



F.A.C.S. REPORT

"A Monthly Newsletter on the Relevance of the Christian Faith"

Vol. 19, No. 5

©Copyright, 2000

May, 2000

What's Inside:

"Ignoring the issue is a sign of the new Christian scholarship that is beginning to dominate the landscape, a sign that does not give us hope for a Christian future of the world in the short term.

... economic and political freedom were given up provided sexual freedom was given in their place.

The French Revolution, now two centuries old, still indicates to us where we are headed.

Aesthetic revolutions, however, have their origin in moral revolutions...

Horror, argues Jones, "is a product of a guilty conscience that will not admit its own wrongdoing."

SEXUAL LIBERATION

by Ian Hodge, Ph.D.

One of my favourite authors is E. Michael Jones. A conservative Catholic, his writings were brought to my attention by R.J. Rushdoony and I have not regretted any purchase I have made of his books. Jones, like Rushdoony, is a critic of the modern world and its abandonment of Christianity. His recent books have explored a similar theme in an attempt to provide a sociological and theological explanation of the modern world.

For Jones, the modern world is exemplified in its attitude towards sexual liberation. For many of us, sexual liberation was something that arose in the '60s, but Jones argues that this movement has a long and unfortunately influential history.

In an earlier book, *Dionysos Rising: The Birth of Cultural Revolution Out of the Spirit of Music*,¹ Jones traced the influence of Wagner on modern music, through Nietzsche, Schonberg and down to the rock and rollers such as Rolling Stones and Mick Jagger, and argued modern

music is inextricably linked with sexual liberation. It most certainly meant, as the "new" music based on the twelve-tone system insisted, a break with all the older rules of music, the idea being that there now no rules. Harmony and melody were to be abandoned in favour of dissonance. The diatonic scale that had served western music so well was seen as an indication of an order in nature, whereas the new system abandoned all order. In other words, the "new" music was driven by a philosophical view about God and His world. Whereas the older music indicates order and harmony and enforces "rules" of composition, the new twelve-tone system abandoned all rules by making each note autonomous. There could be no "resolution" of dissonance such as that found in earlier composers such as Bach. The new music was created "chaos" to reflect a belief about a world without God. This is not a well-known idea, especially in Christian circles where it appears many are hell-bent on

using modern music no matter what modern music might do to the congregation and to Christian faith.

But to Jones, the modern world is epitomized by "rationalized sexual misbehaviour," as he argues in another work, *Degenerate Moderns: Modernity as Rationalized Sexual Misbehavior*. This impulse manifests itself in all of man's actions, hence the changes in music styles, architectural styles, political styles, theological styles, art styles, and much more. This is the underlying theme of Jones's books.

Richard Wagner was a failed political rebel who turned to music in an attempt to bring about a change in the world. Not surprising, since Wagner's conscience would have been troubling him over his amorous misbehaviour. According to Jones, Wagner self-consciously used music in an attempt to achieve a change in the social order. While Jones's thesis is a good one, I don't think he gives sufficient recognition to earlier composers who were also trying to eliminate the standards that Christendom had

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 \$35 or more will receive a full year's subscription. Foreign subscriptions: a minimum donation of \$45, 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
Australia

See us on the World Wide Web at
<http://facs.aquasoft.com.au/facs>
E-mail: facs@aquasoft.com.au

©Copyright, 2000. 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 in any format, apart from short quotations for review purposes, must be obtained in writing from the copyright owner.

nonsense for whole evening's entertainment.

Meanwhile, the late nineteenth century saw the rise in jazz, with its origins in African rhythms and connections to voodoo. The aim of the heavy rhythm, like the use of chromaticism in Wagner, was to produce ecstasy, an unhealthy reliance on emotions and feelings rather than maintaining a balance with reason. Jones saw this connection and many don't like his observation. Thus, for example, one clergyman is known to have told his congregation to ignore those who offer a critique of contemporary pop music and its association with modern culture – modern being seen as “rationalized sexual misbehavior.” Ignoring the issue is a sign of the new Christian scholarship that is beginning to dominate the landscape, a sign that does not give us hope for a Christian future of the world in the short term. When the connection Jones highlights is recognised, on the other hand, Christians might change their style of music and begin the re-transformation of Western Culture to its historic Christian roots.

