

# Occasional Thoughts 5

January 2016

**Virtue versus Truth. Pursuing God's will. Predatory tactics. Weapons - common sense. Making evil good. Economic collapse.**

## Virtue versus Truth

There is no doubt that Christians are to be zealous in good works<sup>1</sup> and fervently boiling in their spiritual zeal.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps I should write a paper about the need for passionate zeal for truth as so many church people today castigate those with zeal and tell them to be more balanced. They would have trouble with Jesus who was passionate for truth and zealous in good works.

But that is not the point of this essay. Unfortunately, there are some that have a very visible presence who are zealous to the point of being vindictive in defending truth. Worse, there are many false leaders that have great zeal in attacking those with the truth. These sorts of people inhabit web sites, blogs, forums, YouTube videos, TV channels and pulpits.

What concerns me is that such folk get into a near frenzy to deride their opponents and become unrighteous in doing so.

Now I am not opposed to exposing error and false teachers, as you well know. I am not criticising those defenders of the truth that use every clear and sharp language in doing so. I am not against the use of irony, useful hyperbole, or sarcasm in attacking heretics because Jesus and the apostles used those same figures of speech.

The position that I am exposing here is when passion for a doctrine becomes an excuse for hatred, unnecessary vilification, ad hominem<sup>3</sup> arguments, abuse, bile, threats of violence, and unrighteous behaviour.

There is far too much of this in evidence in church circles today. In fact, some sections of the supposed church believe it is acceptable to threaten violence to those with opposing views and perpetrate acts of violence; such as arson on opponent's offices or throwing bricks through the windows of their homes. Some Charismatic TV preachers have asked God to kill opponents or said that they wanted to shoot them, while giving a sermon on a church platform.

The level of derogatory language on many supposedly apologetic websites today is beyond belief. Sometimes this language is directed at those that I know are godly men, spoken by men who are also supposed to be godly (but cannot be so).

---

<sup>1</sup> Gal 4:18, 'it is good to be zealous in a good thing always'. Titus 2:14, 'zealous for good works'.

<sup>2</sup> Rm 12:11, 'fervent in spirit, serving the Lord'. 'Fervent' here means 'boiling'.

<sup>3</sup> An argument directed against a person rather than the position they are maintaining.

Now I agree that the times are dreadful and that errors abound everywhere and that we are in unprecedented times of apostasy. I also agree (and my works bear witness) that errors and false teachers must be confronted and confronted with zeal. What I do not agree with is that contending for the faith is an excuse for unrighteous behaviour and vile language.

There is a balance, then, between confronting error with passion and yet behaving with love. We need to address the current unbalance and bring a sense of our work to not just being a work of faith, but of faith working through love.<sup>4</sup>

Thus it may be helpful to show the Scriptures that teach us how to behave with those we confront, or those we may consider to be enemies of the Gospel.

### **Bless them**

Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse. Rm 12:14

Being reviled, we bless. 1 Cor 4:12

Bless those who curse you, and pray for those who spitefully use you. Lk 6:28

### **Love them**

But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you. Matt 5:44

Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, and pray for those who spitefully use you. Lk 6:27-28

Love your enemies, do good. Lk 6:35

### **Do good**

Therefore 'If your enemy is hungry, feed him; If he is thirsty, give him a drink; for in so doing you will heap coals of fire on his head'. Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good. Rm 12:20-21

See that no one renders evil for evil to anyone, but always pursue what is good both for yourselves and for all. 1 Thess 5:15

### **Be courteous**

Finally, all *of you be* of one mind, having compassion for one another; love as brothers, *be* tender-hearted, *be* courteous. 1 Pt 3:8

### **Do not curse**

Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse. Rm 12:14

Out of the same mouth proceed blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not to be so. Jm 3:10

### **Do not react to being reviled**

Being reviled, we bless. 1 Cor 4:12

When He [Jesus] was reviled, did not revile in return; when He suffered, He did not threaten, but committed *Himself* to Him who judges righteously. 1 Pt 2:23

---

<sup>4</sup> Gal 5:6, 'For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, but faith working through love'.

**Not returning evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but on the contrary blessing. 1 Pt 3:9**

We must all learn the point at which contending for the faith becomes vile, fleshly attacks and must not pass from passion and zeal for the truth to becoming unrighteous vilification.

