



Storming Fortresses

For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh,
but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses.

2 CORINTHIANS 10:4

Vol. 20; No. 4

©Copyright, 2001

April, 2001

Inside

It is time for shooters and shooting organisations to begin to think in terms of the big picture. In other words, we can no longer afford to look at the issues affecting us from a subjective standpoint.

The insidious aspect of this is that, being a philosophical system, it is easily imbibed, easily ingested, and easily disseminated—all without leaving a nasty taste in the mouth.

If we want our sport, and the ability to own firearms, protected, we must be willing to change our society.

Political Schizophrenia: A Word to Shooters

or

**What Happens When We are Governed by the
Politician's Whim**

By

Murray McLeod-Boyle

Introduction

A light-hearted soul once gave me a poster that described the three types of people found in society. The first category, illustrated by a crafty character, tiptoeing across the page with dynamite in his hand, was captioned, "Those who make things happen." The second category, illustrated by a watching crowd, was captioned, "Those who watch what happen." The final category illustrated by a solitary figure—a solitary, soot covered, "just blown up by dynamite," figure—who had the ultimate expression of bewilder-

ment on his face, was captioned, "Those who wonder what happened."

Today, many shooters feel like this solitary figure. The state of quiet disbelief at what the government was proposing, has given way to a deeply entrenched state of utter bewilderment at what they have done. The average shooter is rightly confused. "I have never been in trouble with the law, and yet I have been branded as a virtual criminal. What is going on? How could this happen?" they ask themselves. These questions are very pertinent and really do deserve concrete answers. However, it is

exactly at this point that we encounter the problem.

Fluidity

Concrete, is the problem. "Concrete?" you ask. Yes, Concrete! Well, the lack of it anyway. Concrete is a hard durable substance which has many good applications. Most commonly we use it for foundations. Without foundations our buildings simply will not stand for very long. No matter how pretty we make it, or how many coats of paint we apply, the building is doomed without a solid (concrete) foundation. If we think back to our Sun-

STORMING FORTRESSES is published monthly by REFORMATION MINISTRIES, a non-denominational organisation committed to maintaining and implementing Biblical truth as reasserted by the Reformers.

Subscriptions run from July 1 to June 30. Pro rata rates apply at other times. Current rates are as follows:

- \$40.00 Australia and New Zealand, (GST. Incl.)
- \$75.00 United States of America,
- \$ 60.00 All Other Countries.

Amounts payable in Australian currency. Cheques made payable to:

REFORMATION MINISTRIES,
PO Box 1656,
THURINGOWA CENTRAL,
QLD 4817

Donations gratefully accepted. Free 3 month trial subscription upon request. As a ministry, we also seek to make stock items available to those undergoing hardship. Enquiries most welcome.

©Copyright, 2000. All material published in STORMING FORTRESSES remains the property of its author.

Permission to reprint material from STORMING FORTRESSES in any format, apart from short quotations for review purposes, must be obtained from the copyright owner.

day School lessons, we will vividly remember what happened to the house that was built on the sand. It fell with a great crash when it was tested by the flood waters.

What applies to buildings also applies, metaphorically, to our law. If our law is not built upon an unshakable foundation, then we shall have a proliferation of pointless, ineffective laws. We will leave the realm of the concrete and enter Kevin Costner's "Waterworld". Everything will become fluid. Truth will not differ from error; right and wrong will become a matter of perspective; and justice will become a fond, but very distant, memory. In short, black and white will blend into grey.

Banana Republics

Welcome, ladies and gentleman, to the Banana Republic, governed by the politician's whim.

What do I mean by this? Simple. When our law is anything less than

concrete, it becomes mouldable and pliable. Rather than being founded upon a solid foundation, it is relocated to a murky swamp. This means that people of power then have the ability to manipulate the law and sidestep accountability. Consequently, we as a society are cast away from our mooring and begin to drift in the dangerous seas of relativism. Our courts become farcical, the justice system disintegrates, and law abiding citizens are left scratching their heads.

This is the quagmire in which we end up, once we abandon an absolute foundation for our laws. This is the point at which we encounter the pointless proliferation of unnecessary and grossly restrictive laws mentioned above.

"So what does this have to do with us shooters?" you ask. Simply this. In the years since the gun-confiscation (sorry, that should be "buy-back") shooters have been looking for answers to their immediate situation. Many of the answers advanced so far are too introspective, and have failed to take into account wider aspects and issues. It is good that we focus on educating youngsters. It is good that we develop programmes so that we become better at our sport. It is good that we make every effort to be operative in addressing failures within our own ranks—there is no substitute for credibility. However, at the end of the day, *all these efforts are subjective and are therefore not going to guard against further assaults*. To illustrate this, it is like a country under attack reorganising its army structure rather than striking decisively at the enemy.

