



## THE PREEMINENCY OF SAVING FAITH TO SOCIETAL CHANGE

TO: LEGISLATORS

FROM: PASTOR RALPH DROLLINGER 661-803-7970 24/7/365

DATE: FEB. 18, 2013

What does the Bible say is the most excellent way to go about changing culture or a nation? For well over a quarter of a century the basis of the now mostly defunct Religious Right movement has been the emphasis on Christians working to change the laws of the land. That is certainly important, and many of you in office who name the name of Christ are heavily invested in that objective. Such is a worthy pursuit given our “by the people” form of government.

But notice this week from Luke chapter three that there is a more important discipline that every believer should be committed to in order to change the direction of a nation. If the former is a good pursuit, the later is an excellent pursuit. May that which is good not eclipse or diminish that which is excellent.

Let us not only understand the message of Luke 3:3-14 this week, but let us trace the aforementioned idea throughout American church history. Put on your thinking cap! This week’s Bible study will also help you gain a better understanding of American church history – so take the time to absorb this study.

## WEEKLY MEMBERS BIBLE STUDY

WEDNESDAY MORNINGS 7:45 to 8:45 AM

Hot Breakfast Served • Capitol Family Room H324 • Spouses Welcome

## CONGRESSIONAL SPONSORS

Robert Aderholt, *Alabama*  
 Todd Akin, *Missouri*  
 Spencer Bachus, *Alabama*  
 Michele Bachmann, *Minnesota*  
 Marsba Blackburn, *Tennessee*  
 Paul Broun, *Georgia*  
 Dan Burton, *Indiana*  
 John Campbell, *California*  
 John Carter, *Texas*  
 Bill Cassidy M.D., *Louisiana*  
 Rick Crawford, *Arkansas*  
 Jeff Denham, *California*  
 John Duncan, Jr., *Tennessee*  
 Mary Fallin, *Oklahoma*  
 John Fleming, *Louisiana*  
 Bill Flores, *Texas*  
 Randy Forbes, *Virginia*  
 Trent Franks, *Arizona*  
 Scott Garrett, *New Jersey*  
 Louie Gohmert, *Texas*  
 Tom Graves, *Georgia*  
 Ralph Hall, *Texas*  
 Gregg Harper, *Mississippi*  
 Pete Hoekstra, *Michigan*  
 Randy Hultgren, *Illinois*  
 Bill Johnson, *Ohio*  
 Jim Jordan, *Ohio*  
 Steve King, *Iowa*  
 Doug Lamborn, *Colorado*  
 James Lankford, *Oklahoma*  
 Mike McIntyre, *North Carolina*  
 Gary Miller, *California*  
 Sue Myrick, *North Carolina*  
 Randy Neugebauer, *Texas*  
 Steve Pearce, *New Mexico*  
 Mike Pence, *Indiana*  
 Mike Pompeo, *Kansas*  
 Bill Posey, *Florida*  
 Tom Price, *Georgia*  
 Ben Quayle, *Arizona*  
 Tim Scott, *South Carolina*  
 Steve Southerland, *Florida*  
 Lamar Smith, *Texas*  
 Marlin Stutzman, *Indiana*  
 Glenn “GT” Thompson, *Pennsylvania*  
 Scott Tipton, *Colorado*  
 Daniel Webster, *Florida*  
 Allen West, *Florida*  
 Lynn Westmoreland, *Georgia*  
 Joe Wilson, *South Carolina*  
 Steve Womack, *Arkansas*



## CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM

**I. INTRODUCTION**

There has been heated debate among Evangelical pastors and church leaders over the past 35 years as to how the believer should best engage in societal preservation and reconstruction. That topic was my main focus during my seminary training. While both sides of the debate represent noble motives and seek the same objective, there is controversy as to how to best achieve it. Let me suggest that this week's passage makes a strong and simple case for the following:

**THE BELIEVER'S EMPHASIS ON HEART CHANGE WILL ASSUREDLY RESULT IN LAW CHANGE**

Luke chapter 3 is an insightful passage regarding the guaranteed social benefits that inure from the evangelism efforts of believers. Here are excerpts from that somewhat lengthy passage that will enable you to quickly see my point (contextually, the "he" is John the Baptist):

