

Back to Posting

Unfortunately, the last several days have been consumed with assisting with a Writ of Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court. I say that it is unfortunate, because it should not be required to put forth to the highest court in the land that the following words mean exactly what they state:

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

I will probably repeat myself ten thousand times over:

The problem is not the arms an individual possesses or carries. The problem lies in the heart of the individual.

Let's put it this way:

If men had the nature of angels (and not the fallen ones), then every person could have their own nuclear weapon and keep it personally, and no one would ever be in danger.

Strange, the founders of the United States of America knew this:

"If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself." (Federalist 51)

The problem is, men are not, neither do they have the nature of angels. No, the truth of every person of the race of man is

this:

And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done. (*Genesis 8:21*)

And so it is that "gun control" will ever and always be an utter failure. Until the hearts of men change, and that will only happen in Christ, the idea that somehow we can control bad behavior by controlling the objects individuals have access to, is doomed to total failure.

I should be able to return to writing and posting, among other things, more regularly – saving that I have another interruption coming up soon.

Ignoring the Obvious

Well, if it can be ignored, it cannot be that obvious.

Really?

Yes, it can. And how.

In Great Britain (soon to be Lesser Britain – if the current pace continues) guns have been severely restricted for quite some time now. This was ostensibly done to "stop crime," particularly "gun crime." However, as any cursory internet search will yield, the ban has been, and continues to be a total failure. However, that does not satisfy the over-educated and lacking common sense individuals that seem to rule the land of my ancestors. No, apparently the fact that crime has increased since guns were severely restricted, and

the fact that the vast majority of British tourists in America feel safer in America than they do back home, ([America's 'safety catch'](#)) does not seem to impact the judges, sociologists and lawmakers in Great Britain at all. No, not in the slightest.

I must say the temptation to poke lots (and I mean LOTS) of fun at “not so” merry ole England is very hard to resist. Why? Because there stands an elephant in the collective living room of Great Britain – and it’s quite large.

The problems of man’s nature are apparently becoming somewhat of a nuisance to Sir Igor Judge, the President of the High Court Queen’s Bench Division. Apparently, he doesn’t think that anyone ought to carry a knife in their pocket. After all . . . well . . . hold your breath and you can read for yourself the “enlightened” judge’s comments from the bench (please do not throw things at your computer monitor when you read this):

“Carrying a knife or offensive weapon without reasonable excuse is a crime which is being committed far too often by far too many people,” he said.

“Every weapon carried about the streets, even if concealed from sight, even if not likely to be used or intended to be used, represents a threat to public safety and public order.”

“That is because, even if carried only for bravado or carried for some misguided sense that it would be used in possible self-defense, it takes only a moment of irritation, drunkenness, anger, perceived insult, or something utterly trivial like a ‘look’, for the weapon to be produced.”

“Then you have mayhem, and offences of the greatest possible seriousness follow, including murder, manslaughter, GBH, wounding and assault.”

“Offences of this kind have recently escalated. They are

reaching epidemic proportions. Every knife or weapon carried in the street represents a public danger and, therefore, in the public interest, this crime must be confronted and stopped.”

“The courts will do what they can to reduce and, so far as it is practicable, eradicate it. In our view, it is important for public confidence in the criminal justice system that the man or woman caught in possession of a knife or offensive weapon without reasonable excuse should normally be brought before the courts and prosecuted.”

“Even if the offender does no more than carry the weapon, even when the weapon is not used to threaten or cause fear, when considering the seriousness of the offence, courts should bear in mind the harm which the weapon might foreseeably have caused.” ([\(\(Knife crime is epidemic, top judge claims\)\)](#))

Well, so we should all be disarmed, right? Not hardly. The problem with crime goes all the way back to The Fall. You are not going to solve crime by removing so-called “weapons” from the street. No, all you will do is make more victims of crime, and you will drive people to find other items to use as a weapon.

