

Appendix A: Comments Used for Qualitative Examination

Note: In some cases, I have corrected spelling errors and removed extraneous spaces to make comments more readable.

Table A1: /r/liberalgunowners Comments Containing “liber” Feature

Comment Number	Comment Text
1	Like they've come around to seeing things our way when it comes to single payer? Or ending the war on drugs? Or curtailing the surveillance state? Or demilitarizing the police and holding them accountable? Or breaking up the banking cartels? The Democratic Party leadership is pretty well insulated from liberal positions on meaningful issues which is precisely why anti-gun is such a big deal for them. It's a divisive wedge issue they can use to distract from the fact that they're not even remotely interested in liberal causes and are quite content to be Diet Republicans.
2	And liberals wonder why conservatives call main stream media fake news.
3	We have so many libertarians here that they like to call themselves classical liberals. This sub is for democratic liberals but you are still welcomed here.
4	I would go as far as to say that the right to bear arms <i>*is*</i> a liberal ideology. I've never understood how it's become aligned almost exclusively with the Conservative party.
5	Tribalism. Gun rights are a thing right-wingers like, therefore you can't possibly be liberal if you care about gun rights. I mean, right wingers breathe oxygen too, but you don't see me holding my breath to prove I'm a liberal.
6	Ahh yes. The modern Democratic Party. See also: Not caring much about organized labor. See also: Leaked memos where they mock liberals for being liberal See also: Warhawks disguising themselves with a (D) See also: Pro-Wall Street See also: Pro-domestic spying programs Demowhatwasthatagain?
7	Isn't that exactly what we're doing by applying a purity test to people who post and comment? We're literally creating a left-leaning echo chamber by stifling any views that don't agree with the above bullet points. Even worse, we're talking about banning people who simply participate in certain "objectionable" subs. I'm no fan of T_D ¹ by a long shot, but I don't agree with this move. This is one of my favorite subs and definitely my favorite gun sub, but I can't get on board with the idea of banning anyone who doesn't toe the liberal line. I'm not saying I have the answer to resolve the issue of this sub sliding further to the right, but I don't think this is it.
8	So anyone that disagrees with your flavor of grabbing is a secret alt-right troll using fancy specific definitions of liberal to hide how not-liberal they are, because as we all know, unless you're blah blah common sense blah blah the children blah blah Australia blah blah cars blah blah you're not a real liberal. Is this the new 'Russians on Reddit'?

¹ “T_D” likely refers to /r/The_Donald, a subreddit used to discuss content favorable to President Trump. /r/The_Donald was “quarantined” by Reddit in June 2019 because of concerns over threats of violence made on the subreddit.