*3 And he came into all the district around the Jordan, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins....<sup>8</sup> "Therefore bear fruits in keeping with repentance....<sup>10</sup> And the crowds were questioning him, saying, "Then what shall we do?" <sup>11</sup> And he would answer and say to them, "The man who has two tunics is to share with him who has none; and he who has food is to do likewise." <sup>12</sup> And some tax collectors also came to be baptized, and they said to him, "Teacher, what shall we do?" <sup>13</sup> And he said to them, "Collect no more than what you have been ordered to." <sup>14</sup> Some soldiers were questioning him, saying, "And what about us, what shall we do?" And he said to them, "Do not take money from anyone by force, or accuse anyone falsely, and be content with your wages."<sup>1</sup>*

John was an evangelist preaching the need to repent as a necessary component to receiving Christ (otherwise, when you think about it, why do you need to be saved – if in your heart there is no acknowledgement of being lost, then why are you seeking Christ and His forgiveness?)

I have purposefully edited the passage to simply read in a way that makes the social implications of John's evangelism immediately apparent. The three different sectors of Palestinian culture that happened to be present when he preached were the **crowds**, the **tax collectors**, and the **soldiers**. All were profoundly affected by John's message, each of who repented of their sins and were genuinely converted. Stemming from their conversion, all possessed an internal, Holy Spirit-driven unction characterized by and resulting in the same question: **What shall we do?** Said another way, one of the fruits of salvation is the indwelling Holy Spirit who convicts the converted to become better citizens! Each of the three is instructed by Jesus to bear character qualities that will most certainly benefit society! Here then is the best way to effect societal change in the long run. (To disagree with this is to disagree with the simple, clear understanding of the passage).

American Evangelicalism in its attempt to change the country has discounted the power of evangelism! And look at what has happened: The nation has only gotten worse; it has not changed for the better! In 35 years of trying to change laws more so than hearts, the Religious Right has little to show for its efforts.

**WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT IT IS TIME FOR BELIEVERS TO MAKE EVANGELISM A PRIORITY IN THE CAPITOL?**

With the evaporation of the Religious Right movement in recent years, perhaps the time is now to return to the simple formula for effecting societal change as illustrated by and in this passage.<sup>2</sup>



---

## CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM

---

What follows is a brief history of how this Religious Right ideology instead of evangelism per se has played itself out in American Church history. Hopefully this will serve you by providing a broader historical context for this important topic, resulting in a better-informed, deep-seated conviction concerning the same. Stay with me now and read on; this will be worth your time.

### II. 1776: THE PURITAN PULPIT SHAPES AMERICAN CULTURE

In Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, He said squarely, "Seek first the kingdom of God..." (Matthew 6:33a). Accordingly, how a believer perceives the Kingdom of God – whether it is worldly and now, or spiritual and future – greatly affects the present emphasis one deems necessary relative to (among other things) his or her involvement in political-cultural matters. One's convictions concerning the Kingdom will determine how one goes about attempting to obey Christ's clear and resolute command to "Seek first the Kingdom" during their earthly existence.

Having established that basic understanding first, Postmillennialism was the prevailing eschatological point of view of the American church from the Puritan era all the way through to the Civil War. Postmillennialism is the Christian view that Christ will return at the end of the millennial period – after which time believers have Christianized the world and prepared the way for Him. It was the dominant singular motivation as to why Evangelicals were involved in society during this earliest period of American church history. Postmillennialism was promoted through this period of the Great Awakening by such preachers as the great Jonathan Edwards.

