

Eschatological Anxiety and Algorithmic Conspiritoriality: A Scripture-First Critique of Digital End-Time Narratives

Sixbert Sangwa^{1*}

¹Office of the President, Open Christian University, Sacramento, United States

*Correspondence: ssangwa@openchristian.education

Abstract

This article develops a Scripture-first theological critique of contemporary digital end-time narratives emerging at the intersection of geopolitical upheaval, platformized anxiety, and stigmatized knowledge. It argues that war, displacement, surveillance, institutional distrust, synthetic media, and informational disorder create understandable conditions for eschatological concern, but they do not justify the conversion of conjecture into prophecy or the elevation of self-sealing narrative systems into authoritative Christian teaching. Methodologically, the article offers an interdisciplinary conceptual analysis that brings biblical hermeneutics into conversation with scholarship on digital religion, conspiracy belief, conspiritoriality, algorithmic personalization, and public reports on geopolitical and informational risk. Its central contribution is a Scripture-first evaluative typology that distinguishes verified fact, plausible interpretation, and unsupported speculation. The article then identifies recurring doctrinal and hermeneutical distortions in online end-time discourse, including headline exegesis, date-setting, Gnostic epistemic elitism, algorithmic providentialism, totalized conspiracy, and the pastoral deformation of Christian hope into perpetual crisis scanning. The argument does not dismiss every extra-institutional concern as irrational, nor does it baptize every suspicious pattern as prophetic certainty. Instead, it contends that Christian watchfulness must remain disciplined by Scripture, proportionate evidence, theological humility, and pastoral responsibility. A biblically responsible eschatology is sober rather than sensational, discerning rather than paranoid, and strengthening rather than fear-amplifying. It teaches believers to test claims, resist false certainty, endure suffering, speak truthfully, and center hope in the appearing of Christ rather than in speculative mastery over every geopolitical convulsion or viral digital sign.

Keywords: *eschatology; digital religion; algorithmic conspiritoriality; conspiracy narratives; stigmatized knowledge; geopolitics; discernment; misinformation; Scripture-first theology*

Accepted: May 13, 2026

Published: May 14, 2026

CITATION

Sangwa, S. (2026). *Eschatological Anxiety and Algorithmic Conspiritoriality: A Scripture-First Critique of Digital End-Time Narratives*. Open Journal of Stigmatized Knowledge & Suppressed Discourses, Vol 2(2). Open Christian Press.

DOI:

[10.65655/OpenChristianPress.2026.116](https://doi.org/10.65655/OpenChristianPress.2026.116)

COPYRIGHT

Open Journal of Stigmatized Knowledge & Suppressed Discourses is published by Open Christian Press. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license. Copyright © 2026 by author(s).

PUBLISHER INFO

Open Christian Press—the publishing arm of Open Christian University—is produced in partnership with the Center for Faith and Work.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this work are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the positions of the publisher, the funders, or the authors' affiliated institutions.

1. Introduction

Contemporary digital culture has become a dense market for end-time meaning. Armed conflict, economic insecurity, institutional mistrust, viral prophecy clips, synthetic media, and recommender systems now meet within the same interpretive environment. The result is not merely an increase in religious speech, but the emergence of a particular style of eschatological speech: accelerated, affectively charged, cross-platform, monetizable, and often resistant to correction. In such an environment, apocalyptic language circulates alongside war footage, claims about elite coordination, warnings about digital control, and calls to decode the final timetable of history.

The basic social conditions feeding this discourse are not imaginary. The World Economic Forum identified state-based armed conflict as the leading immediate global risk for 2025 and continued to rank misinformation and disinformation among the most consequential short-term risks (World Economic Forum [WEF], 2025). SIPRI reported that world military expenditure reached a record high in 2024, rising by 9.4% in real terms from 2023 (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI], 2025). UNHCR estimated that 123.2 million people were forcibly displaced at the end of 2024 (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 2025).

Freedom House reported a fifteenth consecutive year of decline in global internet freedom, with deepening censorship, surveillance, and arrests for online expression across many of the countries it surveyed (Freedom House, 2025). Digital apocalypticism is therefore flourishing in a climate of real destabilization rather than in a vacuum.

Yet the existence of genuine disorder does not authorize careless theology. Christian readers can move from warranted vigilance to interpretive excess with remarkable speed. The same uncertainty that drives public anxiety can also generate a desire for total explanation. Conspiracy narratives often satisfy

that desire by supplying hidden causes, morally legible enemies, and compressed timelines of inevitable disclosure (Douglas et al., 2017; van Prooijen & Douglas, 2017). Barkun (2015) describes conspiracy theories as forms of stigmatized knowledge, that is, knowledge claimed as excluded, suppressed, or unfairly rejected by authorized institutions. Under digital conditions, such claims no longer remain in bounded subcultures. They travel through algorithmic recommendation, influencer authority, participatory remixing, and networked repetition.