9	ROFL That place is so hopelessly toxic. I sure am glad actual black people aren't that hateful and small-minded. That sub is just urban white liberal hipsters who love the edge of hating other white people.
10	Totally not picking a fight, as I am also pro gun, pro gay, basically everything you mention, and I'm curious what makes you "conservative." Is it fiscal? In which case why wouldn't you consider yourself a fiscally-conservative liberal? Or even an old fashioned libertarian?
11	The existential dread you feel due to the approaching election is a normal, healthy response to being a liberal gun owner. Experts recommend putting your face in your hands and engaging in a futile, muffled, suffocating scream. By "experts", I mean me, and by "recommend", I mean I do that a lot when it comes to be election time. Fuck this political climate. I'd say I don't even know who's evil anymore, except it's everyone, so I do know.
12	I grew up in one of the most liberal places in the US. What has worked for me is to turn anti 2nd amendment conversations into a discussion about the failure to provide education, healthcare and meaningful employment for people at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder. Gun control is just a lazy way of dealing with our social problems and will mostly be enforced on the poor and people of color. Make comparisons to the failed war on drugs and see if you can get a conversation going on the root causes of violence. The more you can steer the conversation to the macro level, the easier it will be to show you are a political ally to them without getting bogged down in the minutiae.
13	What do you want to bet the T_D is praising him for being a genius and deceiving all the liberals
14	Nobody is afraid of the "liberator". People are afraid of the precedent it sets. Half of this article is essentially saying "this gun sucks, so 3D printing of guns isn't a worry." Does that therefore imply that if in the future a 3D printer can create a reliable and powerful weapon that people are justified in their fears?
15	In his warped mind, this was his gambit to make more people love him. It's backfiring spectacularly. He's not going to get the love from the greater liberal crowd over this, *and* he's alienating his core. This is the *one* issue that's getting people to turn on him. Then again, maybe he really wants out, doesn't want to resign because of his ego, and he's growing impatient? Because, *damn*.
16	Yeah move to Vermont, it's all liberal gun owners.
17	I truly believe that this is an area where education and outreach is vital. The NRA does a terrible job at trying to outreach to liberals, which is one of the reasons they no longer have my support. But we liberals can reach out ourselves and explain our positions to our candidates rationally and clearly. I think we're much more able to change our minds on a subject when someone like-minded makes a good argument.
18	Proper liberalism is liberty, and thus the rights of the people shall be upheld and never infringed.
19	I can do that with my bolt action... Edit: Congratulations, sounds like you're not a liberal, just a single-issue gun voter, on the side of gun-control. Which is a bit hypocritical for someone who says: [quote removed]

20	When there's corruption in government, the liberal solution is to clean house. The Libertarian solution is to burn the house to the ground. The two groups have completely incompatible philosophies about government.
21	I feel attacked! I'll have you know that my 50 shades of purple AR-15 is the most liberal of liberal guns. :p For reals though, I'd love to see peoples pre-boating accident pictures.
22	I was looking for a single stack 9 to CC and the guy told me that open carrying is even more comfortable. When I told him that didn't want people seeing my gun his response was "open carry is great, liberals don't talk to me". As soon as he said that I walked out, there are other gun stores.
23	My point wasn't that Obama was right on everything. My point is to show hypocrisy in politics and the media. A suggestion heard by many of the right leaning pro-gunners after the Florida school shooting was to put more good people with guns in schools. The mainstream liberal media blew this up saying how ridiculous such a recommendation is. Now, whether you agree or disagree with this sentiment is up to you. However, I am providing some info that I found to show that such a policy standpoint was also enacted by an anti-gunner. Therefore, Obama loving anti-gunners can't really get their panties in a bunch over such a recommendation without being hypocrites, unless they cried just as much when Obama pushed it, which I doubt.
24	I meet 90 percent of these guidelines but I have a feeling I'm one of the posters these rules are meant to ban. I want liberal gun owners to have a place where they can interact with each other in safety because I think it's a first step to a democratic party I can vote for, but I caution fighting too hard to cover for over the top panic or hatred that is bred through the right-left paradigm. Democrats aren't all that left-wing, and right-wing Authoritarianism has been increasing on the political left steadily for a while.
25	If their liberal base were more vocal about it they'd back down. The Democratic majority in Delaware tried to pass an assault weapon ban last week. Since they control both houses and the governor's office it was assumed a sure thing. But two Democrats blocked it from coming to a vote and killed it on committee. Since those two Dems represent more rural areas in Delaware they backed down. Now if urban Dems got that same pressure we'd have no worries.
26	I think it's mostly an infiltration attempt with a minority of them being some real people. A lot of those along with the occasional "nobody here is actually liberal because it reads like a pro-NRA message board!". Are we supposed to just shut up and unquestioningly say yes to everything these kids are asking for? I don't get it.
27	A lot of them just emotionally hate and fear gun, or they're just authoritarians who worship safety/order at the expense of liberty (even if they don't realise it and still think themselves liberal), the rationalization is mostly mere afterthought. So they're going to be anti-gun no matter what unless you could somehow convince them on an emotional level.
28	I'm guessing it's shall issue with good amount of liberal shooters?
29	his is my congressman, of all the politicians I've researched, his politics are probably most similar to mine. I'd hate to see him go, but love to see him run. The NRA gives him an A+. Democrat from Wisconsin, liberal on every social issue.