The real problem here is the problem of our nature. ([\(\(Why They Hate the Second Amendment\)\)](#)) We are all, including the uppity, nonsensical Judge Igor – **evil**. Since we are all evil, removing supposed weapons out of the hands of individuals does not change anything at all about the heart of the individual. All the weapon is, is an external manifestation of some thing in the heart of that person. It is impossible to determine what the thing that drives them to carry something as a weapon, actually is. Sorry, we have no ability to regulate the heart and thoughts of a person. Funny how the Founding Fathers of America knew that, and this idiotic judge does not. After all,

that is precisely why the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution exists. After all, it was Madison and Hamilton that penned the Federalist 51, which states:

It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. (([Federalist 51](#)))

Hopefully, the quote makes sense (perhaps to some over-educated folk it won't) and there is an understanding that, since we are all evil, there must be checks and balances ("such devices"), in and out of government. The greatest check on crime is to arm everyone – period. It will surely make a very polite and orderly society. Why? Because nobody wants to end up **DEAD**.

Now, obviously the powers that be in Great Britain (and here) would like for one to believe that guns and knives are the most dangerous weapons out there. Sure, most would agree with that too. However, that is not the case. In fact, guns and knives fall far behind the single, most dangerous weapon of all – words.

Yes, WORDS.

Just how did Adolph Hitler rise to power? Ever hear of Mein Kampf? What about all of Hitler's speeches? You know, old Adolph never pulled the trigger on a single Jew. Yet, somehow he managed to be personally responsible for the deaths of six million of them. Moreover, he plunged the world into a massive

war. How did he do it?

WORDS

What about Karl Marx? You know, The Communist Manifesto and Das Kapital? He gave a cohesiveness to the religion of Materialism and collectivism and launched a war against private enterprise and Capitalism. He also is ultimately responsible for the death of millions in the communist purges of various regimes. Why? Because they believed the words of Marx and his buddy Engels.

In fact, words have been and are, responsible for the deaths of more individuals than all the guns and knives put together. After all, words commanded that the gas be turned on in the chambers at the camps. Words brought about the mass starvation of Ukrainians by the Soviets in the 1920's. Words inflamed the Hutus to murder their fellow countrymen, the Tutsis in Ruanda in 1994. Pol Pot used words to great effectiveness in Cambodia, commanding the murder of 1½ million of his own countrymen. And I could go on, and on, and on . . .

Yes, words are extremely dangerous. So dangerous perhaps they ought to be banned altogether.

What?

That won't work?

Why not? After all, Sir Igor thinks that banning knives will change the behavior of his countrymen. Somehow he thinks that getting knives "off the street" will "stop crime" when crime is a result of the heart of an individual, and has **NOTHING TO DO** with the instrument the individual carries.

Oh, as for banning words – that's been tried already. It netted the world the lovely experience of the Dark Ages. Thank the Catholic Church for that one. Oh, and while you at it, a Papal Bull calling for the death of "heretics," is "just a

bunch of words.”

No worries about Sir Ig(n)or(ant)’s words, right?

[A Political Solution?](#)

A couple of weeks back my attention was drawn to some charges leveled against a gentleman I know, and a column he writes for a gun magazine. Now, knowing someone through the internet is a difficult proposition at best, and one can never really be certain if a person is who they say they are. Even when one knows someone face to face, frequently their true character is not known. Thus, the only real evaluation one can go by is the consistency of statements made and the consistency of the positions held. If a person is consistent time and again, it can be reasonably inferred that they are indeed what they claim to be. If not, then we know the answer to that one don't we?

However, this article is not about a particular individual, but about appearances, misconceptions and underlying causes. The preface above is necessary as the following quotes illustrate a common problem today among individuals who say they support this or that, yet do not put enough effort in to really understanding the root cause of the problems of our day. This is particularly true of evangelicals and fundamentalists and their approach to resolving the problems of this nation.

In the following quotes, Mr. Codrea is David Codrea of [War on Guns blog](#), and the quotes are excerpted from some Letters to the Editor concerning a column he wrote in which he contended

that the Second Amendment did not grant the right to keep and bear arms.