This article argues that a Scripture-first critique must resist two opposite errors. The first is rationalistic dismissal, the assumption that every concern about hidden coordination, coercive power, or civilizational deception is irrational because it falls outside official consensus. The second is prophetic inflation, the assumption that every institutional development, geopolitical tremor, or digital innovation is decisive proof that a specific eschatological script is now visibly unfolding. Scripture authorizes neither naivete nor panic. It commands disciplined discernment.

The article's thesis is therefore precise: contemporary end-time narratives often arise from real crises and sometimes from legitimate moral questions, but they become doctrinally and epistemically distorted when they convert plausible interpretation into certainty, elevate stigmatized claims above evidence, and treat algorithmically amplified affect as confirmation of divine revelation. Extending prior Scripture-first analyses of deception, surveillance, and prophecy-inflected geopolitical discourse (Sangwa, 2025, 2026), this article develops a framework for distinguishing verified fact, plausible interpretation, and unsupported speculation. Its controlling norm is not the emotional intensity of the times, but the authority of Scripture, carefully read and faithfully applied.

2. Methodological Approach

This article is not an empirical content analysis of TikTok, YouTube, or other digital platforms. It does not claim to measure the prevalence of end-time narratives across a defined corpus, nor does it infer audience belief from platform metrics. Its method is an interdisciplinary conceptual-theological analysis. It brings Scripture-first hermeneutics into conversation with scholarship on digital religion, conspiracy theory, stigmatized knowledge, conspirituality, algorithmic personalization, and public reports on geopolitical and informational disorder.

The phrase Scripture-first is used here in a precise sense. It does not mean that social data, political analysis, or media theory are irrelevant. Rather, it means that Christian theological judgment must be normed by Scripture before it is normed by platform affect, ideological allegiance, institutional approval, or the charisma of online interpreters. Public evidence may describe conditions of crisis. Media theory may clarify mechanisms of circulation and amplification. Social psychology may help explain why conspiracy narratives become attractive under uncertainty. But such analyses do not possess the authority to turn conjecture into prophecy. Theological authority remains with the written Word of God.

The article proceeds through three evaluative levels. Verified fact refers to claims supported by public documentation, credible reporting, official datasets, or peer-reviewed research. Plausible interpretation refers to disciplined theological or cultural judgments that are consistent with Scripture and proportionate to available evidence but remain open to correction. Unsupported speculation refers to claims that assert hidden causal chains, definitive prophetic fulfillment, or divine certainty without adequate textual warrant or public evidence. This distinction is central because much online end-time discourse moves too quickly

from the first category to the third, bypassing the humility required by the second.

The article also practices theological modesty. It does not attempt to adjudicate every intramural Christian debate over premillennial, amillennial, postmillennial, or dispensational frameworks. Nor does it deny the seriousness of biblical prophecy, the reality of deception, or the possibility that technological and political systems may become instruments of coercive power. Its narrower purpose is to ask how Christians should evaluate digital end-time narratives when real crisis, platform mediation, stigmatized knowledge, and biblical language converge.

3. Digital Religion, Crisis, and Stigmatized Knowledge

3.1. Digital religion and platformed authority

Research on digital religion has shown that religious meaning is not merely transferred into online spaces; it is reshaped by the affordances, constraints, and authority structures of those spaces (Campbell, 2013; Campbell & Evolvi, 2020). Platformed religion is shaped by speed, visibility, shareability, affective intensity, and metrics of approval. These conditions matter for eschatology because end-time claims are often persuasive not only because of their doctrinal content, but because of how they are encountered: repeatedly, emotionally, personally, and within networks of trust.

The mediatization of religion also helps explain the altered authority of digital prophecy discourse. Hjarvard (2011) argues that media increasingly become environments within which religious symbols, institutions, and narratives are produced and interpreted. In contemporary digital culture, the pastor, scholar, journalist, anonymous analyst, self-declared prophet, influencer, and algorithmically amplified commentator may appear within the same feed. This flattening of authority can produce a deceptive equivalence. An anxious viewer may encounter a peer-reviewed report, an edited war clip,

a prophetic dream, a biblical quotation, and a financial-collapse prediction as if they were comparable evidentiary units.

