

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

**[Side A]**

Ken Davis: Some of the things that I'm going to say could be perceived as rather controversial this morning, and they are controversial in perspective, they're not controversial in the mood with which I present them. Uh, quite clearly, what I'm doing is not infallible in any way, shape or form—quite clearly, what I am doing is an expression of my own personal view of things, uh, for your consideration. You'll need to hang on to every word very carefully. And it is extremely serious. As a historian, as a professional historian, I shouldn't be doing what I'm going to do. But as a Christian I can't help it. I can't help but speculate on what's happening to our civilization. And what should be the rule of believer's churches in the face of existing and impending changes. As I've moved about the country, I discern that both in the older generations and amongst young people, and for that matter at pastor's conferences, although it's sometimes rather hidden, even pastors acknowledge a great deal of confusion, of bewilderment and even fright—even fear by our times. Wondering what it's all about. Where are we going? And the future looks extremely foreboding. And young people say to me: “What should we believe about the ultimate nature of—or the nature of ultimate reality in our world and man? This seems to be significant, and there is so little consensus and the whole is so entirely unsatisfactory, and what is right and what is wrong, can we never be sure or is it entirely up to the individual?” The one thing is perfectly clear: past values, the creation of generations and centuries woven into the fabric of our civilization are crumbling fast. We have a very strange situation: we have a civilization where our skills are extraordinarily high, our fear of the environment in comparison to any other age since the beginning of known history, our fear of the environment, our ability to control it, our ability to handle, uh, nature and so on. Our fear of the environment is the lowest it's ever been. Our wealth and leisure are up. In many ways individual bondage is down. In fact, the, the extent of individual liberty and individual freedom is almost too much to handle. And yet tension, suicide is up, mental hospitals are crammed. Thousand are copping out of society in search of complicity(??) of life, and in many cases also taking on a much more restricted and much more authoritarian lifestyle in the commune. There's much pessimism and hopelessness. If one asks: “Well, from the natural in our world, what kind of expressions of optimism do we have? What about the future?” The thinkers of this world seem to be offering only in place of the discredited the liberalism with its empty dreams(??), optimism and social evolutionism and its optimism about human nature—the only thing that seems to be on the horizon for the future is some form of hope, a utopian hope, for the revolution. And if you move about the university, this is the explosion that keeps coming up over and over and over again. The hope for tomorrow is the hope of the revolution. Some kind of social new birth. Which in, which may be anticipated as happening gradually and without violent, but more often, in most cases, it is something that happens in a situation of great violence and turmoil. And it would rightfully add up for our country to dash(??) to understand, to realize how great a majority of the young people in our universities across this country have accepted in one form or another, the hope—the only hope!—for mankind is for revolution. **[5:00]** And the other alternative is the creation of some kind of new, cosmic man. Something much like Orwell's *1984* or Huxley's *Brave New World*, a

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

new man, some sort of cosmic, new man in a technological triumph. Well, neither the revolution nor the cosmic man, when it's analyzed carefully, is really that attractive. Most involve a good deal of the degeneration, a lowering of human dignity and a shrinking of individual personality in the face of increasing control over life. And so despair and loneliness and the absurdity of existence prevail, and Francis Schaeffer has pointed this out very clearly. The avant-garde literature goes beyond even despair to what Kronberg(??) in his intellectual history called “pathetic gesture”. But why all this? What does it mean? Why has it happened? How should we respond as believing Christians today and tomorrow? And I want to draw a few pictures. One, an Anabaptist, biblical philosophy of history. Biblical philosophy of history from an Anabaptist perspective. And the other picture is an attempt at an actual historical correlation. Well, I know that this is a grandiose schemata. But it has all sorts of problems, because it's so grossly abbreviated. And yet it is potentially enlightenment. And what I am doing is combining the preacher and the historian.

First of all, the biblical picture from the Anabaptist perspective, as the Anabaptist believer's church tradition would understand it. The biblical picture of the book of history, the sweep of history, the direction of history. The purpose of history. The biblical picture as a whole focuses on the development of two distinct kingdoms, beginning in Genesis and ending in Revelation. The kingdom of God and the kingdom of the sons of men, the kingdom of this present evil world. The kingdoms of this world [inaudible]. Now the latter, the kingdom of this world, is my concern. As you look at scripture, the development of the kingdoms of man has its own constant and progressive development through scriptures, through the ages, under the ultimate sovereignty of God, but under the direct control of the kingship of state(??). The kingdoms of this world (clears throat) are first pictured as emerging in the Canaanite civilization developing on into the pre-flood civilization. That civilization in which humans skills are maximized, when art and [inaudible] and technology reach high levels of achievement, but along with this there is also the glorification of the secularistic (sic) and the materialistic, there is the glorification of the selfish in human society and man's thoughts become vain constantly in the sight of God, which means self-[inaudible], which means the ultimate idolatry, which is nothing more or less than the enthronement of man himself! (Clears throat) Now as we well know, this civilization was destroyed by an act of almighty God in the flood. But it re-emerges in the scriptures. It re-emerges in full orbed(??) expression in what we think of as the first Babylon. Then its whole destiny to its final end is unfolded in Daniel in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, for example, of the great statue. [10:03] And the successive empires of this present evil world's system going from uh, Nebuchadnezzar's own first Babylon through until the stone is cut out without hands and it destroys and fills the earth. And so you have the image there of the pictures of the ongoing development of this present kingdom of man, the secular kingdom and empire of this world—succeeding secular empire. Now most would agree that the Rome of Jesus' day and the New Testament times was probably the next to the last in these succeeding kingdoms. And what you have in the New Testament itself is an intensifying of the distinction between the kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this present, evil world. And so you have the apostle John, for