I'd like to comment on Mr. Codrea and his recent article about the second amendment not guaranteeing the right to bear arms. My thought is maybe it does, maybe it doesn't. The fact of the matter is we don't need clowns like this idiot pointing this out to the antigun crowd.

I would suggest you take a long, hard look at what Codrea writes in the future, because in my opinion he could very well be a Trojan horse. (http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0B0Y/is_4_54/ai_n24358964)

David Codrea's article "Privileges" ought not to have been written. What's wrong with this guy? He sounds like an anti-gunner. What he said may totally confuse some people. ([ibid](#))

Aside from the fact that the comments of the letter writers are ugly and unwarranted in their tone, they reveal an ignorance of where the Founders of this nation determined that all our individual rights come from. To be blunt, one has to be utterly ignorant and devoid of knowledge of the English language and its construction to not understand the plain text of the [Declaration of Independence](#). Moreover, one would also have to ignore the documents that form the foundation of our constitutional form of government. One of the texts used was John Locke's [Second Treatise of Government](#), in which Locke's entire thesis is predicated upon the fact that God created man, and man exists in this world to fulfill the will and purpose God has for him. Hence, our individual rights existed long before the Constitution or Bill of Rights. Thus, the Second Amendment did not and does not "grant" anything. Rather, it only recognizes a pre-existing right God gave to man. Being that man is evil, and ever given to acts of evil,

the right to keep and bear arms is essential for the control of man's propensity for wickedness.

Now, how does this apply to fundamentalists and evangelicals today?

In Scripture, which is supposed to be the beginning and ending of everything a child of God does, it is very apparent – plain even, that all the problems of man spring from our wicked and unregenerate hearts. The Lord Jesus Christ was very plain and clear in explaining this:

And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: All these evil things come from within, and defile the man. (*Mark 7:20-23*)

Now, it should not be necessary to recount all the references in Scripture that speak to this very thing and prove that it is our individual hearts which are the problem. Moreover, it should also not be necessary to prove that a man thinks and conceives of something prior to doing it. These things ought to be self-evident (like the statement in the Declaration of Independence), and need no explanation or proof by repeated citation of evidence.

So then, why is it that so many fundamentalist and evangelicals always want to seek the solution to America's egregious moral and political problems through the vehicle of politics? Why is it that they want to hang their hats (so to speak) on the likes of Mike Huckabee, et al, instead of applying themselves to the task of setting forth Christ in every aspect of their lives? Is it that being a witness for Christ is not glamorous enough, or that it puts people off and makes them uncomfortable? Is it that playing politics is "fun," whereas teaching the word of God isn't? Or, it is

really that you get to meet the “important, influential people” in government and society, and you don’t have to deal with “ordinary” people of you community?

You know, I have to ask: Whenever did politics change the heart of an individual?

If the statement of the Lord Jesus Christ is true and all problems spring from the heart, isn’t it also true that if the heart is made right so that it is not evil, those very problems would go away? Isn’t it true if you change the heart of an individual, you would also change the way they think about things, and thus the decisions they make would indeed be different? Didn’t Christ state that “evil thoughts” proceed out of the heart? Isn’t it true that, if we think well of our neighbor and fellow man, we would never do anything to harm them, or infringe upon their rights? Moreover, if we have Christ’s thinking in our hearts, wouldn’t we love our countrymen and respect the boundaries drawn by the Constitutions, State and Federal?

Beyond doubt, our “political leaders,” judges and such like do not come from Mars. No, they come from among us. They are our neighbors, members of our respective communities across the land. Our elected and appointed officials come from among us and our society, which is made up of – individuals.

Perhaps if fundamentalists and evangelicals put far more effort into reaching the *INDIVIDUALS* in our society, and less effort into politics, we would change the very character of those running for office in the first place. It is inarguable: if a society consists of predominantly good individuals, then those standing for political office are also going to be predominantly good as well. However, if all that is done is a continual chasing after political influence, then those standing for political office are more than happy to pander to another “special interest” group so that they can garner the votes needed to be elected. And, as we have seen, turn out to

be not at all what they claimed to be.