There are those who are so soppy and tolerant that they do not contend for the faith at all. In fact far more church leaders need to vehemently confront error and name dangerous false teachers. Yet we must, at the same time, not become like those demented and hateful supposed Christian apologists that claim divine authority for being nasty, ungracious, unloving, violent, abominable people.

Furthermore, even when very sharp criticism of a false teacher is required in writing, in order to warn the saints, that does not allow us to be wicked to the false teacher in person. If we meet such a person we must be courteous and convivial, even as we attack his arguments with power. There is never an excuse to be nasty. If we fall into this trap we lose our testimony.

## **Pursuing God's will**

There is a big problem amongst Christians; it is that they do not understand that sincerity does not equal truth. There are very many very sincere people pursuing goals that are utterly unbiblical and will do no good at all. Indeed, there are many supposed Christians who are genuinely sincere people but are actually doing great damage to the cause of Christ.

If we examine the leadership of modern churches, churches that have largely apostatised from the truth, the severity of their heresies must mean that there are leaders who are true wolves in sheep's clothing. They are not sincere believers but are false teachers bent on destruction. This was true in Paul's day and it is true today.

However, there are many leaders of churches, churches that are doing great harm to God's work and deceiving many people, but the leaders are sincere people. They appear to be true believers and sincerely want to serve God. I have personally met a number of such people. Indeed, while I have confronted them for their errors face-to-face, I know them well enough to understand that they cry to God daily to serve him effectively; yet they became false teachers leading people astray.

This leads us to consider an important point: sincerity does not guarantee orthodoxy.

So, we can be zealous for good works, we can long to serve God with power, we can submit ourselves to God and we can pray for hours every day – and yet still we can find ourselves serving God's enemy and ruining our testimony.

None of these subjective things guarantee truth. Many heretics of the past worked hard thinking they were serving God; prayed long, and sought to be sincere. None of these things stopped them being heretics.

This should give us pause.

This means that the subject of divine guidance needs qualifying.

There are hundreds of books and sermons on guidance and many contain useful information. Most of them mention the following, perhaps emphasising one or another:

- Test your proposal against Scripture.
- Pray the matter over.
- Seek the inner guidance of the Spirit in your heart.
- Seek the counsel of older, wiser Christians.
- Determine whether the proposal could lead to any sin.
- Ask for the support of your church.

Some make a big point about the matter of open doors (opportunity), but this is a very ambiguous sign that should not be trusted. God expects us to make rational decisions and this may mean avoiding an open door as well as going through it. In fact, God often directed people away from a very clear open door. Paul ignored the opportunity to avoid imprisonment in Jerusalem, despite being warned, and went anyway because it led to a greater testimony.

The problem is that many people have done all these things and still found themselves doing the wrong thing and being led astray. There was one time in my life when I considered a certain important matter for two years and sought all the correct forms of wisdom. I even received the green light and support from four different pastors. Time proved that the choice was wrong and it took me a long time to recover from this mistake.

Making a personal mistake is one thing but when church leaders are in the wrong then the repercussions are serious and affect very many people.

What then do we do?

Well, the truth is that you cannot trust most of the received forms of wisdom about guidance.

Praying does not guarantee you truth. Many sinners pray and it does them no good at all.

Asking the counsel of others does not guarantee that they will be right, even if they all agree. My counsellors were all wrong and Job's counsellors were united in error. It would also not be the first time that the support of an entire church for a decision was completely wrong.

Simply trusting in the feelings of your heart are unwise since the heart can be deceived very easily.

As I have already explained, an open door is no guarantee of truth; it is just an opportunity to be grasped or rejected.

Avoiding any known sin in the decision is also not a guarantee of truth. The sin in a decision may not appear at the outset but only appear later on. Also, your appreciation of sin may not be as sensitive as it should be.

So, all these subjective guides to God's will cannot be trusted. There is only one factor that is infallible – that is God's word.

All decisions in life must be brought to the bar of God's word and tested fully. This may seem difficult at first if your choice does not seem to be covered by Scripture, but searching Scripture will eventually shine light on the matter.

Only God's word can accurately and certainly give you light in a decision. Nothing else should be trusted.

