the good could not come.

The Christian world tells us that Christ was celibate. Must we say that celibacy is the standard? Is that the moral law? Is that Restored Design? Many think so.

Christ died upon the Cross. Must a Restored Design require self-immolation? The Christian world says, "yes". Martyrdom, not dominion, is considered the highest virtue.

The balanced approach to this subject requires us to distinguish Christ's virtues from His unique mission. It also requires us to understand that His mission was in response to the *failure of man to obey Moral Law in the covenants*. In other words, if we fail to obey the moral law as it is contained in the Old Testament, then we will have rendered Christ's mission to have been in vain. Its purpose was to restore us to our Original Design

What would Jesus do? He would obey the Law.

## THE CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTIONISTS

As I said, I discovered R.J. Rushdoony's works in 1978. I found them at Minneapolis School of Theology. Rushdoony is credited as being the father of the modern Christian Reconstructionist "movement", which claims such luminaries as Gary North, Greg Bahnsen, Gary DeMar, Dr. D. James Kennedy and so on - all Presbyterian and Reformed leaders

During the early 1980s, I studied the works of the Reconstructionists and put to the test some of their theories in my ministry, as I did the Moral Government theology of Finney's successors. I was not successful. I discovered that Christians have been inoculated against truth, particularly the importance of obedience to the Moral Law. My generation, the Baby Boom generation, is existentialist, even in the churches. Each individual is an autonomous interpreter of the Scriptures. The Scriptures can mean whatever they want them to mean at the moment. There is no objective standard to which they are accountable.

The post-Baby Boom generation is becoming increasingly nihilistic. In the study of philosophy, we learn that nihilism is the logical result of existentialism. Recent mass murders committed by school-aged children illustrate what I am saying here.

During my time of ministry, I noticed different paradigms of Christian Reconstruction beginning to emerge. There came into existence "the Tyler group" associated with Ray Sutton, James Jordan, and Gary North in Tyler, Texas. They were trying to distance themselves from the "low-church" paradigm of Rushdoony's Reconstructionism. They promoted a "high-church" view.

Basically, the low-church paradigm of Rushdoony de-emphasized the institutional church. Rushdoony says the institutional church is just one institution, among many, in the Kingdom of God. There is the family, state, school, and the professions, with the family as primary. He does not believe that the church has a monopoly on the sacraments. A group of doctors, for instance, could get together in an office for Communion.

The "high-church" Reconstructionists believe that the church *does* have a monopoly of the sacraments. They follow a tri-institutional paradigm for society: *church, state, and family*, with the church being the central institution, because it is the active agent in Reconstruction. This has been the historic view, at least since the time of Augustine. It is popular with Reformed pastors, for obvious reasons. In this system, the sun rises and sets for them.

## GOTHARDISM

Early in my ministry, I took a close look at the teachings of Bill Gothard, a graduate of Wheatland Seminary and founder of the "Basic Youth Conflicts" seminars. Responding to the anarchism and rebellion of the youth movements in the 1960s, Gothard began to teach city-wide workshops on the value of obedience to institutional authority, whether church, state, or family. His ministry was immensely successful.

His success was due to overwhelming support from the Establishment. His teachings supported the status quo, and all Establishments support movements which protect the status quo. There is nothing new or unique about his teaching. It can be traced back to Cyprian, a proto-papist.

The value of Gothard's ministry is that it introduces people to the idea of theonomy. Gothard likes to use samples from the Old Testament. He also emphasizes the importance of authority, which is Biblical. However, his paradigm is all wrong. His view of Divine Providence says that "that which is, is right." The notions of revolution, the change of allegiance, separatism, and divorce are all foreign to him, if not sinful. His theology tends to ossify in blind obedience to existing authority. If the current authority is evil, there is no remedy except prayer and martyrdom.

For this reason, Gothardism is a counterfeit, theonomic movement. Theonomy requires obedience to lawfully constituted and ordained authority which can be traced back to Jesus Christ in all spheres of life: family, church and state, and which operates within the perimeters of His Covenant. It also teaches us that for every wrong there is a remedy. Theonomy encompasses a doctrine of succession. Gothard has the wrong one.

