



# Only who can learn from the past?

a brief history of democracy and human rights

by Markus Reichenbach August 2021  
Introduction to a Biblical Christian Worldview

## **Abstract**

The West has tried to establish democracy in Africa, the Middle East or Afghanistan. But it has not worked. Instead of helping these countries, the West remains in danger of losing democracy and human rights itself.

Why is that? The West does not look back to history. They think that the past can teach them nothing. To understand where our culture comes from, they instead push for a cultural revolution. The great organisations that have emerged from history want to bring about a revolution and free themselves from the dust of the old age. But what are the consequences of this?

Let us take a brief look at the history of the development of democracy and human rights. If we believe in holding on to human rights and democracy, we need to understand where they came from.

This booklet will not go into the details of history. There would be much to add. But I hope it can make you think. It helps you to come in a discussion about history and the source of human right and democracy. I hope it can help to understand freedom in the world better.

# Content

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>The history of democracy</b>	<b>4</b>
The Greek system felt	4
The French Revolution felt	4
Revolution broke out in whole Europe – but it felt	6
The human beings	6
Why Switzerland have found the source of democracy?	7
<b>The consequences of revolution in the 20<sup>th</sup> century</b>	<b>8</b>
The ideology of atheism	8
The revolutions ended in the First World War	9
The Russian Revolution ended in a disaster	9
The second world war destroyed Europe	10
The last reformation found back to the source	11
Moral rearmament movement found the key	12
<b>The cultural revolution continues – have people learned nothing from history?</b>	<b>14</b>

# The history of democracy

## The Greek system felt

Many people would mention that democracy is coming from the Greece or the French Revolution. Democracy is a Greek word, which means that the people rule. Historians say that there was never more than around 20% of the population in Greece involved in the ruling class. Only people who had a position in the cities. But most were peasants, workers, slaves, women or children. They all never had the opportunity to say anything to the ruling.

It didn't work among these elites either. The biggest problem was that they had no common law. No human right. Just being a team didn't help. In the end, it became a power play between the philosophers and the rhetoric.

Socrates accused the ruling class of this and he had to die. He had the choice of leaving the city, leaving the upper class, or drinking the poison. He chose the second. To claim that our current understanding of democracy comes from the Greeks is obviously wrong.

It is a debate anyway what people understand by democracy. There is the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In short words: North Korea. That has nothing to do with democracy in our sense. It is a pure dictatorship. Just to have the world democracy on paper does not make a democracy.

Socialists understand that democracy means that everyone has the same thing. So, communists also claim to be democratic. The anarchist understands that everyone can do what they want. People are not under a ruler. That was the idea of the French Revolution.

The US tried to establish democracy in Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq or the Middle East, but it did not work. Africa also became free, but instead of becoming democratic, which most political systems claim to be, it usually ended in dictatorship. Probably the biggest misconception about freedom is that people believe that a democratic system create freedom. It is probably the opposite. Freedom in the heart of the people makes a great political system possible.

A good system is to reach a certain goal but cannot discipline people. Disciplining people is a matter of the heart. It also cannot be forced, which many people try to do. People have to learn to live the right way. Then they can build a well-functioning democratic system.

People need to understand where the system comes from and why it works and why it doesn't work.

## The French Revolution felt

The French Revolution 1789-1799 claimed that man can be free when there are no more authorities to oppress people. Of course, the French upper class and the clergy oppressed the ordinary people. There was a lot of injustice. But with a revolution, people can hardly never change a system.

The French Revolution declared a new year zero on 5 October 1793. They overthrew all the authorities. They killed most of them. But they forgot that people cannot fight injustice with the same means that the authorities used to oppress people. The Bible says if you use weapons, you will be killed by weapons<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Live by the sword, die by the sword" (Matthew 26:52)

That is exactly what happened. In the end, everyone killed everyone. The climax was when they killed Robespierre<sup>2</sup>, who started the revolution.

Napoleon Bonaparte<sup>3</sup> stepped into that vacuum. He became the new dictator and messed up not only France but all of Europe. In the end he was exiled to an island and in 1815 all of Europe was reconciled in the Vienna Pact.

