

Why San Francisco Declared The NRA A Terrorist Organization

The city board of supervisors for San Francisco has just taken it upon itself to pass a resolution, declaring the National Rifle Association to be a terrorist organization.

Yes, one of the nation's leading non-profit organizations, made up of law-abiding citizens, is now considered by some to be nothing more than a group of terrorists, simply because they don't agree with the agenda of the radical left.

This is clearly nothing more than a political stunt; but it's also a dangerous precedent. It is basically trying to say that anyone can be named a terrorist, or any organization can be named a terrorist organization, if they don't agree with the left's stance on an issue. In this case, the issue is the Second Amendment.

The supposed grounds for this action is an old line that the political left has been throwing around for a long time; that is, that the NRA supports selling guns to those who commit crimes, specifically the crime of mass murder. But they don't. They never have. The NRA stands for responsible gun ownership; and unlike those who are vilifying them, they have never stood on the side of the criminal.

One perfect example of this is the instant background check system that is currently in place. If you want to buy a firearm from a licensed dealer (not a private sale), the dealer must call the NICS (National Instant Criminal Background Check System) to verify that you are legally eligible to buy that firearm. Those with criminal records or who have been adjudged mentally incapable of the responsibility of firearm ownership are supposed to have their names and

other identifying information entered in this database, declaring them ineligible to buy firearms, thereby preventing the sale.

The NICS wouldn't exist if it wasn't for the NRA, as it was the NRA's initiative and support that caused its creation. Yet the left consistently states that the NRA has opposed the formation of the NICS and wants its dissolution.

Old Tactics with a New Face

The left has been attacking the NRA and anyone else who supports the Second Amendment at every opportunity. We've all heard politicians and pundits talk about how the politicians who vote against gun control laws have been "bought" by the NRA. But is that true?

It's no secret that the NRA is a lobbying organization and that like other lobbying organizations they give donations to political campaigns. In 2017, their highest year, they gave a total of \$5,122,000[1]. When we compare that to other organizations making political donations, we find that it really isn't all that much. According to Open Secrets, a watchdog organization, the NRA doesn't even give enough to be listed on their "Top 50" contributor's list[2].

With that being the case, then it is clear that organizations like Bloomberg LP (\$95,907,318), the Carpenter's & Joiners Union (\$42,035,154), and the American Federation of Teachers (\$39,917,711) should also be considered terrorist organizations. After all, they are all giving money to politicians, in order to support their agenda. Isn't that the same?

One could argue that unions are only trying to protect their members, but that doesn't cover Michael Bloomberg's organization, which lists as number 1 on the chart or George Soros', which lists as number 17. Both of those have clearly


given money in order to control politicians against the public interest. Bloomberg is constantly attacking our Constitutional rights and Soros has such a bad reputation in coming against freedom and democracy, that countries like Hungary are passing laws specifically aimed at stopping him.

While I might be tempted to call both Bloomberg and Soros terrorists, I would be just as wrong to do so, as San Francisco is in calling the NRA a terrorist organization. A terrorist is one who uses violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims.”[3] While there is pretty good evidence that Soros at least has funded the use of such violence, that still doesn’t make him a terrorist. It only makes him one who supports terrorist organizations.

On the other hand, there is absolutely no evidence that the NRA has ever put money, guns or anything else in the hands of terrorists or others who commit violent acts against their fellow man. Of the over five million members in the organization, I am sure that 99.99% would be glad to slap the handcuffs or pop a cap on any terrorist they came across. They are the antithesis of terrorists.

But the left has never concerned themselves with accurate descriptions. We see that in how they are muddying the difference between men and women, causing Facebook to now offer 58 “genders” to choose from. In the left’s playbook, if you don’t like what a word means, than change its definition; they do that all the time.

What's Going on Here?



As we've seen over the last several years, part of the left's strategy is to publically destroy the reputation of anyone who doesn't fall in line with their agenda. They control the majority of the media, as well as many of the other key spheres of public influence. Through the years, they have become experts in using this control to shame people into submission.

We've just seen this with Wal-Mart, which has caved to the left's pressure in limiting the calibers of ammunition they will sell. This follows earlier decisions by the retail giant to stop selling AR-15 type rifles and not sell firearms to anyone under 21 years of age, regardless of what the law says.

The thing Wal-Mart and other companies don't realize, is that they are succumbing to the demands of a minority of the population, without hearing from everyone else. However, that minority, because they are far to the left on the political spectrum, has the support of the mainstream media. Therefore, their voice is amplified over the majority of American citizens, who want to protect their Second Amendment rights.

This can make them sound like the majority, even though they're not.

For the last few years the NRA has been vilified in those media outlets, every time there is a mass shooting. The twisted logic behind that is that the NRA is the primary lobbying organization supporting our Second Amendment rights. Therefore, they are supposedly helping mass murderers commit their heinous crimes. Several have thrown around the term "terrorist organization" when talking about the NRA, but this is the first legal action taken to identify them as such.