In another work, *Living Machines: Bauhaus Architecture as Sexual Ideology*, Jones explored the origins of contemporary architecture. Aesthetic revolutions, however, have their origin in moral revolutions, as Jones argues quite well. But we do not understand this architectural revolution, led by Walter Gropius, a German architect, unless we appreciate what it was that Gropius was keen to change. First, a little background.

Another Jones, Douglas Jones, teamed with Douglas Wilson to write a book, *Angels in the Architecture: A Protestant Vision for Middle Earth*.² The two Douglas's are teammates at Christ Church, Moscow, Idaho, publishers of *Credenda Agenda*, one of the best Christian magazines available today, and founders of Canon Press, who publish this and a range of other very useful books. In this book, the authors argue for a more favourable appreciation of the medieval world, and especially the contribution medieval Christianity has made to the development of the West. This is particularly true in the medieval view of family and how this flowed into the development of social structures that

created. Once the standards in private morals are questioned, music became a vehicle to also abandon standards in the artistic realm, as if doing away with the stands in music would also do away with standards in the area of sexuality. No such luck, however, but Beethoven, half century earlier, also broke “conventions” as his new and bold compositions stormed across Europe at the same time the French were undertaking their grand experiment. Revolution was in the air right across Europe.

Wagner followed Beethoven with even bolder ideas, a deliberate use of chromaticism which the ancients knew was tied up with sexuality which, in turn, is tied up with the Old Testament and its moral standards. Perhaps here is the real reason for Wagner's attitude to the Jews: they were the original recipients of God's Law. Little wonder Hitler's regime was so enamoured with Wagner's music. But Wagner also led to the twelve-tone system, which involved disrupted harmonies, unresolved melodies, a destruction of the difference between harmony and disharmony, and decline in concert audiences. Not surprising, since the music is untuneful, a cacophony of sound, and unpleasant to listen to for sustained periods. Yet concert goers were expected to listen to this

The Regulative Principle of Politics

by Ian Hodge, Ph.D.

For many of us, the introduction to Reformed and Presbyterian thought brought with it another challenge. The history of the Reformation brings with it a debate that still divides Christians. Denominations base their existence on it, and the issue is still a hot topic in many quarters.

Recent articles in the *Chalcedon Report* by Rev Steve Schlissel have highlighted the debate of the *Regulative Principle*. The RP is, in essence, a debate over how we are to worship God in “official” services. An official service is the public worship of God called by a duly constituted church authority. On this basis, most Sunday services would fall into this category. At these services, say the RP supporters, we may only worship God in the way He has *explicitly* commanded. We cannot come to God on our terms, they argue, only the way He has prescribed.

With this point many are in agreement. The real debate begins, however, when we ask what Has God instructed us to do. Should we sing hymns? Should we stand or sit when we pray? Should we have musical instruments in the church worship service? Under the RP it is easy to answer these questions. Is there a command in Scripture to use musical instruments in public worship? If not, we should not use them? Is there a command to sing man-made hymns, or does the phrase “psalms, hymns and spiritual songs” refer to the Psalms and other Scripture only? Supporters of the RP will sing psalms only in church and will usually have no musical instruments. Singing is unaccompanied. At home or elsewhere, the adherents of the RP will sing hymns and use musical instruments.

Those who don't support the RP argue along different lines. While it is true that we may only worship God in the way He has commanded, they

made the family a key element in society.

An important aspect of the medieval world, argue the authors, is the integrated world and life view that was developed and adhered to. While it was not perfect, it was nevertheless recognizable. The great gothic cathedrals, for example, reflected a particular theological view about God, the world, and man's ultimate destination. Here on earth, the family was important, the home a castle, and the dwellings built to last a thousand years or more as a symbol of the family's security and future. Political structures were put in place based on a Christian view of man, the effect of sin as it often manifested itself in the grab for power, so that a more liberal and caring social order was developed and maintained. This is what the historians call Christendom.