In the present debate, a cogent example would be the focus upon "rights". Much has been said and written about our "right" to own a firearm.¹ However, is the sixties

peace child with the hippie girlie locks going to share your sentiments? I do not think so. Stalemate! You assert your "right" to bear arms, whilst your opponent asserts his "right" to live in a gun free environment. Whose "right" is right? In the end, both argue for different things, yet they do so from the same standpoint.

It is time for shooters and shooting organisations to begin to think in terms of the big picture. In other words, we can no longer afford to look at the issues affecting us from a subjective standpoint. We cannot allow ourselves to believe that we are the only ones suffering from political schizophrenia. We are not. Consequently, we must look at the whole picture, the panorama of our culture, and work out the best way forward. In doing this, firearms owners will be guaranteed a much brighter future.

The Real Enemy

"How so?" you ask. Well, our first priority is to accurately diagnose the problem. The ailment that afflicts us is "political schizophrenia." It is the result of our law becoming relative, and our politicians using that law to their own political advantage. It is not the politicians in and of themselves that are the problem—although improvement in this area would not hurt.² Rather, it is the philosophical belief system that currently holds sway. A belief system that has eroded the solid foundation and left us with a society that thrives on relativism and contradiction.

The insidious aspect of this is that, being a philosophical system, it is easily imbibed, easily ingested, and easily disseminated—all without leaving a nasty taste in the mouth. In

1. This has especially been the focus of media attention because the American Constitution gives its citizens the right to bear arms.

this manner, it reaches to every sphere of life and leaves little that does not feel its ravaging effects. Thus, in our society, we have a so called 'justice system' that is manipulated by psychologists and dribble libertarians (sorry, civil libertarians) instead of being reigned over by the judges; an education system that often fails to give our young a valuable education, yet actively teaches them to spurn authority; a tax system that supports people who will not work or contribute to society and therefore levies unbearable burdens upon those who do work; a penal system that does not deal adequately with criminals; a political system that isolates the constituents so that the people's voice is never heard; and last, but by no means least, a medical system that does not provide adequate health facilities to the nation, yet when manipulated can raise revenue for the confiscation³ of firearms from law abiding citizens.

This is a philosophical system that caters to and for the corruption of man rather than the righteous standards of God.⁴

Political schizophrenia, the imbibing of cultural nihilism, and the erosion of a solid base for our law, ethics and morals, has lead us to where we are today. Our society is packed with contradictions⁵—the very contradictions that have bewildered firearms owners in recent times.

Making Money From Law Suits

To illustrate this, we will look at the current situation in the United States where firearms manufacturers are being sued to recoup the cost of so-called "gun violence."

In a society with laws, morals and ethics, based on a solid foundation, these law suits would never have been entertained. Why? Because no ethical person believes that second, third and fourth parties can or should be held accountable for the actions of another. If this suit is successful, who is next? Shall we sue the timber merchant who supplied the wood for the stock? I know! We shall sue the projectile manufactures as well. After all, the firearm manufactures

do not make the bullets, they only fire them! Then we shall sue the mining company that made the copper and lead available for the case and projectile. Next, we shall sue the refinery where these metals were purified and forged. Next, the woodcutter who fell the tree to supply the timber for the stock. Of course, we must also the sue the truck driver who took the timber from the forest to the sawmill—and it is probably not totally inappropriate to sue the mechanic who kept the truck on the road. Then we must take down the chainsaw manufacturer for murder, not to mention environmental and cultural vandalism. Then we sue.... I think you get the picture. Second, third and fourth parties can only be legally guilty, justifiably according to real law, if they are accessories to or after the fact.

The current state is madness and it does not bode well for anyone in our society.

At this point I would like to digress momentarily. This article is aimed at shooters. I have empathy and sympathy for their situation because many do not understand

2. The Bible tells us that as a man thinks in his heart so he is. This means that you should find out more about you local politician than whether he supports firearms ownership. A man who lies to his wife will have little problem lying to a stranger. A man who cannot uphold his marriage vows is unlikely to uphold any other oath. More to the point, if he cannot uphold the highest of all vows, those sworn to his betrothed at their wedding, then any other oath is meaningless. This is where shooters generally come to grief. They will seek to know whether a politician supports firearms ownership and this is where their inquiry will end. The ethics and morals of the individual are considered to be irrelevant. "If he is having an affair, that is his business," they reason. However, they fail to consider the implications. There are those we have just outlined. Then there are considerations such as, what if the affair leads to political blackmail? Support this bill or I will release the photos! Compromise at one point can jeopardise any commitments made at another. Political schizophrenia is nothing more than moral schizophrenia or ethical corruption.
3. We believe that "stealing" and "thievery" are better terms to describe the governments actions.
4. It is important to note that this has not always been the case. At one stage in our history, the politicians of this country believed in "absolutes". Their laws, specifically the implementation of those laws, showed this. A person guilty of a crime was punished and society was protected. Today we have the diametric opposite; *the guilty are protected and society is punished*. Furthermore, it is no coincidence that with the advent of "free thinking" and other antinomian concepts that vandalism, serious crime, drug dependence, pornography, domestic violence, road rage and the like are on the increase.
5. Under Common Law the right to privacy means that your home is your castle. No one can enter unless you give them permission. Why then can a burglar sue you for cutting his hand when he breaks into your home (this was the case in most states until recently)? What about the most famous case; an inmate trying to escape from jail injured himself and successfully sued for damages. This is not justice. It certainly is not what belonging to a juridical society should be. Rather, it is cultural madness, governed by the politician's whim.

