

6. Cosmic Panaceas.

The English word “panacea” finds its origin in the Greek noun **πανάκεια (panákeia)**: “universal remedy” and its derivative **πανακής (panakés)**: “all-healing.”

Client-nation decline is instigated by loss of thought, initially by rejection of the laws of divine establishment and the authority structure associated with them.

Substituted are panaceas that alter the laws of divine establishment which, in a client nation, are based on principles derived from biblical guidance.

As the loss of thought continues, then the gospel of Jesus Christ is altered, changed, or dismissed followed by the Word of God being taught in compliance with cultural trends or abandoned altogether.

Human viewpoint, human good, and evil gradually supersede and ultimately replace the core standards that define a client nation and its core laws that maintain order are replaced by humanistic substitutes.

The Luciferian strategy for destroying a client nation is the panacea of equality which requires the body politic to be restructured so that all citizens assume the same level of income thus creating the proletariat or the “working class.”

Administering this status quo are the bourgeoisie or the “employers” who dominate the social order. This system has been proved through trial followed by error in modern communistic systems, the Soviet Union in particular. This excerpt brings clarity to this failed system:

Bourgeoisie is the social order that is dominated by the so-called middle class. The term arose in medieval France, where it referred to the inhabitants of walled towns. These townspeople practiced arts and crafts and occupied an intermediate position in the economic and social scale between rural landlords and peasantry. This distinction became politically important in the early 19th century in the course of the reaction against the indiscriminating democratic idealism that flourished during the French Revolution. (pp. 428–29)

Later, Marxists built an insupportable system of social and political philosophy on this distinction between bourgeoisie and proletariat. That the attempt to create a comprehensive philosophy of history and politics on this narrow basis was unrealistic is demonstrated by the subsequent struggles between different schools of socialism and communism.

Karl Marx's early collaborator, Friedrich Engels, made the first breach in the Marxist system when he admitted the importance of evolution as well as revolution in the development of human society. The successors of Marx and Engels, from Karl Kautsky \kaut'-skē\ and Vladimir Lenin to Joseph Stalin and Nikita Khrushchev, were forced to make increasing concessions to the realities of modern industrial and political life. The Marxist theory of social classification yielded to a growing recognition of the baffling complexity of modern society and politics.¹ (p. 429)

The reason Marxism did not work is because it is in opposition to the biblical system of economy which is capitalism which consists of the upper class, the middle class, and the lower class.

This economic system provides the freedom of mobility among the three classes. Volition offers the freedom to move upward or downward through the system each direction dependent upon subscription to or rejection of the "Protestant work ethic":

Protestant ethic, in sociological theory, the value attached to hard work, thrift, and efficiency in one's worldly calling, which, especially in the Calvinist view, were deemed signs of an individual's eternal salvation.

The German sociologist Max Weber \vā'-ber\ [best known for thesis linking Protestantism and capitalism] in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904–05) held that the Protestant ethic was an important factor in the economic success of Protestant groups in the early stages of European capitalism, for, because worldly success came to be interpreted as a sign of election, it was vigorously pursued.

Weber's thesis has been subject to criticism by various writers. Although the English historian R. H. Tawney accepted Weber's thesis, he explained it in his *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1926) by arguing that political and social pressures and the spirit of individualism with its ethic of self-help and frugality were more significant factors in the development of capitalism than Calvinist theory.

¹ *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed. (2010), 2:428–29.

Weber's monocausal explanation for the rise of capitalism has been abandoned in favor of multicausal explanations.²

Having entered the Britannica's article into document 33, I later discerned that the writer's conclusion was yet another effort by those who strive to diminish the impact of Protestant Christianity upon Anglo-Saxon culture.

There is no question that the monocausal explanation for the rise of capitalism is primarily the result of Protestant theology while other factors were not separate from but influenced by Christian doctrines.

An excellent analysis of the impact of the Reformation and Protestant theology on the West is a subject addressed by Dr. Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn in his book, *The Intelligent American's Guide to Europe*:

² Ibid., 9:740.