When I think about some church leaders that I have known and the lengths they went to ascertain guidance, I am shocked at the outcome. I have known certain famous leaders establish prayer meetings nationally to determine a matter. They instituted local 24-hour prayer and fasting vigils, gathered wise men to discuss the issues and had many strategy meetings. The end result – they established churches that were riddled with heresy and aberrations that have done damage to the church for generations. All the praying, supposed prophecies, counselling, meetings etc. were all pointless. The end result was a satanic deception.

The reason is that that the decision did not involve a proper evaluation of Scripture. The planned church building was utterly devoid of any Scriptural warrant. No amount of praying and discussion was going to override the basic fact that the strategy was already unbiblical.

There is no point seeking guidance through multiple means if the basic principle is unbiblical.

The Bible itself promises to give light on all matters:

All Scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work. 2 Tim 3:16-17

Oh, how I love Your law! It *is* my meditation all the day. You, through Your commandments, make me wiser than my enemies; For they *are* ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers, For Your testimonies *are* my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep Your precepts. Ps 119:97-100

The entrance of Your words gives light; it gives understanding to the simple. Ps 119:130

Do not My words do good to him who walks uprightly? Mic 2:7

Although the Bible may not mention certain factors of modern life, the principles established in God's word will still give very clear direction of guidance regarding those items.

Christians must learn to put far more attention on Scripture in order to be certain that choices are correct. If we all did this there would be far less error in the church.

## **Predatory tactics of unrighteous governments**

Imagine you are enjoying a family gathering, perhaps a wedding or a birthday, and you are celebrating in a garden party with grandparents, aunts, uncles, parents, brothers, sisters and close friends. All is well with the world.

Then suddenly, as you are tucking into barbecue chicken, there is a high pitched squeal from the sky, quickly followed by a huge explosion. Searing hot chunks of metal fly in all directions. People fortunate enough to get cut to pieces by shrapnel die quickly, but many others are terribly and mortally injured, slowly dying from multiple causes. A few tragic children are running around whilst burning alive. In the end the death toll is 95% of your family. Four generations of a single family are wiped out by an unseen enemy wielding terrific power from the air.

Welcome to the way the USA and Britain conducts military operations today.

Is it any wonder that so many people in the world hate NATO, the US and her allies. Can you be surprised that Muslims (the main targets of such air strikes) are so full of hatred for the west that they become suicide bombers?

Now we will ignore the airstrikes from warplanes that drop, or have dropped, sophisticated missiles in your name on townships in Iraq, Syria, Ukraine, Libya, Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen and elsewhere. Here I want to look at the unprincipled use of Predator drones and similar craft. If ever there was a more casual and sickening use of power in modern times I would be surprised.

While there are various war drones in use today, the most famous is the General Atomics MQ-1 Predator.<sup>5</sup>

This is a war drone used by the US Air Force and the CIA. It developed from drones originally developed in the early 90s for aerial reconnaissance. Today, instead of cameras they carry two AGM 114 Hellfire missiles or other munitions. The USAF calls such drones 'medium altitude, long-endurance, unmanned aircraft systems'; essentially they are robot killers of the innocent. The drones can fly up to 740 km and loiter overhead for 14 hours before returning to base. Air force or CIA technicians sit at computers directing the drone to targets as if they are playing a video war game.

Despite appalling mistakes, especially conducted in Afghanistan, where more than one wedding party was accidentally wiped out by drone missile strikes, the use of Predators has increased significantly. Barack Obama famously referred to them humorously in a widely televised speech. *'I have two words for you, Predator drones. You will never see it coming. You think I'm joking'*. For an American president to joke about a machine that had killed hundreds of innocent people is a disgrace. To increase the use of such an indiscriminate killer is a tragedy.

What you need to understand is that drones are hopeless in achieving their aims. How can a geek sitting at a computer hundreds of miles away be certain what he is shooting at? This is to say nothing of the calm resignation that any drone missile strike, even if it actually hit the intended target terrorist, will also kill many innocent civilians in the adjacent area. The concept that it is OK for a western president or prime minister to blow up numerous people to get a single villain is beyond despicable.

Yet this is happening every day, paid for out of your taxes and done in your name. There are thousands of drones in operation world-wide.

However, the real disgrace is the silence of the mainstream media to report on the actual results of drone strikes. Why is it not front-page news that drones have killed hundreds of innocent people and nearly always kill innocent people?