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

example, warning against this present, evil world. And though it's—though the principle of government, which functions in it as an act of God's grace, although the principle of government is of God, yet the actual control of this system is satanic, is under satanic rulership and satanic control. And the apostle Paul talks in Galatians 1:4, this great chapter of Christian liberty, uh, Paul talks in Galatians 1:4 of the whole redemptive processes, wrapped up in Jesus Christ, having as its ultimate objective the purpose of being saved, being that of delivering people out of this present evil world system. Galatians 1:4. That's the salvation that has something to do with the here and now. That has something to do with the progress of life for the century. And the apostle Paul goes on to speak of, uh, the demonic elements in society as the mystery of iniquity, or the mystery of lawlessness. And he goes on to speak of the spirit of Antichrist already at work, that is the worship of the creature and the created thing over the creator. And in his famous chapter, uh, in the first of Romans chapter 1, he talks about the ultimate and humanistic idolatry. Man will not accept God, although he knows, but he is turned over into the pursuit of self-idolatry which ultimately lowers itself into the enthronement of our basic lust and the control of human affairs in our individual lives. Jesus himself uses the same symbolism: he talks about, “And it was in the days of Noah”—the time of the triumph, for the first triumph of the Babylon, the first triumph of the Beast. “As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be in the days of the coming of the son of man.” He warns: “You cannot serve God and Mammon.” Mammon meaning the secular materialistic world, of course, lifestyle, things. Revelation chapter eighteen, of course, you have symbolic Babylon. Babylon moving all the way through, the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar, the one of Rome, the Babylon of the end times. Babylon simply meaning the city, and the city representing civilization and society, they thought of society and civilization in terms of city and urban control. Babylon is the city of civilization of the end times, and again the picture that is there in Revelation chapter eighteen is the same thing: it's a pattern of high technology and high culture and great wealth and great revelry, and, and the merchants of the world find their trades, and accumulate wealth, and humanistic sensualistic and materialistic values prevailing. And the Bible pictures this last, final society, this last, final manifestation of the evil world system, as one whose end is divine judgment and total destruction. Revelation chapter 18, let me read just a few verses: “And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven having great power. [15:03] And the earth was lightened with his glory and he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying ‘Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become a habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all the nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of their fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies.’ And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not her people, and that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.” And in in verses 7 and 8. “How much she has glorified herself,”—idolatry—“and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her: for she says in her heart: “I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

who judgeth her.” We’re looking at verses twenty-one on. “And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone and cast it into the sea saying, “Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more. And the voice of harpers, and musicians and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more in all—at all—in thee; and no craftsman, of whatsoever craft he be, shall be found any more in thee; and the sound of a millstone factory shall be heard no more at all in thee; and the light of candles shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.”

That is a competent(??) picture of the Beast. And the Anabaptist tradition has always taken this Biblical picture of the two kingdoms very, very seriously, and of God’s judgment upon secular society very, very seriously. And I want to move to the second picture, its historical counterpart. And I’m only moving now from post-New Testament developments, I hope you’ve all had something of a survey of Western civilization or a survey of church history or something of that sort will help you to follow what I’m saying. The early church—the church of the apostles—the early church found itself very quickly in mortal conflict with Rome and Caesar, just as the New Testament predicted. And as we have already seen, the New Testament itself articulated that conflict and the necessary dualism that provides the base for that conflict. That is, the church, the church exists in this world as the representative of an alien kingdom, an alien kingdom yet to come, that is in diametric opposition to the one who controls the kingdoms of this world. We exist in this world as the enemy! And therefore the church is to be distinct. It is to be autonomous. It is to be separate. And therefore as Christians we are joyfully to accept martyrdom, rather than call Caesar lord. Then came the anti—in my judgment, in the believers’ church tradition—the anti-biblical alliance. In the fourth century, this thing we call the Constantinian settlements, there was the so-called conversion of the emperor, and the changing of the Roman Empire from a secular empire into a so-called Christian Roman Empire, with its partial secularization of the institutional church. What happens in the fourth century is that the Christian church begins to look like and to act like and to be organized like the Roman expression of Nebuchadnezzar’s Babylon! [20:10] The church becomes the representative of the Beast. Many of those still holding to biblical separation were forced into the deserts and the mountains and forced into the isolationism of monasticism for bare minimal survival. Now that adulterous relationship with Rome led to many serious consequences in terms of our understanding of the church’s role, and the church’s mission, and the church’s message. And what you get from that point on is that it leads to missions, to missionary activity, in which people are thought to be converted to this ecclesiastical secularism in some ways, uh, could be thought of, people are brought to conversion by the force of Caesar’s(??) army, and Augustine is a supporter of such a position. What begins to develop in the early middle ages is a coerced Christian world—what you get is the tamed Beast! Not the transformed Beast—not redeemed—the tamed Beast. The secular political organization that we call Rome in the West—the political organization collapsed. But already the church had adopted the system of the unified society, and