Scholars have argued over when Christendom was abandoned. Certainly the French Revolution was a major attempt to overthrow it. And since that time, the abandonment of Christianity has manifested itself in many areas.

The cultural heritage of the West was one of the first casualties of the Great War. The house was the locus of the home; it was the primary building, sheltering the primary cell of society, the family, which was the nurturing ground of the values men held most dear. It was there that man first learned about God. It was there that he learned his native language. . . . It was there that he learned that his language aligned him with a particular race and state. All of the more important human activities, which give man his identity, took place in one sort of building or another, and those of most significance took place in the building known as the house.³

Gropius, however, wanted to change this. Modern man no longer was tied to the family. The home was no longer to serve as the family castle and last a thousand years. Instead, the home would make way for the apartment, a box-like construction, consisting of paper-thin walls and multi-storeyed, since there was no need to provide space

or territory for the family. Residents in Sydney may recall the ugly high-rise public housing that was part of the Redfern landscape, demolished in recent years. This is the symbol of the modern world's attempts to deny the family, its moral foundations in monogamous marriage, and the family house, surrounded with at least a small amount of dirt and grass making it independent from others, as the family refuge and fortress. Thus, for Gropius,

The rented apartment replaces the inherited family house; being settled in one place is replaced by a new nomadic individualism, which is fostered by the rapid increase of mechanized means of transportation. Just as the tribe lost its land, so the family will now lose its house. The power of the cohering family retreats in favor of the state-recognized rights of the individual.⁴

The change in architecture is further illustrated by comparing contemporary church buildings with those of the past. According to Jones, the modern church looks like a factory building, designed to seat hundreds. The grandeur and symbolism of the great cathedrals are missing. The atmosphere that the older cathedrals created is also missing. Missing also are some of the older views of Christianity that created our Western civilization and gave it its name, Christendom. A few years ago I preached in a church that was a renovated industrial site. It was modern and beautiful, but possessed none of the symbols of the faith in the right place as would have been done in earlier times. Inside, the symbols of the past have been altered to put man at the centre of activity. Whereas once the centre of the congregation's focus was on the Communion Table and the open Bible, with the pulpit off to the side so as not to make man central, now the modern church will have the preacher located centre-front, the communion table, if present at all, either off to the side or behind the preacher, the open Bible no longer to be seen. The preacher himself will not be dressed in the clerical gown indicating his representative function (just as judges still often wear the robe that

say, we believe His commands allow some latitude as to what we may do. If God has expressly forbidden something, then it should not be done. But there are many things that are not expressly forbidden and we may do these things as acceptable worship to God.

This is, by all standards, a very important debate. Its implications are serious. Are we really worshipping God in the manner He has prescribed? If not, are we in dangerous waters.

The *Regulative Principle*, however, is too narrowly defined if it refers to public worship only. It is, though, a very important issue as it applies to the political agenda.

One of the very great challenges before the Christian community is to develop a coherent biblical philosophy of the political state. This philosophy will determine, from the Scriptures, the God-ordained role of the state. Should it, for example, be involved in using its taxing power for social engineering purposes? Should it, for example, own and operate schools, or hospitals, or any many other activities? Should it even control the police? What are, in fact, the God-ordained *limits* to its jurisdiction? Does it even have limits, or can it do whatever it likes?

The *Regulative Principle* provides a solution to these questions. For at the heart of the RP issue is the way in which we read the Bible. When applied to public worship, the RP says we may only do those things *expressly* commanded in Scripture. The opponents argue that we do anything *unless* it is prohibited.

When applied to politics, the non-RP followers have a major problem. If we apply their principle to the political realm, we open the floodgate to a near-totalitarian system of government. Is the political state free to do whatever it likes? No, we say. Then is it free to do those things *only* expressly given to it by God, or is it free to operate wherever it likes unless it is expressly forbidden to do something?

Now we can see how important the *Regulative Principle* really is. It

3 E. Michael Jones, *Living Machines: Bauhaus Architecture as Sexual Ideology* (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1995), p. 16.