The statistics on drone strikes are pathetic. Almost 90% of people killed in recent drone strikes were not the target; 90%!<sup>6</sup> US drone strikes alone have killed scores of innocent civilians in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia. This information comes from a report quoted in 'The Intercept', ignored by the BBC and newspapers. This report arose from classified documents released by a source in the intelligence community, which

---

<sup>5</sup> One variant is the MQ-1C Gray Eagle another type is the MQ-9 Reaper.

<sup>6</sup> Huffpost Politics, Marina Fang, 'Nearly 90% of people killed in recent drone strikes were not the target', 20 October 2015.

corroborates many accounts of civilian deaths recounted by families of victims but ignored in the west.

This is what the report said,

Documents detailing a special operations campaign in northeastern Afghanistan, Operation Haymaker, show that between January 2012 and February 2013, US special operations airstrikes killed more than 200 people. Of those only 35 were the intended targets. During one five-month period of the operation, according to the documents, nearly 90% of the people killed in airstrikes were not the intended targets. In Yemen and Somalia, where the US has far more limited intelligence capabilities to confirm the people killed are the intended targets, the equivalent ratios may well be much worse.

And this is what has been admitted! From past experience I suspect that the real situation is even worse.

A typical example is a drone strike in Yemen in December 2013, which killed 14 people returning from a wedding. The operator mistook their vehicles for those of terrorists. In Pakistan parents are so fearful of drone strikes that they have taken their children out of school.

Vile politicians actually defend these indiscriminate drone killers; one US official said, '*Anyone caught in the vicinity is guilty by association*'.<sup>7</sup> He said this because Obama has re-defined 'militant' to mean '*all military-age males in a strike zone as combatants*'.<sup>8</sup>

A typical example of a drone strike report in the media is the New York Times piece on 26 January 2015. This reported that '*a CIA drone strike in Yemen ... killed three suspected Qaeda fighters*'. Firstly, who has the right to kill merely suspected terrorists? What about justice? Secondly, how can any US official be sure they killed the right people when they were not on the ground with accurate intelligence? Thirdly, if the officials were certain, why did they not name the individuals? Fourthly, local people did provide the names; one of whom was a teenager whose father and brother had been previously killed in USA drone strikes in 2011.

This teenager was a Mohammed Tuaiman al-Jahmi who was only 13-years old. He had already expressed fear of the 'death machines' in the sky, especially after his father and brother were murdered whilst tending their flocks. Mohammed was killed along with his brother-in-law and a third man. Mohammed's brother stated that Mohammed had been burned alive until his body became like charcoal. The reason is that the American weapons are designed to incinerate people. Apart from being only 13, his family affirmed that he had nothing to do with terrorism.

The killing factor of the Predator is usually the Hellfire missile. This is an air-to-surface missile (though it can be used from the ground also) made in the USA and has been in service since 1984. It is essentially a solid fuelled rocket with a warhead. These warheads vary from anti-tank to blast fragmentation configurations, using up to 20 lbs. of explosive charge. Many missiles are called 'thermobaric' weapons because they carry an explosive that utilises oxygen from the air to generate an intense high-temperature explosion that has a long blast wave. They are significantly more energetic than conventional condensed

---

<sup>7</sup> Huffpost Politics, Marina Fang, 'Nearly 90% of people killed in recent drone strikes were not the target', 20 October 2015.

<sup>8</sup> The Intercept, 'Glenn Greenwald, 'The US media and the 13-year-old Yemeni boy burned to death last month by a US drone', 10 February 2015.

explosives of equal weight. Thus they have the most destructive force of any explosive apart from nuclear weapons. This is why they incinerate victims.

This increasing use of drones ought to be prosecuted by an international court for atrocities; instead, the west is ramping them up.

Remember that I have only concentrated on drones here. American airstrikes from warplanes and ships have caused even more mayhem. For example, one US cluster bomb killed 35 women and children in Yemen when a cruise missile hit the wrong target.<sup>9</sup> Obama made certain that the Yemeni reporter who proved this story to be true, Abdulelah Haider Shaye, was imprisoned for five years.

These vile and despicable acts go unreported in the west, in the main, and actively promote the cause of radical terrorists. You need to know that your government is constantly doing this in your name. Shame on our leaders.

For leaked information on US drones see, The Intercept, *'The Drone Papers'*.

## **Weapons - a plea for common sense**

Yet again the debate on gun control in America is raging, provoked by Obama re-deploying his determination to get rid of privately owned guns, especially assault rifles.