## **BRITISH ISRAELISM**

During this period, I also took a long look at the British Israelite message. It interested me because it was theonomic (e.g. Howard Rand's *Digest of the Divine Law*). Any movement which advocates Biblical law interests me. But what I found in that movement - a fact true of even the Reconstructionists - was that theonomy was not central to its message. Something else was more important and "modified" or "upgraded" Biblical law.

In the Reconstructionist movement, Reformed theology is central. Biblical law is modified by a Christological typology, which I will address later in this study. Gothard's cyprianism makes the authority figure's interpretation central - likewise with the British Israelites.

Historically, British Israelism began as Jewish propaganda to open their admission into England during the 14th Century. It was later used as an alternative to the Roman model for the Church. Combined with the Davidic doctrine - the belief of the Davidic origins of the English monarchy - British Israelism provided a fully-orbed alternative to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession found in the established churches. Although John Wycliffe's assaults on the Papacy weakened Roman influence in England, it did not overthrow it. It was British Israelism which provided the foundation for the Church of England: the revived House of Israel headed by the King - the Son of David.

I have not found British Israelites to be racists. They are Anglophiles. Sometimes, they are xenophobic. But they are not racist. Parallel movements, such as Christian Identity and Aryan Nations, are racist. Clumsy reporters will often paint them all with the same brush.

Traditional theologians wax eloquent in condemning British Israelism. They do so on points of doctrine, never on the archaeological and historical record. They accuse British Israelites of an ethnic basis to salvation. Many of these accusers, then, in the next breath, claim the Jews are saved because of election. Perhaps some British Israelites think that their racial heritage entitles

them to salvation; but generally, they teach that their ethnic doctrine has to do with earthly dominion and the Messianic Kingdom - after the Second Coming, of course - and not with eternal salvation.

The "Jews are Israel" dogma did not get traction until after the 1967 War. It serves the purpose in our time that British Israelism did for the Jews in England. Fundamentalists are important players in American politics. The modern State of Israel needs massive amounts of American foreign aid to survive. To keep that assistance flowing, Israelis need the goodwill and support of the American people. That the Jews are "God's Chosen People" and that they are somehow fulfilling Bible prophecy in the Middle East is useful propaganda to maintain that support. It does not mean that it is true.

An interesting side note to the British Israelite movement is its impact on first generation Pentecostals. Pentecostal pioneers such as F. F. Bosworth were British Israelites. Indeed, the case can be made that Pentecostalism grew out of the British Israelite movement. Charles Fox Parham, the founder of the Bible College in Topeka, Kansas, at the turn of the century where speaking in tongues began, was a devoted British Israelite. He also believed that the "Pentecostal blessing" was a fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies to Israel.

Today, British Israelites labor under a premillennialist perspective. Premillennialism teaches that the last 2000 years have been a "parenthetical period". This is the prevailing belief among Fundamentalists: that the current church age is a period disconnected with the flow of history. It is a time of evangelism only, not of reconstruction. Changing the world can only occur after the Second Advent of Christ.

American theologians, especially Lutheran, hate British Israelites because they are British and fawn over the monarchy. They also hate them because they represent a theonomic movement. If British Israelites are right, then the Old Testament law is our ethnic heritage and our ethnic obligation. The Old Testament law is an objective standard for the laws of our civilization. Like the gold standard for money, it provides ethical discipline for our institutions.

Churchists have hated Old Testament law because it interferes with the discretion of Popes, Councils, and Synods. It is too specific. It also fell into disfavor with the British monarchy. That is why the *39 Articles* of the Anglican Church excludes the civil laws of the Bible from the moral law. The Crown is exempt from enforcing the civil laws of the Bible. The Anglican Church tells its people what the moral law is. The King is the Head of the Church.

## **THE NEW FEUDALISM**

Influenced by Celtic theonomics, British Israelites have argued for restoring the Jubilee: the Levitical law which requires that every 50 years, debts be forgiven, prisoners be set free, and family estates be restored to their original owners. This is probably the main reason why British Israelism fell into disfavor with the British Crown. Returning family estates and forgiving debts are policies disruptive to commerce. The power brokers in the Empire were unwilling to lose their hegemony.