30	I was banned from them last month for advocating liberals start taking up firearms. Still salty, don't get me started. That's why I'm here. Edit: I'd rather we didn't have mass shootings, but they're a fact of life and I'm sick of having my life threatened for being a dem. So, I did what conservatives have been asking me to do for years and bought some firearms.
-----------	--

Table A2: /r/guns Comments Containing “post” Feature

Comment Number	Comment Text
1	lol they're silly people who apparently do and say what everyone else is doing and saying. Therefore I've downvoted this post just to spite it. All guns are great, and I dont downvote Taurus's, I'm downvoting the upvoting.
2	Hello, [username removed]. Per the sidebar rules, link posts require a description in the comments of your post. Please add a description or this post will be removed.
3	Ah yes, /r/firearms, where people who don't read the posting rules of /r/guns go to bitch about /r/guns.
4	That would be fascinating to know! If you get your hands on it, please make a follow up post. I love to read the history of awesome guns like this.
5	[**Good news**] Credit to [username removed] for posting to /r/wa_guns
6	Hey there everyone, this is my [Greener Mk III shotgun] that I got back in March and forgot to post until now. This one was refurbished by Odin Arms in MO and re-chambered to fire 12 gauge instead of the original proprietary 14 gauge.
7	Makarovs are stolen Walther designs, all subsequent Mak posts are rightful Deutsche clay
8	Is this account going to do anything other than post pictures from your publication, with your magazine or company watermark front and center? Asking as a moderator here, just for clarification.
9	Except literally everything about the operating system is different. You say so in your post, open bolt short stroke piston vs long stroke piston rotating bolt. For one thing, short vs long stroke are very different. Not even getting into open vs closed bolt. They're completely different systems at heart. The only thing the M60 took from the FG42 was the grip and the sight. Everything else came from the MG42.
10	People keep posting these damn things and I'm here trying to find a threaded model in .32 ACP without much luck outside of one on gunbroker for \$150 over MSRP. STOP IT before I cave in a buy it anyway!
11	Wanna be Oper8er? Would be my guess. Anyone can build a "work" rifle. It's the internet, it's full of Chairborne Rangers. My CO wouldn't be happy if we posted pics of our "work" gear. Just my experience anyway, but I could be full of crap too. :)
12	I'm of the opinion that because this post is popular it hit the front page of /r/all and this guy saw it was a gun sub and thought gun sub=NRA=right wing=Trump=collusion with Russia. Hence the snarky Russia comment. Could be wrong though. Edit. Looking through his post history this dude is definitely not anti-gun. I was wrong!
13	Hello, [username removed]. Per the sidebar rules, link posts require a description in the comments of your post. Please add a description or this post will be removed.
14	/r/oddlysatisfying Really cool post, no wonder drums can be dubious in reliability and a pain in the ass to load.
15	Yeah; between this and the NY Bill to require someone applying for a permit to possess a firearm turns over their social media passwords the antis are

