



# F.A.C.S. REPORT

FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES  
P.O. Box 547, Ferny Hills QLD 4055

Vol. 14, No. 3,

©Copyright, 1995

March, 1995

## TRANSFORMING CULTURE

by Don Bell

Changes. That was the name of the game according to the campaign promises of the Clintons-Gore trio. "It was the pivotal force of 1992, the fulcrum of Bill Clinton's victory and the reality intruding on many American's lives. Shackled by a stagnant economy, fearful for their children's future, voters sought a fresh start with youthful energy and optimism. That's why when Clinton declared in July, Now that we have changed the world, let's change America,' it sounded more convincing than when Bush first uttered the line in January." So editorialized Steven Roberts in *USNews*. But at the end of his article titled, "State of the Union," Roberts was careful to add: "Not all change is good . . . that is why managing the conflict demands of change and continuity will be Clinton's toughest first-year challenge."

Irving Weiss, famous veteran from the market crashes of 1929 and 1987, was more explicit. He wrote, "On Jan. 30, 1993 Bill Clinton will walk into the White House . . . and throw out all his campaign promises." Two *Miami Herald* Washington Bureau staffers voiced the same opinion. They said, "With his Cabinet complete President-elect Bill Clinton has given a preview of how he will govern. The early signs are that he will pursue moderate policies, execute them cautiously and seek a consensus whenever he can. Bold initiatives, creative ideas, sharp idealogues, fresh facts — these are not hallmarks of the team selected by the man who promised to be an agent of change. Instead, Clinton is playing it safe. He has selected prag-

matic advisers who represent the Democratic Party's diverse special interests, who fit in with the Washington establishment and who have the government expective to get it done.

Of course, we can't be sure until after the inauguration and the "100 days" and Clinton has taken charge just what may be in store for the Nation under Clinton's regime. This change agent is very changeable. But this seems certain. The power brokers who chose Clinton to replace Bush have taken charge of their agent. Clinton was allowed to be Clinton so long as he didn't shout Institute for Policy Studies slogans and kept Hillary suppressed. It was necessary that he shout change and promise diversity in order to be sure to win the popular election. But now that he is to take charge, his policies will not be his policies, but those of the ruling elite. There was a similar situation when Franklin Delano Roosevelt campaigned and won his first term. The people were conditioned to demand change, and FDR promised to change things. He certainly did. But he campaigned on the most conservative program imaginable, and once in office he "threw out all his campaign promises" and installed the Conspirators Hierarchy program known as the New Deal.

Clinton, it seems, is about to do the same but in reverse. He'll throw out his ultra-liberal program and proceed according to the dictates of his real bosses. That his Cabinet and Administrative team are flooded with members of the Council on Foreign Policy, Trilat-

### What Makes a Country Lovely?

by Haven Bradford Gow

For us to love our country, said Edmund Burke, our country must be lovely. If Burke meant that only a country that is lovely is loved by its people, then he is mistaken. For it is true that many Germans loved Nazi Germany. But if we understand Burke's remark to mean that for a country to be worthy of admiration, it must be lovely, then Burke certainly made a valid observation.

But what causes a country to be lovely? The justly eminent 18th century British statesman and political philosopher had a ready and astute reply. The country that is lovely, Burke trenchantly observed, is permeated with the spirit of religion and the spirit of the gentleman, qualities without which no civilized society can endure.

The "spirit of religion" is a complicated phrase. But what Burke meant is a reverence for God and a corresponding acknowledgment of an authority higher than the state. For Burke, it also meant a dedication to a cluster of shared values and the religious foundations for those values such as tradition, liberty under the law, courage, integrity, honour, civility, decency, the dignity of the individual because he is made in the image and likeness of God, the recognition of God-given rights and corresponding duties.



F.A.C.S. REPORT is published monthly by the FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES, a non-denominational educational organization. A free six month subscription is available upon request. Donations are invited, and those who send a donation of \$25 or more will receive a full year's subscription. Foreign subscriptions: a minimum donation of \$30, payable in Australian currency, is required for a year's subscription. Cheques should be made payable to F.A.C.S.

FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT  
of CHRISTIAN STUDIES  
P.O. Box 547  
Ferny Hills QLD 4055

©Copyright, 1995. All material published in F.A.C.S. REPORT remains the property of its author.