Like the Celts of old, American Independence began as a revolt against the English monarchy in favor of Biblical law, specifically the Jubilee. Historian, Michael Hoffman, has

satisfactorily proven that the hope of an American Jubilee was the primary motive men had when they signed-up for Washington's Continental Army. They were not fighting for some philosophical abstraction called "freedom". It was a real, tangible deliverance which was needed. That was why the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia was inscribed with these words from the Jubilee Law:

*Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.*

- Leviticus 25:10

Although the Founding Fathers reneged on their promise for a Jubilee in order for the American States to join the family of nations, they did include parts of it in the various bankruptcy and homesteading laws. For that reason, there was genuine freedom in the united States for almost a century: freedom from the feudal overlords of Europe.

The period lasted until the Civil War. The War Amendments (13, 14 & 15) provided an exact mechanism to bring the American people back within a feudal system. It abolished private property in persons in favor of state ownership (13th Amendment). It then created equal standing in the courts for artificial persons (corporations: individual, collective, and governmental) (14th Amendment), meaning that the law of contracts could be enforced by artificial persons against natural persons. And finally, it created a huge voting block of artificial persons (newly freed Negroes) who were wards of the state (artificial government) to compete with freemen in the electoral process.

The Freedman Bureau which managed the freed Negroes later became the Social Security Administration, and through the law of contract, the entire population lost property in their own persons. In legal terminology, this is the very definition of slavery. Common law has been replaced by the Roman civil law in its various forms: martial law rule, law of equity, law merchants, commercial codes, federal statutes, executive orders, public policy, and so on.

Through such legal fictions, the People of the United States have been brought back under the British Crown. By the law of contract, all the land, the people, and possessions of the United States have been made the property of the British Crown, or perhaps more accurately, those who control the British Crown. When each American citizen applies for a Social Security Number, he enters an *implied, hazardous contract*. In law such a contract creates a dependency equivalent to minority status (the status of children). It is hazardous because the terms are created and changed at will by Congress, without approval by the individual. Thus, we have been brought into vassalage.

Proof? Follow the chain of title. Through liens, all assets are owned by banks and corporations, which are in turn owned by others, until it ends in the royal houses of Europe. "The borrower is servant to the lender" (Proverbs 22:7). This is information obtainable from the public record. A decade ago, Congress acknowledged that the U.S. was in receivership (see e-mail address below for source documentation).

The People no longer have "common law" rights (see **BT #1** ). They are governed by Equity Courts, which are the successors of the Exchequer's and Chancery Courts, Courts of the King, and are feudal in nature. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court wears the robes of the Lords Chancellor and did so at the Impeachment proceedings of President Clinton. That is why President George Bush went to England to be knighted by Queen Elizabeth after he left office.

Why would a former President of the United States be knighted by a foreign ruler? What service did he render to earn this honor?

Do not forget the original 13th Amendment, the Titles of Nobility Amendment. It meant the loss of citizenship for anyone who received any title, gift, or other emolument from a foreign power. It was designed to respond to the crisis of British agents flooding into the country early in the 19th Century who were subverting our republic from within. They reached the highest levels of government and became entrenched in the judiciary.

The new 13th Amendment abolished involuntary servitude and slavery. But it did not abolish voluntary servitude. Voluntary servitude operates under the law of contract in the Constitution. It is through that provision by which most Americans have been enslaved. They have voluntarily given up their freeborn rights by signing into Social Security. It should not surprise us that the Social Security number has been officially changed to the "Citizen Identification Number" and that it is required for almost all transactions. We cannot go back to the old Republics.

Almost no one understands this. They do not know the predicament they are in. They think we still have the old Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We don't, except in name only. The American people have tacitly accepted vassalage under the royal houses of Europe. People do not care about legal technicalities, of course, because times are good. And when times are not good, they will fight back. But they will be striking at their own shadows. They will not understand the nature of their bondage or of the means to obtain deliverance.

The only hope the American people have is to swear allegiance to someone who is free and at law is able to set them free: Jesus Christ. They cannot regain their freedom in any other way, not even by force of arms. For freedom is not just obtained by victory on the battlefield. One must be certified by a Higher Power to be "entitled" to be free. This happens by establishing headship. It happens by submitting to an earthly representative of Jesus Christ.