The idea of the French Revolution was freedom and equality for all. But it didn't work. They did not build on the past. They ignored history and wanted to start all over again. The past was just bad for them. Instead of bringing change, they brought war. Instead of reform, they brought revolution. A revolution thinks that the past is all bad and everything has to become new.

But a reformer understands that for change to happen, people have to see that not everything is bad. That some things are good and some things are bad. With this view, they are able to reform the bad and build on the good.

People need to see history and learn from it. But often people just see an idealistic world. They often forget that they make the same mistakes as people before them. They cannot see their blind spots. In the end, they bring more curse than blessing.

The main problem was that the revolutionaries had no law over them. They overturned the structure of the culture and people were free to do whatever they wanted. That is the literally idea of democracy. The people can govern themselves. But it didn't work.

The revolutionaries did not understand why freedom works or will not work. They didn't want to go back to the beginning of our modern Western civilisation.

Especially the idea of Jean Jacques Rousseau<sup>4</sup> thrilled the revolutionary. He grew up in Geneva and experienced the great Reformation in the 16<sup>th</sup> century there<sup>5</sup>. They freed the people from the authority of the church and state and put the people under the authority of the Bible. The people were no longer just under the people, they were first under God and had to obey him. The Genevans replaced the vacuum of the clergy and the ruling party with the Bible.

Therefore, not everyone could do what he wanted. He had to do it according to the law of the Bible. Everyone could stand with the Bible in his hand and tell the others that what they are doing is wrong. The Bible freed people from the oppression of men.

Rousseau hated the idea of sin. For him, the biblical law was only a justification for the upper class to oppress the others. He wanted to abolish this absolute norm over human beings. For him, people are inherently good, when they would be free from authority. But this idea of anarchy did not work. Man became a wild animal in the French Revolution.

---

<sup>2</sup> Maximilien Robespierre, 1758-1794

<sup>3</sup> Napoléon Bonaparte 1769 –1821, was a French military and political leader who rose to prominence during the French Revolution and led several successful campaigns during the Revolutionary Wars. He was the leader of the first French Republic from 1799 to 1804. As Napoleon I, he was Emperor of the French from 1804 until 1814 and again in 1815.

<sup>4</sup> Jean-Jacques Rousseau, French 1712 1778 was a Genevan philosopher, writer, and composer. His political philosophy influenced the progress of the Enlightenment throughout Europe, as well as aspects of the French Revolution and the development of modern political, economic, and educational thought.

<sup>5</sup> [https://jmemwiler.ch/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Reformationstour/Reformation\\_tour\\_English.pdf](https://jmemwiler.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/Reformationstour/Reformation_tour_English.pdf)

The idea that man is good when he is free was an illusion. Rousseau's idea of a perfect society never worked.

### **Revolution broke out in whole Europe – but it felt**

The French began to revolutionise more in the following years. But every time it felt. In 1848, revolution broke out all over Europe. The idea of founding a new world went through all nations. But things turned out differently. It left people to the fate of their feelings and the whims of nature. Europe turn back again to the old system of monarchy. The revolution didn't succeed.

### **The human beings**

History always tells the same story. People look for themselves first. It is never good when people have too much power. The reformers were right. They claimed that man is a sinner. Therefore, people need a political system that has an emergency exit. They built a system where people had to give accountability. They need a system where they could replace rulers if sin became too strong in them. This was later called a democracy.

Winston Churchill<sup>6</sup> said; "Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others" A democracy is not the absolutely perfect system, but it is the system that best fits the reality of sinners.

If people deny the beginnings of the modern democratic idea, they will experience what the French Revolution experienced. They will end into chaos. It will not work if everyone is free to do what they want to do. If everyone demands their rights. If this is the main understanding of democracy, then democracy is no better than a dictatorship. Only a dictatorship of the elites who has the most money and the most power. Those who control the media and be enough corrupt. In such a system, the powerful will always win.

A democracy in which there is no absolute law over the people leads to chaos. People cannot live in it. In such a situation, people will be willing to give up their freedom for a central government. Chaos cannot last long; it will force a new ruling power. The French Revolution it is a god example. It brought a new dictatorship under Napoleon.