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

all this collapsed to simply one department of state, the temporal, political, civil department of state; but the ecclesiastical department of state went on! And the Roman church, the ecclesiastical organization of Roman Babylon carried on in its control, and out of the elemental pagan material, out of the Germanic western world, it tried to create a seeming Western Roman Christendom—a Roman-Christian civilization, a Christian-pagan alliance with the church dominant over the tamed Beast. And Thomas Aquinas says it himself, an expression of this kind of thing, an attempt to create a harmony between Christ and Aristotle—an artificial alliance. The papal monarchy, as historians speak of it in the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth centuries, the papal monarchy is a foretaste of Revelation 17 where ecclesiastical Babylon rides on the Beast, exercising control over secular civilization. This artificial alliance reminds me of an ancient sort of proverb story, uh, the story of the camel and the Arab in the tent. It's this old story if you remember—I don't remember it exactly myself, but I heard it when I was a little kid in school—and uh, it's a story about an Arab and a camel in the desert, and he gets cold at night, and he has a little tent, and he gets in his little tent, the Arab gets in his little tent to keep warm and the camel is outside and camel is cold and the camel can talk, and the camel pounds on the door and he says, “Hey! It's cold out here, won't you let me in?” And he says, “No, I can't sleep at all, I can't let you in here, no room for both of us,” “Oh, come on, it's cold out here!” “Well, all right, put your head in.” And so the camel put his head in and then he got his front feet in and eventually the whole camel was in the tent and the Arab was outside and cold. (Crowd laughs) Well, I need to change that story just a little bit, because the tent becomes the ecclesiastical camp. And the camel becomes not as it started out to be a single, western, uh, secular society—the camel, the camel disintegrates and becomes a lot of little camels. A lot of little faith. [25:00] And what's even stranger yet, these little, beautiful, lovely, little teen camels (sic), small enough to cluster around in the bed of the Arab in the ecclesiastical tent, so lovely in their smallness, began to grow. And they changed from camels into dragons and beasts. And gradually the problems increasingly arise as these little beasts become increasingly unruly inside the ecclesiastical tent. And it leads to the breakup of the unity of the Roman-Christian civilization in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Protestant Reformation, the magisterial Protestant Reformation, sad to say with the exception of the Anabaptists, who called for separation and distinction and pluralism, the Protestant Reformation did not change that relationship of the ecclesiastical tent of the Beast. All it did was reorganize it. What they said is, “These little beasts are getting too powerful and too unruly to be in one camp, so what we will do is make a number of Arabs and a number of tents, and we'll put one of the little beasts inside of each tent.” Now that's really the same thing. And what they proceed to do is try to tame the Beast again by adjusting the setup. But these little dragons keep on growing and getting bigger and bigger, and by the eighteenth century, the collective beast in the little tent of statism(??) are now spawning secularism and rationalism, and these little beasts are able to challenge for power. They're losing their tameness, and the ecclesiastical Arabs are going to be pushed out the ecclesiastical tent. By then, by the end of the eighteenth century and the French revolution is a primary(??) expression of the situation, they are not only filling, they are beginning to control the ecclesiastical tent. In fact, they are even reversing the situation and are beginning to make pets out of the Arab. Now

**Side A** Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

**Side B** Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

what you get then in the nineteenth and twentieth century—I told you, you had to listen carefully to follow this—these tamed, dominated Arabs give us a very good picture of what we see on the ecclesiastical scene in the latter nineteenth and twentieth century. The taming of the Arab is the humanizing and the secularizing of a significant portion of institutional Christendom—a significant portion of the church. And almost inevitably, by the middle of this twentieth century, there emerges camel theology—or Beast theology, that is, secular theology, Anti-Christ, Babylon in terms of ecclesiastical society and his false prophets! And so our world bows in this twentieth century not only to rampant mammonism and materialism, but also to a secularistic (sic) religious humanism! The religion of the Anti-Christ! The religion of the Beast! In an article that appeared—a couple of articles that appeared in *Christianity Today*, professor Beierhaus(??), a famous professor of missions at the university of [inaudible name], reports that the chief ideologists of contemporary European theology are not theologians at all, but philosophers and sociologists! [30:00] The expression of the Beast, and secularism! And philosophers and sociologists of Neo-Marxist conviction, such as Herbert Marcuse, Rudolf Bultmann(??). Already theology of the vast ecclesiastical institution faces the sellout to theological humanism. And the Bultmannian theologians prepared the way, for example Herbert Braun(??), claimed, and I quote him, “God himself is not an objective personality or entity, but rather a certain form of human interrelatedness.” So I’m going to say a little bit more about that, uh, as we move along. Or Joachim Kahl, who wrote the theological bestseller of seven years ago, uh, *The Mis*—entitled, *The Misery of Christianity: A Plea for Humanism without God*, also preparing the way for the exponents of this theology of secularization, [inaudible name] and Harry [inaudible name], in which the church does not exist for God or for his son, but for man! For the world! This again is the great adulteress: the main purpose of the church is to humanize society! Recently, reports Beierhaus, a more radical contingent of young theologians in Germany, having abandoned now all appearances, dedicated themselves openly to Marxism, even engaging in anti-evangelism, trying to convert their fellow theological students away from the last remnants of their Christian perspective. Some of these students at Münster in the theological college there even staged a black mass to Satan. The sin of this present evil age. [Inaudible] right when Jesus said, “I and the Father are one,” he actually dethroned the sovereign God and enthroned himself as a man. A man in God’s dignity. What Blok(??) is saying is that Jesus, too, was an atheist, and a humanist. Beierhoff’s(??) comment, “We rightly say that the death-of-God theology was of impacting significance, today it is being replaced by the man-is-God theology, which is actually the theology of the Anti-Christ. If the transcendentant (sic) God of the Bible, if the personal creator and sustainer God, the God who calls man to account(??) but totally of it, if God in that sense can be eliminated, then man is God! And eventually God is reduced to sensual feeling, heightened mentally and psychically perhaps by LSD, or heightened physically and emotionally by sex and radical encounters of group(??) experience. God, you see, becomes only a model, an abstraction of human creation. Literally an abstraction of myself in relation to other human beings, in relation to other selves(??). And that means that each new society creates a new God—man creates God. We come back to Romans chapter one, that when man rejects God, he is given