**IN THIS CONTEXT THE CHURCH WAS  
GUIDED BY A PROPHETIC DETERMINISM  
TO WORK FOR SOCIETAL CHANGE VIA  
DIRECTLY ATTACHING ITSELF TO  
CULTURE AND POLITICS**

Such involvement was essential to ushering in the Kingdom: This is only logical in that, again, Christ will only return at a point in time when believers have prepared the way by Christianizing all the nations of the world. In Postmillennial thought, Christianizing the world was and is "the believer's side of the bargain" that must be achieved in order to enact Christ's Second Coming. To illustrate the tangential fervor of this American Postmillennial belief in early America, church historian Marsden summarizes what was widely believed at that time:

America has a special place in God's plans and will be the center for the great spiritual and moral reform that will lead to the golden age or 'millennium' of Christian civilization. Moral reform accordingly is crucial for hastening this spiritual millennium."<sup>3</sup>

The Puritans as well as present-day Postmillennialists (known today as Dominion Theologians or Theonomists) believe that Christ's Kingdom will grow out of the spiritual and moral progress gained by and through the believer's efforts at *reforming* politics and culture in the present age. But *reforming* is not necessarily equated with soul winning, i.e. the simple formula of Luke, chapter three evangelism. Social progress then, in the Puritan period was evidence of the advance of the Kingdom of God. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, a leading Postmillennialist who stated, "The kingdom of God is not a kingdom lying in another world beyond the skies but established here and now", illustrates further the summation of this belief.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, missionary progress was measured during the Puritan period not only in terms of evangelistic crusades, revival and church planting, but in terms of cultural advancement. Cultural successes pertaining to slavery, abolition and technological achievement were just as much measurements of the Christianization of America as anything else.

The point to all this is that prior to the intrusion of theological Modernism into the church after the Civil war, Postmillennialism was the singular



---

**CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM**

---

prevailing theological impetus that motivated, wedded and justified the emphasis of the Church to be directly involved in the politics and culture of the country. Therefore one's attempt to ascertain the repeatable effectiveness for today of the Evangelical church's involvement in the political/cultural arena, as was the case during the Puritan period, rises or falls on whether or not Postmillennial eschatology is biblically demonstrable and verifiable today. In fact Postmillennialism is not exegetically popular today; it has been roundly discounted by leading conservative Evangelical theologians. Today, the dominant eschatology in the American Church is Premillennialism, (this predominant eschatological camp believes that Christ's Second Coming will occur at the start of the Millennial period in order to save the world from its own tragedy). Most of the leading national Evangelical expository preachers are Premillennialists. Accordingly,

**POSTMILLENNIALISM IS IN NO POSITION  
TO BE THE TOUR DE FORCE THAT IT  
ONCE WAS SO AS TO BE A LEADING  
IMPETUS FOR CULTURAL CHANGE TODAY**

(and from an interpretive/exegetical standpoint, that is a good thing because there is no Scripture to support the idea that Christ's Second Coming is predicated on the Church Christianizing culture beforehand). Postmillennialism is a good pragmatic motivation to engage believers in culture, but it is woefully lacking in terms of biblical underpinnings.

In other words, if prophetic determinism (postmillennial thought to usher in God's Kingdom by transforming culture) is the total motivation and justification for manifesting social actions, then social involvement by the church pivots on its ability to biblically substantiate postmillennial belief. (A theological discussion pertaining to the strengths and weaknesses of Postmillennialism warrants its own Bible study at another time). So, if the premise of Postmillennialism is built on faulty eschatological exposition (the American Church

had largely rejected Postmillennial eschatology by the conclusion of WWII), then it stands to reason that what motivated Puritan cultural involvement back then is non-sustainable and incapable of doing the same for today.

To summarize this first epoch of American Church history as it pertains to the preeminence of saving faith to societal change (the emphasis of Luke, chapter 3), the impetus and formula that served to engage the early American Church in a mission to change society was Postmillennial eschatology more so than simple evangelism. The Puritan motivation to change culture was based on a very pragmatic, but exegetically faulty eschatology more so than the simple evangelism formula contained in this week's passage of Luke, chapter three.