### **CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION: A DEAD END**

The Christian Reconstructionist leadership does not understand these things. Rushdoony does. He favors the Jubilee laws. The movement, however, has not matured enough to understand his scholarship. Because Rushdoony has not aggressively pursued his model for Reconstruction, it has fallen to the Tyler group by default. The institutional church has become the primary vehicle through which Reconstructionist teachings have been propagated. Churchists are inherently biased toward the "high-church", tri-institutional model.

The Tyler group favors the Establishment. Jordan and Sutton have become Anglicans. North remains Presbyterian and a capitalist. He is still influenced by the Celtic South, which moderates his views and which I will address below. Unfortunately, he opposes the Jubilee because he thinks it is socialism.

North's rejection of the Jubilee, as well as other laws, is based upon a hermeneutical principle devised from Christological typology. The writings of James Jordan is where you will find this principle best developed. Essentially, it says, that if an Old Testament law foreshadowed the life and ministry of Christ and was fulfilled somehow in Christ's Atonement, then it was done



away. In the case of the Jubilee, deliverance from the bondage of sin and its effects is considered to be its true fulfillment. Like the Sabbath laws, a ritual observance of the Jubilee is held to offer no benefit to our society.

The error of this hermeneutic can be demonstrated in two ways. First, it assumes that these laws are merely typological in nature, meaning that they serve only one purpose, and that is to point to Christ. Of course, everything points to Christ, but it does not mean it is nullified by Christ. What is sin? The transgression of the law. One of the laws we transgress is the Jubilee.

Does transgressing the Jubilee lead to bondage? Yes, in a very real sense, it does. Does Christ deliver us from this sin? Yes, he does. First, by pardoning our disobedience and shining His favor upon us, and then, by providing for us, providentially, a form of government which will obey this precept. The fact that we do not have such a government is not the fault of our Lord. We do not want to be free from the bondage of this sin. Consequently, we might say that the sanctification of the Church has not reached a point where it will plead for the Jubilee.

What I have demonstrated here is that Biblical law served, and continues to serve, a dual purpose. First, like a tutor, it leads us to Christ. It has a *soteriological* purpose. It leads us to recognize our need of a Savior. Second, it has a *dominical* purpose. It equips us to serve Christ in time and on Earth in a just manner which glorifies Him.

**Just because we can find typology in a law does not nullify it. All things in the Law are typological.** The Tyler group is on a slippery slope, here, which can conceivably lead to a repudiation of the entire Old Testament law, except those portions reiterated in the New Testament. **The Law has a soteriological purpose and a dominical purpose.** The soteriological purpose has been fulfilled by Christ, *and could only have been fulfilled by Christ.* **The dominical purpose is fulfilled by us, because we have been left in the world to rule with Christ.**

There is a second way which this hermeneutic can be demonstrated as in error. It confuses the natures of Christ, mingling the human office with His divine office. The Creeds of the Church teach us that our Lord had two natures, one human and one Divine. On Earth, He was both God and man. His mission was both human and Divine. Working together, yet without mingling and without confusion, His human nature qualified Him to fulfill His Divine calling and His Divine nature qualified Him to fulfill His human calling.

As God, His Atonement was efficacious for the salvation of the whole world. As a mere man, our Lord's suffering would not have been sufficient to satisfy Divine justice. As God, He qualified to be the Savior of the world.

As man, of the Seed of David, He was qualified to be the Messiah, the new federal head of the human race. As God alone, He could not have represented the race of Adam. This is a human office.

Applying this, then, to the interpretation of the Law, a typological argument which nullifies a law because it is fulfilled in Christ confuses His natures and His offices. Using the Jubilee as an example, our Lord fulfilled that law in both His Divine nature and His Human nature. In His Divine nature, it is fulfilled by His Atonement which secured the presence and ministry of the Holy Spirit. In His human nature, provision is made for its fulfillment in the Messianic government which He has established in His Church.

**Denying a dominical fulfillment of Biblical law in the Church denies the humanity of Christ. It denies His Messianic office, which is a human office.** It denies Him as our federal head.

The Christian Reconstructionist movement is weakening, ideologically, and is slowly being reabsorbed into standard, Augustinian Christianity. Re-absorption has been a tendency of all spiritual movements in the life of the Church because this tri-institutional model of society, which was devised by Augustine, has not been abandoned. This Augustinian model relies heavily on participation of the state to support the church and society. And while North - to use him as an example - is a localist, he is still a statist in this respect. I see Cromwell on the horizon. We seem doomed to repeat the errors of the past.

