

Current Affairs # 12—For Thine is the Kingdom and the Power

Sam Soleyn

May 11, 2019

I want to have a discussion of power today, and over several subsequent teachings, because we are watching a church accept and embrace a form of power that is derived from the consent of the governed and trying to live within that power in order to assume a position of relevance. The biggest shift going on today—I would consider this, if not *the* great falling away, it most certainly is a falling away. The sad truth is that this falling away is not a new thing. God has been constantly trying to restore our understanding and our functionality within the power of God, but what the enemy has continuously attempted to do was to have us bow down and worship him in order to have the powers of the age.

This is the same as what he tried with Jesus. In one of the three temptations recorded in Matthew 4, he took Jesus to a high mountain and showed Him what is described as the kingdoms of the world, which of course represent a different configuration of power than that that God established in the earth. So, the enemy took Jesus to this high mountain; I believe what is here, what he showed Him, were the systems of the cosmos, of which Satan is the *kosmokratōr* (Strong's Greek 2888), the creator. And with that, the enemy tempted Jesus by saying, "If you will fall down and worship me, I will give you the kingdoms of this world, because they are mine to give" (cf. Matthew 4:8). Well, they really were Satan's to give, because he is not talking about a configuration of power that God established when He made Adam the ruler of creation by saying to him, "Have dominion." Actually, since that time—since the time that God gave dominion to Adam and that Satan stole that dominion through deception—he set about to consolidate his power by creating a system of reliances, upon which if the human relies, it is also impossible to rely on the power of God. Of course, that power is based in systems—systems such as an adversarial system for the adjudication of disputes; or, a system for the maintenance of health that is based in *pharmakeia* (Strong's Greek 5331), as opposed to a divine healing or walking in divine health; a system of commerce that is based in the production of profit rather than in the sharing of goods, and so on and so forth; educational systems that glorify man as opposed to revealing the knowledge of God. So, these things were designed to take us further and further away from the power, from the knowledge, from the understanding, from the wisdom of God.

Historically over time, when the church has reached that place of such complete self-indulgence and addiction to privilege, it becomes a harlot and is offered this power all over again. It happened when the Roman Empire had persecuted the church mercilessly. Victims of that persecution included both Paul and Peter, to name two of the more notable figures in history associated with the Kingdom of God. I think it interesting that that same empire, the Roman Empire, proposed a church, which of course was the church of that empire, that considers itself the foundation of the Christian faith, when in fact for nearly 250 years it was the prime persecutor of the faith that Paul and Peter, and the others had introduced. Now, that said but not wishing to go down that path, you can easily see that there are two configurations of power constantly at work, and the temptation to have power as between these two things, mankind is often pulled. And the church has not been entirely successful—in fact, for most of its existence it has not been successful—in understanding its inheritance of power. So it has defaulted to, in an attempt to respond to the offers of power that are based in an opposition to God, a form of power that promises human well-being but, in fact, denies the prime message for the existence of believers in the world at any point in time.

Now, power is not just a thing that is out there. Power is, of course, an invisible concept but has real effects. Power is the ability to move and to command and to affect and to change. Without power, we are the ones affected, we are the ones moved, we are the ones changed by those who have power, by those who have authority. But, there is this notion that has long been floating around in the modern church of disembodied power. Mostly, the way it is presented and thought about is for God to do some miraculous work or series of miraculous works through a person, thereby authenticating the person. In that usage of power, the person is then elevated to a certain status and presumes to speak for God. What we see today is, whenever God does something of a miraculous nature because He has mercy on people, the vessels through whom He does this miraculous power then claim to be authenticated by God for every purpose. So, they go off and they develop theology and they pronounce the various things, and people follow them as if these demonstrations of power are God's own personal authentication of the individuals through whom some measure of power may be demonstrated. That is because we define power primarily as one of many spiritual gifts—a gift known as the gift of healing, for example, as opposed to the gift of miracles. By the way, there is that distinction in 1 Corinthians 12. So, we look for personal authentications of power to provide us with ideas about who ought to lead. But you know, power

is by no means that sort of amorphous, undescribed thing. It cannot be. Because whoever is able, whether by actual miraculous doings of God or things that may be explained otherwise, suddenly becomes a center of power in and of themselves.