	really upping the evil levels. Both are downright evil but taking away someone's children is a special kind of evil. This all ties back to the Marxist/Post Modernist view that children as a form of community property.
16	If they had cell phones in WW2 and/or the press had not been censored I cannot imagine. Some captain and his soldiers posing for selfies with destroyed Panzer IV's, some Oberfähnrich posts to IG "LMAO They don't even know how to concentrate armor" with a selfie of his STUG in front of a bunch of burning Russian tanks. The more and more I have gotten into my love of WW2 history the more I realize especially on the Axis side how few photos we have of many different fighting vehicles still in working order. Also are you feeling more [Battle of the bulge now]
17	Hello, [username removed]. Per the sidebar rules, link posts require a description in the comments of your post. Please add a description or this post will be removed.
18	Had a bit of a machine gun shoot last Sunday. We took out about 12 machine guns to celebrate an employee leaving and perusing a career in a different field. If I had to guess how much ammo we blew, it had to be around 6k. I guess people from down the road said it sounded like a war zone. I will be posting more videos from the shoot. Also I should talk about the gun in the video. It's a full auto p90 with a yankee hill machine supressor. As you can see you can write your name with this thing. There are no words to express it. The 5.7x28 cartridge is absolutely Insane.
19	Who looks through another persons post history just to criticize or make assumptions about them?
20	Yeah, I love getting downvoted for multiple posts, when reddit decides to post the same thing three times in a row in a comment thread.
21	Before I bought mine few years back I researched it, read bunch of posts etc and most people preferred the manual safety. Now maybe things have changed recently but I bought it based on that.
22	Post history suggests you're in anti-poaching. If I have that right, you're doing God's work. Poachers are scum. Also, cool gun.
23	How so? "Submit a new link" option allows picture and title, but no follow up information. "Submit new text" option allows title and follow up text, but no image. Sorry if I'm being a dumb, but I've posted here a few times and was never able to post pic and description all at once.
24	I actually haven't. I've only shot the 226, and emperor scorpion but without a doubt the 320 felt more comfortable in my hands than my glock. And you hit the nail on the head, if it fits you it shouldn't matter what everyone else's opinion is. And as for the modularity, I don't plan on building an Arsenal (I say that now ha), I have my eyes on a 1911 in the near future, but other than that to be able to have a pistol that can essentially transform not only its size but its caliber is phenomenal. I'll keep you posted if it comes home!
25	I finally signed up for my NRA lifetime membership and received this sweet new glawk 40 serial number not included! And it came with a handy zippered bag which was really a nice touch. In all seriousness for 6 dollars on amazon for the bag and 200 for a terrible firearm this post just had to happen. Gun is awful, my god just awful. But hunnit lyfe 5ever. Edit: Also holy cow folks just to be clear, NRA didn't actually send me this firearm as a free gift. This was supposed to be a joke.

26	I wasn't aware possums were beneficial I will stop killing them now. I didn't post this with malicious intent. 12ga is more humane than 22lr. You can correct people without calling them retarded.
27	I was Christmas shopping today at a few gun stores and finally came across what I was looking for, a Zenith Z5RS MP5. Like the title stated, I dropped a ridiculous amount of money to have her and will probably have to sell a couple guns to ease the suffering. Scroll through my post history and help me decide which one(s) to let go as none have any sentimental value. The sucky part is that I have to wait a week to take her home. Thanks, Maryland.
28	I'd just go with irons and a top mounted flashlight. If you can mount the flashlight in between the sights and get enough clearance to see the front post. That way the flashlight will light up the front post slightly and basically give a large and fairly visible point of reference while shooting, even when not using the rear sight. A foregrip doesn't really mean much to me but you might want grip tape or something for the action but nah it probably wouldn't work.
29	Will you bastards stop posting these pictures! I wont have an extra \$1000 till June.
30	So, you want to post a photo of a gun and say nothing about it?