## RECONSTRUCTIONISM AND THE CELTIC SOUTH

Christian Reconstructionism has found allies in the South. This is understandable. Reformation Scotland was Presbyterian in church polity and Reformed in theology. The South is heavily populated by these Scots-Irish.

Also, after the Puritans lost control of the great institutions of New England in the late 18th Century, they migrated to the South and eventually provided it with its intellectual leadership.

I said earlier that Celtic Christianity is Pelagian. At first, it does not seem logical for Calvinistic Reconstructionism to combine with a Pelagian culture, as it has in the South. The answer is found in what the two groups have in common: *theonomy*.

Celtic Christianity produced the Common Law in the person of Alfred the Great, who consulted with Celtic monks when he prepared his Book of Dooms. That Common Law was based upon Exodus 20-23 (the Law of the Covenant) and the teachings of James, the Lord's brother, who was the leader of the Jerusalem Church. It has been with us ever since. Calvin embraced Biblical Law, also. So have his followers in the Reconstructionist movement. Although their theologies differ, the Celts and these neo-Puritans are both united in the quest of covenant-keeping.

I said the Christian Reconstructionist movement is waning. That is because of its institutional emphasis. Our generation finds institutionalism to be cold and cruel. There is a great hunger for a renaissance of the Christian home and a return to small-town America. Many Reconstructionists are looking to the Celtic South for a new paradigm for the movement, one which places greater emphasis on the family and clan.

Kerry Ptacek and his Family Covenant Ministry is an example of what I am talking about. He advocates a greater role for home worship. Along with Philip Lancaster and his *Patriarch* magazine, Ptacek encourages families to meet in homes where fathers can minister to their families. He also advocates family devotions on a daily basis. Both of these men are Southerners and have been heavily influenced by Celtic familism for which the South has been famous. Both of them, however, are Augustinian and are members of the Reformed Presbyterian movement. As long as they remain in that movement, they will never be able to break free of its tri-institutional model, one which gives the institutional church a monopoly over the sacraments. Neither of them are willing to give these sacerdotal powers to fathers in their homes.

That is why I say the family renaissance within the Reconstructionist movement is a fraud. Like the Communists who are willing to surrender power in every area of society except for the military and police where it really counts, the Reconstructionists give lip-service to the family, but narrow its sphere of operation to a point which denies Christian fathers true authority in society as fathers. To have any true authority outside of the home, or to prevent intrusion into his home from church or state, a father must wear a different institutional hat.

Yet, the Celtic sunrise continues. Other luminaries promote its cause: Franklin Sanders, Douglas Wilson, Otto Scott, R. C. Sproul, Jr., George Grant, and Steven Wilkins. With all of its flaws and compromises, it is breathing new life into the Reconstructionist movement. It will continue until the inherent contradictions become unworkable and play themselves out.

## WYCLIFFE

In 1983, I studied the life and works of John Wycliffe, the "Morning Star of the Reformation". His Lollard movement was a completely different branch of the Reformation, which finds its roots in Celtic Christianity (see *The Separatist Papers #10* and *Biblical Terranomics #10*). I saw Wycliffe's theological individualism as a tool to break-out, ideologically, from Augustine's tri-institutional model. But his individualism was not an end in itself. I did not stop there, as did the Baptists and other similar branches. His theology simply returns us to the possibility of finding another collectivism - which I found in the Biblical doctrine of the extended family.

I hold no illusions about Wycliffe. Wycliffe's success was based, in part, upon the fact that he was a successful apologist for the British Crown against the authority of the Roman Pope. British Israelism served the same purpose. That is why I have spent so much time explaining the Celtic model in my other writings. It is a tradition which pre-dates the British Crown and the Roman Pope. Its origin is in Jerusalem and the Jamesian tradition of the Desposyni. It teaches a family based society according to Old Testament customs which operate within the structure of the extended family group - a kinship group or clan - both in worship and the enforcement of law. This is the only other paradigm for society which exists, other than the tri-institutional model (see *BT #10, 16 18, & 19*).