how the philosophical ebb and flow of society impinges upon their sport, firearms ownership and the like. However, if you are reading this and you are opposed to gun ownership, then please do not switch off. The salient point is applicable to everyone. The gun buy-back was paid for through an increase in the Medicare levy. Who authorised this? This means affected every tax paying Australian. Furthermore, this action has set a precedent for any government who wants to raise extra revenue. It is also more than plausible that all these aspects could be drawn together again at some time in the future against another group of people. This is political schizophrenia. When it reigns, no one is exempt.

Firearms and Vandalism

Alright, so the firearms manufacturers are sued. Most could live with this if it were not for the glaring hypocrisy and incongruity of the whole situation. What every firearm owner would like to see is this same policy applied equitably across the board.

In Queensland, vandalism costs the economy approximately 20 million dollars a year. In 1994-95 the Queensland government spent 5.3

million dollars on graffiti and vandalism. In 1996 the Queensland Department of Education spent over 3 million dollars on "malicious damage."⁶ A 1997 report by the Tasmanian Department of Education indicates that 3 million dollars a year is spent on repairing wilful damage and providing security services.⁷ Victoria is suffering too. According to one report "vandalism of Metcard machines has cost taxpayers 3.4 million in the salaries of security guards alone."⁸ A report commissioned by the State Rail Authority of New South Wales also has some interesting snippets. This report shows that in 1984-85 the "cost of repairing damage due to vandalism and cleaning graffiti in trains" was approximately 4.76 million. This, however, was only the monetary cost. In 1996, four young persons were killed attempting to place graffiti on trains.⁹

In every respect, graffiti and vandalism are far more common and far more costly to society than the few hiccups we have had with firearms in recent years.¹⁰ One source estimated that graffiti cost Australians approximately 200 million dollars per annum.¹¹

Therefore, one is forced to ask, when are we going to sue the paint manufacturers, the spray can makers and the makers of "nikko" type pens? Surely, if gun manufacturers are to be sued as a second or third party because of "gun violence," then paint manufacturers should be sued to recoup the cost of restoring defaced property. This, after all, would be consistent and fair.¹² Nonetheless, **this is not** what the average person wants to see.

Consider these words from the Neighbourhood Watch Association of South Australia:

Spray paint is widely used as a favorite tool of the Graffiti Vandal. *We should be careful not to place the blame for graffiti onto the spray paint product or the manufacturers.*¹³

It is unjust to sue paint manufacturers because of graffiti vandals. Likewise, it is unjust to sue firearms manufacturers because of social terrorists. *It is wrong to sue or implicate anyone who was not directly associated with a crime.* Why? Because we realise it is unjust. Justice demands punishment to the guilty and restitution to the victim. Justice is not a self help group where we gather to apportion blame!¹⁴

6. *Writing 'on the Wall' for Graffiti Vandals*, June 1996. Available at <http://www.qld.gov.au/html/justice/vandals.htm>.

7. *Minimising Wilful And Accidental Damage to DoE Buildings: Section 2 Extent of the Problem*. Available at <http://doe.tased.edu.au/facnet/guidelines/facilitysupport/vandalism/rvsec4.htm>

8. Sandra McKay, *Ticket machine vandalism costs more than \$3.4m*, *The Age*. Thursday 27 May 1999. Note that this figure is "security guards alone." This means that spare parts, replacement machines and repair costs can be added to this figure.

9. Paul Wilson et al, *Research Brief number 6: Graffiti and Vandalism on Public Transport* (Australian Institute of Criminology, July) 1987.

10. Please do not misunderstand me. One death with a firearm, one robbery with a firearm, one act of foolishness with a firearm is, and always will be, **one too many**. However, to single out firearms and pay no attention to a myriad of other issues is nothing short of hypocrisy.

11. Unfortunately, this figure was unsubstantiated. However, the figures quoted above show that this estimation is fairly accurate. The next piece of math is multiplication. This is a per annum figure. We are paying this figure each and every year. In this light the cost of the gun buy-back begins to pale.

12. This would also mean we sue car and beer manufacturers every time there is a car accident due to drink driving. It would mean we sue KFC or McDonald's for the cost of cleaning up litter, et cetera.