Now the first thing to say is the obvious; this is a plan by the elite to remove the threat of armed opposition to despotic martial law and oppressive government. No military take-over of the USA can occur unless the millions of guns owned by citizens are first removed.

After Pearl Harbour the Japanese had the opportunity to invade a weak America that was not mobilised for war and was riven by divisions. The emperor that suggested this was dissuaded by his military chiefs; not by the fear of the American military (which they did not fear at all) but because the emperor was told that it would be impossible. He was told that *'behind every blade of grass there would be a rifle pointed at them'* and an invasion would fail.

Thus the Japanese were persuaded against invading by the fear of the rifle-owning population and the history of Americans to quickly form local militias from volunteers, such as the 'Minutemen',<sup>10</sup> that were so effective in the rebellion.

### **The Constitutional issue**

In fact, the purpose in the American Constitution, under the Second Amendment, of the right to bear arms, was not to dispel invaders from without, but to protect against tyrannical governments from within. The Constitution provided for the population to democratically oppose despotic governments by armed rebellion. The fear of such a rebellion was meant to keep federal governments in check. The principle stated was that the citizenry should have the equivalent weapons as the army (this is the argument for owning assault rifles).

So, the very first issue regarding gun control in America is that the founding fathers (many of whom were Christians) decreed that it was a necessary right for citizens to be able to

---

<sup>9</sup> The Telegraph, Richard Spencer, 'US cluster bombs killed 35 women and children', 7 June 2010.

<sup>10</sup> A member of a class of militia during the American revolutionary period who volunteered to be ready for service at a minute's notice.

protect themselves. Any discussion today has to have this foremost in mind. Removing all private guns would be a removal of the Second Amendment. Now you can try to make an argument that the Second Amendment is out of date and should be removed, but that must be done democratically before any gun control laws come into being.

So the first thing is that overriding Congress by Executive Action (which is what Obama is doing) without the discussion about the Constitution first, is illegal and undemocratic.

In the wider sphere, Christians who are pacifists, (like me) need to remember that the Puritans defended the right to carry swords for personal protection. In those days where brigands, cut-purses, footpads and highwaymen were more of a hazard, the mere presence of a sword would help to protect a citizen from being attacked. We should also remember that swords were carried in Parliament at one time. In fact, the despatch box is in the centre of a two-sword distance between the governing and opposition parties to help avoid someone with an inflamed temper doing some damage.

### **The pragmatic issue**

The next factor in the debate is the question of pragmatism. Does taking guns away from law-abiding citizens actually do any good in reducing violent crime? The answer is a resounding no. This has been proved by multiple academic studies and is obvious from common experience.

With the recent government threats of gun control in America, sales of guns have gone through the roof. Faced with a possible threat of gun-ownership becoming illegal, gun sales have rocketed before they are removed. What was the impact on crime statistics? Gun crime went down markedly. The idea that gun-ownership increases gun crime is a provable fallacy.

Note the situation in Britain. After the Dunblane massacre the Blair government overacted with draconian laws to remove all private handguns and drastically control replicas and antiques. This was nothing but a big media spin to look like they were doing something and to obscure the connections between the murderer and establishment figures.

Did this do any good regarding gun crime? Not one bit. In the years that followed gun crimes went through the roof. Guns became more readily available than ever before on the streets. Shoot outs between rival gangs using sub-machine guns became commonplace, but many of these were ignored by the media (why?). Only occasionally, when bystanders were shot, such as in Birmingham, London and Manchester were there newspaper reports.

Guns are now more easily available illegally than ever before. One teenage gunrunner in London was recently interviewed by the BBC and explained that he had sold thousands of guns to criminals. He affirmed he could get anything anyone wanted.

Taking guns away from law-abiding citizens does not reduce gun crime.

What it does do is:

- It removes an innocent personal pleasure of many thousands of people. I know of one seriously disabled Christian woman who found her only earthly pleasure in being an excellent handgun shooter. She represented the UK in the Paralympics and became a gold medal winner. The Blair law took her handgun away.
- It makes no sense to make handguns, or even replicas, illegal but to allow shotguns to be owned legitimately. Many gun deaths in the UK were from shotgun wounds, but anyone with a legitimate reason (such as a farmer) can easily obtain a shotgun.