Power has to be understood, and there is no concept of the projection of power apart from the existence of a kingdom. You see, power—the exercise of power—is the function of being a proper and properly ordained delegate of a kingdom. There must be the existence of a kingdom before anyone may demonstrate power. What is interesting is that quite often in the claims to power, there is almost no understanding of the kingdom. How then, one might ask, would such persons be held accountable? How could they be questioned about the anatomy of this power? In other words, how could you test their legitimacy? In case you think that this is just an intellectual exercise by someone who might be jealous of people who can do miraculous things, the word “deception” was not invented by me. Jesus used it and He said that in the last days there will come many deceivers, and they will deceive many. As a consequence of this there will be a great falling away. Falling away is the recognition that there is a standard from which those who are falling away, have fallen away.

Power is for the demonstration of the existence of things that are not otherwise easily understood, not even easily understood to be existent. The authentic and genuine manifestation of power is the indication of the existence of something greater. When Jesus demonstrated power, He said, “I can do nothing of Myself, I only do what I see My Father doing. Whatever the Father is doing, that is what the Son is doing.” (cf. John 5:19). He anticipated the question—Well, how do you know what God is doing?—and He answered the question by saying, “The Father loves the Son and shows Him what He is doing” (cf. John 5:20). So, He placed Himself squarely in connection with the Father. In fact, He described His relationship to the Father in these terms: “I am in the Father and the Father is in Me” (cf. John 14:11). That was true; He was *in* the Father in the sense that both the prophetic Scriptures and the Word of God Himself authenticated His standing in the earth as the vassal, the *kurios* (Strong’s Greek 2962), the Lord, the One sent from the Father. God Himself said, “*This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased!*” (Matthew 3:17), and on another occasion said, “*This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to Him!*” (Matthew 17:5). The prophetic Psalm, the second Psalm, one of many speaking of Jesus, said that God the

Father, the Almighty God said, “*You are My Son; today I have become Your Father. Ask Me, and I will make the nations Your inheritance, the ends of the earth Your possession*” (Psalm 2:7-8).

In the relationship of Father and Son, one is made aware of the fact that the Son is the representation of the Father, which means that in the discussion of power we have to go back and ask the question: From where does the authority to govern come? What is the source of the authority to govern? Because in the demonstrations of power, what is intrinsically implied in any demonstration of power is that there is a kingdom, a configuration of authority and rule.

By the way, that is the Greek term *basileia* (Strong’s Greek 932), the Latin term *basilica*, which is: a foundation or basis of power and rule. This notion of *basileia* in Greek, *basilica* in Latin, this notion of a foundation of power and rule did not begin with a discussion of church in the New Testament. The Roman emperors all established large, administrative buildings that were called their *basilicas*. In fact, in the ruins of ancient Rome prior to the Christian faith, you will see the ruins of certain of these *basilicas*. The most imposing of these *basilicas* (of course, here in the time just after the Christian faith was established) is the Basilica of Constantine. He had his own basilica before one was established as the Vatican, called St. Peter’s Basilica. That would be in the 300s; I believe St. Peter’s Basilica was established in the 1600s. In fact, it was the fight over the raising of funds for the establishment of the Basilica of St. Peter that led to the Reformation, when a certain John Tetzel was confronted by a certain German priest named Martin Luther on the matter of the sale of indulgences to fund the building of St. Peter’s Basilica.

My point is, centuries, in fact a millennium before the notion of a basilica was associated with anything “church,” the Roman emperors built *basilicas*—administrative buildings from which they projected their power. It was the housing for the seat of the projection of their power, and it gave a kind of legitimacy to their rule. But again, even there, *basilicas* existed in the ancient world in most ancient cities. For example, in the city of Ephesus there was the temple of Diana, in the city of Corinth there was the temple of Zeus. These were the administrative centers. These were not a little church building off somewhere; these were the most massive structures within the cities of ancient worlds. These *basilicas*, these temples, usually they were either the location from which the king also ruled or the king’s palace. The ruler of that city, the ruler of that domain, would have a palace next door to the temple, usually connected by underground passages, because the

connection of church and state—in those cases, pagan basilicas/pagan temples—were one and the same.

