



# *Last Days Beacon*

April 2020 - Vol. 5, No. 4 L-50

## THE LINE IN THE SAND



The Battle of San Antonio - 1836



The Battle of Richmond - 2020

### ***WHY TYRANTS ALWAYS GO FOR THE GUNS***

*By Dr. David Schnittger*

Let me begin with a quote commonly attributed to Martin Luther, the father of the Protestant Reformation:

*If I profess, with the loudest voice and clearest exposition, every portion of truth of God except precisely that little point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Christianity. Where the battle rages the loyalty of the soldier is proved; and to be steady on all the battle-field besides is mere flight and disgrace to him if he flinches at that one point.*

I would like to apply that quote to Satan's assaults on America over the last 60 or so years. In 1962-1963, the Supreme Court voted, in two separate decisions, to remove Bible reading and prayer from public schools. In 1973, the Supreme Court legalized abortion on demand in the *Roe v Wade* decision. As a result of that decision, over 60 million unborn and newborn babies have been slaughtered in America. In 2015, the Supreme Court legalized same sex marriage (*Obergefell v. Hodges*).

Also, in recent years, there have been a number of laws passed in several states, to restrict the rights of gun ownership by American citizens. For example, since 2018, Red Flag laws have been passed in 17 states and the District of Columbia. We have also seen in recent months, draconian gun laws proposed in Virginia that have brought the state to the brink of secession or civil war.

What do all of these satanic assaults have in common? They went mostly unopposed by Christians in America. I believe one of the reasons why Christians did not mount a stronger resistance to these assaults is because most pastors did not inform or mobilize God's people to resist evil.

## REASONS FOR PASTORAL SILENCE

Why is it, that in the last 65 or so years, pastors have become so reticent to address the moral issues of our day? Let me suggest several reasons:

One reason is because of the 501(c)3 law that dates back to 1954, commonly known as “the Johnson amendment,” declaring that pastors cannot speak out in some ways regarding political matters, lest they risk their church’s tax-exempt status. However, to my knowledge, no church has had their tax-exempt status revoked for “political” statements or endorsements from the pulpit. Although President Trump has revoked the Johnson amendment, many pastors still hide behind their 501(c)3 non-profit status as their excuse for political non-involvement.

Another reason why so many pastors have been silent on the moral issues of our day is because of a misunderstanding of Romans 13:1-7. Many pastors teach that obedience to civil government is unconditional and, therefore, to speak or act in opposition to governmental dictates is unspiritual. California pastor John MacArthur is one who advocates this view:

“So how can believers balance the priority of God’s kingdom with the desire to be good citizens on earth? Political and social activism are not the answer. After all, God has called His people to just two foundational civic responsibilities. The first is in Romans 13:1: ‘Every person is to be in subjection to the governing authorities.’ The second is in Romans 13:7: ‘Render to all what is due them: tax to whom tax is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.’ The sum of our civil duty, then, is to submit and pay taxes. Beyond that we should focus on those things that are of eternal value. Political activism may seem significant in the moment, but it pales next to kingdom priorities (Matthew 6:33).

“The apostle Paul lived in a day under Roman control and dominion, in which Christians were viewed with suspicion and often greeted with persecution and suffering. Yet the right response was not retaliation, but deference and compliance. In Romans 13:1, Paul established this fundamental principle: as Christians we are to obey our civil authorities no matter whom they may be. Believers have a God-given duty to submit to the government, even when the ruler is as wicked as Nero.” *Right Thinking in a World Gone Wrong*, page 126.

I would recommend to pastor MacArthur that he review apostolic history. The Apostle Paul spent about as much time in Roman jails as he did out of jail. Does pastor MacArthur really believe that Paul spent so much time in jail because he exercised “deference and compliance” to the unjust, repressive, evil laws of the Roman authorities? Every apostle except John (who died in exile by the Roman government) was killed by the tyrannical Roman government because they refused to submit to unjust laws. How pastor MacArthur views the apostles’ behavior as “deference and compliance” is beyond my understanding.