No, I am afraid that the vast majority of fundamentalists and evangelicals are like the letter writers quoted at the beginning of this post – blind to the truth of the matter. Like the letter writers, fundamentalists and evangelicals cast away a solid foundation in favor of the whim of man. After all, if the right to keep and bear arms comes from Almighty God, who can take it from us? Instead, we would have to give it up by abdicating our responsibility. Even so, should a child of God cast away the most powerful, influential message ever to reach the heart of man – the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, in favor of a political solution?

For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. (*Isaiah 55:8-11*)

[An Answer to David @ War on Guns](#)

The following is an answer to David Codrea who runs the [War on Guns blog](#). He disagreed with my assertion that it is wrong to lie – period. This disagreement arose over the issue of the

[Olmert government in Israel taking government issued guns away from settlers](#), and the settlers giving them up. David held that it would be fine to lie to the government. I hold that it is never right to lie, as that is a sin before God.

Please be advised, this is a much longer article than I normally publish on the blog. However, I do believe you will be blessed by it.

I know David, you think you've got me. That's all right. However, my reply will not be short, as you require a decent, proper answer to your assertion.

To begin, the commandment of the LORD God is very plain:

And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. (*Matthew 19:16-19*)

Moreover, to lie, is to follow after the father of lies, the Devil:

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. (*John 8:44*)

Thus, lying is not an option as it directly disobeys the express command of God. Thus, it appears that we are left

between a rock and a hard place by your scenario. However, there are some things that are beyond our limited understanding, but not beyond the understanding, scope and power of the LORD God.

Now, I will not tell you that one must blindly believe and trust the LORD God for the outcome for such situations as that would be superstition. The LORD does not operate through, nor does He acknowledge superstition. Instead, one must operate by the instrument of faith.

Thus, the instrument of faith is extremely important to understanding everything that follows.

Now, allow me to present a couple of instances where individuals in Scripture chose different options for dealing with their situations, and the results of their choices. I will begin with the Hebrew midwives in Egypt:

And the king of Egypt spake to the Hebrew midwives, of which the name of the one was Shiprah, and the name of the other Puah: And he said, When ye do the office of a midwife to the Hebrew women, and see them upon the stools; if it be a son, then ye shall kill him: but if it be a daughter, then she shall live. But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them, but saved the men children alive. (Exodus 1:15-17)

Now, it is quite plain that the Hebrew midwives were disobedient to the commandment of Pharaoh and they were called into account for their disobedience:

And the king of Egypt called for the midwives, and said unto them, Why have ye done this thing, and have saved the men children alive? And the midwives said unto Pharaoh, Because the Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women; for they are lively, and are delivered ere the midwives come in unto them. Therefore God dealt well with the midwives: and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty. And it came to pass,

because the midwives feared God, that he made them houses.
(Exodus 1:18-21)

Okay, they lied. Moreover, the LORD God still blessed them and gave them houses. Now, that would seem to indicate that one could lie and the LORD God will still bless. Additionally, much like your hypothetical situation above, the Hebrew midwives lied for the express reason of saving Hebrew babies. In your situation, one is doing it to save one's family. Fair enough.

However, we need now look at the situation in Babylon with three Hebrew men who refused the commandment of another king:

Then Nebuchadnezzar in his rage and fury commanded to bring Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Then they brought these men before the king. Nebuchadnezzar spake and said unto them, Is it true, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up? Now if ye be ready that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of musick, ye fall down and worship the image which I have made; well: but if ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace; and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands? Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up. (Daniel 3:13-18)

Now that is bold, and seemingly stupid. After all, how can one know what will happen. Even the Hebrew men acknowledged they do not know for certain what God would do. However, they did know that they could trust the LORD for the outcome. At this stage, everything is seemingly in the hands of Nebuchadnezzar,

and he has full control. Moreover, by their reply they have invited certain death.