## FAMILY VALUES

Astute Bible scholars have called attention to the word "family" in the Bible. It is *mishpachah*. They tell us that there is no English word which is an equivalent of this Hebrew word. Rushdoony's magazine, *Chalcedon*, some years ago contained an article which claimed that it refers to a multi-generational, extended family group living on the same land parcel. I have talked about this concept in several publications (e.g. *The Family Spokesman*).

Some scholars use the term "clan." Although that is better than trying to equate *mishpachah* with the conjugal family, it still is not enough.

In *BT22*, you will recall that I did a complete study of the term. The resources I used are readily available to any Christian. The Hebrew Dictionary in the back of most Strong's Concordances is sufficient. It quickly becomes obvious why these scholars refuse to openly state the meaning of *mishpachah*. It would offend the sensibilities of Church feminists.

*Mishpachah* means a group of "wenches". That is Strong's term, not mine. However, he uses it with the old English meaning: not with our pejorative connotation of fallen women, but in its original sense of sexually available maidens. *Mishpachah* is plural and feminine and genital. Read my study to get the particulars. I only cite it here to make this point: there *is* an English equivalent for *mishpachah*: **harem**. The proper rendering is harem, not family. Thus, when God says to Abraham that in him shall all "families" of the earth be blessed, it ought to be rendered that all "harems of the earth will be blessed". Exodus 21 describes and regulates the harem. This is the family of Biblical law.

Have we found here "Original Design"? Is the childless, conjugal family of Genesis 1-3 the standard? Or is the standard found in Exodus 21? I believe the latter is the case. Exodus 20-23 contains the "Law of the Covenant". It contains the Ten Commandments along with the Case Laws to apply them to everyday life. Remember, this Law of the Covenant was given before the Golden Calf apostasy. Unlike the Levitical laws and the distilled summation in Deuteronomy, this law was not restorative or redemptive in purpose. It was a straightforward expression of Moral Law. Here, we find a matured expression of Original Design.

As I have shown in my other studies, polygamy provides the means for a family to become big enough to carry institutional clout in society (see [Eros Made Sacred](#)). The conjugal family is simply not big enough to compete with the church or state. A harem provides a division of labor and a sufficient number of offspring to empower a man with the ability to overcome his competitors. **Monogamous families are weak and dysfunctional by Biblical standards.**

Consequently, moral crusaders for "family values" are not defending the kind of family we find in the Bible. The Biblical family was a harem. Harems are outlawed in the "Christian" West. Thus, we have no families in the Biblical sense of the word. Any return to Biblical law must include polygamy as part of the equation.

Polygamy will not be acceptable in the South, the nation's so-called "Bible Belt". (Where the divorce rate is the highest in the country.) The Celtic South is a matriarchal society, and has been so ever since the close of the Civil War. Any society which is invaded and subjugated becomes a matriarchal society. Observe Southern customs. Although the women defer to their men for tasks considered "men's work", it is only because the women choose it that way. These tertiary distinctions for male/female relations only serve to cloak the real source of power in Southern society: the women who fund religion. Wealthy widows who support powder-face preachers control Southern culture. As long as this is true, the South will never rise again. They have served their purpose but have now outlived their usefulness.

Rushdoony is sympathetic to the concept of a family-based society but he refuses to embrace polygamy - which is inherent in any authentic familism - even though the Reformation's greatest Puritan, John Milton, wrote in defense of it. Consequently, Rushdoony's branch of Reconstructionism has moved into a ministry to the professions: Christian reconstruction in the areas of men's dominion tasks. He has refused to attack the professions as illegitimate because they subvert tasks once handled in the village and clan. For that reason, I believe the Reconstructionist movement has crested and will decline.

## THE JAMESIAN MODEL

*For the term "resurrection" is not applied to that which has not fallen, but to that which has fallen and rises again; as when the prophet says, "I will also raise up again the tabernacle of David which has fallen down." (Amos 9:11)*

- Methodius, *ANF* v. 6, p. 367

*After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David. . .*

- James in Acts 15:16

*His [Joseph's] firstborn was James, surnamed 'Oblias', meaning 'wall', and also surnamed Just, who was a Nazarite, which means holy man. He was the first to receive the bishop's chair, the first to whom the Lord entrusted his throne upon earth.*

- Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis *The Panarion* 78:6-8.