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

over to a reprobate mind to worship himself and ultimately his own lust, with the result lies as we see it in society around us of unisex and homosexuality and all the rest of it. [35:09]

Now some time ago I had the—I won't say pleasure—had the opportunity of hearing these things firsthand. There is an organization that is attempting to create the new Christianity called—or the new religion of Anti-Christ, as I call it—For the New World. It's, uh, deeply rooted in the national and world council of churches, it has its tentacles reaching out in seminars all over the world, and all over North-America, and it's centered in what is known as the Ecumenical Institute in Chicago. I was able to sit in on a number of lectures and I have some of their materials, and what I am about to say comes firsthand: I saw it grafted on blackboards, I heard it presented clearly. This is the new religion of man aiming at the religion, the new religion in the creation, in the development of a new religion for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It says we haven't a shred of evidence that Christ himself actually lived. All we know for sure is that some two thousand years ago something significant happened. The real meaning of *messiah* is this: that you are significant, and unique and an irreplaceable human being. “We are,” says one of the staff, “a laboratory for the new church. We are searching for programs and testing projects that will update the church and prepare it for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.” Now this will be interesting: they run a school, uh, they have their own [inaudible] school. Schools—experimental schools for the creation of the new man, of the new society, a nimbus school for children in Chicago; they say grace! Uh, in fact, they shout grace. And the saying and shouting of grace is a joy to the ear, as modern as the mast in English(??). There is a syncopated clapping of hands, then a chorus of voices shout, “Food is good!”—an answering chorus sings out “Life,” then, “Life is good!” Again a full-bodied, “Life!” Finally, “All is good!” And all the children yell, “It's okay!” And that's great. And that's humanism. That's humanism. It goes on to say(??), we are searching for what is relevant in our time, one story of the universe, and we know there is no God upstairs—God is a happening. We believe that the individual finds himself, saves himself only through identification with the group; shades of Orwell. Well, I could go on. What has the institute learned that will be carried on into the church of the 21<sup>st</sup> century? How can urban life be better than man's spirit brightened? The staff members are attentative (sic)—well, it's still early in the service—the staff members are as attentative (sic) as they are undogmatic: borrowing terms from Judaism and Mormonism and even communism. They envision tomorrow's world as threefold: there will be the center temple—perhaps nothing more than a pile of rocks—where the great celebrations for all of civilization will take place—this is their own literature!—; then there will be the stakes of the synagogue, these will be the houses and neighborhoods where people gather to worship—shouting that life is good—and study and plan; and finally there will be the guilds, the task forces to combat trouble and fight injustice and work for greater humaneness. The institute sees religion in the future as each man is priest and rabbi and all men, regardless, all men are formed into a free [inaudible] of believers. Believing what? Well, it goes on to say—and this is part of their courses, the nature of their courses—you begin, you begin this experience of the new religion with a cultural revolution! [40:05] That means you analyze what is happening to our world, you look at changes in basic human mood, the secularism of our world, and once you

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

understand that you move on onto course two, the religious revolution, which means that you learn to how live with the changes that have taken place and you create a religion to sacrilize (sic) and sanctify and glorify the secularism that has triumphed! You don't challenge anything that man or the beast does or want collectively. You learn—and this is the new religion—you learn to accept this and create a new religion to support it. And I quote, “Temple models are forged out of the signals of the time or an intentional future.” You secularize, you sacrilize (sic) the beast. Well, man creates God. The roots of this new religion of humanistic secularism, are also expressed in the atheistic and existential ethics of Sartre and Heidegger. I quote from Stromberg's *Intellectual History*, “The essential existentialism is the message,”—and we had it there in that ecumenical institute, too—“The essential existentialism is the message to be authentic, to refuse to be depersonalized.” And for them this means that you can't ever be told what to believe in, not even by God. There is no revelation. It goes on: “We must presumably pass,”—and this is their secular new birth, their secular salvation, “We must presumably pass through the crisis wherein we see that there is no god, no meaning in the universe as such.” Nothing or no one can help us—then we realize the uniqueness and wonder of man, the creator of values. Man the creator. Man the creator—and he keeps coming back, and coming back, and coming back.

Now all of this ultimately boils down to this: what they are saying is that religion is simply human sensual experience as it is collectively understood. They're all imperative. Worship is nothing more than interpersonal feeling. And certain kinds of social, psychological oriented humanists become the new high priests. And sensitivity and counter groups become the new churches. I could go on to give personal illustrations of this about the chaplain of this university who got involved in this thing and came back telling us about his new birth and he never mentioned God. And whenever he went for a weekend retreat to this ecumenical institute with a bunch of men and women and they felt each other's faces and did all sorts of things and cried on each other's shoulders and they hugged one another and all the rest of it, but they never mentioned God or prayed to God the entire time and he came back and told of the holy experience of new birth. He identified it with the new birth of the scriptures. What you have is physical and psychological and emotional humanism, substituted for the real, transcendental God of the scriptures, substituted for the koinonia—the fellowship—of the redeemed community of the New Testament—[audio cuts off] [44:36]