### **III. 1877: THE ENCROACHMENT OF THEOLOGICAL LIBERALISM**

The period in American church history that immediately followed Puritanism was the rise of Modernism, or better, Theological Liberalism. This changing of the guard was a dominant (but not entire) metamorphosis that occurred over a period of time from approximately 1865 to 1915. It transformed Postmillennial-driven Puritanism into liberal Protestantism and ushered in what is commonly referred to as the emergence of a social gospel form of "Christianity." During the period of American church history, there can be no doubt as to the accelerating involvement of the American "Church" into the political/social arena, as depicted by the synonymous name "the *social* gospel." The more pertinent question however is this: "Was the social gospel form of Christianity a biblical Christianity – or for that matter, was it Christianity at all?" J. Gresham Machen said resoundingly, "No it is not." In his book *Christianity and Liberalism* published in 1923, he became the chief spokesmen against what had become a thoroughly established liberal Protestantism. Machen (from whose primer I learned the Greek language) had been a New Testament professor at Princeton Theological



---

## CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM

---

Seminary prior to the liberal Presbyterians' wresting control of the institution. Machen and his theologically conservative cohorts then left the school to found Westminster Seminary. Importantly and accurately, he insisted that liberal Protestantism was "another religion, since it proposed an entirely new view of Jesus and a scheme of salvation other than Christianity had ever taught before."<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, Modernist Christianity, if Machen was correct, possessed no scriptural basis for political/social involvement because it was not a legitimate depiction of Christianity to begin with!

### **LIBERAL PROTESTANTISM HAD ESCAPED THE CONFINES OF CHRISTIANITY'S IRREDUCIBLE MINIMUMS**

It's core heresy continues to be this: Jesus is not our Savior, he is merely a humble, humanitarian role model worthy of personal exemplification – as if that is all that Jesus is about! Herein is a satanic stripping away, a denuding of the power of the cross of Christ.

Modernism represented a not so subtle convergence of four concussionary confluences on Puritan Christianity. Briefly, it was composed of Naturalism or Darwinianism, which raised doubt as to the supernatural and scientific accuracy of Scripture. Secondly, Modernism contained within it the presupposition of human rationalism. That is to say that man's reasoning was deemed superior to God's revelation in Scripture. Therefore whatever in Scripture could not be understood through (man's finite) reasoning was viewed with suspicion. Thirdly, Historical Criticism was imported from the Tubingen School in Germany. This criticism had many forms, with the intellectual intent of casting doubt, among other things, on the accuracy of the Synoptic gospels. It asked the question, could the believer trust what Matthew, Mark and Luke wrote? Or was the supposedly real historical Jesus different from the "Christian" Jesus that the gospel writers had portrayed and embellished? In this sense, both

Naturalism and Historical Criticism (Historical Criticism is the science of codifying the ancient manuscript evidence in the manufacture of the Bible) enshrined the Scriptures with theoretical plausible doubt. Add to that the forth confluence of the encroaching Social Gospel as invented by Kant, Schleiermacher and Beecher, and "Christianity" had degenerated into nothing more than a moral code for people to live by. Liberal Protestantism was – and remains – a far cry from biblical Christianity. (As an aside, this explains why so many, who say they are "Christians" in the capitol, but are embedded in theological liberalism, reason differently on policy issues. As Machen quipped, they may wear the name "Christian" on their shirtsleeve – but they are part of another religion!).

During this period of transformation there was very little defense of the true biblically based Christian faith. The lionhearted rhetoric of William F. Warren, the president of Boston University, provides insight to the fact that conservative Christian leaders were pridefully asleep at the wheel. Notice this in his words,

Toward the middle of the last century came the fullness of God's time for generating a new Christian nationality.... [Now] all these threatening surges of Antichristian thought have come to us from European seas; not one arose in our own hemisphere....

Conservative Christian leadership of that time either possessed few apologists of learning, or else they made little of the threat until it was too late. They were reluctant to justifiably "Be angry" (Ephesians 4:26) in the sense of righteous indignation and an aggressive rejection of encroaching false doctrine. This attitude is descriptive of the great evangelist D.L. Moody. He was opposed to controversy itself. Whereas the New Testament writer Jude preempted his soteriological emphasis in order to earnestly defend the faith from apostasy (Jude 3), Moody, who possessed the platform and the influence to do so



---

**CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM**

---

in the American Church as a leading evangelist, seemingly would have no part in such activities. He was known as a theological pragmatist and “often tested doctrines relative to their suitability for evangelism.”<sup>6</sup> He always sought peace and avoided controversy, seeking a “religion of the heart, versus a religion of the mind.” He often dialogued with theological liberals, giving them grace with the hope that they would eventually come around and embrace his views. But such was not the case, and in part, as a result, Modernism became well rooted, the primary theology and cultural force in America.