In the ancient world, you see, everyone understood that the term “citizen” did not simply mean an individual who could go around and do whatever he or she wanted. A citizen was described by his connection to a city. By his connection to that city, he was connected to a god, he was connected to an economy, he was connected to his defense. So the word *polis*, from which we get the word “citizen,” relates to such terms as people, population, politics, and so on, because there was never a concept of an individual actor who sort of just did whatever he or she wanted to. The notion of projecting power individually is a figment of the imagination of persons. Whether we like it or not, whoever has power has power because they are representatives of a particular kingdom, of a particular way of doing things, a particular way of life.

When Christ spoke of having all authority in heaven and on earth (cf. Matthew 28:18), He was speaking both about the source of His authority to govern, as well as, He was speaking of His relationship to God, who was the settlor—the one who could give this power, who could give this authority to Him in which to act. Jesus spoke of the most intimate of connections to this settling power, to this power of the Creator; He said, “He is in Me and I am in Him” (cf. John 14:11; 17:21). The sense in which He was *in* the Father is that He did nothing by Himself, as we have previously said, and the Father acknowledged His coming into the world to be the One through whom the Father, the invisible Father, would make Himself visible through His attributes, through His character, and the like. And the Father was *in* Him—this is John 17 where Jesus says, “I am *in* the Father, the Father is *in* Me.” It is on that basis that the Kingdom of God came to the earth in the person of Christ, because of representational authority. Jesus was the representative of the Father. He was *in* the Father in the sense that He was completely governed by the authority of the Father, so much so that He would say (as I have said earlier), “Of Myself I can do nothing. I only do what I see My Father doing” (cf. John 5:19, 30). And then He claims that the Father was *in* Him. The way in which the Father was *in* Him was, of course, the Spirit of the Father bore complete witness to the Spirit of the Son, Spirit to Spirit. The mind of the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ was dominated by the mind of the Father.

Now, how does this domination come about? Well, He was the Child of the Father, meaning that He was the Seed of the Father. His birth was that conception where the Seed was provided by God Himself. So, His Spirit came as an original grant out of God into flesh that was supplied by Mary's body, and flesh that grew in Mary's womb. This is the last of creation; this is the last Adam. The first Adam was created out of the dust of the ground, in that he had no human progenitor. But procreation permitted the continuation of that form among human beings, between Adam and Eve. So Mary was the descendant of that procreated form that came out of the dust of the earth, into whose being Spirit was placed again, as God placed spirit in formed earth in the creation of the original Adam. Now, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Father, came to take residence within the mind of the Spirit of Christ. Because, you see, a spirit, like a soul, has these three dimensions: it has a mind, it has a will, and it has a heart. The mind of the Spirit of Christ was in firm and inseparable connection to the mind of the Spirit of the Father, so He knew what the Father was doing. That is why He could say, "I only do what I *see* My Father doing, because the Father loves the Son and shows Him what He is doing" (cf. John 5:19-20).

This mind might also be in us—"*Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus*" (Philippians 2:5)—a mind dominated by the Father, so that we might know the will of the Father as borne to the mind of our spirits. That connection is vitally established by the Holy Spirit. So the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son is brought to us by the Holy Spirit and takes residence within the minds of our spirits. So, He may be *in* us—the Father may be in us, the Son may be in us, and the Spirit of God Himself may be in us—so that we may become the sons of God in this process. Therefore, we can also become representatives of the Kingdom of Heaven and heirs to the powers that Jesus had by His representation of the Father. Therefore, the Kingdom of God, though invisible, is very real. One cannot say, "Look, here is the Kingdom," or "Look, there is the Kingdom" (cf. Luke 17:21). The Kingdom of Heaven is resident within the spirit of man—those who are born again through the process by which the Father lives in us, the Son lives in us, and the Spirit lives in us. Now when that is so, we are the legitimate representations of the Kingdom of Heaven on the earth and all of the sovereign power and authority that reside within that Kingdom. So, the concept of kingdom is inherently implied whenever there are demonstrations of power.

Current Affairs # 12– For Thine is the Kingdom and the Power | Sam Soleyn

I want to speak more directly in the next message to power. I have spoken about representation of power in the form of a kingdom; next, I will speak about the constitution of power when we speak the next time. I hope you will join me.

Thank you. This is Sam Soleyn. Bye-bye.