**[End of Side A]**

**[Side B]**

—substituted for a fellowship through and in Jesus Christ, in which, according to the scriptures, unlike sensitivity training, in which each one is a responsible self. And in which each one must give an account of himself to the almighty God. Now what is the state of this coming new world? The growing dominance of materialistic, secularistic (sic), humanistic concept and control. This means that we face increasingly a world of industrialized, urbanized lifestyle with lonely and isolated and valueless— a world of ruthless competition even amongst those whose social



*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

doctrines would try to eliminate it, have simply reversed to another level. A world of godless, humanless (sic), moralless (sic) machine technology, a world of materialism, a world of careless exploitation of fellow man and nature, a world that's already begun to take shape around us [inaudible]. A world, a society, a civilization which has virtually abandoned the Christian social norms and values, and laws, whether you're talking about marriage or family, and our whole care of souls program is going to have to change to adapt to the new world, and to new voices and to new temptations. In its early stages today this secular society may not even look too dangerous, the beast may not yet look too wild. It may allow for, it may tolerate a measure of pluralism. But I suggest to you that toleration will only be temporary. The beast says that it is willing to grant political freedom—they say it in Russia, too. It is willing to grant political freedom to believe religiously anything one chooses. But don't be fooled. The writings of Marcuse, for example, one of their prophets, one of their major prophets, espouses open intolerance of all who do not conform to the religion of the Beast. Well, the scriptures tell us the same thing. In reality, what we face, whether there is physical force or not, in reality what we face is control through the media, control that our social and economic and educational [systems] in their structure constraints and influences that are coming upon us increasingly under the supervision of those with a secularistic mindset in our society and in our Canadian society. This represents a growing, massive anti-Christian force with vast potential for brainwashing and using all the techniques of modern hidden persuaders that are more dangerous and more significant and greater than the military persecution that faced the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, or the martyred church of the second and third. We're going to have to be very, very much on our guard.

Now how should we respond, as believers' church Christians? Now we should respond in a way that is quite different from other Christians, who either see their goal of their Christian effort as somehow the Christianization of society—I fear for them. [5:06] And we see this goal is failing more and more and more. Or even what those of the liberal church try to do, simply interpret secular society as if it were sacred and so fall into the great horrors of self-delusionism (sic). But what should we do, as believers' church Christians? As New Testament Christians? Run away and hide, as they did in the fourth century, as they had to do in the fourth century. No, I don't think that's the answer the New Testament indicates as the answer in the end times. Certainly we are to lift up our heads, for it means our redemption is drawn nigh. Certainly it means we are to work, for the night is coming when no man can work. But I think beyond that there are four fundamental principles of action in the New Testament for the believers' church in the last days. The first is this—now this is a kind of paradox, according to scriptures—according to scripture our response as Christians is to be bold in separation and prepare for witness. Bold separation and witness! Revelation 18 says: “Come out of her, my people, be not partakers of her sins.” And Matthew asserts this gospel shall be preached in all the world for a witness—then cometh the end. Separation here is in the context of cohesive, meaningful supportive centers for outreach! It means building walls that can protect from the forces of the outside, but it means building walls that are walls of glass, with the whole life and testimony and witness of Christian vitality going on in the life where those in the darkness outside can see in. It means distinction

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

and identity without isolation. It means outreach without dissolution of your own lifestyle and perspective. Now how do you reconcile this business of separation and commission? Separation and witness? Only—and this is the second point that I think we need to remember very, very clearly—and we heard it preached over and over and over again and yet we get confused on the matter. The reconciliation requires a constant remembering that our task as the church of Jesus Christ is to witness, not to Christianize! But that does not mean that we do not persuade other people as much as we can. That does not mean that we do not have a full capacity—and they like full capacities—‘cuz we do. But that is not the purpose, that is the [inaudible] happening. The purpose is to witness, not to Christianize. And we must not forget that the New Testament clearly assumes the—that Christians will be functioning in a secular society at the end. The third point is to remember that God is also working. I emphasized in this presentation only the one side, the side of the present evil world and its development. We need to remember that God is also working—working out his purposes, completing his church, or his kingdom. [10:02] And I would pose to you, dear friends, this morning, that the opportunity for the church of Jesus Christ, in particular for believers churches: the opportunities were never greater, if we can retain our own values and identity as the sons of God and as his people, and his kingdom, along with openness and a sense of mission. Now, how can secularization as it is taken place in our world now, in preparation—I believe—for the end, how can secularization be beneficial to the Gospel? Because it is. Two ways, particularly: it is beneficial in that one of the major problems facing New Testament Christians in the past decade has been the utter confusion of society out there as to who is the church and what is the gospel. The distinction between church and non-church was so muddled that it was hard to get people saved. It is beneficial in that the confusion of what is real Christianity and what is bogus Christianity is lessening at a remarkable level. Twenty years ago you had universities filled with student Christian movements and all sorts of things that were liberalized, humanistic Christianity, and nobody knew for sure what was real Christianity. You could go to a university campus and you would find sixty percent of the professors on the campus attending church once in a while, and even if they didn’t attend church, they claimed to be Christians although they were liberal Christians. Today you go to a university campus and you can hardly find a professor who goes to church and claims to be a liberal Christian. They either belong to the Lord Jesus Christ as Biblical Christians, or they flatly say they are non-believers. Liberal Christianity is intellectually finished. It has ceased to exist. And that spirit is simply a few years behind as it moves down into society at last. And so we face an opportunity. The confusion of what is real Christianity and what is bogus is lessening. And therefore a better opportunity exists now to call out disciples, real evangelism, to call out citizens, ultimately, for the kingdom of Christ. This is a tremendous advantage, an advantage that did not exist when Christianity was pseudo-Christian. Today’s society involves more religious realism and more religious integrity than ever before.