Francis Schäffer<sup>7</sup> said 50 years ago that people in the West will be willing to give up political freedom just for prosperity and personal peace. Isn't that exactly what is happening?

This danger exists today. People deny the beginning of modern Western civilisation. That is why they do not understand the system.

As a Swiss politician, Jeremias Gothelf said. First the duties and then the rights. "The Lord God put duties first, after duties come rights, after sowing comes reaping".

The French Revolution demanded justice and freedom for all. But they forgot the obligations. The obligation to whom? Only to themselves?

The Enlightenment began to believe in a natural law that replaces God. A law that is actually in every heart. Rousseau claimed that people have to free themselves from oppression then they will behaviour in this natural law. This law will be the new guide. But it didn't work.

---

<sup>6</sup> Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, 1874 -1965 was a British statesman who served as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1940 to 1945, during the Second World War, and again from 1951 to 1955.

<sup>7</sup> Francis Schäffe, who should we then live? 1976

People are not good. They had never been good and probably will not be good in the future. So many wars and conflicts in the world prove that. But why do people keep making the same mistake?

If there is no other authority outside man, then man becomes the authority. There is no other option. So, which is better? Do people want to be under man or under God?

### **Why Switzerland have found the source of democracy?**

General Henri Dufour<sup>8</sup> brought the opposing parties 1848 to a peace treaty. It ended in a constitution for Switzerland. It was the first in Europe. As the rest of Europe sank in depression Switzerland arise.

Why he was able to do it? Because he was able to combine the old and the new. He understood the beginning of our western civilisation.

He was a deep Christian and understood that man is a sinner. General Dufour was a convinced Christian. He founded the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and was a co-founder of the Red Cross.

He understood; it is not good for man to have too much power. Man needs an absolute law over himself. A law that stands over all the people.

The constitution of Switzerland begins with the name of God. They accepted a godly law over them. They understood the beginning of Western civilisation 300 years ago. They understood that man is a sinner. But they could also see the evil thing in it and were able to reform it. The conclusion was a constitution for Switzerland 1848.

The constitution command 5 later 7 federal members. They do not have a president. They believed it is better when people discuss and come to a conclusion then when only one to it. That man is a sinner and must be held accountable helped the Swiss build a stable sustainable structure that has survived to this day.

Switzerland remained neutral in the world war and did not participate. Even today, Switzerland's well-known neutrality. It is a cornerstone for world politics.

In this time, the Swiss authorities proclaimed a day of prayer, which is still held on the second Sunday in September. It is written that the Swiss need God's help in this tension of revolution. The people were in this time in uproar and there was no longer any way to hold it back. Only God can help. And he did. The opposition parties prayed instead of fighting and ended up with a compromise. They understood history. They understood the Reformation in Geneva.

Geneva became the first accurate democratic system based on separation of powers and a constitution, the Geneva Convention of 1537.

The Swiss eventually understood that people should not be forced to become Catholic or Protestant. While the conflict between the Catholics and the Reformed in Europe ended in the Thirty Years' War 1618-1648, the Swiss concluded several treaties on religious freedom. They eventually found a compromise without the use of weapons. Even though some

---

<sup>8</sup> Guillaume Henri Dufour, Swiss, 1787-1875

conflicts brought death, they cannot be compared to the millions of victims and the damage caused by the Thirty Years' War.

They understood the bloodless revolution in England 1688. There the king was ready to give up his power to parliament. It is called the bloodless revolution, built on the ideas of the Bible. A change cannot be done with the same weapon that before oppressed the activists.

Likewise, the War of Independence in America was under this worldview. For example, Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1776: "We hold these truths, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." So they were able to reform the world instead of destroying it.

Reformation can only happen when people have an absolute standard about people. And everyone is allowed to know it and analyse it. Everyone can refer to this standard and can hold people accountable. This is what the people in the past understood. Until today there was no other system that could bring this amount of freedom and stability then the understanding of the bible.

But the revolutions produced only losers. The rest of Europe except Switzerland sank into crisis and in the end returned to the old system of monarchy.

## **The consequences of revolution in the 20<sup>th</sup> century**

### **The ideology of atheism**

In the middle of the 19th century, criticism of Christianity grew enormously. Charles Darwin claimed to prove that the beginning of the world did not need a creator. Everything had come into being through a natural process. He claimed to be scientifically what many doubt today. But his ideas quickly spread to society. The whole society have been shaken.