Table A3: /r/progun Comments Containing “govern” Feature

Comment Number	Comment Text
1	Rights are not granted to citizens by a government. They are only to be recognized BY the government.
2	I was a born in this city and over the last 20 years our government has slowly restricted and made it harder for the average law-abiding citizen to obtain fire arms. It started with our buy back scheme, shortly after they upgraded police handguns form .38 revolver to semi auto glocks. They then restricted hand gun sales and licensing. Now they are allowing regular police officers access to ar-15s where previously they were reserved for our TRG (S.W.A.T). I'm really concerned about this because I believe every Australian has a right to defend themselves and their property, especially if one day they need to do so against their own government.
3	What I find ironic is that I'm Jewish and many of my friends are Jewish. Almost all of us have direct relatives that barely survived the Holocaust. Yet virtually every one of my friends is clamoring for more gun control, as if they have already forgotten that excessive government control was exactly what made us in particular vulnerable...
4	And this is the biggest problem around the world. We're supposed to think for ourselves, not follow what the government or media says.
5	Our Government is out of control; eliminate the ATF, divide up its duties among other agencies. I hope the plaintiff sues and wins all sought fees for malicious prosecution.
6	I think bump stocks are worthless garbage and I don't want one. That said, fuck anyone who tries to take away my rights or hold me to the same standard as a murderous criminal. I am not willing to be governed by the standard of the lowest common denominator. I am responsible for my own actions, not those of cowardly criminals, and I will not tolerate politicians who treat me like a child who cannot behave responsibly. If we don't fight about stupid bump stocks then we will be allowing harmful precedents to build up against our second amendment rights and the fight for ARs, pistols, standard capacity magazines, etc., will be that much harder to win. "Shall not be infringed" is supposed to mean something.
7	I want to buy a printer, download, and print a Liberator simply to have something in the safe as a massive fuck you to groups and the government who say I should not be able to create and own guns like these.
8	It's the same "logic" that treats cutting government funding for something as outlawing that thing. People are dumb and resort to straw men when they have no actual argument.
9	Nah, let me translate that for you: “I take no personal responsibility for my actions nor my safety. I rely on the government to give me everything I need, and whatever they want in exchange is fine by me. I am prepared to have the will of others imposed on me at all times, and can do nothing about it.” There, that’s better.
10	Then I guess the first amendment is only for printing presses and not for the internet. So the government should be able to control what is said and done online since the bill of rights was only for the 1700s

11	This, 100%. While we're licensing rights, I'm going to need to see that you've been properly vetted before expressing that opinion though. Mandatory government education and maybe a small fee ought to be required before you can vote, as well. Maybe a quick literacy test beforehand, too. I also think that maybe that right to due process is a bit squirrely, yeah? Maybe put a few more hurdles between any yahoo and their 4th Amendment rights. Anyway yeah, all in all, you're right. [No one wants to take your guns.](/r/NOWTTYG)
12	Russia has little government? Venezuela has little government? That place is literally failing because it has TOO MUCH government
13	While I think magazine limits of any kind are silly, I have no problem with police being held to the same standard as other civilians. Why should the police (the state) be allowed to possess something that is prohibited for the rest of the state's inhabitants, especially since the second amendment exists specifically to combat government tyranny?
14	Unfortunately, these days don't want freedom. They want the magical wand of government to fix everything, without realizing the full implications of what they're asking for.
15	To People who use the line "you would never beat the U.S. government in war" I like to say "thank god our Founding Fathers where not the pussies you are and beat the shit out of the most powerful military force on earth at the time with a few rag tag men with rifles, a few crappy artillery pieces, grit and patriotism"
16	In the U.S. Supreme court case Bowers v. Devito: "there is no Constitutional right to be protected by the State against being murdered by criminals or madmen. The Constitution is a charter of negative liberties; it tells the state to let the people alone; it does not require the federal government or the state to provide services, even so elementary a service as maintaining law and order." There is no mutual obligation. In exchange for your vote to the system, you receive a false sense of security.
17	For those that don't know: The amount of kindling in a forest only increases over time, until it's cleared out by a wildfire. Traditionally, the government took an approach to extinguish all fires immediately. As a result, kindling on the ground grew while no fire burned it away for years, until the occasional wildfire that does occur has so much more kindling and burns much faster at much higher temperatures. Trees that would have been fine under a light fire are killed by these hotter fires. In light of this information, the government has taken a different approach, to create small controlled fires to safely burn away the kindling.
18	Once 2 is gone the rest just have a matter of time before they are unrecognizable. By the time you realize you need a firearm they will long since be traded away for a false sense of security. Not saying that the U.S. would devolve into a Nazi Germany or Soviet Union situation, but if the time came that we had to send a wake-up call to the government, I would rather not do that with a black powder rifle or a shotgun.
19	People need to apply this logic to other amendments to see how it applies to the 2nd. Of course you can criticize the government verbally, but free speech accessories like facebook, instagram, twitter, et al. are not protected.
20	Well both of those are authoritarian (especially the way "medicare for all" is setup) nor are they the only things the dems are doing. You have dems like