I am also curious to know pastor MacArthur’s view of the *jus primae noctis* (‘right of the first night’) practice during medieval Europe. This was a supposed legal right allowing feudal lords to have sexual relations with subordinate women, in particular, on their wedding nights. Following pastor MacArthur’s prescribed “deference and compliance” regimen, it would be the duty of the Christian husband to surrender his bride to the licentious government official. Is this really what Romans 13 requires?

Another reason why so many pastors have been silent on the moral issues of our day is because of what I call “pietism.” Pietism is the notion that the church’s concerns are to be primarily, if not exclusively, “matters of the soul,” an emphasis on individual piety. The pietist believes that earthly matters, or political issues, are by their very nature, carnal. This thinking is an extension of platonic dualism. Dualism is the view that the immaterial is good and the material is evil. Therefore, Christians should not concern themselves with carnal “worldly” matters such as politics, but rather focus solely on “soulful” issues pertaining to salvation and Christian living.

The deafening silence from many pulpits is also because many of the pulpits in America are occupied by hirelings, not shepherds. Jesus said in John 10:11-13, “I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth; and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep.”

Jesus made it clear that the central difference between a true shepherd and a hireling (hired hand) is that the shepherd is willing to fight and die to protect the sheep, while the hireling is not willing to risk his life for the sheep. When the true shepherd (not the hired hand) sees the wolves coming, does he run away and leave the sheep to be slaughtered or does he confront the wolves and fight to the death to protect them? The shepherd stays and fights, while the hireling runs away.

That is exactly what is happening with the gun confiscation efforts occurring in so many states in America. This assault on our God-given right of self-defense goes to the very heart of the lives and liberties that brave Americans fought and died to secure for their posterity. The protection of human life, whether it be from the abortionist in the operating room, the criminal in the back alley or the psychopath in the state house, is a basic tenet of a free country. To stand silent amidst the destruction of our right to self-defense is as cowardly as a hireling that flees when the wolves attack the flock. How dare our pastors stand silent and mute in the face of such evil? How dare they refuse to sound the alarm and muster the troops? Does not their refusal to fight or even warn their congregations prove that they are not really shepherds at all, but mere hirelings.?

After more than 25 years of pastoral ministry I have observed that many American pastors are more concerned with their salaries and positions than they are in protecting their parishioners. They refuse to take a stand on the “controversial” issues of the day because of fear that it may affect the finances of the church or their job security. They have become managers of church growth rather than champions of biblical morality.

Often, pastors hide behind the excuse that they are called to only “preach the gospel.” Let me ask quite frankly, “How much courage does it take to preach the gospel in a sanctuary filled with a mostly saved and mostly supportive congregation?” Also, if a pastor’s calling is only to preach the gospel, about 95% of the Bible is irrelevant. For example, Hebrews 11 is totally irrelevant because it challenges us with the examples of men and women who were “not afraid of the king’s commandment,” who did not fear “the wrath of the king,” who “subdued kingdoms,” “waxed valiant in fight,” and who “turned to flight the armies of the aliens.” Apparently, these heroes of the faith did not get the “deference and compliance” memo!

The story of God’s people, from Genesis to Revelation, is the chronicle of people who refused to submit to tyrannical, unjust laws and who chose to “obey God rather than men.” Yet, many American

pastors refuse to resist. They choose to sheepishly comply with the unjust laws of evil, wicked men. And they refuse to be courageous shepherds to their congregation. They are hirelings!

The satanic assaults that America has experienced over the last 50 years were battles that Christians have lost by default. If pastors had rallied their congregations, by the tens of millions, to resist these evils, the enemy would not have been victorious. But now that these assaults have been victorious, none has been overturned. It is nearly impossible to regain ground that has been lost.

Now, we are faced with another satanic assault, this time on the God-given right to self-defense. I believe the battle for the right to keep and bear arms is literally the line in the sand that all Christians, indeed all liberty-loving Americans, must draw.