Then was Nebuchadnezzar full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego: therefore he spake, and commanded that they should heat the furnace one seven times more than it was wont to be heated. And he commanded the most mighty men that were in his army to bind Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, and to cast them into the burning fiery furnace. Then these men were bound in their coats, their hosen, and their hats, and their other garments, and were cast into the midst of the burning fiery furnace. Therefore because the king's commandment was urgent, and the furnace exceeding hot, the flame of the fire slew those men that took up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. And these three men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace. Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonished, and rose up in haste, and spake, and said unto his counsellors, Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king. He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God. Then Nebuchadnezzar came near to the mouth of the burning fiery furnace, and spake, and said, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, ye servants of the most high God, come forth, and come hither. Then Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, came forth of the midst of the fire. And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king's counsellors, being gathered together, saw these men, upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed on them. (Daniel 3:19-27)

There is here a world of difference between the way the LORD blessed the Hebrew midwives and the three Hebrew men. The midwives only received houses, but the three Hebrew men walked with God Himself in the midst of a fire that killed the very

men who threw them in.

Now, there is a significant difference between the way the LORD God protected the Hebrew midwives and the way the LORD protected the Hebrew men. Thus, analogous to your proposed situation, there are three more options to telling where one's family is:

1. *Refusing to speak at all.*
2. *Telling them that you will not say at all. In short, saying "Go ahead and kill me, I will not tell you."*
3. *Preaching unto them the gospel.*

Of the five options available, the very last one is one that the LORD God will honor every time. I know this as it is expressly His promise that His word will accomplish the work He has for it:

For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. (Isaiah 55:8-11)

However, if one has no understanding of the promise of the LORD as they cannot see, then they will not understand the power of the fifth option. That understanding of the power of the word of God comes by the instrument of faith. Without this instrument, one is blind to the express will of God in situations, and to the power of God to change hearts in an instant. The LORD God does have the power to restrain someone, no matter how evil their intent. As in the case of the Hebrew midwives however, the power of God to work on Pharaoh was

limited by the fact that they lied to cover up their activities. The Scripture is quite plain: had they simply told Pharaoh they will not kill the LORD's heritage, no matter the consequences, the LORD would have done some other thing to protect them and the Hebrew babies. However, they lied as they could not see by faith the LORD's will in this. Thus, they chose a lesser option. The LORD blessed them, as saving life is better than allowing murder to take place. Nonetheless, the blessing was not of the magnitude of the blessing of the Hebrew men for boldly testifying of their confidence in the LORD God to save, one way or the other.

This is not to say the Hebrew midwives had no faith. Rather it is to say that their use of it wavered as they allowed what they saw and heard with their physical senses to overwhelm what faith showed them.

At this point, it must be clearly understood that faith, that is, the faith described in Scripture, is not merely believing, or hoping in God or the things promised in Scripture. Rather, the faith that enables one to be born-again in Christ is given to the individual upon their consideration of what the LORD states in His word:

So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. (*Romans 10:17*)

This then is a promise by the LORD God that whosoever will hear His word and seriously consider it, then He will grant them the means to see the truth of what He states. Thus, faith is a spiritual instrument that belongs to the LORD and He grants it to anyone who fulfills the criteria He set forth.

Faith, like many other instruments, enables one to perceive things not readily apparent to someone who does not possess the instrument. Some examples I frequently use are radar, a microscope, and a radio, all of which enable the possessor to perceive certain things that cannot be perceived by someone

who does not possess any one of those instruments.

Hence:

Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. For by it the elders obtained a good report. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. (*Hebrews 11:1-3*)

In the situation you propose, if faith is not in use, then one's perception of the options available is indeed limited. On the other hand, faith would show that the LORD God is sovereign and is in full control of the situation. Even if one doesn't fully grasp what the LORD is doing with the situation (as in the case of the Hebrew men), one is still assured that the LORD God has his reasons for allowing the situation, and His purpose is beyond the mere moment we are dealing with.