This does not mean that institutional religious authorities are always trustworthy or that lay digital speech is necessarily irresponsible. Scripture itself warns repeatedly about corrupt teachers and false religious authority. The point is more specific: digital platforms alter the conditions under which authority is perceived. They reward intensity, clarity, immediacy, and identity confirmation. A claim can feel spiritually weighty because it arrives with urgency, repetition, and emotional force, even when it lacks exegetical and evidential discipline.

3.2. Conspiracy belief and the appeal of suppressed knowledge

The category of stigmatized knowledge helps explain why end-time narratives intensify when trust in institutions declines. Barkun (2015) identifies stigmatized knowledge as knowledge that adherents understand to be excluded by authorized institutions. The rhetorical power of such claims comes partly from a moral reversal: marginalization becomes evidence of authenticity. If a claim is mocked, censored, or rejected, that reaction can be read not as a defeater but as confirmation that the claim threatens hidden power.

Social-psychological research clarifies the appeal of such narratives. Douglas et al. (2017) argue that conspiracy beliefs often promise epistemic, existential, and social benefits. They appear to explain confusing events, restore a sense of control, and bind believers into communities of awakened insight. Douglas et al. (2019) further stress that conspiracy theories should not be treated only as eccentric beliefs, because they are bound up with distrust, identity, political behavior, and social cohesion. The relevance for Christian eschatology is evident: when global instability is interpreted through biblical language, conspiracy narratives may appear to offer both cognitive explanation and spiritual seriousness.

Crisis intensifies this dynamic. van Prooijen and Douglas (2017) show that societal crises heighten the attractiveness of conspiracy explanations because fear, uncertainty, and perceived loss of control stimulate the search for meaning. Crisis does not create conspiracism from nothing, but it can make deliberate-agency explanations more compelling. For digital Christian publics, wars, pandemics, financial shocks, migration pressure, moral confusion, censorship, and technological acceleration are often interpreted through explicitly biblical categories. The temptation is not merely to ask whether these developments matter, but to insist that they fit a hidden script with near-prophetic certainty.

3.3. Conspirituality and algorithmic personalization

Ward and Voas (2011) identified conspirituality as a hybrid formation in which conspiracy thinking and spiritualized meaning-making converge. This hybrid is especially important for digital end-time discourse because it turns suspicion into a spiritual posture. The user is not merely informed; the user is awakened. The claim is not merely plausible; it is revealed. The community is not merely skeptical; it is positioned as morally and spiritually superior to the deceived majority.

Recent scholarship has updated this analysis for algorithmic culture. Kanthawala et al. (2025) describe algorithmic conspirituality as the belief that social-media algorithms know users intimately and deliver content at precisely the right revelatory moment. Cotter et al. (2024) similarly show how users oscillate between skepticism and mystical receptivity, interpreting algorithmic curation as potentially meaningful in quasi-providential ways. This matters because digital personalization can simulate providential precision. What feels divinely timed may be the result of recommender systems optimized to sustain attention.

For Christian discernment, this creates a subtle counterfeit. A believer sees a sequence of war clips, warnings about digital identity, financial-collapse

predictions, prophetic exhortations, and calls to prepare. The sequence feels personally addressed. It arrives when the believer is already concerned. The platformed experience may then be interpreted as divine confirmation. Theologically, however, algorithmic relevance is not equivalent to revelation. God may providentially use any medium, but the felt timeliness of content is not a sufficient hermeneutical test.

4. Geopolitical Upheaval and the Acceleration of End-Time Discourse

The present digital environment does not merely transmit eschatology; it reshapes the conditions under which eschatology is believed, performed, corrected, and monetized. Reuters Institute data from 2025 indicate that when people suspect information may be false, they do not turn exclusively to traditional journalism. Trusted news brands and official sources remain significant, but younger users are more likely than older users to include social platforms and AI chatbots in their verification habits (Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, 2025). This mixed ecology means that theological claims, geopolitical updates, rumors, commentary, pseudo-analysis, and machine-generated answers can appear side by side as apparently comparable inputs.

Platform culture rewards compression. Short-form video and headline-fragmented feeds favor claims that are emotionally vivid, morally polarized, and easy to narrate as signs. Anxious publics seek not only information but orientation. End-time narratives supply orientation by converting diffuse volatility into a moral storyline: this war, this treaty, this payment technology, this censorship rule, or this economic program is presented as evidence of where history is going and who is really in control.

A concrete example appeared in the 2025 RaptureTok episode, in which a viral prediction identified September 23 or 24, 2025, as the timing of the rapture and spread widely across social media, drawing belief, ridicule, debate, and correction (Henao, 2025). The significance of this episode is not

that one viral prediction proves widespread doctrinal collapse. It is that platform architecture now allows speculative prophecy to scale rapidly across audiences primed by cultural unease. What once circulated slowly in narrow subcultures can now become trend material in hours.