- It removes a legitimate hobby for collectors. There is a huge number of law-abiding gun collectors who reasonably want real guns in their collection. Why can museums, stately homes and others own real handguns in display cabinets but other citizens cannot?
- There is a huge market for replica gun collectors. Making such illegal makes no sense whatsoever. It just removes a collecting hobby from law-abiding people. Saying that there is the risk of someone using a replica to threaten people (as in a bank robbery) is utter nonsense since all a criminal has to do is: a) get a metal replica that is legal and paint it black instead of orange; b) get a child's toy gun or a BB gun and do it up, such as by painting it black; c) buy a legal, de-activated, real handgun.
- The law has created unemployment and reduced GDP. There was a thriving business in both real and replica handguns before the law changed. Many people were made unemployed and firms collapsed as a result.

The draconian laws in Britain include restrictions on knives. This is also ridiculous. All that you can carry in Britain today is a folding knife with a three-inch or less blade that does not lock; actually, you can still kill someone with this – so what's the point. This basically means that anyone using a knife for good reasons (fishermen, gardeners, campers, Bushcraft fans etc) are at risk of cutting themselves.<sup>11</sup>

Anyone seriously into Bushcraft or camping absolutely requires a fixed-blade knife at least 4.5-inches long. Yet no one can openly carry such until he is on private property for fear of arrest.

Has this restriction reduced knife crime in the last 20 years? Absolutely not. Knife crimes have also risen dramatically. It seems today that someone gets knifed every day.<sup>12</sup> Removing knives from genuine law abiding citizens is pointless and stupid.

While Bushcraft enthusiasts cannot carry the knife they need to get a fire going, anyone can buy a 10-inch kitchen knife, or a sword or bayonet for their collection. Many knife crimes are committed using legally obtainable Stanley knives. All this makes the law nonsensical.

When I was a child it was common to wear a sheath knife<sup>13</sup> at school, such as in Boy Scout or Cub uniform, on special occasions. Men commonly wore sheath knives on hikes in public, I certainly did. Gardeners would often wear a locking knife on their belt. Fishermen would carry a fixed-blade knife on their fishing trips travelling by bus. In those days there were very few knife crimes. In fact, knife crimes in the 50s and early 60s were by criminals and Teddy Boys using cut-throat razors or razor blades, which are legal. Early gangsters in Birmingham, in the 1920s and 30s, sewed razor blades into the lining of their caps and then used the cap as a bladed weapon.

This shows that the draconian laws make no sense and demonise legitimate, innocent people. I want to teach my grandchildren how to use a knife safely in camping and Bushcraft to develop life skills; but I cannot do this until they are 18, and then only on private land, when the interest in such good things is probably wearing off as they become focused upon university, boyfriends/girlfriends, getting a job etc.

---

<sup>11</sup> When the blade folds back on itself and slices your knuckles. This happened to me once as a child.

<sup>12</sup> Days after I wrote this new crime figures showed a massive increase in violent crime using knives and guns since last year; the levels were raised by between 8 and 14% for different types of crime and even over 20% in some cases.

<sup>13</sup> A fixed-blade knife over 3 inches long carried on the belt in a sheath.

Today many people enjoy the outdoors vicariously through documentaries by Bear Grylls or Ray Mears; but there is nothing like learning survival skills in the wild outdoors to build character, and perhaps learn to save a life. Scouting certainly did that for me and I carried a sheath knife the whole period.

### **The wrong principle – making the instrument illegal**

Now almost everything can kill a person, from a plastic bag to a hammer. Are we to make all these illegal? Of course not.

Many tools have cutting edges that easily become weapons in the wrong hands. In fact it is common for criminal teenagers to carry such (Stanley knives, electrician's screwdrivers, chisels, gouges, etc.). Should we thus criminalise all tools?

Many criminals have used hammers to kill and maim people right up to this day. Should hammers be made illegal?

Many criminals have killed people with jemmys (crowbars), tire-levers, ratchets, spanners and such like. Are we to make all car tools illegal?

The Cluedo favourite, a piece of lead pipe, has actually been used to kill many people. Should plumber's equipment be criminalised?

We could go on and on.

It is not the instrument that kills, it is the criminal using anything to hand that kills.

### **My perspective**

As you know, I am a pacifist. I see no normal reason for me to resort to violence and I would not fight in a war of any kind; neither would I rebel against a tyrannical government. The Christian is called to suffer.