Additionally, for the child of God (one who is born-again in Christ) there are a couple of things we are expressly told concerning our life on this earth after salvation. I will not say they are easy things to remember, as the implications are far-reaching:

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. (*Romans 12:1*)

And:

And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. (*Romans 8:28*)

However, the child of God should understand by the instrument of faith that absolutely nothing happens without the LORD's express permission, and no one, but no one is able to go beyond the limits of action set by the LORD. This was made

clear in Job when Satan challenged the LORD concerning Job:

And the LORD said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil? and still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou movedst me against him, to destroy him without cause. And Satan answered the LORD, and said, Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face. And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life. (Job 2:3-6)

On this, I am reminded of a Romanian Baptist preacher, whose testimony I heard several years ago. Dr. Josef Tson lived under Ceausescu, but was able in the late 60's to leave (not legally) and was trained at the Baptist School at Oxford. They stressed repeatedly that the sovereignty of God must be the pillar of one's theology. When he finished his training he elected to return to Romania. There he suffered greatly under the persecution of the secret police. However, he relates that he always understood Romans 8:28 to be active, and the LORD was the one in full control of the situation. Josef Tson, by faith, perceived and understood the working of the LORD in his life, and the lives of all who persecuted him. ((<http://www.bpnews.net/bpnews.asp?ID=18713>))

We must also know and understand what Elihu understood when he testified to Job and his three friends about the sovereignty of God and the LORD's ability to instantly take someone's life if the LORD deems necessary:

Therefore hearken unto me, ye men of understanding: far be it from God, that he should do wickedness; and from the Almighty, that he should commit iniquity. For the work of a man shall he render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways. Yea, surely God will not do wickedly, neither will the Almighty pervert judgment. Who hath given him a charge over

the earth? or who hath disposed the whole world? If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; All flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust. (Job 34:10-15)

Fundamentally, there are two different perspectives one can have:

1. The perspective of this world, and the limited perception of our physical senses. This will yield the response that you advocate – lying to protect your own life and the lives of your loved ones. Nevertheless, lying is still a sin before the LORD, and we will answer for it.

2. The perspective of faith, and having the mind of Christ toward this world and all in it – even those who are evil. This yields a perception of the state of the soul of the individual, and that they are in need of the salvation Christ offers them. This salvation WILL change the very nature of their heart and soul, and they will no longer desire to harm you or your loved ones. Yes, there are modern, current testimonies of this happening, where kidnaping “victim” witnessed to their kidnapper and the kidnapper repented, believed the gospel, and then released the “victim” and turned themselves in.

You must remember, the child of God, who is born-again in Christ Jesus, has a very different purpose in their life from someone who is not born-again: they are to be witnesses of the grace that is in Christ, of the righteousness of God, and of the salvation and reconciliation the LORD God offers through the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. The child of God also should never be concerned about dying, as for them it is a matter of simply going home. The apostle Paul put it this way:

For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour: yet what I shall

choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. (*Philippians 1:21-24*)

There is your answer David. I could have simply slammed down the Scripture and the commandment, but you deserve a better answer than that. You may still disagree. However, I would that you consider what the Scripture states seriously, and consider Who really is in charge of everything.

I trust the LORD to watch over you and yours. May the grace of God be upon you.

[Why They Hate the Second Amendment](#) [or](#) [What the Second Amendment Declares About Us](#)

Of all the amendments to the Constitution of the United States, none is more reviled and controversial than the Second Amendment. One has to wonder why, seeing that it is just a few words that simply declare an individual has the right to keep and bear arms, without infringement. Moreover, that this basic right would guarantee we always have the means of forming militias is short order in case of invasion.

What place does this particular issue have on a fundamental, unaffiliated, KJV-only, Baptist's blog? If you are familiar with the scripture, and what the scripture repeatedly declares about man, then you will have no problem discerning where this short article will go. If you are not, then be prepared to learn just how evil and wicked we really are, and why we need to protect ourselves from both our fellow man and our own selves.

Now, in case you disagree with the above statement, you need to seriously consider that your argument is not with me, but with both the Founding Fathers, and with the LORD God. After all, I simply, whole-heartedly agree with the LORD God, and with the insight the Founders had in recognizing the true state of man, and formulating a nation's response to that depraved state. However, if you still wish to be angry with me, go right ahead. After all, I don't have to answer to the LORD God for your anger over having the truth put before you – you do.