A second point that I make in terms of the values of the secularization is that what I have discovered is a greater readiness in the face of this for even thinking men to admit. That nothing less than the radical transformation of man is called for, if anything good is to ever happen in this

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

country. There is far less soft talk about the real nature of the human predicament. Even Marxism and the revolution is undergoing transformation and the nature of the revolution and the nature of the change in the very soul of man that is required is becoming more and more obvious to them. Their failure to come up with a new birth was part of a very, very interesting and a very significant article that appeared just a couple weeks ago in *Christianity Today* by a pastor in Romania that had been struggling within the communist system with this same thing: he found no basis for morality. No real basis for the morality that the communist world in fact needs and wants. No real basis for transformation of the nature of man. And then lastly, how should we respond as believers' church Christians? [15:00] A secular society—now this may be the most important thing that I have to say—a secular society calls for the presentation, once again, of the original God. And I'll say a little bit more about that tonight. It calls for a new kind of witness. It means that we as Christians need to once again begin to recognize that the way in which the gospel is presented has to change when the culture and the society in which you present it changes. You can't go on preaching nineteenth century sermons! We need to go back to the basics. We need to proclaim and espouse and live the kingdom! I guess. This is what I call “pre-evangelism”. Actually, it's real evangelism. It's the fundamental evangelism: proclaiming and explaining the gospel today requires—now don't get me wrong, I am not condemning those when this worked properly and was the right way to do it under a previous set of conditions—but proclaiming and explaining the gospel today requires much more than glibly affirming that Jesus is the answer. It requires much more than decision evangelism, which in many cases is very little more than statistics for the successful ecclesiastical machine. What the gospel and the proclamation and the presentation of the gospel requires today if it's going to be effective is a level of honesty and integrity that we have never known before. It calls for a witness by faithful disciples to a counter life, an alternative. It calls for the creation of a visible, alien alternative to society in all its aspects. It calls for the living and the presentation of the kingdom at its most fundamental levels. Real evangelism means that we can no longer assume anything. We can no longer assume that those in the world out at large with whom we have contact have any Christian knowledge. You can't go to them quoting Bible verses when they don't know the Bible, and if they do know the Bible they don't believe it anyway. That doesn't mean stop using the Bible, but use it in a different light. You can no longer assume anything about their belief system. You can no longer assume anything about their awareness. You can no longer assume anything about their moral values. You can't go to them with, “Now, look, don't you know you shouldn't be living with that person who isn't your wife! Bunked(??) up in that place.” And you can't expect him have any guilt about it; they don't feel any guilt about it. They have absolutely no knowledge of Christian values, moral values, lifestyle, as we have traditionally understood it. What you face is total ignorance or more often grave misconception and distortions, even of what the nature of Christianity is. Now how do you awaken their conscience? That's part of the pre-evangelism, that's part of the Christian task! In this case, a distinctly Christian lifestyle without apology. Now I have to drive this home, because the church is going the other way at a time when we should be more Christian and more distinctive, we are becoming less! [20:00] In this case a distinctly Christian lifestyle without apology of any sort is prior to and stronger than

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

witness. Verbal witness. It in fact stronger *as* witness than even correct explanations of the Christian faith, which of course is necessary and can come later in the process. But—now note this well—distinctive, the distinctive godly lifestyle, now I say this to pastors in particular in respect to the [inaudible], the distinctive godly lifestyle will become harder to retain in a totally secularizing environment. It was easy, relatively speaking, to persuade Christians, young people, that they shouldn't have premarital sex—before the pill. You were never quite sure whether they were abstaining because they really believed in the sanctity and the beauty of God's view of sex and out of Christian motive, or because of the fear of the tight social system of the church in which they existed, and what would happen to them if they got pregnant and so on. You were never quite sure. Now this whole thing of upholding basic Christian values gets tougher and tougher and tougher when you live in a secular environment which tolerates these things, and you can do it and get away with it and there isn't even any social pressure on you. And we will discover in our churches that it is harder to retain a godly lifestyle than it is to give people the ability to put out correct orthodox argumentation. Theological orthodoxy is gonna be a thousand times easier to attain than moral orthodoxy. This is where our greatest danger of failing is going to be centered. And the New Testament I think clearly warns us of this. When the son of man comes shall he find the faith. In totality, working, living faith on the earth. That means far more than doctrine. Or again: because iniquity, lawlessness, self-indulgence, because the spirits of humanism, of self-indulgence, shall be multiplied. The law—now that's the practical, not theology, that's in danger—the law of man. [Inaudible] The law is the patriotism of the kingdom of God.

Now how should we respond? By witness: a living, vital, active, moral witness to authentic New Testament Christianity? Yes. Through sacrificial separation? Yes, yes, yes! And don't get hung up by bypasses(??) about separation that are not what the word talks about, and let the real thing get by you. This separation, however, based on love, and based on a vital(??) personal love for our lord and saviour and for our neighbours. And nothing less will make it in the secular realities of the next decade, if our lord returns. [25:00] And I'm convinced that no one is better fitted and able to handle this coming age than those holding to the New Testament primitive perspective of the kingdom, which I believe is embodied best in the believers' church today.

[Piano music is heard from 25:27 until 26:33]

Dr. Ken Davis: Yes?