Why is gun confiscation the line in the sand for patriotic Americans? Let me give you a couple of reasons. First, because attempts to disarm Americans have led to war on two occasions. When the British attempted to disarm Americans at Concord in 1775, patriots resisted and a free nation was born. When the Mexican army attempted to disarm Americans at Gonzales in 1835, the Texians cried, "come and take it," and Texas gained its independence. Americans have repeatedly surrendered their lives rather than surrender their firearms! Can we do anything less?

### **GUN CONFISCATION LEADS TO DEMOCIDE**

Another reason why gun confiscation is the line in the sand for Americans is because gun confiscation is normally followed by mass democide, death by government. Consider the history of gun confiscation, just in the twentieth century: Stalin took the guns. Hitler took the guns. Mao took the guns. Castro took the guns. Idi Amin took the guns. Pol Pot took the guns. The monsters of the last century all took the guns before they began the roundups and purges, the gulags and death camps, and the firing up of the crematoriums. Do not say it can't happen here! Consider the chart below, which documents that approximately 262 million people were murdered by *their own governments* in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In each of these countries, the citizens were substantially disarmed before the mass democide took place. Consider the chart below, tabulating the mass murder of defenseless citizens by their own governments:

## 20TH CENTURY MORTACRACIES

DEMOCIDE LEVEL MORTACRACIES	YEARS	DEMOCIDE (000)	TOTAL (000)
<b>DEKA-MEGAMURDERER</b>	<b>1900-87</b>		<b>219,634</b>
China (PRC)	1949-87	76,702	
U.S.S.R	1917-87	61,911	
Colonialism		50,000	
Germany	1933-45	20,946	
China (KMT)	1928-49	10,075	
 <b>MEGAMURDERER</b>	 <b>1900-87</b>		 <b>19,180</b>
Japan	1936-45	5,964	
China (Mao Soviets)	1923-48	3,468	
Cambodia	1975-79	2,035	
Turkey	1909-18	1,883	
Vietnam	1945-87	1,670	
Poland	1945-48	1,585	
Pakistan	1958-87	1,503	
Yugoslavia (Tito)	1944-87	1,072	
 <b>MEGAMURDERER?</b>	 <b>1900-87</b>		 <b>4,145</b>
North Korea	1948-87	1,663	
Mexico	1900-20	1,417	
Russia	1900-17	1,065	
 <b>CENTI-KILOMURDERERS</b>	 <b>1900-87</b>		 <b>14,918</b>
<b>TOP 5</b>	<b>1900-87</b>	<b>4,074</b>	
China (Warlords)	1917-49	910	
Turkey (Ataturk)	1919-23	878	
United Kingdom	1900-87	816	
Portugal (Dictatorship)	1926-82	741	
Indonesia	1965-87	729	
Other	1900-00	10,844	
 <b>LESSER MURDERERS</b>	 <b>1900-87</b>		 <b>2,792</b>
<hr/>			
<b>WORLD TOTAL</b>	<b>1900-87</b>		<b>260,669</b>
<b>WORLD TOTAL</b>	<b>1987-99</b>		<b>1,331</b>
<hr/>			
<b>WORLD TOTAL</b>	<b>1900-99</b>		<b>262,000</b>

<https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/20TH.HTM>

## THE FOUNDERS PERSPECTIVE

The reason the second amendment is included in the Bill of Rights is because those who fought the Revolutionary War against British tyranny were those who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They understood that the God-given right to keep and bear arms is the last defense against tyranny. Listen to what some of the founders said regarding American's rights to bear arms:

"Firearms stand next in importance to the constitution itself. They are the American people's liberty teeth and keystone under independence . . . from the hour the Pilgrims landed to the present day, events, occurrences and tendencies prove that to ensure peace security and happiness, the rifle and pistol are equally indispensable . . . the very atmosphere of firearms anywhere restrains evil interference - they deserve a place of honor with all that's good." - George Washington

"Those who hammer their guns into plowshares will plow for those who do not . . . The constitution of most of our States assert that all power is inherent in the people; that . . . it is their right and duty to be at all times armed." - Thomas Jefferson

## CURRENT SECOND AMENDMENT THREATS - RED FLAG LAWS

One of the real and present dangers to gun owners in America today is what is called "**red flag**" laws. These laws have been passed in 17 states and the District of Columbia subsequent to the mass shooting at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas high school in Florida in February, 2018.