The Second Amendment states plainly:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

We should ask ourselves certain questions in relation to the above statement, such as:

1. If man is basically good, why did the Founders deem this amendment necessary?

2. If it is generally true that men follow the law, why was it necessary to add this amendment (with others) to a document that all the Founders plainly professed was a positive law document that functions very much like Power of Attorney?

3. *If it is true that arms are implements of violence, why did the Founders determine that it was necessary for individuals to not only keep arms, but carry them openly; and that such possession and open transport upon one's person should never be hindered?*

Interestingly enough, the Founders of this nation were not silent about why they determined the Second Amendment to be utterly necessary. In the Federalist 51, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton gave the reason in as clear and plain a statement one could ever hope for:

“If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.” (([Federalist 51](#)))

Now, I know that the question begs to be asked: How can you know that this is the reason behind the Second Amendment?

It is because they were familiar with the following statements from scripture which speak to this very issue:

And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done. (*Genesis 8:21*)

The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it? (*Jeremiah 17:9*)

Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of

death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. (Hebrews 2:14)

These three statements from scripture speak plainly that the nature of man is evil and wicked, and that men fear death. Now, how would Hamilton and Madison know this? The testimonies of both men are plain in demonstrating that they knew the Bible and believed what it stated. However, more than the personal testimony of either one of the men, the fact is that they penned the above statement in the Federalist 51, which is entirely contrary to the way men always view themselves.

Indeed, it has always been the case that men think more highly of themselves than is actually true. That is why people get offended when it is demonstrated to them that they are evil and wicked, and sinners by nature. But, if it were true that men are basically good, then there would be no need of government to control the excesses of individuals in society, and there would be no need of controlling the government.

The answer the Founders had to the dilemma presented in the Federalist 51 is amply demonstrated in the Second Amendment, as it places a check upon both the government, and upon the individuals in society at large. Why? In short, when everyone is armed, everyone tends to politeness and respect – else there exists a significant likelihood that one may not live beyond the moment they violate the rights of those around them. Moreover, when the population in general is armed, those who are supposed to serve in public office are made ever mindful of the fact that their lives could be forfeit if they decide to violate the rights of their fellow citizens who put them in office.

Thus, even though men are evil, they also fear death. Moreover, they fear where they will go when they die. For this simple reason alone, the Second Amendment secures the rest of the rights that the LORD God gave us. It is only when men do

not see any prospect of dying that they become bold in their wickedness, and their willingness to harm their fellow man. This is also the reason the death penalty is effective in deterring crime as well.

The problem today is that we in America are a society in which the vast majority of individuals believe that they are inherently good, and that only a few "bad apples" cause the problems we have. This kind of thinking is not scriptural, rather it comes straight out of humanist doctrine and teaching. In fact, the idea that man can become good by his own efforts is a central part of the philosophy of Communism and the striving to create the "new communist man."

The outworking of this kind of thinking is the belief that we can somehow create a utopian society if only we can get rid of the implements of violence. Thus, the blame is laid upon "the gun" when guns are used in the commission of a crime, instead of upon the person who wilfully chose to commit the crime. (After all, that would be to tacitly admit that we are all inherently given to evil.) It is also the driving force behind the idea that individuals in government are somehow better than the "common man" and that they are more enlightened and would never oppress their fellow citizens. After all, aren't they elevated above the rest of us?

Thus, there is a drive to destroy the Second Amendment because of what it declares about our nature: we are wicked, evil, sinful creatures who think only about our own selfish interests, and couldn't give a rip about anyone else, unless it nets us what we want – and the last thing we want is to die getting what we want.

The Founding Fathers knew this, and they knew that the only way to maintain order in society, and have a government that obeys its own laws, is to have everyone armed. The only other option is for this world to be ruled over by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, in which case the government will be

righteous, even if the people are not.