[Inaudible question]

Dr. Ken Davis: [deep sigh] Well, a couple things, and it ties, you see, into the proclamation of the gospel. First of all, uh, as a response of believing faith, they expected repentance. That is, they expected a genuine full confession of sinfulness. And with it, uh, some sort of assertion of determination to cut it out(??). Uh, this took place before baptism. Now it goes on further in that they saw baptism as a kind of covenant. Baptism was not just a, uh, a witness to the regeneration that they claimed had taken place, but it was also a covenant to uh, a covenant made to the fellowship of believers to uh, to, to development of the new life, to the resurrection. Uh, it was

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

the symbol of both death and resurrection. And the, and the, the resurrected life included the willingness through repentance and the ongoing repentant spirit and the change of will, and I suspect the most significant sign of the change of the will was the willingness to put themselves unto the discipline of the local church, and if the local church told them it was wrong, that's what was wrong. And one who is, one who is, uh, strong-headed and disobedient and unwilling to accept the, uh, understanding of the Christian life of the fellowship, was considered to have an unregenerate spirit. And that puts a lot of bite into baptism. Okay, uh, now of course what we're talking about is something like the New Testament again—you're talking about first generation Anabaptism(??) as a movement. You have to go into the next generation—another twenty-five, thirty years, uh, particularly, well, another twenty years, anyway—to begin to see what happens, um, what happens in the matter of raising children within the community and, uh, I do have a few remarks to make tomorrow on that, when I come to this business of the quality of life. And uh, it's interesting to take a look at some of the baptismal formulae. And uh, when you got up to be baptized, they didn't say, “Are you a Christian?” and you said, “Yes.”—you gave a whole series of vows before the congregation as to what you are prepared to do, and how you are prepared to live, and the disciplines you are prepared to accept, which included, before they even baptized you, a statement that if necessary you would put all your goods and wealth at the disposal of the community. [30:00] If the Lord made that necessary. And anything less than that kind of submission was considered to be non-accepting of the lordship of Jesus Christ: the material things are still primary and not the Spirit of God, so that in fact, uh, amongst the Anabaptists they not only—they came very close to adult baptism as believers' baptism, they did not baptize at eight or ten or eleven or twelve years of age. They believed that persons at those ages still automatically accepted—they wanted to be like mommy and daddy—they were still automatically, psychologically oriented towards the home and to the acceptance of what would bring home approval, and that they automatically wanted to do whatever it was that mommy and daddy and the rest of the family were. Of course they wanted to be Christians. But they believed that the real choice did not come until the devil came. And they would say this was something that was only known in the plan of God in the action of the Holy Spirit—you didn't just decide when you were going to get saved on your own, it's when the Holy Spirit determined it—but it came at a time when a young person actually felt the pull of the world and then made the decision to accept Christ rather than the world. Knowing what it was about, this as adolescence at least, and in most cases they held off baptism until about sixteen, or older. Sometimes eighteen. Also of course remember that this has many of the same characteristics of the early church. To be baptized as an Anabaptist meant right up until the 1570s there was a very strong possibility you would be burned within a week. You thought twice about the matter, anyway. And if you weren't burned, there was a pretty good chance you would be losing your home, clothes and everything else and heading on the highway, in a matter of a very few weeks. So if we think—now this is another matter—but if we think the simple business in the New Testament—this is an extremely simplistic, and again a reading of the New Testament without understanding the historical context—if we think the New Testament just went through a very simple formula that somebody suddenly became a Christian and bang, within fifteen minutes you

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

baptized him, uh, you don't understand the New Testament. You don't understand the conditions of the New—I say that quite flatly. Nobody asks for baptism under those terms unless they were already three-quarters a Christian by being a committed Jew. Nobody asked for baptism under those terms in the early church. And you only have to know something of the very earliest church history to understand that. The very earliest record going right back into the life of these apostles, the earliest records show when they went out into the gentile world, that they, uh, that people often went under instruction for as long as three years, before they were brought to baptism. They didn't say they weren't Christian. They just wanted to be sure, because there could be a traitor and that would end up with the destruction of the whole group.

[Inaudible question]

Dr. Ken Davis: I haven't been able to find a list of do's and don'ts, specifically. What they did do was list the biblical do's and don'ts—there are plenty of them in the New Testament. And of course in their century, when the church was very loose-living in society and society was very loose-living, and society was considered church at large, and so the standards of society at large were considered the standards of the church, too, uh, just to list what the Bible called for was itself an absolutely incredible standard for the people in that day to try and maintain. And they really didn't have to go much beyond that. But they did recognize that the Bible said certain things, drunkenness and what have you, and they did recognize that it goes on into such things. They didn't—they never, never said that, uh, the church didn't have the right to add things that weren't specifically in the Bible. And they said yes, the fellowship in its sensitivity of the leading of the Holy Spirit has that right, but it must do so, uh, in the context of the Biblical pattern.

Dr. Ken Davis: Ya?