Red flag laws allow private citizens to request court orders for officials to confiscate the firearms of people legally permitted to own them. The goal of these laws is to head off mass shootings before they happen. Targets of gun confiscation orders are often unaware that such orders have been issued, or even petitioned. The legal gun owners often are unable to appear at a hearing or cross-examine witnesses. In other words, the citizens' guarantee of due process articulated in the Fourth Amends is trampled.

This is not just a violation of fundamental procedural rights; it has led to tragic outcomes. Police arriving unannounced at a gun owner's home demanding that he turn over his firearms is a recipe for tragedy.

Let me illustrate: In a pre-dawn raid that took place on November 5, 2018, two Anne Arundel, Maryland police officers were serving an extreme risk protective (red flag) order that required them to confiscate guns from a man they'd never encountered at a home they had never visited. In other words, this was a man who had no criminal record.

The resident, Gary Willis, answered the door, wielding a Smith & Wesson .357 magnum. The 61-year old set the six-shooter down at the officers' request. As the officer explained the requirements of the "red flag" order, Willis became increasing agitated - particularly when they mentioned he'd had to leave the home he'd shared with his family for 20 years.

When Willis reached for his revolver, he and the officer struggled for the gun. In the melee, the gun went off. The officer proceeded to shoot Willis five times, killing him.

Apparently, this "extreme risk protective order" was issued because Willis had engaged in an argument with a disgruntled relative, who then went behind Mr. Willis's back to the courts. Mr. Willis,

who had no knowledge of this, was startled and threatened in a pre-dawn police raid, and subsequently murdered.

Neighbors who were interviewed after this event, were shocked, stating, “Gary Willis had never or would never hurt anyone.”

The Anne Arundel County State’s Attorney’s Office ruled that the shooting was justified and recommended no charges against the police officers. That, my friends, is how red flag laws work!

There are many Democrats and Republicans in Congress that are pushing for a Federal “red flag” laws, which allows private citizens to request court order for officials to confiscate the firearms of people legally permitted to own them. One such bill is S.2521 - Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2018. This bill, sponsored by Senator Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) and supported by Lindsey Graham (R-SC) states: “This bill amends the federal criminal code to authorize procedures for a family or household member, or law enforcement officer, to request an extreme risk protection order with respect to an individual who poses an imminent risk to themselves or others. An extreme risk protection order is a federal court order that prohibits a person from owning possessing, receiving, or having control or custody of a firearm.”

Though this bill has not passed Congress, it is revived after every mass shooting in America. If this bill is passed, it is just the beginning of gun registration and confiscation, akin to the Nazi gun registration and confiscation prior to the holocaust.

## ASSAULT WEAPONS BANS



The Battle of Richmond - January 20, 2020

Another attack on the second amendment rights of Americans is a renewed attempt to ban assault weapons. The Associated Press ran a February 17, 2020 article entitled, “Virginia’s proposed ban on assault weapons rejected by lawmakers.”

“Virginia Gov. Ralph Northam’s push to ban the sale of assault weapons failed Monday after some of his fellow Democrats balked at the proposals. Senators voted to shelve the bill for a year and ask the state crime commission to study the issue, an outcome that drew cheers from a committee room packed with gun advocates. . .

“Virginia is the current epicenter of the country’s heated debate over guns, as a new Democratic majority seeks to enact strict new limits. Democrats ran heavily on gun control during last year’s

legislative election when they flipped control of the General Assembly for the first time in more than two decades.

“But gun owners, especially in rural communities, have pushed back hard. Last month, tens of thousands of gun rights activists from around the country flooded the Capitol and surrounding area in protest, some donning tactical gear and carrying military-style rifles. And more than 100 counties, cities and towns have declared themselves Second Amendment sanctuaries, vowing to oppose any new ‘unconstitutional restrictions’ on guns.