13. *Graffiti* available at <http://www.nhwatch.asn.au/graffiti.htm#more>. Capitals in original, emphasis added.

However, when we are governed by political schizophrenia anything is possible. This is so because political schizophrenics thrive on relativism and obscurities. The less concrete, the less fact, the more they like it.

The Essence

Here is the point for firearms owners. Each and every one of us are victims of political schizophrenia. Not because we are shooters, but because we belong to a society that has undertaken a major cultural shift. Our lives are impacted by these changes all the time. The only difference is that, when this monster raised its head to confiscate our firearms, we felt its sting more harshly. This monster has an insidious nature and tends to act by stealth. *This is precisely why we must sound the wake up call and look to correcting the issues within our society and not just within our sport.*

In essence, I am talking about ethics. We once had a standard in this Nation. We believed in right and wrong. We believed that there was such a thing as truth, and that truth was knowable. We understood the principles of discipline. We believed that law was good. Most importantly,

we *knew* that **obeying the law gave us true freedom.**

If we want our sport, and the ability to own firearms, protected, we must be willing to change our society. This can only be done if we are prepared to boldly address the root cause. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. We cannot promote radical individualism and belief in a society. We cannot promote the idea that everyone is free to do their own thing regardless of the cost and at the same time expect to have a society where everyone is selfless and polite. These philosophies are diametrically opposed to each other and can never live at peace with each other. In this sense, we are in a cultural war. At present, the liberals are winning this war. They have entered the schools and taught a generation or three that they are free agents, unaccountable, and entitled to do what they please—is it then any wonder that we have Port Arthurs and Columbines? Their maxim for life is the contradictory, “do what makes you feel good, as long as you do not hurt anyone else.”¹⁵

Conclusion

Now here is the crux of the mat-

ter. Until our society addresses the wider issue of its own degradation, we will all be subject to the effects of political schizophrenia. The politician’s whim will win out and our state of bewilderment will continue. It is that simple. Firearms owners are the victim of a philosophical and ethical trend sweeping our society. If we want to protect our sport and our right to own firearms then we must attack the root cause. None of us, upon discovering our house was on fire, would run to the shed and grab a can of paint and a paintbrush and hurriedly paint over the blackened, charred pieces of timber, hoping to give the house a better appearance. No! We would all run for the hose and douse the flames. *We would put a stop to the very thing that was destroying our house.* Then, and only then, would we consider the need for paint. So it is with the firearms issue today. We must “scratch where it itches.” We must reverse the ethical trend in society, the real enemy, or be prepared to become expert mathematicians, as we count our firearms and our freedoms being taken away one by one.

If we will not attack the real problem, all our other efforts, worthy as they may be, will be in vain.

14. Is it not quizzical that in our rank individualistic society the blame is passed off to everyone except the individual who perpetrated the crime.
15. This statement is contradictory because the premise will always win out over the qualifier. Thus the maxim becomes, “do what makes you feel good.” Similarly, this maxim requires action upon the premise before we know what impact there is going to be. Think of it this way. I say, “you can have a cup of coffee as long as you do not make a mess in the process.” How do you know whether or not you will make a mess? History might show that you make a mess 60 per cent of the time. Having watched your mother, you may know that she only makes a mess 15 per cent of the time. Common sense tells you that trying to make coffee whilst juggling three mangoes in your left hand and riding a unicycle down a spiral staircase may severely reduce your ability to carry out the task successfully. However, you will not know until you try it. In the long run, the only way to know whether you will be able to enjoy a cup of coffee is to start the process. Only then will you know if you make a mess or not. So it is with the maxim under consideration. You will not know what pain you cause to others until you are in the process of doing, ‘what makes you feel good.’ Statistics may bear out the probability of your success, but this is unimportant to the postmodern mind. Hedonistic in disposition, they are willing to risk pain to others in order to get pleasure for themselves. Devoid of morals, they will derive pleasure for themselves by deliberately causing pain to others.

ATHANASIAN CREED

Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith; Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

And the catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; Neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit.

But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coeternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Spirit. The Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Spirit uncreated. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Spirit incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit eternal. And yet they are not three eternals but one eternal. As also there are not three untreated nor three incomprehensible, but one untreated and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Spirit almighty. And yet they are not three almighties, but one almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God; And yet they are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Spirit Lord; And yet they are not three Lords but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord; So are we forbidden by the catholic religion to say; There are three Gods or three Lords. The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made nor created, but begotten. The Holy Spirit is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits. And in this Trinity none is afore or after another; none is greater or less than another. But the whole three persons are coeternal, and coequal. So that in all things, as aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.

Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man of substance of His mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood. Who, although He is God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of that manhood into God. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ; Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead; He ascended into heaven, He sits on the right hand of the Father, God, Almighty; From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies; and shall give account of their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.