[Inaudible question] [35:00]

Dr. Ken Davis: I really can't. (Laughs) (Audience laughs) Uh, in the, in the—these are very, very complicated issues and uh, the, actually, the four or five lectures on the scene that I'm giving is just the first in a group in preparation of another one I am giving and it'll eventually come together. Uh, Anabaptist eschatology—I think I had some graduate students working on that—is a very complex thing because it relates first of all to defining Anabaptists. Uh, what you had is—hah, I can go into a very interesting thing—you had an interesting eschatology that was developed by Thomas Müntzer. And Thomas Müntzer's eschatology was uh, a kind of post-tribulationism. And he had a very strong sense of a, uh, a seven year period just before the coming of Christ, um, and the church was in that seven year period, and it was in his day and he was one of the prophets of the tribulation. And uh, uh, the uh, the whole business of the date—he was able to begin, he began to date because he had that specific thing going, he began to date notions of the return of Christ, and you have this a three and a half-year, three and a half-year thing, and the thing was discredited, of course, when he was killed rather than the revolution being successful. But it was taken up and reworked by Hans Hut, who was a sort of half-Anabaptist: he was baptized so you have to accept him as an Anabaptist, though he hadn't had any teaching in legitimate Anabaptist theology in 1526. So he was sort of a half-Anabaptist and half a follower of Thomas Müntzer. And uh, so, Hans Hut went up preaching his eschatology—

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

he was actually predicting through the Turks and so on the coming of Christ about, uh, 1528 or 1529, he saw the death of Thomas Müntzer in 1525 as the halfway point, the cutting off of the symbolic person, and so 1528 was the coming of the Lord. And as 15—late 1527 approached and through the influence of more legitimate Anabaptists who got a hold of him, including Hubmaier(??) and Denck and others, uh, he began to change that and say you couldn't predict the end and so he switched the whole seven year thing. Uh, this Thomas Müntzer seven year eschatology was picked up by the Lutheran preacher Melchior Hoffman and was preached as part of his Lutheran doctrine for many years before he turned in the 1530s towards Anabaptism in Strasbourg. Now, when he became an Anabaptist, he became an Anabaptist in order to use the Anabaptists as the messengers for the proclamation of the kingdom at the end of the seven years, which he had redated and pushed forward, and so—but he was a pacifist, you were not to be revolutionary, and that way he rejected part of Thomas Müntzer but uh, uhh, you were to preach the gospel of the kingdom and the new Jerusalem was to come to Strasbourg in about 1530 or '32 or something like that. Now all of that is a pre-millennial kind of post-tribulationism. And that was not Anabaptist. That was rooted in the Taborite eschatology from Bohemia, drawn out by Thomas Müntzer in his period of sojourn in Bohemia. Uh, what its medieval roots are really hasn't been investigated yet. Um, it does not typify most Anabaptism. As far as we can gather, most Anabaptists, including Hubmaier(??) and Grebel(??) and the rest, were, uh, no different in eschatology from Luther and Calvin, they were all millennials. Uh, if they were pre-millennialists they were post-trib pre-millennialists—although most of them didn't have that seven year hang-up thing in a program. Okay? I think I better leave the others, cause they're very long. Particularly the one on the sacrament, that's, that's a big thing. Um, I can't, I haven't found any literature that specifically talks about uh, uh, women preachers and so on, except that we do have evidence of kind of deaconesses. And we do have evidence of prophetesses. [40:00] But of course they, they uh, allowed for a certain prophetic ministry in the whole congregation anyway. Uh, I don't find any evidence of actual sort of ordained, uh, pastors, or anything like that who were women, but, uh, their wives were expected to be full part of their ministry. They travelled with them and so on. But there is no treatise on it that I know of. There is some on marriage, but there is nothing that I know of about women preachers.

Dr. Ken Davis: Yes?

[Inaudible question]

Dr. Ken Davis: Yeah, you remember one of the quotations that I've pointed out to you, I made some reference to laying on of hands(??). And uh, what they conceived was that the ministry was a charismatic thing; the person was called and gifted in a special way to serve. A special way might include an apostolic—by which they didn't mean apostles, but which they meant simply missionaries—uh, they believed in prophets, and by that they meant either a layman or the preacher, could be exercising a prophetic ministry, for much of the regular ministry of the pastor could be prophetic if it was not strict instruction, if it was for exhortation and edification and comfort. Um, but they did believe that the particular role of shepherd or pastor was a gift of the Holy Spirit that was an individual, but which was recognized by the congregation. The

*Side A* Ken Davis – “Lecture Five: The Believer's Church Facing a Secularized Society”

*Side B* Ken Davis – “Questions from Lecture Five”

congregation did not make(??) the pastor, but the congregation confirmed the existence of the gift and recognized it. And if the congregation did not recognize it, then the gift was in doubt. It was a mistaken thing. Now this goes back again to the whole business of whether you're defining doctrine or defining morality or defining discipline, or expounding scripture or so on, it was a collective thing. It was the body of Christ that did it. And if you were choosing a pastor it wasn't a democratic thing, you didn't run an election. You sought really for the unanimity in the spirit in the body of Christ in choosing, ordaining, a pastor. In fact all their decisions were based on the unanimity of the spirit, or as close as possible—never on majority or another kind of vote. And in fact, in many cases they felt the very exercise of the spiritual growth, and in many cases if a majority wanted a thing, a sizeable majority of reasonable and respectable Christians and the group didn't want it, then the majority acquiesced and prayed until they all came to the unity of the faith, one way or the other. And that constituted spiritual growth, rather than running a church like a business.

Dr. Ken Davis: Yeah?

[Inaudible question]

Dr. Ken Davis: They were very conscious on the business of what constitutes a church, what brings a church into existence. They were fully cognizant of not any gathering of Christians was a church. Uh, if the church was not going to be constituted by some sort of unbroken line of succession from Peter, in which there was some particular authority to ordain ministers and these ministers to create congregation and church around them, then there was some other way in which church was constituted. And their understanding of the constitution of the church related to the practical application of the new covenant, related particularly to the sacrament, to the Lord's supper and baptism, both of which they thought of as covenantal ordinances—(audio cuts off) [44:36]

**[End of Side B]**