**WHEN ALL WAS SAID AND DONE, THE SOCIAL GOSPEL HAD ECLIPSED THE PURITAN PULPIT AS THE MAJOR INFLUENCE IN AMERICAN CULTURE**

The “Church” was now – for certain – engaged in societal change, but was far from being the true Church of the New Testament.

It therefore follows that the Modernists’ justification for social action by the use of Scripture is illegitimate. This is because they truncate the basic doctrines of biblical Christianity in order to achieve their social gospel ends. The historic doctrines of the faith were reworked and modified into a supposed foundation for social aims. Make no mistake: Scripture does not justify the Social Gospel, as much of it is the replacement of Scripture. Therefore Scripture does not accommodate the political/social direction of Modernism because the Social Gospel is not a substantiated manifestation of biblical Christianity whatsoever! To the contrary, it is antithetical to it! Modernism was founded upon a self-styled isogetical epistemology, which seeks to morph Scripture in order to use it to support preconceived liberal social views, versus the objective use of Scripture: which is motivated by a desire to extract and apply from it its timeless precepts.

Accordingly this period of church history is void of a legitimate, extracted from Scripture, theological

treatise to biblically justify its social expression. Therefore, Christian involvement in the political arena through this epoch of American church history is found wanting of a biblically and theological correct underpinning. Luke, chapter 3 evangelism was far from its agenda because, theological liberalism was about social moralism, not personal evangelism.

What about the coming Fundamentalist period? Would it be characterized by the primacy of saving faith to create societal change?

**IV. 1920: THE FUNDAMENTALIST REACTION**

One of the recurring themes in Joel Carpenter’s book *Revive Us Again* is the idea that the Fundamentalist movement’s social involvement (that involvement which is apart from evangelism) was motivated out of reactionary pride to take back the center stage from the Modernists, who had stolen it away from the Puritans. States Carpenter,

Those who founded the fundamentalist movement witnessed this shift in cultural leadership and began to notice that their own status and influence was waning.<sup>7</sup>

Earlier in his book he states,

[They saw] their status as community leaders and the influence of their evangelical values decrease sharply while a new elite of university-trained secular professors and liberal clergy gained power and prestige.... Fundamentalists had been deeply shamed in the battles of the 1920’s, but they could not give up on the vision of a Christian America.<sup>8</sup>

The human desire to get back all that had been lost to the liberals (seminaries, colleges, denominations, churches, mission agencies, publishing companies, and their likes) was a compelling motive that seemed to eclipse the need for a clearly reasoned theology relative to how to go about doing that. This same compelling desire seemed to eclipse as

**CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM**

well the need to stop and question the validity of the earlier Puritan objective to “Christianize America” (as was motivated by a postmillennial eschatology) in the first place. Furthermore there existed an underlying assumption by the Fundamentalists that that which was lost was that which God intended for believers to get back and always possess. Again, how biblically speaking, one should go about achieving repossession of these institutions is missing from the literature of the time. Accordingly Fundamentalists sought many means to “take back America from the liberals” but there exists no biblically reasoned document by any leader during the period as to how one should achieve that. Fundamentalists were motivated and driven by, if not captivated by, an overwhelming reactionary pragmatism to recover their huge losses.

One of the chief intellectual spokespersons for Fundamentalism (although he did not identify himself as a Fundamentalist) was, as previously mentioned, J. Gresham Machen. Importantly, Machen argued *against* Fundamentalist political/social involvement that was intended to change culture.<sup>9</sup> Machen believed it was too easy for the church, when focused on means other than evangelism and discipleship, to lapse into a moralizing campaign void of a biblical justification. Why try and take back that aspect of theological liberalism, he reasoned? Machen alludes to this when he says, “The Christian Missionary.... His chief business, he believes, is the saving of souls, and souls are saved not by [teaching] the mere ethical principles of Jesus but by His redemptive work...human goodness [the emphasis of theological liberalism] will avail nothing for lost souls; ye must be born again”<sup>10</sup>

Theological liberals had united with the institution of government in order to achieve their understanding of Jesus’s gospel: that it was not a personal conversion (a reformed and puritan understanding of what Scripture teaches) but rather a social gospel. Thus the Fundamentalists’ reaction to the aberrant understanding of the gospel as

being social was this: they withdrew from all forms of governmental involvement – lest a Fundamentalist be perceived to be a Modernist!