Geopolitical disorder genuinely heightens the conditions for interpretive overreach. When conflict expands, displacement rises, and humanitarian strain intensifies, readers of biblical prophecy understandably ask whether such developments should be read as signs of the end. Scripture itself teaches that wars, rumors of wars, persecution, lawlessness, deception, and global distress belong to the church's horizon of expectation ([Matt. 24:4-14](#); [2 Tim. 3:1-5](#)). The theological difficulty is not the recognition of historical seriousness, but the premature movement from general eschatological vigilance to specific prophetic identification without sufficient textual and evidential warrant.

This distinction is vital because Scripture gives the church categories for recurring patterns before it gives interpreters permission to identify every event as final fulfillment. War, deception, false teaching, persecution, and coercive power are not foreign to biblical eschatology. Yet the presence of these features in history does not by itself justify confident claims about exact timetables, named prophetic actors, or the definitive identity of every contemporary institution. The church's vocation is vigilance under Scripture, not omniscience over history.

5. A Scripture-First Theological Framework

A Scripture-first analysis begins not with the feed but with the text. The New Testament does not portray the church's historical horizon as morally tranquil. Christ warns His disciples about deception, wars, tribulation, false prophets, lovelessness, and lawlessness ([Matt. 24:4-14](#)). Paul warns believers not to be unsettled by claims that the day of the Lord has already arrived ([2 Thess. 2:1-3](#)). John commands the church to test the spirits because many false prophets

have gone out into the world ([1 John 4:1](#)). Peter likewise warns that false teachers will introduce destructive heresies ([2 Pet. 2:1-3](#)). The biblical posture is therefore neither indifference nor panic, but watchful sobriety.

First, biblical eschatology is Christ-centered rather than rumor-centered. The decisive object of Christian hope is the appearing of Jesus Christ, not possession of a superior decoding system ([Titus 2:11-14](#); [1 John 3:2-3](#)). This matters because much online end-time discourse gradually shifts attention away from Christ and toward signs, systems, personalities, hidden documents, and predictive timelines. Such discourse may retain biblical vocabulary while displacing the biblical center.

Second, Scripture requires epistemic humility. Jesus teaches that no one knows the day and hour ([Matt. 24:36](#); [Mark 13:32](#)), and Acts denies the church authority to master the times and seasons by speculative calculation ([Acts 1:7](#)). This does not cancel watchfulness. It disciplines it. Biblical readiness is constant, but secret calendar mastery is not the church's assignment.

Third, Scripture frames watchfulness morally rather than sensationally. The command to watch is tied to holy readiness, endurance, repentance, prayer, and faithful service ([Matt. 24:42](#); [Matt. 25:13](#); [Luke 21:34-36](#)). Watchfulness is not an invitation to fear-driven consumption, endless decoding, or contempt toward the uninformed. It is a summons to fidelity before God.

Fourth, biblical discernment must be distinguished from generalized suspicion. Christian discernment tests claims by truth, doctrine, fruit, and fidelity to Christ, not merely by anti-establishment posture. A claim is not rendered true by being censored, marginal, or alarming. Nor is it rendered false merely because powerful institutions oppose it. The Pauline command to test everything and hold fast to what is good ([1 Thess. 5:21](#)) requires openness to truth and refusal of credulity.

Fifth, apocalyptic symbolism must be handled canonically and patiently. Revelation speaks of beastly power, false worship, economic coercion, Babylonian luxury, propaganda, idolatry, and satanic deception ([Rev. 13](#); [Rev. 16](#); [Rev. 17](#); [Rev. 18](#)). These themes justify serious theological reflection on empire, technological mediation, propaganda, and coercive political economy. They do not, however, license the hasty identification of every passport regime, payment tool, treaty bloc, public-health measure, or diplomatic summit as a definitive one-to-one fulfillment. Biblical prophecy often discloses patterns, types, and trajectories before it supplies easily charted event equivalents (Bauckham, 1993; Beale, 1999; Koester, 2014).

This framework also guards against an underdeveloped concept of apocalyptic. Apocalyptic discourse in biblical and Second Temple contexts does not merely predict future events. It unveils reality under divine sovereignty, exposes idolatrous power, strengthens suffering communities, and relativizes the claims of empire (Collins, 1998). A Scripture-first eschatology therefore does not empty prophecy of historical seriousness, but it refuses to reduce prophecy to headline-matching. It reads the present under Scripture, not Scripture under the emotional pressure of the present.