Everything until then had been built on the idea of the Creator. But now the church and the old structure under God were blamed as the real problem of freedom. Now revolution seems to be around the corner.

One of the first practical atheists was Karl Marx<sup>9</sup>. He claimed that God is the problem. He believed that if we abolish God, we can create a new world where freedom can reign. He believed that the problem of injustice is that people justify injustice with God.

He believed; people claim that they have something because they received it from God. This only creates jealousy and greed, the source of all evil. But if there is no more giver, no more creator, then people cannot claim that things belong to them. Anyone who claims it belongs to him is a thief and can therefore be banished.

With his ideas of no God, he abolished private property and declared all those who claim to own something to be evil. They would prevent peace and freedom from being in the world

---

<sup>9</sup> Karl Heinrich Marx (1818 – 14 1883) was a German philosopher, economist, historian, sociologist, political theorist. Marx became stateless and lived in exile with his wife and children in London for decades. His best-known titles are the 1848 pamphlet *The Communist Manifesto* and the three-volume *Das Kapital* (1867–1883). Marx's political and philosophical thought had enormous influence on subsequent intellectual, economic and political history.



and therefore they must be abolished. Socialism was born. It became the basis of the communists and many who would follow.

Karl Marx with Friedrich Engels<sup>10</sup> wrote the Communist Manifesto. They claimed that a revolution, a civil war, is necessary to come to this new world where people are free from the idea of possessing something. Where people are free from the claim that it is mine. It will be a total classless society where private property is abolished. But not only that, it will be a world where evil is abolished. But to maintain this state it will take strong rule and civil war to rid the world of this evil thought of a creator.

Marx followed the French Revolution and destroyed the past. He rewrote history new and wanted to tear down all the structures of the past. Years later, people will believe him and take the world to a new stage. A horrible stage they had never seen before.

### **The revolutions ended in the First World War**

Industrialisation brought a lot of new technology and prosperity. People became optimistic and thought they were now entering a new world. But it would take a revolution. They marched with trumpets and trombones into the First World War 1914-1918. They believed that this war would bring them to the new world. Karl Marx's ideas found their way to the people. But the end was different. Millions of deaths. There was almost no family in Europe that did not have to mourn a death in their family.

The illusion was gone, the consequences were horrific.

### **The Russian Revolution ended in a disaster**

But the idea of revolution did not die. In 1919, the Russian Revolution broke out. They not only believed that the war would bring them into a new age. They believed that the philosophy of abolishing God and private property would bring the breakthrough. Vladimir Lenin<sup>11</sup> became the leader and led the Russian into the 20<sup>th</sup> century The Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union confiscated all private property. Those who did not hand it in were killed or sent to reduction camps. Under the first two presidents, Lenin and Stalin<sup>12</sup>, over 20 million were eliminated. After the Second World War the eliminated again Millions because of this philosophy in the cold war. It was supposed to be the beginning of a new world, but it was the terror.

The people lost creativity and motivation to work. Because they all became slaves to the states. No one was allowed to do more or earn more. This led the Soviets into hunger and poverty. Even today you can see the deep wounds from this.

---

<sup>10</sup> Friedrich Engels German 1820 –1895), was a German philosopher, economist, historian, political theorist and revolutionary socialist. He was also a businessman, journalist and political activist, whose father was an owner of large textile factories in Salford (Lancashire, England) and Barmen, Prussia (now Wuppertal, Germany).

<sup>11</sup> Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov Russia 1870 1924, was a Russian revolutionary, politician, and political theorist. He was the first and founding head of government of Soviet Russia from 1917 to 1924 and of the Soviet Union from 1922 to 1924. He was a Marxist, he developed a variant of this communist ideology known as Leninism.

<sup>12</sup> Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, 1878–1953 was a Georgian revolutionary and political leader who governed the Soviet Union from 1924 until his death in 1953 He consolidated power to become the Soviet Union's dictator by the 1930s. Stalin formalised these ideas as Marxism–Leninism while his own policies are known as Stalinism.