	Sanders wanting 90+% tax rates on even people in the middle class. He's also urged workers to literally steal companies and make the "public" (i.e. government) controlled. I could also talk about Oscar-Cortez but that's like beating a 2-year-old in Dark Souls.
21	I'm sorry but that is absolutely not true. Its pretty universally agreed that the Bengal famine was fueled massively by the refusal of the British government, especially Churchill, to divert food supplies from North Africa, where they weren't needed anyways. Churchill was very comfortable with starving millions of Indians to death if it convinced the Japanese to delay their invasion of the subcontinent.
22	Because civilians killing each other (remember over 2/3rds of that figure you stated are suicides) absolutely pales in comparison to when a government decides that it's time to start killing civilians. If the government decides that's a good idea, you better believe there's a very large section of the population that will be executing anyone in a uniform.
23	It was "Death by Government" by R. J. Rummel that convinced me.
24	The leaders want people to be dependent on the government. Government-dependent citizens won't challenge the government.
25	Well no shit I'm not going to turn in anything, and I don't think our government wants to pay fair market value for everything either.
26	As a British person, I apologise on our behalf off for these utter nincompoops. I also apologise for having a government that doesn't allow us to defend ourselves. I'm genuinely discomfited by the actions our government has taken, and I actually wanted to purchase Swiss Army knife when I turn 18... wonder when that becomes illegal.
27	We should all be up in arms that essentially our own government is threatening war and nuclear annihilation just to infringe on the constitutionally protected rights of all Americans. He needs to be forced to resign.
28	About time we had some facts out there. Lets put this in perspective...control nuts love to claim we have such a huge proportion of guns compared to other countries...but we are 56th in shootings. Hmmm...sounds like an inconvenient truth for gun rights abolitionists doesn't it? Freedom and leadership is why everyone has looked up to America so long. Let's also lead with respect to maintaining gun rights and the other constitutional freedoms our founders wisely constructed. We aren't perfect, but probably the best humans can do for a free nation and democratic republic style Government.
29	Liberals laugh when you bring up the tyrannical government thing despite calling Trump a fascist. That argument is a no go for most anti-gunners.
30	In the U.S. we are granted our rights by natural law. Our constitution states it so, governments are instituted among men to guarantee these rights. The government doesn't have the power to take away what it never had the power to bestow. Only cowards bow before kings.