6. A Scripture-First Typology for Evaluating Digital End-Time Claims

The preceding framework requires a practical evaluative heuristic. Contemporary end-time claims should not be sorted into only two categories, true or false, orthodox or heretical, awake or deceived. Many claims contain mixtures of fact, interpretation, anxiety, and speculation. A more disciplined approach distinguishes verified fact, plausible interpretation, and unsupported speculation. This typology is not a rigid taxonomy. It is a tool for slowing the movement from evidence to certainty and for making theological judgments proportionate to both Scripture and the available data.

Table 1. A Scripture-first typology for evaluating digital end-time claims

Domain	Verified fact	Plausible interpretation	Unsupported speculation
Geopolitical instability	War, militarization, and displacement remain severe and measurable in public datasets and official reports.	Such conditions can intensify eschatological concern and heighten receptivity to strong narrative explanations.	Every conflict is the decisive final battle, and specific actors can be identified with prophetic certainty absent clear textual warrant.
Digital surveillance and algorithmic mediation	Platform systems shape attention and can amplify misinformation, outrage, personalized meaning, and credibility cues.	These developments deserve theological scrutiny in light of biblical warnings about deception, idolatry, and coercive power.	Any new payment, identity, surveillance, or platform tool is automatically the final form of the beastly order.
Viral prophecy and short-form media	Predicted end-time dates and rapture warnings can scale rapidly through social platforms.	Digital virality can reveal widespread anxiety, weak doctrinal formation, and the power of platformed religious authority.	Virality itself proves divine confirmation, prophetic authenticity, or the spiritual superiority of the claim.
Hidden coordination and institutional distrust	Institutions sometimes conceal motives, manipulate publics, or coordinate in ways that deserve moral scrutiny.	Some extra-institutional concerns may warrant careful investigation, especially when supported by evidence and biblical moral reasoning.	A total hidden script explains nearly all events, and contrary evidence only proves the depth of the cover-up.

Note. The typology is intended to discipline proportional judgment. It does not deny that verified facts may carry theological significance, but it rejects the move from significance to certainty when Scripture and evidence do not sustain that move.

Typology contributes to the study of digital religion by showing that the problem with much online eschatological discourse is not simply misinformation. It is a disordering of theological inference. Verified facts about war, displacement, surveillance, or digital manipulation are often real. Plausible interpretations may therefore be pastorally and intellectually necessary. The failure occurs when interpretive possibility is inflated into prophetic certainty. At that point, the claim no longer functions as discernment. It becomes a closed system protected from correction.

The typology also protects legitimate moral inquiry. Christians should not surrender moral judgment to institutional consensus. Scripture contains strong warnings about rulers, empires, false teachers,

merchants, sorcery, propaganda, idolatry, and unjust power. But Christian truth-telling must name what can be responsibly named and withhold what cannot. The stronger the prophetic claim, the stronger the textual and evidential burden.

7. Doctrinal Fallacies and Hermeneutical Errors

7.1. Headline exegesis

One recurring error is headline exegesis, the practice of allowing current events to determine the meaning of biblical texts rather than allowing biblical texts to discipline the interpretation of current events. In this pattern, Daniel, Revelation, the Olivet Discourse, or Pauline eschatology becomes a flexible code into which each crisis can be inserted. The problem is not that current events are irrelevant to theological

reflection. The problem is that the event becomes the controlling interpretive key.

Headline exegesis produces instability. When each news cycle is treated as final proof of a preferred scheme, repeated non-fulfillment often yields embarrassment, reinterpretation, or deeper self-sealing certainty. The text remains formally honored but functionally subordinated to the feed. A Scripture-first approach reverses that order. It asks first what the text authorizes, then what claims about the present may be made with proportionate confidence.

7.2. Date-setting and timetable insinuation

A second error is date-setting, including its softer form, timetable insinuation that masquerades as humility. Digital prophecy culture may avoid the explicit statement, 'I know the day,' while functionally training audiences to expect immediate fulfillment through escalating sequences of signs. The 2025 RaptureTok episode illustrates how quickly a date-specific claim can become mass pedagogy in the wrong direction (Henao, 2025).

Christ's prohibition remains decisive ([Matt. 24:36](#); [Mark 13:32](#)). The denial of calendar mastery does not make the church passive. It makes the church faithful. Readiness is constant. Obedience is urgent. Mission is necessary. But secret mastery of prophetic timing is not granted to the church. Any teacher who repeatedly produces urgency by implying hidden timetable access trains believers away from biblical sobriety.