“The proposed assault weapon ban has received the most opposition. Gun owners have accused the governor and others of wanting to confiscate commonly owned guns and accessories from law abiding gun owners Northam and his allies have said repeatedly they do not want to confiscate guns, but argued that banning new sales of assault weapons and high-capacity magazine would help prevent mass murders.”

The issue of assault weapons bans has also become a campaign issue for Democrat candidates for President. Failed presidential hopeful, Robert “Beto” O’Rourke famously impaled his campaign by stating, “Hell yes, we are coming for your AR-15s!” Now that he has returned to well-deserved obscurity, the Democrat’s latest anointed candidate, Joe Biden, has promised to put “Beto” in charge of the “gun issue” when he becomes President.

Biden has a long history of opposition to the second amendment. He supported the 1993 Brady Bill as well as the 1994 Assault Weapons Ban. He has been endorsed and financed by two anti-gun organizations: *Everytown for Gun Safety* and *Brady*.



**Biden and Beto are coming for your AR-15s**

Biden has also run ads highlighting his opposition to the second amendment. He stated in his ads, “I’ve taken on the NRA and defeated them twice. . . I believe we need a candidate who will fight alongside these (anti-gun) leaders, not the NRA or gun manufacturers.”

## **U.N. ARMS TRADE TREATY**

The United Nations Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), entered into force in December 2014, when President Obama signed the treaty. The treaty urges record keeping of end users, directing importing countries to provide information to an exporting country regarding arms transfer, include “end use or end user documentation” for a “minimum of ten years.” Each country is to “take measures, pursuant to its



national laws, to regulate brokering taking place under its jurisdiction for conventional arms.” Data kept on the end users of imported firearms is a de-facto registry of law-abiding firearms owners, which is a violation of federal law. Even worse, the ATT could be construed to require such a registry to be made available to foreign governments.

Perhaps the easiest way to understand the future danger the ATT posed to U.S. gun owners is the complete refusal by proponents of the treaty to clarify that it would have no effect on the possession of small arms by law-abiding American gun owners. NRA and other opponents of the treaty repeatedly asked for a carve-out in the treaty, yet those requests were flatly denied. If the treaty’s proponents had no intention of limiting American gun ownership, why resist such a limitation to the text of the treaty?

Thankfully the ATT never received the Senate ratification that the Constitution requires for all treaties. In May, 2019 President Trump took the historic step of ordering the “unsigned” of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. President Trump’s action effectively withdraws the United States from the most comprehensive effort toward international gun control. However, President Trump’s signature did not remove this Treaty from the Senate docket.

Enter Senate Resolution (S.Res.) 204, introduced by Senator Rand Paul (R-Ky) on May 13, 2019, shortly after President Trump’s “unsigned” of the Treaty. S.Res.204 would remove the Treaty’s “pending” status in the Senate and prevent it from coming up for ratification in the future. If, on the other hand, the treaty is not returned to the White House, it will remain in the Senate and could come up for a vote at any time. According to the Library of Congress, S.Res.204 was sent to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations the day Paul introduced it, where it has been marooned with no hearing or votes held or scheduled. Fortunately, the House of Representatives does not involve itself in resolutions of this sort, so I suggest you call your senator and urge movement on this resolution.

## CONCLUSION

The struggle between liberty and tyranny is as old as mankind. Each successive generation must step up and fight the good fight against government tyranny. Our first President George Washington said, “Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, - it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant, and a fearful master; never for a moment should it be left to irresponsible action.” Why do tyrants always go for the guns? For the same reason thieves and murderers want to break into the homes of disarmed residents. Tyrants do not want armed resistance!

Reprints of this publication may be obtained from  
**Southwest Prophecy Ministries (swpm.us)**  
P.O. Box 58043, Oklahoma City OK 73157

5 copies for \$5.00; 25 copies for \$15.00