The Fundamentalist, who understood and believed in the power of change via personal conversion to Christ, those who possessed the unadulterated message of salvation, in their knee-jerk reaction to Modernism, abandoned the mission field of the State!

Accordingly, even though Fundamentalists possessed a proper understanding of the Gospel in the sense of Luke, chapter three, that it was salvific and could internally change a person into being a good citizen, they elected to forsake the mission field of government in reaction to that Modernist emphasis. They threw the baby out (taking the real gospel to the institution of government) because they perceived the bath water (the theological liberals had made this their primary point of emphasis and involvement to achieve their understanding of Scripture) to be dirty. How tragic!

In our search for a historic application of the simple truth of Luke, chapter three – that saving faith is the best progenitor of societal advance – let us recap:

- The Puritans engaged culture motivated by Postmillennialism more so than personal evangelism
- The Modernists engaged culture motivated by a social understanding of Jesus, not personal evangelism
- The Fundamentalists did not engage culture even though they believed wholeheartedly in personal evangelism

**V. 1950: THE BIRTH OF NEO EVANGELICALISM**

During the late 1940’s Harold Ockenga and Carl Henry, among others, birth Neo-Evangelicalism



---

**CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM**

---

with the intent of sanding-off the seemingly rough edges of an increasingly sectarian militant Fundamentalism. By this time Fundamentalism had been bloodied in its war with liberal Protestantism. And its resulting public image was one of a combatant, which in simple terms had marginalized its influence in the eyes of broad society. Accordingly, “Neo” Evangelical is a new titling to a movement and desire to, among other things, increase Evangelical influence in society. Motivated by the belief that Fundamentalism had isolated itself from being able to play a major role in the influence of American culture, the purveyors of Neo Evangelicalism were attempting a Christian metamorphosis, a makeover and reintroduction of biblical Christianity. This “new chapter” idea can be illustrated in several ways.

First is the landmark magazine article that appeared in *Christian Life* magazine in March of 1956, titled, “Is Evangelical Theology Changing?”<sup>11</sup> contributors to the article were numerous noted Christian leaders. Among the eight listed major changes from Fundamentalism to Neo Evangelicalism was the need to have “A more definite recognition of social responsibility.” The article states in this regard, “Nevertheless – unlike Fundamentalism – Evangelicalism realizes the church has a prophetic mission to society. There are times when the church must thunder, ‘Thus saith the Lord!’” The article goes on to say in greater specificity, “We must...make Evangelicalism more relevant to the political and sociological realities of our time.” But the article failed to build a biblical basis, be it the evangelism model of Luke, chapter three, or otherwise as a basis for the aforementioned conclusive statement.

Carl Henry was the leading voice in the Neo Evangelical movement. He is known for his leading work in this regard, titled *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*. This book represents the magna carta of the Neo Evangelical position as the emerging movement attempts a pendulum swing away from historic militant Fundamentalism. It is

important to note this context when examining the book’s reactionary argumentation.

From a sense of logic and reasoning, Henry’s postulations seem quite persuasive. However, he fails to provide any sort of biblical basis for his thesis regarding the necessity of a social emphasis by the church apart from the obvious relationship that is seen in Luke, chapter three – that social change stems from evangelistic endeavor. As a matter of fact the simple formula of Luke, chapter three is nowhere to be found in Henry’s book! This is unfortunate, because once again in the major epochs of American church history, the church is about to once again miss the obvious way in which it should primarily – and is best suited to, in terms of overall effectiveness – relate to the State.

When Henry makes the charge that “Modern Fundamentalism does not explicitly sketch the social implications of its message for the non-Christian world” he is correct; but nor do he and Neo Evangelicalism – because what he and his movement are about to tread is once again the path of theological liberalism. The trump card of the church is evangelism, not moralism!