Many countries followed. Not all of their own free will they are colonised and oppressed. By the sword they are converted. All these countries fell into poverty.

One of the big problems is the question; who controls the one who controls. The one who controls that all have nothing must also be controlled. Why can he claim that he will be different. That is how the communist ruling party was. They controlled everyone but no one controlled them. They could do whatever they wanted. They lived in prosperity but society suffered much more than before.

There was nothing about man for this people. But if there is no God, then man becomes a god. Someone will control and the question will be who controls the one who controls.

China also became a socialist state. Today they are still ruled by the communists, but they are no longer communists. China became a modern state with a capital dictatorship. They just use communism for justify their dictatorship and colonialism. Many people in the West still don't see that. It will become the new superpower. It will colonise many nations and oppress them.

China builds their way through the whole world. But they separated them from the idea of history. They no longer looked back to the past. They don't believe in human rights either. They go back to the ideas of kings and Napoleon. Survival of the fittest, and that will be the Han Chinese. For them, a great ruler is someone who can impose his opinion. He does not have to give away his power and find compromises with the other side. Democracy for them is weakness, old fashion and death.

It would be so ignorant to say that this revolution brought freedom to the world. It was again a revolution and not a transformation.

A lot of what they observed was right. There was a lot of oppression by the rich people. But not everything was bad.

They didn't learn from the past and wanted to destroy all history. But in the end, they used the same weapons as the oppressors. They became even more brutal than before.

## **The second world war destroyed Europe**

Historians say that the Second World War was just a reaction to the First. Adolf Hitler<sup>13</sup> was at the table at Versailles 1918 for the peace treaty. Germany was announced as the criminal and had to bear most of the recovery costs. Historians believe that Hitler was so angry and decided that he will take it back. And he did. The Second World War broke 20 years later out. It was a huge terror and Europe get destroyed again. But probably after this time the people will learn something from it.

---

<sup>13</sup> Adolf Hitler, German 1889 1945 was the dictator of Germany from 1933 to 1945. He rose to power as the leader of the Nazi Party. Becoming Chancellor in 1933 and then assuming the title of Führer und Reichskanzler in 1934. He initiated World War II in Europe by invading Poland 1939. He was central to the perpetration of the Holocaust, the genocide of about six million Jews and millions of other victims.

## **The last reformation found back to the source**

The US president Franklin D. Roosevelt<sup>14</sup> and the Prime minister of Great Britain Winston Churchill<sup>15</sup> met in secret on the British warship in Placentia Bay in 1941. They agreed on the Atlantic Charter. But before they began to negotiate, they celebrated a service and prayed to God. They understood that they needed humility and the grace from God. They understood that the world needed hope and common principles for freedom in the world. On 1 January 1942, 26 nations signed the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Declaration. Today the UN have 193 member states.

Nations should not be given too much power and should not conquer others. The world needs a law where all nations are under it. The UN should be the guarantor that holds these independent nations together.

The last peace treaty, the League of Nations from 1920, did not survive long. But with the UN, the time seems ripe. It was more successful than the League of Nations because people returned to the old ideas of the reformers. They were able to combine the old and the new. It was a Reformation understanding that people who come from the past are entitled to something worthy. Not everything has to be turned upside down.

As a symbol of freedom, the founders made a statue in front of the UN headquarters in New York. On it is written: "Let us beat swords into ploughshares". Isaiah, a prophet from the Bible, had this vision from God. One day a redeemer will come and see to it that swords are turned into ploughshares. The UN saw themselves as the visible embodiment of this vision. Being faithful to the Bible, they understood that it was God's will. It was Jesus who made it possible through the cross. They made the cross visible with the UN.

The UN Charter and human rights were a standard for all nations. No one can change them. No king, no nation, no powerful, no minority or majority. But they knew. Man, alone cannot find them. Therefore, they need the revelation of God.

## **The human rights**

They believed that the world needs human rights that everyone and every nation is accountable for. Rene Cassin, the inventor of the Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, wrote that they were an application of the Ten Commandments from the Bible. The teaching of the Bible found an answer for the world.