4 Quoted in Jones, *ibid.*, p. 37.

signifies they do not act on their own behalf), and will instead wear designer-looking suits that make him appear smart, even if the suits don't have the designer label stitched inside. Even more tacky, in some quarters it is thought that to "dress down" perhaps with no suit but just shirt and tie somehow is going to attract the common people to the church. Hardly likely, when the common people would adore to afford designer suits, and just love it when someone well-dressed appears on the door to sell them insurance, motor cars, or the latest in home gadgets.

Modern architecture, argues E. Michael Jones, is thus just one of the many attempts used by those who want to replace the Christian foundations of the West with another religion, that with man at the centre. But there is more.

In his latest book, Jones looks at the sexual revolution from another angle, that of political control.⁵ If sin is the attempt by man to free himself from God's moral order, especially in relation to sexuality, then it is interesting to see what man will pay to achieve this result. According to Jones, economic and political freedom were given up provided sexual freedom was given in their place.

Again, sexual liberation cannot be understood without an understanding of the role and function of the political order. The modern world, following de Sade, believes that everything is permissible. The state's role in this scheme, according to Rushdoony's perceptive analysis, is to "dismantle all law and religion (other than the worship of nature)."⁶ To do this, however, the state must deny God's law and replace it with its own version of the Ten Commandments. Thus property rights, once the underpinning of the family, no longer exist, except as national rights. All land belongs to the Crown in Australia, despite your bill of sale, which is why you can be removed at will (though you can argue for fair compensation). But the very existence of state-forced sale indicates where true economic power resides today.

In the move by modern man to have the state liberate sexuality from its Christian underpinnings, men have been willing to give up just about everything else. Once it was considered a matter of Christian duty to object and prevent the introduction of confiscation of private property through the imposition of state and national taxes. Now, the Christian community is willing to acquiesce on these matters. But for what purpose? Does it matter if families will be hurt by the introduction of a GST with its imposition of a significant workload for all business as they collect, on behalf of the government, the taxes imposed on business transactions? Who cares if some people might be put out of work or their business closed because of these taxes? Who will care for these poor and needy if the Christian community will not do so? We cannot expect the non-Christians to care, since many of these want homosexuality, abortion and euthanasia made legal. We cannot expect them to care because they have no reason to care for their neighbour. And though the Prime Minister of the day may talk about un-Australian activities that hurt some people, nothing is more un-Australian or un-godly than the confiscation of the wealth of others just because you have the police, courts and military power to enforce it. This is the worst form of tyranny, yet we live silently with it today, as if this is the way things should have been from the start.

The French Revolution, now two centuries old, still indicates to us where we are headed. But few complain. Instead, we take the lovers of the Revolution, the promoters of the ideals of the Revolution – its main ideal being to build a civilisation without God – and insist that our children study the poetic writings and musical compositions of people whose deliberate aim was to overthrow Christianity, while we live in houses designed by architects with the same aim.

Jones begins his first book for 2000⁷ at the French Revolution,⁸ a place we find ourselves again and again if we wish to understand the modern world. The French

is not an issue that can be confined to the area of public worship, which is where the debate has been confined in most instances. Rather, the RP provides us with a framework to solve the political dilemma we all face: defining the limits of the state.

Consider these questions: How much tax may the government impose? If the RP is in place, they may only take what God has expressly said they may take. Otherwise, they are free to take whatever they like, since there are biblical limits to tax levels. There is no passage in the Bible that says the state may take up to a certain amount.

There are other issues. May the state pass compulsory school attendance laws with the aim of getting people better educated? Again, there is no prohibition against the state doing this in the Bible. Should the state enforce tithing? Now here's a fascinating topic. If people fail to tithe, should the state step in and enforce tithing. Under the Regulative Principle, there is no room for the state to do this. Just as there is no room for the state to fine its citizens for any offenses. The state may certainly ensure restitution for crimes is paid to the victims, but it may not fine its citizens to line its own coffers.

The Regulative Principle even has implication for the church. Can church leaders enforce tithing? If so, what penalties should they apply if people fail to comply?