7.3. Gnostic epistemic elitism

A third error is Gnostic epistemic elitism. Some digital end-time subcultures imply that true discernment belongs only to those who have awakened to hidden plans, while the broader church remains asleep, compromised, or deceived. This posture flatters the knower. It converts discernment into identity performance and can foster contempt rather than charity.

Biblically, discernment is inseparable from humility, teachability, holiness, wisdom, and submission to truth ([Phil. 1:9-10](#); [Heb. 5:14](#); [Jas. 3:13-18](#)). A community may indeed fail to see danger, and correction may be necessary. But correction cannot be grounded in self-exalting secret knowledge. Christian discernment should produce sobriety, patience, truthful speech, and love for the body of Christ, not contempt for ordinary believers.

7.4. Algorithmic providentialism

A fourth error is algorithmic providentialism. Christian users may interpret recurring exposure to similar end-time clips, warnings, or digital coincidences as evidence that God is confirming a particular narrative. Yet the literature on algorithmic conspiratoriness suggests that platform personalization readily produces feelings of uncanny relevance without any need to invoke divine endorsement (Cotter et al., 2024; Kanthawala et al., 2025).

Theologically, this requires careful distinction. Providence is real, and God may use ordinary means to instruct, warn, or comfort His people. But providence is not read by treating algorithmic recurrence as revelation. A claim encountered repeatedly online must still be tested by Scripture, evidence, doctrine, and fruit. The fact that content feels spiritually timed may disclose a pastoral concern in the viewer, but it does not establish the truth of the content.

7.5. Totalized conspiracy as false coherence

A fifth error is the collapse of moral concern into totalized conspiracy. Revelation's portrayal of beastly politics, idolatrous economy, and Babylonian seduction should make Christians alert to concentrated power and coercive systems ([Rev. 12-13](#); [Rev. 18](#)). Daniel's visions likewise expose arrogant political power under divine judgment ([Dan. 7](#)). Nevertheless, these biblical themes do not justify grand unifying narratives in which every global institution, technological tool, public-health measure,

migration crisis, and diplomatic process is treated as part of one coordinated script beyond serious dispute.

The stronger the claim, the stronger the evidence must be. If evidence supports institutional concealment, manipulation, or coordination in a specific case, Christians may name that case carefully. But a totalized theory that explains nearly everything while rendering all counterevidence impossible to consider has ceased to be an inquiry. It has become an epistemic enclosure. Scripture calls Christians to expose darkness, but it also forbids false witness.

7.6. Pastoral deformation

A sixth error is pastoral deformation. Some end-time media trains believers to live in a permanent state of anxious scanning. Instead of producing holiness, endurance, courage, and mission, it produces obsession, paralysis, relational suspicion, and selective attention to catastrophe. This is not a minor side effect. It is a theological failure because eschatology is meant to strengthen the suffering church, not destabilize it.

Paul's teaching on the Lord's return is given so that believers may grieve with hope, encourage one another, and remain steadfast in the Lord's work ([1 Thess. 4:13-18](#); [1 Cor. 15:58](#)). Peter's eschatology similarly leads to holiness, patience, and hope ([2 Pet. 3:11-14](#)). A discourse that continually intensifies fear while producing little holiness, prayer, endurance, or mission has departed from the pastoral function of biblical eschatology. God gives His people power, love, and sound judgment, not a spirituality of panic ([2 Tim. 1:7](#)).

8. Implications for Church and Public Theology

These distinctions have implications for the church, theological education, and public reason. The first task is catechetical repair. Believers need robust teaching on biblical prophecy that neither evades difficult themes nor rewards reckless speculation. Churches should teach how apocalyptic texts function canonically, how false prophecy operates, how to

evaluate evidence proportionately, and how fear can impair judgment. Discernment ministries that never teach hermeneutical discipline are not training discernment. They are training their appetite.

Second, Christian leaders should recover the pastoral difference between warning and sensationalism. Scripture unquestionably warns. It warns about deception, counterfeit spirituality, imperial arrogance, moral corruption, persecution, and final judgment. But biblical warning is tethered to repentance, endurance, faithfulness, and hope. Sensationalism rewards novelty, urgency, and emotional overextension. It often converts secondary interpretive questions into tests of spiritual seriousness.

Third, scholars and Christian public intellectuals should resist one-reflex treatment of stigmatized knowledge. Some claims deserve dismissal because the evidence is absent or the logic is self-sealing. Some deserve sustained scrutiny because powerful actors do sometimes hide motives, manipulate publics, and coordinate behind closed doors. The point is not to sanctify stigma or trust gatekeepers automatically. The point is to insist on distinctions disciplined by Scripture, evidence, and moral seriousness. This is one useful implication of prior Scripture-first work on surveillance, global power, and prophecy-inflected geopolitical narratives: suspicion without biblical and evidential discipline degenerates into narrative absolutism, while naive confidence in public power leaves the church vulnerable to genuine deception (Sangwa, 2025, 2026).