Human rights brought the breakthrough. Every human being is created by God. Therefore, we all form the same family. But even more. Every human being is a sinner and needs redemption. No one is good and all need a turn. No one can add anything to their salvation. It is the same grace for all. Nothing else could ever bring that deep human understanding that everyone has equal value. But also, the same duties. Everyone needs it. It was a higher law than just natural law. So, everyone is saved and accepted into the family. This brought the idea of equal values and equal rights for all. The Bible brought the key of freedom to the world.

The ideas of naturalism did not bring freedom into the world. The ideas of Darwin's naturalism and Marx's materialism brought about the greatest misery in history.

The Bible is an absolute standard of what is right and wrong and everyone has access to it. This idea comes from the time of the Reformation. In several steps, nations are trying to find a way to put this idea from the Bible into practice.

---

<sup>14</sup> Franklin Delano Roosevelt 1882 –1945 was the 32nd president of the United States from 1933 until his death in 1945. A member of the Democratic Party.

<sup>15</sup> Winston Churchill was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1940 to 1945, during the Second World War, and again from 1951 to 1955.

## **Moral rearmament movement found the key**

During this time, an American pastor, Franc Buchman, founded the Moral Re-Armament Movement 1938. He saw that people needed more than guns and regulations. They need a "moral rearmament".

The American historian Daniel Sack writes: "Moral rearmament sought to change the world by changing human nature, including in the field of politics and economics. And it did so not only through rational persuasion or logical argument, but also through the changing of hearts."

They received a big Hotel Palace in Caux above Montreux in Switzerland. The appeal of rearmament resounded throughout whole Europe and the world. They welcomed thousands of leaders in high positions from politics and business. They came together and celebrated services. They celebrated and let their hearts changed. They believed that they needed God's help. He had to renew people's hearts so that they can live together in freedom.

The movement had a strong influence in the freedom in Europe especially between France and Germany. Robert Schuman<sup>16</sup>, twice Prime Minister of France, was part of the movement. He was a key figure in the construction of post-war Europe. He presented the idea of a steel and coal union in Europe.

To build weapons, man needs steel and coal. This would prevent another war because both sides would have to be accountable to each other. He was the initiator of the idea of a European Union, the Council of Europe and the transatlantic cooperation NATO.

The 1963 agreement between Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and President Charles de Gaulle ended the enmity between Germany and France. They both were influenced by the movement. Both were convinced Catholic Christians. The spirit behind the political developments was the deep realization that people need more than what the world can offer with education and technology. They need something above all the people. They need God.

Pope Pius XII promoted reconciliation after the end of the Second World War and championed the idea of a European Union.

Nations need a law above themselves. The catastrophe of the 20th century was not to be repeated. The EU was their idea of a small UN holding independent nations together. But things turned out differently because the worldview behind got lost. Instead of independent nations it became an oppression and England already left the EU.

In 1945 it was the deep understanding of the Bible that nations need a higher law that is somewhat above them but today this understanding is lost.

Somehow, they understood what the Reformer had said almost 500 years ago. It is not good that people have too much power. Power has to be shared. The French changed that in their new constitution 1958<sup>17</sup>. This is now the freedom that Europe has experienced in the last 70 years.

The moral armament tried to face the atheistic ideology mainly coming from communism socialism. The main conflict between this two is probably the view on economy.

Reformation laid the foundation of freedom and prosperity of the West. It came from a understanding there is a God. The reformer had a strong emphasis on separation of power. They experienced the oppression from the Catholic Church and the Kings. They want to create a system where this centralized power is balance. They create the today called democracy. But the system was not perfect.

---

<sup>16</sup> Robert Schuman, French 1886 –1963 was a Christian Democrat political thinker and activist. a reformist Minister of Finance and a Foreign Minister.

<sup>17</sup> Constitution of the Fifth Republic 1958

As long as God and the Bible were over the people it worked. But as in the time of enlightenment after the 17<sup>th</sup> century the Bible and God got replaced with humanism this decentralization led often to oppression. The rich people got richer and richer and poor became even more poor. The social gap between these two widened enormously. It was rather the upper class that grew and the weaker sections were not taken along. But anyway, a lot of oppression and misusing of people were the consequences. It showed the weakness of the reformation.