Permission to reprint material from F.A.C.S. REPORT must be obtained in writing from the copyright owner.

eral Commissioners, and Fellows of the Institute for Policy Studies, etc., indicates that there will be changes, but they will be dictated by the power elite. Further, everything that Bush has said or done since losing the election, has been approved by Clinton. That includes obeying the manufactured UN order to send UN troops into Somalia, approving the NAFTA Treaty, of his deals with Russia, all indicate that Clinton will not create a new foreign policy, but will further the policies begun by Bush, including promotion of the New World Order. And when we consider the former Jimmy Carter aides that have been resurrected and selected by Clinton as Cabinet Secretaries and assistants, we can suspect two things: That Clinton's domestic policies will follow those that Carter sponsored but couldn't complete, and that Clinton's foreign policies will be the continuation of George Bush's foreign policies.

In the transition period when Clinton was selecting his Cabinet members for Congressional approval, one of his guideposts was *diversity*. He attained what he desired except that he said he would have like to have chosen one Republican to complete the diversity. But while this government of men was being formed to provide this diversity, there was another form of diversity that was being ignored or has never been heard of by the great majority. The controlled communications media continue to tell us that Communism is dead. Western society has been blinded to a deadlier variety of Communism which is very much alive, is being promoted in Russia, and "lurks half hidden within political and official

organizations and bureaucracies," this is according to a responsible authority which we shall not name, and "Only a small minority of informed observers is alert to the dangers presented by the cadres."

"More than any other movement within the revolutionary tradition, communism was born with its name, wrote James H. Billington, author of *Fire in the Minds of Men*. "When the word first appeared publicly in 1840, it spread throughout the continent with a speed altogether unprecedented in the history of such verbal epidemics. Unlike other revolutionary labels, communism was a new word, associated from the beginning with a new concept.

"The idea was refined and finally made manifest by Marx on the eve of revolution in 1848." Up to that time, revolutionaries had been struggling to find a name for their movement. They toyed with the word Democracy, then with Liberalism, finally accepted Socialism as a general term. It too was a new word. Robert Owen, who unsuccessfully planted communist centers in the United States, was said to have been the first to accept the word Socialism in his writings. But before the words Socialism and Communism there was the work of such men as Saint Simon, Fourier, Fichte, and so many others who laid their own foundations upon which the various types of Socialism was (sic) created. And before Socialism or Communism came the Order of the Illuminati, created on May 1, 1776 by Adam Weishaupt. But neither was this a new idea.

Nesta Webster, in her *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, wrote "That Weishaupt was not the originator of the system he named Illuminism. . . . It has needed in fact all the foregoing chapters [in her book] to trace the source of Weishaupt's doctrines throughout the history of the world. From these it will be evident that men aiming at the overthrow of the existing social order and of all accepted religions had existed from earliest times, and that by the Cainites, the Carpocratians, the Manicheans, the Batinis, and the Katmathites many of Weishaupt's ideas had already been foreshadowed. . . . Thus de Sacy has described in the following words the manner of enlisting proselytes by the Ismailis: They proceeded to the admission and

By the "spirit of the gentleman" Burke was referring to something much more than mere social poise and the ability to win friends and influence people. Cardinal John Henry Newman once described the gentleman as one who is "tender towards the bashful, gentle towards the distant, and merciful towards the absurd. . . . He never speaks of himself unless compelled, never defends himself by mere retort, he has no ears for slander or gossip. . . ." The gentleman, continued Newman, is "patient and forbearing"; he resigns himself to suffering because "it is inevitable, to bereavement because it is irreparable, and to death because it is his destiny." And if the gentleman engages in controversy of any kind, "his disciplined intellect preserves him from the blundering discourtesy of better, perhaps, but less educated minds, who, like blunt weapons, tear and hack instead of cutting clean, who mistake the point in argument, waste their strength on trifles, misconceive their adversary, and leave the question more involved than they find it."