Fourth, Christian engagement with digital culture must include algorithmic literacy. A person may understand classical doctrine and still be catechized by platform design. Repetition, recommender loops, emotionally charged thumbnails, parasocial trust, clipped context, monetized urgency, and synthetic media all affect what feels credible. UNESCO's warning about deepfakes and the crisis of knowing underscores the need for institutions, educators, and

communities to develop sharper habits of verification in an age when visual and auditory evidence can be fabricated with increasing ease (UNESCO, 2025). Churches that treat digital mediation as neutral risk misidentifying platform effects as spiritual insight.

Finally, Christian eschatology should be reclaimed as a doctrine of holy hope rather than merely a discourse of imminent catastrophe. The New Testament does not deny tribulation. It locates tribulation inside the sovereign purpose of God and beneath the lordship of Christ. The church is taught to be alert, but also steadfast; sorrowful, but also hopeful; discerning, but also charitable. A biblical end-time ethic produces prayer, repentance, mission, endurance, and refusal to bear false witness.

9. Limitations and Future Research

This article has three limitations. First, because it is a conceptual-theological analysis, it does not offer a quantitative account of how frequently digital end-time narratives appear across platforms or denominations. Second, it does not conduct interviews with believers, pastors, influencers, or viewers who participate in online prophecy discourse. Third, it does not attempt to settle broader eschatological debates among Christian traditions. Its aim is narrower: to develop a Scripture-first evaluative framework for claims circulating in a digitally mediated environment of crisis and suspicion.

Future research could build on this framework through empirical studies of platform-specific end-time discourse. One line of inquiry could examine TikTok, YouTube, Telegram, or X communities that circulate rapture predictions, digital-control warnings, or prophecy-based geopolitical commentary. Another could analyze how algorithmic recommendation pathways move users from mainstream Christian content toward more speculative or conspiratorial narratives. A third could interview pastors and church educators about how they respond to congregational anxiety around war,

artificial intelligence, digital identity, surveillance, and prophetic speculation.

Further theological work is also needed. Christian scholars should examine how different eschatological traditions handle the boundary between legitimate watchfulness and speculative certainty. They should also develop pastoral resources that help churches teach prophecy without producing fear dependency. The goal is not to domesticate biblical eschatology into moral therapy. It is to recover its biblical function as truth, warning, hope, endurance, and worship.

10. Conclusion

Eschatological anxiety in contemporary digital culture is neither pure fantasy nor self-authenticating revelation. It is a historically understandable response to real upheaval unfolding within an information order that rewards compression, affect, suspicion, personalization, and identity reinforcement. Wars are real. Displacement is real. Institutional manipulation is sometimes real. Platform-driven misinformation is real. Synthetic media is real. But Scripture does not authorize Christians to turn these realities into an indiscriminate theology of certainty.

The church's task is more demanding and more faithful. It must name deception without becoming deceived, confront power without being captivated by totalizing suspicion, and proclaim Christ's return without pretending to possess an infallible map of every current convulsion. Verified facts should be acknowledged. Plausible interpretations may be explored with humility. Unsupported speculation must be refused, even when it flatters believers with a sense of privileged insight.

The article's central contribution is the Scripture-first typology of verified fact, plausible interpretation, and unsupported speculation. This typology helps Christian communities slow down, test claims, respect evidence, read Scripture carefully, and resist the emotional coercion of digital urgency. It also helps scholars of religion and media see that online

end-time discourse cannot be reduced to misinformation alone. It is a theological, affective, and platformed formation shaped by crisis, authority, identity, and hope.

If contemporary end-time discourse is to serve the church rather than destabilize it, Scripture must remain the controlling authority. That means refusing date-setting, resisting self-sealing narratives, testing digital signs rather than venerating them, and keeping the center of eschatology where the New Testament keeps it: in the coming Lord, the call to endure, and the command to be found faithful when He appears.