We can see, therefore, that the RP has far reaching implications. Without a *Regulative Principle* the doorway is opened for all kinds of errors, whether this is in public worship or in any other area. If the RP has validity, then it most certainly pertains in the political realm, for there is no other interpretive principle that can provide freedom from an oppressive political or ecclesiastical regime. While it is difficult to accept the *Regulative Principle* as it is applied to worship, it is much easier to see that the *Regulative Principle* is at the heart of defining the limitations of the various spheres. We do not, for

5 E. Michael Jones, *Libido Dominandi: Sexual Liberation and Political Control*, South Bend, IN, St Augustine's Press, 2000.

6 Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Politics of Pornography* (New Rochelle, NY, Arlington House, 1974), p. 62.

7 E. Michael Jones, *Monsters from the Id: The Rise of Horror in Fiction and Film*, Dallas: Spence Publishing, 2000.

Revolution was not just a political revolution. It was moral revolution in more ways than one. The horrors of the Revolution – headless corpses by the hundreds – gave rise to a new horror, Frankenstein and Dracula. Horror, argues Jones, “is a product of a guilty conscience that will not admit its own wrongdoing.” Enlightenment thought, the origin of the Revolution, “tried to drive out religion and morality, but found that they returned in the form of a monster.”⁹

At the time of the Revolution, Paris book stores were circulating the writings of the Marquis de Sade, who, amongst other things, said what you feel like doing sexually with someone is OK, even if you have to force them to do it.

Let it not be said that I contradict myself here, and that after having established, at some point further above, that we have no right to bind a woman to ourselves, I destroy those principles when I declare now we have the right to constrain her; I repeat, it is a question of enjoyment only, not of property: I have no right of possession upon that fountain I find by the road, but I have certain rights to use; I have the right to avail myself of the limpid water it offers my thirst: similarly, I have not real right of possession over such-and-such a woman, but I have incontestable rights to enjoyment of her; I have the right to force from her this enjoyment, if she refuses me if for whatever the cause may be.¹⁰

This is the logical conclusion of world without morals. Just as totalitarianism in the political order is the logical result of abandoning the Christian view of God and His moral order and replacing it with the State and its humanly-derived moral structure.

Beginning his story with the mother-in-law of Percy Bysshe Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, a lady who not only challenged the mores of the day but moved to Paris during the Revolution in order to lose her virginity, Jones provides a perceptive yet somewhat controversial

analysis of the rise and motives of horror stories. Abandoned by her lover when she became pregnant, Mary Wollstonecraft gained first hand experiences of the horror of the Revolution. Returning to England she eventually married William Godwin, who had earlier written a book, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*, a defence of the Revolution in France. The Godwin home was quite a centre of artistic influence. Samuel Taylor Coleridge used to give readings of his poetry in the Godwin home. Shelley would one day make his way there in pursuit of Godwin and his views on political and sexual liberation, and eventually seduce, and later marry, Godwin’s daughter, Mary, who authored *Frankenstein*.¹¹ A lover of the free love principles popular at the time, Shelley rejected conventional morality, finding it difficult to accept his first wife’s rejection of his idea that Mary Godwin move in with them. According to Jones, Mary Shelley wrote *Frankenstein* as a way of talking about the horrors of the new world order without God and morals, in which she had played a part. Shelley’s first wife, Harriet, committed suicide, Mary’s conscience eventually troubling her because of her part in the destruction Shelley’s relationship with Harriet. The monster novel was the vehicle Mary Shelley chose to speak about the unspeakable.

But the horror story became much more than that. Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*, a later horror story, exemplifies the use of horror in its attempts to overthrow Christian faith.

Both Christ and Dracula deal with blood and eternal life. Vampirism is . . . the antithesis of Christianity. Whereas Christ shed his blood so that his followers could have eternal life; Dracula shed his followers’ blood so that he could have eternal life. Dracula is a reworking of Christianity according to the canons of Social Darwinism. The monster is simply the inversion of Christianity that was waking place throughout Europe as once again the Enlightenment was implemented through one of its pseudoscientific ideologies.

example, believe the church should have the power of the sword because we believe this has been given to the state.