*The disciples said to Jesus, "We know that you will depart from us. Who is to be our leader?" Jesus said to them, "Wherever you are, you are to go to James the righteous, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being."*

- *The Gospel of Thomas* 12

In Acts 15 we find the First Church Council. This is the Council which brought the Gentiles into the Christian Church on equal footing with Jews. The ruler of this Council was James, the brother of Jesus. The Council was not a democracy. The Apostles and Brethren did not vote. They presented the issues, like attorneys before a judge. James, and James alone, rendered the decision.

It was no small decision. The validity of Paul's ministry hung on James' ruling. The fate of the Gentiles hung on that ruling. This Council was the most significant one in the history of Christianity, yet no one understands what James said, except the part which exempted Gentiles from circumcision.

For James, the admittance of the Gentile churches turned on one issue: their role in restoring the House of David and Covenantal Law. Ponder this point carefully. The admittance of the Gentile churches into the commonwealth of Israel was in distinction from the matters of eternal life. No one disputed that the Gentiles were saved, except a handful of xenophobic Judaizers. The question at issue was their admittance into Israel. *Israel* is the visible manifestation of the Kingdom of God on Earth. It had to do with the Church as a government and as a people with dominion tasks in the earth.

The head of this commonwealth is Jesus Christ, of course. It was expected that His rule would be mediated through His appointed viceroys of the House of David. James saw the Gentile churches as fifth columns into the Gentile world, enclaves of Davidic rule, shadow governments which would eventually bring down the pagan empires of the world and establish the Stone Kingdom of Daniel's vision.

That was why James closed his ruling with this curious statement:

*For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.*

Meaning: that the Gentiles have access to the Mosaic law for their life of sanctification. Sanctification is the spiritual process by which we gradually transform our lives and our cultures. Old Testament law is central to that task. Sanctification is a process which occurs within the life of the Church, not one which must be achieved before admittance into the Church. James expected that Old Testament law would be adopted gradually by the Gentile churches. The Epistle of James reinforces that viewpoint. The Gentile churches were catechumens.

The next question to be asked is what does it mean to "restore the tabernacle of David?" We must begin with what does the expression - the "tabernacle of David" - refer to.

George Lamsa, the Aramaic scholar and translator of the Aramaic Scriptures, in *Old Testament Light* 16 , p. 744, provides our clue. In his Commentary of Jeremiah 10:19-20, he says:

*The prophet here is speaking collectively. The tabernacle is symbolic of the kingdom of Judah, which is soon to be overthrown by the Babylon army, and the people carried away captive. This is a grievous wound which cannot be healed. The tabernacle is dismantled; that is, the reign of the Kingdom of David is over. The cords are broken; that is, all the sacred bands which united the Jews are temporarily broken, and the people are taken captive. Then again, the tabernacle is symbolic of the earthly habitation. When a family, a tribe, or a kingdom rises to power it is said, The tabernacle has been raised, and when they are destroyed, it is said, The tabernacle has been dismantled.*

The tabernacle of David's refers to the dominion of David's offspring.

*And in mercy shall the throne be established: and he shall sit upon it in truth in the tabernacle of David, judging, and seeking judgment, and hasting righteousness.*

- Isaiah 15:5

You need to understand how the Davidic government worked. It was a caliphate, meaning that King David ruled on the Throne, but his local representatives were his sons and other members of his household and clan. We find evidence in Scriptures such as 1 Chronicles 18:17; 2 Samuel 8:18; Psalm 122:4-5. Proof can also be found by comparing the names in the chronologies and genealogies. Joab, his general, was David's uncle.

The Davidic government was destroyed by the taking of Jerusalem and slaying the king's sons (2 Kings 25:4-7). It will be restored when his descendants are increased, identified and restored to power:

*As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant. . .*

- Jeremiah 33:22

*And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord.*

- Jeremiah 23:4

(Look at the context, here - Jeremiah 22:30-23:5- the Prophet is talking about the good and bad shepherds of the House of David.)

*And this shall come to pass if ye will diligently obey the voice of the LORD your God.*

- Zechariah 6:11-15

The Church must make it happen through obedience.