References

- Barkun, M. (2015). Conspiracy theories as stigmatized knowledge. *Diogenes*, 62(3-4), 114-120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192116669288>
- Bauckham, R. (1993). *The theology of the Book of Revelation*. Cambridge University Press. dn710800.ca.archive.org/0/items/ChristianE-booksli/TheTheologyOfTheBookOfRevelation-RichardBauckham.pdf
- Beale, G. K. (1999). *The Book of Revelation: A commentary on the Greek text*. Eerdmans. <https://dokumen.pub/the-book-of-revelation-a-commentary-on-the-greek-text-080282174x-0833648514.html>
- Campbell, H. A. (Ed.). (2013). *Digital religion: Understanding religious practice in new media worlds*. Routledge. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Heidi-Campbell-8/publication/293958274_Digital_Religion_Understanding_Religious_Practice_in_New_Media_Worlds/links/56bcfa8408ae5e7ba40fbdf0/Digital-Religion-Understanding-Religious-Practice-in-New-Media-Worlds.pdf
- Campbell, H. A., & Evolvi, G. (2020). Contextualizing current digital religion research on emerging technologies. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(1), 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.149>
- Collins, J. J. (1998). *The apocalyptic imagination: An introduction to Jewish apocalyptic literature* (2nd ed.). Eerdmans. <https://www.amazon.com/Apocalyptic-Imagination-Introduction-Literature-Biblical/dp/0802843719>
- Cotter, K., Ritchart, A., De, A., Foyle, K., Kanthawala, S., McAtee, H., & Watson, T. X. (2024). If you're reading this, it's meant for you: The reflexive ambivalence of algorithmic conspiratoriality. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 30(6), 1897-1915. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13548565241258949>
- Douglas, K. M., Sutton, R. M., & Cichocka, A. (2017). The psychology of conspiracy theories. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(6), 538-542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417718261>
- Douglas, K. M., Uscinski, J. E., Sutton, R. M., Cichocka, A., Nefes, T., Ang, C. S., & Deravi, F. (2019). Understanding conspiracy theories. *Political Psychology*, 40(S1), 3-35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12568>
- Foertsch, S., Chakraborty, R., & Joosse, P. (2024). Asymmetric conflation: QAnon and the political cooptation of religion. *Politics and Religion*, 17(1), 58-80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755048323000275>
- Freedom House. (2025). *Freedom on the Net 2025: An uncertain future for the global internet*. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2025/uncertain-future-global-internet>
- Grusauskaite, K., Harambam, J., & Aupers, S. (2025). Reactionary exiles: How conspiracy theorists deal with socio-technological exclusion. *Cultural Sociology*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17499755241248726>
- Henao, L. A. (2025, September 23). A doomsday prediction about the Rapture is spreading on TikTok. *AP News*. <https://apnews.com/article/rapture-end-times-evangelical-christians-tiktok-e7d065520186503a6223ee12df1f02dd>

- Hjarvard, S. (2011). The mediatization of religion: Theorising religion, media and social change. *Culture and Religion*, 12(2), 119-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14755610.2011.579719>
- Kanthawala, S., Cotter, K., Ritchart, A., De, A., McAtee, H., Yun, C., & DeCook, J. (2025). Algorithmic conspiratoriality: Explicating its emergence, dimensions, and persuasibility. *New Media & Society*, 27(5), 2885-2910. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231217425>
- Koester, C. R. (2014). *Revelation: A new translation with introduction and commentary*. Yale University Press. <https://www.amazon.com/Revelation-Translation-Introduction-Commentary-Commentaries/dp/0300216912>
- Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. (2025, June 17). *How the public checks information it thinks might be wrong*. <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2025/how-public-checks-information-it-thinks-might-be-wrong>
- Sangwa, S. (2025). Secret societies, central banking, digital surveillance and the Great Reset: The serpentine strategy and biblical prophecy. *Open Journal of Stigmatized Knowledge & Suppressed Discourses*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.65655/pe2j7b54>
- Sangwa, S. (2026). The stages of World War III as narrative policy: Computational mapping of conspiracy discourse and biblical prophecy. *Open Journal of Stigmatized Knowledge & Suppressed Discourses*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.65655/ynayd346>
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2025). *Trends in world military expenditure, 2024*. <https://www.sipri.org/publications/2025/sipri-fact-sheets/trends-world-military-expenditure-2024>
- UNESCO. (2025, October 1). *Deepfakes and the crisis of knowing*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/deepfakes-and-crisis-knowing>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2025, June 12). *Global trends: Forced displacement in 2024*. <https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends>
- van Prooijen, J.-W., & Douglas, K. M. (2017). Conspiracy theories as part of history: The role of societal crisis situations. *Memory Studies*, 10(3), 323-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698017701615>
- Ward, C., & Voas, D. (2011). The emergence of conspiratoriality. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 26(1), 103-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537903.2011.539846>
- World Economic Forum. (2025). *The global risks report 2025* (20th ed.). <https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2025/>