But we can go beyond this. We do not believe the state has power in education because we believe it has never been given this power. We do not believe the state has power to tax beyond the amounts God has said they may legitimately take. We do not believe the state should be involved in social engineering because it has never been given this task. We do not believe the state should redistribute wealth, because it has not been given this task. We do not believe the state should have *total jurisdiction* because God has never given it such latitude.

We do believe, however, that the state should no more than what God has said it may do. The issues that it has not been given are either given to the institutional church or retained within the family. The rest God keeps for himself. For example, we see in Scripture that God retains for himself the disciplinary actions to ensure His people tithe as He requires them. Without a *Regulative Principle*, both church and state can become usurpers of the authority and jurisdiction of the family, or worse, they attempt to take God’s prerogatives for themselves.

It is time the *Regulative Principle* debate was widened to incorporate more than just worship. Then we might get some of the political reform we need so badly.

In a satanic way, typical of the reversal of Christian order that the vampire creates, man achieves immortality through immortality and by infecting others – that is, through lust. Christianity exalts love; vampirism – Darwin’s survival of the fittest pushed to its extreme – exalts the hunger of desire. Man under the thrall of lust is epitomized by this disease, loses his reason and becomes a zombie bound to do the bidding of the *pate treponema*, the white worm. Man is thus made a function of nature,

8 Which is where I think he should have started his study on music with Beethoven, rather than half a century later with Wagner.

9 *Monsters*, p. xii.

10 Quoted in Rushdoony, *op. cit.*, p. 54f.

11 Shelley also translated an English version of the French national anthem, *The Marsellaise*, a translation still in use today.

much as the Marquis de Sae said he was.¹²

Jones, thus, sees sexual undertones in the great horror stories. Stoker, who died of syphilis, used this disease as his unnamed killer disease in the story of *Dracula*. Many innocent people were infected with this disease when a philandering husband returned to the nest. In *Dracula*, innocent women are also contaminated and die.

But it is more than just sexual liberation that is involved here. People have no response to de Sade's conclusions. In a world without morality, anything goes. Murder, rape, incest – the destruction of civilisation itself. The solution for Jones is a return to Christianity, but this is not a solution the world was ready to embrace. Hence the horror stories of grotesque figures and the use of blood. A century later, this alienation would be captured in a myriad of Hollywood films, all reflecting this alienation. The enemy is unknown, from outer space, possessing terrible powers to inflict death and mayhem. For Jones, this is indicative of man's revolt against Christianity.

There is an interesting implication in all this. If man had returned to the Christian faith as a way of resolving the problems that Enlightenment thought - highlighted in the godless and amoral French Revolution – then the monster and horror stories would not have been necessary. Hollywood's continued use of monsters and horror is seen as a part of the unwillingness of guilty men and women to find a solution for their conscience in the Christian faith.

Conclusion

THE BOOKS OF E. Michael Jones, therefore, tell an interesting tale of the modern world's revolt against God and against Christian social order. He documents this revolution in a number of areas, argues his case well, and writes lucidly. His books are a pleasure to read.

What is evident from this is the place education plays in advancing the modern world as defined by Jones. Students are encouraged to read and learn the works of the

poets who helped subvert the Old Order. While they read these materials, the science and biology classes attempt to rationalise the world's origins based on the unscientific theories of Darwin. Meanwhile, the music department entertains with the highly sexualised pop music, with its heavy rhythm patterns designed to enhance the sexual liberation of the modern world.

E. Michael Jones in part charts the downfall of the West. By so doing, he indicates how we might reclaim the world for Christ. Not by following the modern world's artistic or architectural styles, not by entertaining ourselves with fiction, especially horror fiction, nor by copying the modern world's musical styles while we worship in buildings whose design was also intended to replace the Christian concept of civilisation.

The foundations of the modern world need to be replaced. This means, amongst other things, new architecture, new art, new music, and most of all, a renewed commitment to bringing "every thought captive to the obedience of Christ."

12 Jones, *Horrors of the Id*, p. 124.