We find this restoration promised in Old Testament prophecy. But is this how the New Testament Church interpreted those prophecies? Consider Epiphanius' record:

*Now when the royal chair was changed, the royal dignity was in Christ transferred to the church from the house of Judah and Israel which is of the flesh, but the throne is established in God's holy church forever, the throne whose royal and high-priestly dignity rests on two bases - the royal dignity coming from Our Lord Jesus Christ in two ways, from the fact that he is of King David's seed according to the flesh and from the fact that he is, as is certainly true, a greater king from eternity in his divinity. . . James having been ordained at once the first bishop, he who is called the brother of the Lord and apostle . . . But we find as well that he is of David's stock through being Joseph's son and that he was a Nazarite. . . There is much to say about this.*

- Epiphanius in the *Penarion* 29

Epiphanius, an early bishop with an impeccably orthodox reputation, tells us that James was chosen as our Lord's successor to the episcopal throne for two reasons: first, he was a holy man, and second, he, too, was of the House of David. Here, Epiphanius acknowledges that Davidic bishops have primacy (see [BT22](#)).

Did the Gentile churches fulfill this plan to restore the tabernacle of David? Apparently not. They may have during the First Century, but during the Second Century, there were two doctrinal departures.

First, they rejected the Davidic government in favor of Rome. This they did in refusing assistance during the Bar Kochba revolt. Apparently, they feared a society under Mosaic Law. The Gentile churches have been stuck in this apostasy ever since.

Second, they embraced Stoicism in the form of the Mahuzzim heresy. They inverted sexual values. They rejected sexual passion and family life as non-spiritual, if not decadent. Consequently, the polygamy of Davidic bishop-princes was condemned as perverse. Celibacy was promoted as the highest good. Rome favored a centralized priesthood which was celibate. That meant that clerics had no conflicting loyalties except the good order of society, of which Rome, of course, was its guardian.

Heirs of the Davidic Covenant continued to be appointed bishops in the Jerusalem Church for at least another century after James. Also, records of their existence as leaders in the churches of the Near East continue until the 4th Century. After that, we begin to find records in Celtic Britain of the presence of the Desposyni (as they were called) who intermarried with the families of Celtic princes.

The Celtic model teaches that Jesus alone is the King of Kings. It opposes a centralized earthly monarchy as an assault on the Messianic monarchy. It opposes primogeniture, also. The earthly Messianic kingdom is a republic of the Davidic family, a decentralized caliphate of federal representatives ruling the peoples of the earth as Christ's viceroys.

The question now turns to the issue of genealogies. Is there anyone today who can make an authentic claim of Davidic lineage? There are plenty of mockers. For some reason, these mockers have faith in the transmission of the Scriptures, that our copies of God's Word today providentially match the originals. These mockers will accept the records of Apostolic Succession. They will even believe in their own state records, which are often altered. But they will not accept the ancient records which give the Davidic genealogies.

These genealogies are Celtic in origin, particularly Welsh. The mockers of today continue a campaign which was first initiated by ancient Roman Popes and then later by the Normans to destroy the Celtic Church and its entire civilization. It is not a pleasant thought to consider that the people one is dispossessing and exterminating is a holy race. Their propaganda had to attack the roots of the Celtic Church: which lay in their claims of antiquity and Davidic origins. Take that away, and there is nothing left.

## CONCLUSION

Sometimes, I sound like a broken record. I keep saying the same things over and over again. That is because people are deaf. There is too much background noise. Let me summarize again what I am saying.

All of the current models for Christian reconstruction are invalid. Period. They do not pursue Biblical law as a completed system. They excuse themselves from obeying laws they don't like, such as the Jubilee laws or polygamy. The only tradition that I have found which is consistent in its pursuit of Biblical law is that of the Jamesian Church, the Church of Jerusalem.

The Celtic Church is freely acknowledged to have originated in the Jerusalem tradition. It was also Davidic and continues to be Davidic. It is a tradition which teaches familism. It begins with a restoration of the family of David to dominion, and then it flows out to all of mankind.

Any paradigm of Christian dominion must be accepted by faith. Don't expect proof. The acid test is whether it brings God's blessings or not. If Camelot was real, if the reign of Solomon was real, then a future Millennium is real. All we need is the correct paradigm, the one which brings obedience, then we can have Paradise.