Yet I know that many Christians disagree with this and affirm their right to self-defence; the Puritans are the chief example of this and they committed regicide and slaughtered the Scots and the Irish. It would test me if I were in a situation where I had to defend my family (which is Biblical) against a violent threat, but, thank God, I have not been placed in that situation. For Christians, self-defence must be legal; that is proportionate and in response to attack and not using illegal weaponry.

Now I happen to like handguns from a historical perspective but I am prevented from owning any (apart from deactivated or vintage) by the law. I am interested in their historical development; in fact the study of military weapons is the study of human technological development. Does this mean I would own a real handgun for self-defence if I were living in the USA; no, I would not. I would have a collection of historical handguns but would not have a firing pistol for self-defence in my house or on my person. However, if I were hiking in dangerous territory I would carry a weapon to defend myself against snakes, wolves, lions or bears. Fortunately in Britain this is unnecessary.

So, I am not personally interested in carrying a handgun even if it were legal. However, the situation in America must be determined by common sense, pragmatics and the Constitution. As for the law in England, well that just makes no sense at all.

## **Making evil good**

**Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; Who put darkness for light, and light for darkness;  
Who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Isa 5:20**

It was just a matter of time. Satan has his own dedicated television programme in America.

Fox TV has just released its programme 'Lucifer', sadly starring UK actor Tom Ellis (the boyfriend in Miranda). This is a dramatising of a comic, also sadly written by Brit Neil Gaiman.

In this, according to the blurb, Lucifer, bored of ruling over hell, decides to spice up his life by moving to Los Angeles where he aids the police to solve crimes.

Firstly, this medieval idea of Satan ruling over hell is utter nonsense. God is sovereign over all things, including hell, which is his place of eternal punishment. Satan's future presence in hell (he is not in there yet) is as a victim not a ruler. Note that this emphasis seeks to twist Biblical understanding and wrest authority from the sovereign God.

Secondly, featuring Satan as a central character in a television show, and then casting him in a good light, is about as cynical as it gets. For this to occur in a so-called Christian nation, where Biblical values have a majority amongst the populace, is a strategy of the ruling elite (which contains many Jewish Luciferians that hate Christ) to further seek to overcome or ridicule Christianity.

Mark my word; many such negative heroes will start to appear in the media now. The elite wants to reverse Christian morals and twist the default thinking of society. This is just a new beginning of corruption.

## **Economic collapse**

A couple of years ago I warned of a coming global economic collapse that would engulf everyone and be much worse than the great depression.

Some just scoff at this presuming that current bedrock features of society are immovable. Other agree that there is something wrong but that a global collapse is an overstatement. However, there are now multitudes of brilliant, maverick, very qualified people that are proving this inevitability from various standpoints, and many of them predicted that it would occur this year or very soon afterward.

In fact the economic collapse has already begun, but central banks are trying everything to fend this off for a while longer. This cannot be sustained.

The public awareness of how much corruption lies in the banking system has yet to fully rise to the surface, but more and more people are seeing how shocking things are. The new Oscar nominated film, 'The Big Short' is one piece that will show the sheer corruption of bankers and the banking system to large audiences.

The immense fraud of the bankers is hard to believe. Elite controlled governments do everything in their power to protect the bankers, despite some crimes coming to the

surface. Bankers have been prosecuted for fixing the Libor rate,<sup>14</sup> rigging the Forex,<sup>15</sup> causing the 2008 crash and many more crimes, yet none of the real leaders ever goes to prison. Despite this, crimes that have been exposed have led to \$100 billion in fines in the US alone – no director was incarcerated. Whistleblowers keep reporting on multiple criminal activity, most of which never gets to court. One bank in America has even been found to sponsor Mexican drug lords.

But the inevitability of the economic collapse and the demise of the banking system as we know it is round the corner and has already begun.

All the prime indicators of economic activity are in steep decline. The Baltic Dry Index<sup>16</sup> has constantly dropped and is now at record lows. This means that goods are just not moving internationally. US student loans are through the roof. US food stamps have risen dramatically. US Federal debt is through the roof. The price of oil is at record lows.<sup>17</sup> US wages are in steep decline. US labour force participation is in steep decline. US health care insurance costs are rising massively (some have doubled). Money printing keeps rising. Worker's share of the economy has decidedly gone down. US median family income has steadily kept dropping. Home ownership is in steep decline. Currencies around the world are collapsing and many nations have devalued their currency to try to keep afloat. Japan has just instituted negative interest rates.<sup>18</sup> The Chinese economy is in severe problems. We could go on and on; all the indicators are bad.