Burke would have agreed with Newman's sentiments; he, like Newman, meant something more than external gentility and the mere observance of the traditions of civility. Burke also was talking about the nobility of mind and character that helps one distinguish between truth and error, right and wrong, the estimable and the base: The refinement of mind and character that elevates one above the social, intellectual, religious and moral fads and foibles of one's group and of one's times. As Russell Kirk trenchantly observes, Burke believed that the spirit of the gentleman meant "that elevation of mind and tender, that generosity and encouragement of mind, (and that) habit of acting upon principles which rise superior to immediate advantage and private interest."

Were Burke alive today, he would find little of the spirit of religion and the spirit of the gentleman in our country. He would discover little respect for the canons of rational and civilized discourse; and he would find little observance of the norms and traditions of civility.

Instead, Burke would find the spirit of religion and the spirit of the gentleman considered "effeminate" by those most doubtful of their own sexual identity; he would encounter widespread indifference, if not hostility, toward religion in both private and public life. He would find increasing numbers who think in slogans, who shout down speakers, who refuse to listen or to consider views contrary to



the initiation of new proselytes only by degrees and with great reserve; for, as the sect at the same time had a political objective and ambitions, its interest was above all places and all classes in society. It was necessary therefore to suit themselves to the character, the temperament, and the prejudices of the greater number; what one revealed to some would have revolted others and alienated forever spirits less bold and consciences more easily alarmed.' This passage exactly described the methods laid down by Weishaupt for his "Insinuating Brothers" of speaking sometimes in one way, sometimes in another, so that one's real purpose should remain impenetrable to members of the inferior grades."

There is the theory that Illuminism died in about 1800, as has Communism supposedly died since the 1980s. But Billington wrote that "Illuminist ideas influenced revolutionaries not just through left-wing proponents, but also through right-wing opponents. As the fears of the right became the fascination of the Left, Illuminism gained a paradoxical influence far greater than it had exercised as a living movement."

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) said by Frederic Bastiat (1801-1850) to be "the supreme authority of the democrats," wrote what might be considered the final word of advice to change agents who, at any time or place, desire to create a New World Order. Rousseau wrote:

He who would undertake the political creation of a people ought to believe that he can, in a manner of speaking, transform human nature, transform each individual — who by himself is a solitary and perfect whole — into a mere part of a greater whole from which the individual will henceforth receive his life and being. Thus the person who would undertake the political creation of a people should believe in his ability to alter man's constitution, to strengthen it, to substitute for the physical and independent existence received from nature, an existence which is partial and moral. In short, the would-be creator of political man must remove man's own forces and endow him with others that are naturally alien to him.

The French revolutionaries of the 1790s couldn't agree on how their New

World should be Ordered. The leaders began assassinating each other and their followers began decimating the populace with accent on Christians. Napoleon was asked to restore order. He did but he also dreamed of creating his own New World Order. The retreat from Moscow in 1812 and the defeat at Waterloo in 1815 ended the dream. Revolutionary discord resumed and brought about a new revolution in the 1840s and the bloody Paris Commune which ended with the establishment of the Third Republic in 1875. The Communist leaders in the early 20th century were still in disagreement.

The Communist Party became two parties: Radical Bolshevism under Lenin and more moderate Menshivism under Kerensky. Lenin won, was commissioned by the international bankers to invade Russia, destroy the Czarist government and create a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in its stead. But again came dissent. Trotsky wanted to promote international communism, Lenin and Stalin wanted to solidify control of Russia first and then add other countries step by step through political action or military pressure. Lenin gave up half an empire to gain his point, then died. Stalin succeeded, Trotsky fled to Mexico and was murdered. Tito refused to join the USSR as did Albania. China and Russia separated never to be reunited. Much the same kind of disorder existed in Communist Parties in various countries. Mussolini adopted a mutant form of Communism and called it Fascism. Hitler did likewise and called it Nazism. Finally, in the latter 1980s, Communism was said to die and the Cold War to end. Communist theoreticians, steeped in totalitarian bureaucracy and unfamiliar with individualism and private enterprise, sought a new way to bring Communism back to life. And they found what they sought in the recorded history of the Italian Communist Party.