Many more voices of founding Neo-Evangelical influence who advocated social-political change via the Church could be cited, but even though one of the major tenets of Neo Evangelicalism is social involvement and reform (similar to the emphasis of Theological Liberalism, but void of its doctrinal heresy) the leaders provide no scriptural basis for social involvement – and overlook the extremely simple model of Luke, chapter three.

## **VI. 1975: THE BIRTH OF THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT**

The attempts by Evangelicals to change the cultural direction of America through political involvement perhaps bloom more fully in the mid 1970’s than ever before. Fundamentalist pastor Jerry Falwell founds the Moral Majority.<sup>12</sup> Thereafter Televangelist Pat Robertson takes the mantle of





## CHURCH AND STATE: PRIORITIZING EVANGELISM

leadership via the auspices of his moralizing Christian organization, The Christian Coalition, founded in the mid 1980's. And then approximately 10 years later Focus on the Family's Dr. James Dobson takes that baton. It is the latter's organization that published the book, *Why You Can't Stay Silent: A Biblical Mandate to Shape Our Culture*.<sup>13</sup>

I should first couch what I am about to say with this: Dr. Falwell while alive was good friend of mine, as are Dr. Robertson and Dr. Dobson to this day. I love these men. Focus on the Family's book (Dr. Dobson is no longer with Focus on the Family) is the first major attempt to provide a biblical basis for cultural involvement by Evangelicals, but again, unfortunately, little is said about Luke, chapter three and the simple relationship of evangelism to societal change. Why is it we can't seem to get this right?

### VII. SUMMARY

Luke, chapter three is the simple solution. The best way the Church should relate to the State is via evangelism! The State needs it; the Church has it.

The Puritans although motivated primarily by Postmillennialism, out of necessity did a lot of evangelism. And because they did, America was founded with a dynamism and power unmatched in world history.

### **TODAY WE STILL RIDE THE WAVE OF THEIR EVANGELISTIC SUCCESSES WITH OUR FOUNDING FATHERS**

But that Tsunami of the Puritan influence has lessened greatly over the years due to all the following epochs of American church history wherein we have been unable to dial it correctly: Theological liberals lost their doctrine as they sought to influence America with a gospel of their own manufacture. Fundamentalists had the gospel right, but retreated from culture. Neo Evangelicals in their attempt to right the wrong of Fundamental

sectarianism still failed in that their solution was void of the primacy and simplicity of evangelism. And the Religious Right movement, although full of sincere passion, it too underemphasized the simplicity and focus of evangelism substituting in its place the complexity of policy change – and though commendable and necessary in a “we the people” nation, is not as powerful as an emphasis on calling people to repentance and new life in Christ.

**What then shall we do** is the necessary attitude in the citizenry of every society that provides staying power, and it only results from the Church engaging the State via evangelism.

Will the next epoch of American Church history – one that I think is about to begin – be characterized by the priority and simplicity of evangelism or will we somehow miss out on this once again?

<sup>1</sup> New American Standard Bible: 1995 update. 1995 (Lk 3:3–14). LaHabra, CA: The Lockman Foundation. Used with permission.

<sup>2</sup> “What is today a matter of academic speculation begins tomorrow to move armies and pull down empires.” (J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Culture*, Princeton Theological Review 11 [1913], 7). The Religious Right movement emphasized policy change to such a heightened degree that evangelism of souls in the capital community was eclipsed.

<sup>3</sup> George M. Marsden *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) p 112

<sup>4</sup> Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Quoted on page 50 of *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925*, by George Marsden (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980)

<sup>5</sup> George M. Marsden *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) p. 185

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from Gundry.

<sup>7</sup> Joel A. Carpenter *Revive Us Again* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997) p. 36

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 11

<sup>9</sup> Ned B. Stonehouse *J. Gresham Machen, A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955). I must add that I have not fully studied Machen and if or not he develops his arguments for social exclusion from Scripture.

<sup>10</sup> J. Gresham Machen *Christianity and Liberalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1923) p. 156

<sup>11</sup> Christian Life Magazine, Volume 17 #11, March 1956

<sup>12</sup> *Falwell An Autobiography* (Lynchburg: Liberty House Publishers, 1997)

<sup>13</sup> Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001