The socialists were often right with their complaints against the upper class. Often the misuse of people was done from Churches and Christians. The critic to the Church was often justified. The question is now can this system also be reformed.

Through the influence of moral rearmament, people like the German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard<sup>18</sup> and many others came out with a new idea of an economical system. Erhard was part of this movement.

The idea was a social market economy. This means that to have a welfare state that is concerned with helping the needy. Through taxes it will balance the rich and the poor. On the other hand, there should be a free private market economy where the private sector can make profits, invest and invent new things. The idea is that the state sets limits, but only intervenes in the private sector when necessary. This was an idea to bring the old and the new together. It was the third way between capitalism and socialism.

Of course, the social democrats (left) always wanted more state and more taxes and the right wing always wanted less of it. But to include all people and find a compromise was the best idea to hold a society together.

Germany became a world wonder after the Second World War. It has become successful and powerful again because it implements this kind of policy. Germany rose again to become a leading power in Europe. Today, most countries in Europe follow this policy. It is not the perfect solution, but it has also brought 70 years of stability in Europe.

Another good example to find a compromise happened 1918. It was the only time there was a general strike in Switzerland. 250'000 people were on the streets from 12-14 November 1918.

Workers were often without rights and the First World War created inflation and hunger. Many people were trying to keep their heads above water and a bourgeois upper class was doing well.

The bourgeois right reacted in 1918 and responded to the demands of the street. A 48-hour week was introduced for all public and private enterprises. Better services and good care are advocated by the government.

We could say that Switzerland has won. It has found a compromise and managed to keep the old and bring in the new. Switzerland has never again experienced a general strike again. When workers strike all over Europe, it will not happen in Switzerland. It was another success story to keep the old and the new together.

The Catholic Party in Germany and the Catholics in France were the great reformers during this period. The Catholics and the Reformers reformed the world, even if they differed in their approach.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ludwig Wilhelm Erhard 1897 –1977 was a German politician CDU, and the second Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) from 1963 until 1966. He is known for leading the West German postwar economic reforms and economic recovery (Wirtschaftswunder, German for "economic miracle") in his role as Minister of Economic Affairs under Chancellor Konrad Adenauer from 1949 to 1963. During that period, he promoted the concept of the social market

The reformers are mainly for separation of powers and self-responsibility. The Catholics are more for centralization and limitation of the powerful from above. Both believe in one God. The Catholics believe that the best to represent God is to have a centralized government to control evil. The Reformers believe that people should not have too much power. They emphasize the separation of powers. They believed that this is the best application of God's idea for this world.

Both believe in the sinfulness of man and want to limit evil. Probably the next reformation will take place when these two flows come together and find a compromise. The world always needs new reformations. There is no perfect system. But if people understand the reality of creation, they are able to bring about a reform instead of a revolution.

Now that generation is dying out and a new generation, unconcerned with the past, is rising. But what would be the consequences?

## **The cultural revolution continues – have people learned nothing from history?**

The UN, human rights and the understanding of cooperation in various organizations brought freedom to Europe in the last 70 years. But at the moment there is a culture revolution going on. It is not done on the battle field it is done on the speaker desk. Countries around the world are changing their common values. Europe seems to be at the forefront. The old values and ideas no longer count. Same-sex marriage is being introduced in many countries. Children can choose to be a girl or a boy. The old familiar understanding of family and gender no longer exists.

People want to have the right to abort children. How can one speak of human rights when the state is no longer able to protect the one who needs protection the most?

Western culture is in great danger. The past seems to have been forgotten. People do not learn from the mistakes of history and are in danger of making the same mistake again. The cultural revolution today brings a relativism where everyone can decide for themselves what is right and wrong.

People cannot decide whether or not to crash to earth when they jump out of a plane. When they do it, they will die. But at the moment, people are doing it with our society. The order of creation and the common law that holds the whole society together no longer count.

The West grew enormously compared to the other parts of the world through the innovation of the reformers. They were able to create freedom and stability, which no other religion or philosophy was ever able to do.

The question is whether people in the West do not need to rethink and reflect on the heritage they had. The foundation on which Western civilization was built. The danger is big that Democracy and Human rights losing their foundation and the Western Civilization is forgotten.