Mussolini had been a Communist. "His journalistic activity as head of an official party organ bore striking resemblance to that of Lenin," wrote Billington. But he broke with Stalin on matters relating to intervention in World War One. He was expelled from the Italian Socialist Party in 1914, started his own journal and began

their own; he would see a denigration of the concepts of personal freedom and responsibility; he would witness in our society an attack by those without roots upon the delicate balance between freedom and order, tradition and change; he would see a vicious and officious assault on the sanctity of human life, on the right to life of unborn children. And Burke, to this dismay, would discover a violent and tragic rupture of "the bond of human affections," the ties that promote unity and a sense of community rather than divisions; the ties, that is to say, that bind a person to his neighbour, to his family, to his church, to his community, to his country.

To fight today for the resuscitation of the spirit of religion and the spirit of the gentleman would seem to be a lost cause. But no great cause is ever truly lost. Consequently, for so worthy a cause we must continue to struggle until these qualities prevail — qualities which cause a country, as well as an individual, to be lovely.

*[The author of this article lives in Arlington Heights, Illinois.]*

\* \* \* \* \*

**O**ur apologies to subscribers for the lateness of recent newsletters. A relocation interstate and a new job have taken more time than estimated. The enclosed newsletters, however, are an effort to get back on track and bring subscriptions up to date.

We are saddened to hear of the recent loss to the Chalcedon staff of Otto Scott. Mr Scott relocated interstate to obtain better medical facilities for his wife. Mr Scott continues to write and publish his *Compass* newsletter.

A note for people's diaries. We plan to hold a 1996 conference with international guests. It is hoped this can be held in the second quarter of the year, and if there is sufficient interest, we will hold separate conferences in major capital cities. More on this later, but for those who like to plan ahead, you have been given plenty of notice.



developing his own form of corporative socialism which is called Fascism.

Meanwhile, a young Communist intellectual named Antonio Gramsci became the Togliatti co-leader of the newly created Italian Communist Party. There was a political struggle between Mussolini's Fascism and Gramsci's Communism; Mussolini won and Gramsci was jailed, but continued to write. He argued that "the *cultural* superstructure determines the political and economic base, not the other way around." He emphasized the importance of Lenin's "long march through the institutions — that is to say, the penetration of the media, the universities, public interest groups, churches and cultural institutions — stressing that by working through such institutions, cultural values can be altered and morals softened irreversibly, setting the stage for political and economic power to drop into the hands of the Left," according to the *International Currency Review*, 108 Horse Ferry Road, Westminster, London SW1P 2EF. Gramsci said man must be transformed, along with culture itself, and there must be the absolute elimination of Christianity.

Now let us compare. Weishaupt (1776) called for abolition of all national governments, of private property, of the traditional family, of all accepted religions. Rousseau (about 1778) said: "He who would undertake the political creation of a people ought to believe he can transform human nature, transform each individual . . . into a mere part of a greater whole from which the individual will henceforth receive his life and his being. . . He must remove man's own forces and endow him with others that are naturally alien to him." Rockefeller in 1904 created the General Education Board whose Occasional Letter No. 1 stated: "In our dreams we have limitless resources and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our moulding hands. The present educational convention fades from our minds and, unhampered by tradition, we work our good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk." Communist Antonio Gramsci in the 1920s wrote that "The cultural superstructure determines the political and economic base, not the other way around. . . . It is necessary to transform culture itself. . . . The revolution will triumph only after first conquering civil society." Today's

Education (1970) said: "The change-agent teacher does more than dream, he builds, too. He is part of an association of colleagues in his local school system, in his state, and across the country that makes up an interlocking system of change-agent organizations. This kind of system is necessary because changing our society through the evolutionary educational processes requires simultaneous action on three power levels."

Compare the sources of the above quotes and it becomes obvious that a powerful force seeks to destroy Christianity and the culture it spawned. And what confirmed Communists now learn from the writings of Gramsci has been the doctrine of change agents in the West for years. TV, stage, cinema, drugs, crime and moral corruption so attest.

For "if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Psalm 11:3). "For other foundations can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Corinthians 3:11).<sup>1</sup>

1. ©Copyright, 1993, Don Bell Reports. Reprinted by Permission *Don Bell Reports*, P.O. Box 2223, Palm Beach Florida 33480 USA. Foreign subscription rates; \$US50 per annum. While this material is a little dated, relating as it does to the early days of the Clinton Presidency, it is thought that the insights and thoughts of this author would be of interest to subscribers. This essay does not necessarily reflect the opinion of F.A.C.S.