Catherine Stefani, San Francisco's District Two Supervisor, is the architect of this act, creating the resolution and pressuring other members of the board of supervisors to vote in favor of it. Included in the resolution is wording accusing the NRA of "arming those individuals who would and have committed acts of terrorism." Considering the tactics of the left, had any of them voted against the resolution, they would have probably been accused of giving material support to a terrorist organization.

This claim is ridiculous. The NRA has not ever placed guns in the hands of terrorists or any other type of criminal. A recent study put out by the FBI clearly states that over 70% of the guns used in crimes are obtained illegally. Only 10% of the guns used in all crimes are purchased legally from retail sources, including 0.8% bought at gun shows. The NRA has never supported any sort of illegal gun acquisition.

The truth obviously doesn't matter in this case. If Stefani and her accomplices can label the NRA as a terrorist organization, they'll apparently do so. She stated, "The NRA has it coming to them. I will do everything I possibly can to call them out on what they are, which is a domestic terrorist organization."

Does that mean that all five million plus members of the NRA,

some of who are pillars in our communities, are terrorists too? She apparently thinks so.

**Can They
Really
Do That?**

**THIS IS THE KIND OF GUN USED
BY THE TEXAS CHURCH SHOOTER**



**THIS IS THE KIND OF GUN USED
BY THE CITIZEN WHO STOPPED
AND KILLED THE CHURCH SHOOTER**



**MORAL - IT'S NOT THE GUN - IT'S
THE MAN WHO USES IT THAT DETERMINES
IF IT'S USED FOR GOOD OR BAD**

The other issue here is whether the city of San Francisco really has the right to make such a determination, and if they do, what it means. Normally, designations of terrorist organizations are done at the nation-state level or even by international bodies, like the United Nations. But a city?

There really is no precedent here. I can find no other case in which a city or state has taken it upon themselves to make

such a declaration. So the legality of San Francisco's actions may very well be at question here. While the Constitution does recognize state sovereignty, it doesn't recognize that of cities within those states.

As it stands right now, it would seem that it is illegal for the NRA to operate in San Francisco. This could mean that anyone working for or in conjunction with the NRA is at risk of being arrested for exercising their constitutional rights and engaging in legal activities.

If the city board of supervisors gets away with this, it could be the very tool that the left has been looking for to totally silence those of us who don't agree with their ideology. What would be the difference between them declaring the NRA a terrorist organization and them declaring the Republican Party one and shutting them down in their city? I can't see one. It would probably be even easier for them to do that with the Tea Party.

Clearly this is an illegal action, unless it is taken to only be something symbolic. Taking it any farther than that turns it into a political weapon of the likes that this nation has never seen before.

Basically, this is tyranny at its finest. One political party, gaining control, makes all opposition illegal so that they can have total control. It's also about demagoguery, controlling the people through their prejudices. Calling the NRA a terrorist organization puts them on the same level as ISIS, who we fought a war to destroy. Therefore, the NRA is worthy of our hate, according to those in power. The general populace supports the action of the board, because they've been convinced that it's the right thing to do.

The NRA's Response

Of course, the NRA can't take this lying down. They are no stranger to courtrooms, spending a large percentage of their members' dues in legal fights to protect our Second Amendment rights. Nevertheless, this isn't an attack against the Second Amendment, but rather the First. The city of San Francisco is essentially trying to say that the NRA doesn't have a right to express an opinion that is contrary to their own.

This is a shutting down of political debate; a step towards a one-party political system. The NRA exists largely to formant such political debate. But they are being vilified for doing just that. As an organization, they have always been willing to discuss anything having to do with their members' rights, even with those who oppose them. They don't shut down those on the left; they try to engage in fact-based debates and conversations with them.

This should be no surprise, considering the world we live in today. More and more we're seeing the left attack our right to Freedom of Speech, especially in those areas which are their strongholds (college campuses and the mainstream media). Yet it isn't limited to those types of areas, as "political correctness" is also used constantly as a cudgel to beat anyone who dare say anything against their declared stance on an issue.

The basic tactic is a common one amongst those on the left. If you can't get what you want legally, then use whatever means you can, even if it is illegal. That might mean using activism in the courts to create legal precedent. It might mean using the court of public opinion. Or, as in the case with Governor Cuomo of New York, it might mean creating roadblocks to doing business with their enemies; in this case, the NRA.

Unless the city capitulates, this lawsuit should probably end up before the Supreme Court, as it deals with a basic

constitutional right, that of freedom of speech. There have been several cases in which the Supreme Court has upheld our right to keep and bear arms, but that's not the issue here. Should the city win the day on this case, it opens the door for other cities and states to use such measures to silence those who don't agree with the direction that any government or group within the government is taking, at any level.

If someone wants to turn the US into a tightly controlled society, where we don't have even the most basic rights, like freedom of speech, this seems to be the tactic that will work. I sure hope the NRA wins this battle; they are literally fighting for us all.

Resources

[1]

<https://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D0000000082&year=2018>

[2] <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/list.php?id=>

[3] Oxford dictionary online