Let me give you a specific US example of what this means on the ground:

There is a well-known guitar maker based in San Diego, California. He has just announced that he will no longer be making any guitars. The reason is that the three lumber-mills in his city have closed down, which has made it very hard for him to procure the necessary specialist woods that he uses. To get any wood at all now requires driving for hours and hoping to find it, which is not cost effective. So, the tax office has lost this revenue from high-cost, specialist guitar sales. But it has also lost the generated feed-in business from subsidiary firms, such machine-head manufactures, or makers of strings, pick-ups, electronics, toolmakers, and other hardware. Now take this one-man industry and multiply it to millions of small businesses – there you have the current economic climate in the USA.

Yet the elite-run media and Obama keep telling us that the economy is fine, stocks are safe, growth is assured. The media tells lie after lie to keep markets as docile as possible.

The American national debt now stands at nearly \$20 trillion and debt keeps mounting up. This is an impossible situation that has to explode soon. Many national banks are exposed to the derivatives market bubble that really has no value. The German central bank is exposed to trillions of this, many times more than the German GDP, and bankruptcy is inevitable. The only thing stopping market collapse at the moment is that the American Fed is secretly buying back stocks and shares as investors are selling stocks left, right and centre. Only this buying back has stopped a run so far.

Then again the central banks have been constantly proved to be stupid. They failed to see dangers, despite many proven analysts spotting the issues and warning about them. They

---

<sup>14</sup> The average interbank interest rate on the London money market.

<sup>15</sup> Foreign exchange market. A global market for the trading of currencies.

<sup>16</sup> Describing the movement of goods minus oil.

<sup>17</sup> This is due to overproduction by the US and Gulf States designed to ruin the Russian economy.

<sup>18</sup> Which means that customers have to pay to keep their savings in the bank.

pursued failed policies and did things at the wrong time; such as the recent Fed small rate hike which was absolutely at the wrong time and has led to the terrible economic figures of 2016 thus far. The elite's austerity strategy, undertaken by the EU for example, has crippled societies and damaged GDP by not stimulating real growth and productivity and reducing the tax base, while at the same time creating a bubble for the rich and bankers. Nations already in austerity measures will suffer much more in the coming collapse. In the last decade the 0.1 per cent rich people in society have got much richer while most of the rest of society has got much poorer. A mere 62 people own half of the world's wealth.<sup>19</sup>

The real question is, 'how bad is this going to get?'. Some analysts are warning that it will be apocalyptic, sending us back to feudal times. All good analysts are saying that it will be far worse than either 2008 or 1929. Others think that a reset will occur and there will only be chaos for a few months as the global default currency changes, probably to the Yuan. What is certain is that the American dollar cannot survive.

The truth is that we do not know what effect there will be in the UK; but there will be economic chaos; especially as this wicked government has already weakened the national infrastructure by its failed austerity measures and doubling the national debt, while at the same time failing to tax greedy global companies.

I advise you to read my previous paper on this and take the relevant precautions in order to prepare yourself for any eventuality. This is wise. Even if absolutely nothing happens, you have not lost anything. However, if the worst happens and you don't prepare you will suffer unnecessarily. At the very least keep some hard cash hidden away, which will help until paper currency fails, as well as food items. The first things to collapse in a banking crisis are Cashpoint machines followed by food on supermarket shelves.

Be encouraged, however, this is not the end at all; it is the beginning of a time of crisis<sup>20</sup> that will lead to a new order of things, which in turn will lead to advanced globalism.

**You are all sons of light and sons of the day. We are not of the night nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep, as others *do*, but let us watch and be sober. For those who sleep, sleep at night, and those who get drunk are drunk at night. But let us who are of the day be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and *as* a helmet the hope of salvation. 1 Thess 5:5-8**

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version © Thomas Nelson 1982

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2016**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

<sup>19</sup> The Guardian, Larry Elliot, 'Richest 62 people as wealthy as half of world's population', 18 January 2016.

<sup>20</sup> Which may involve a world war.