Table A4: /r/liberalgunowners Comments Containing “govern” Feature

Comment Number	Comment Text
1	People talk about “what if Dems were pro-gun” and I wonder “what if GOPrs weren’t anti-marijuana”? If they actually pushed individual freedom instead of backwards government intrusion.
2	All the guns he wants so long as he can provide the government with a valid need for them, never carries them loaded, and so long as they all fall within government sanctioned criteria and get government approval. I'm not positive of the law in Ireland, but if it's anything like the rest of that area of the world, you're almost shit out of luck if you use any of those guns to defend yourself, too. Christ, they're talking about legislating pointy knives. Almost everything you post is a fucking joke. People like you, urging more and more concessions (concessions that don't even work), are way worse than any of the "not one more inch" type. Maybe that's your goal, though.
3	Exactly. People just oppose/support whatever form of governing fits them at that moment. This thread doesn't like citizen initiatives because it's not working for them. But what happens when legislatures are anti-2A? Are you anti-republicanism then? What if courts are anti-2A? Are you anti-courts? Democracy is and always has been imperfect. That doesn't mean it can't be improved.
4	Another example of why the 2nd Amendment is important. It's not just from protection against the Federal Government, but any group including private corporations who may use force to get their ways.
5	Yep. They hate guns so much they want the government to use guns to murder each and every one of us. And they call us the crazy, violent ones.
6	It should absolutely scare anyone and everyone. If the government can change what an amendment means without passing a new amendment then basically anything and everything is at risk anytime we have an election.
7	Your employer didn't come up with this. It's a widely adopted concept, endorsed by government and law enforcement. It's intended for the average civilian, employee or college student who isn't armed. In the absence of armed opposition to an active shooter, these are your best options.
8	"Gun control seems to be the hill the Democrats want to die on." The hill they've died on. IMHO, this particular platform is the primary reason that they control, and will continue to control exactly none of the Federal government. Many voters I know will openly agree with just about everything the Dems stand for, but then candidates start blowing their "gun control" dog whistle and these same people throw their hands in the air and check the other box.
9	If the NRA were serious about defending gun ownership, at a minimum they would shut the hell up. People like Trump are the REASON that the 2nd amendment is important. Gun owners win by converting Democrats, not by trying to silence them. Let Democrats spend some time being afraid of their government, they'll come around...
10	I don't think the wording is that difficult to understand. Using similar wording *The people* have a right to have and use books. Why? Because schools are necessary to the education of a free state. Nothing in there says *only the government is allowed to have books*, or that the central government is required to have total control of the schools. It just states

	schools as the reason *people have the right to books.* I think 90% of the confusion is willful misunderstanding.
11	Now now, root-cause analysis makes too much sense for government work. Let's just raise the price of insulin, ban guns, and roll back funding for the VA and Planned Parenthood and call it a day? In all seriousness, the two-party system is ruining this country because it has a knack of catering to the most extreme voices on either side. And none of those voices care about science or the constitution...especially when it gets in their way.
12	Right, wtf kind of parenting is that. Even if it were justified with little children, why would they think that the government has the same role as overbearing parents? Not to mention that we know how overbearing parenting works on a household scale with sex/drugs and on a national scale with drugs
13	It boggles my mind what the message of the Democratic party seems to be this year. "Our country has been taken over by an agent of a foreign and hostile government, now give up your guns."
14	Does anyone have the bill number? Like good Yankees, MA operates under some extremely open government rules so every single bill is digitized at every stage. I want to make sure we've got a source we can use in this discussion that can't be disputed. "Read the bill" is a lot stronger of an argument than "I got an email from a gun rights group." Edit: All I've found is this, from 2017 [quote removed]
15	Wouldn't have to explain themselves but they did. Since there's a law making the gun in his vehicle authorized and his employer was a government agency I think this might have legs.
16	Bingo. Now do the Dems, please. And then the Uniparty theory and how it leaves people like us twisting in the wind. If anyone here thinks any cog or cog puller in the machine of government is going to advocate for Your liberties, which by nature reduces their power, I got some bridges for sale cheap.
17	i have the same heritage as you and marvel at the people who are so anti-2a that they want no one to have firearms. the 2nd Amendment does not actually exist to allow people to protect themselves from their immediate surroundings. it exists to protect people *from* the government. no one will win that fight against the govt, but it would be damn ugly and has been enough of a deterrent thus far. the sooner everyone understands that the better off we will be. i am still for keeping guns out of the hands of kids, but i don't support doing away with it for this reason.
18	So when the first amendment refers to "the right of the people", it's an individual right. When the fourth amendment refers to "the right of the people", it's an individual right. But when the second amendment refers to "the right of the people", it's somehow a collective right held by the federal government? How does that work, exactly?
19	Yes and no. The government should NOT compel you to fight and die for another nation (Afghanistan/Vietnam/ww1/etc). But the government should if to defend your own nation's lands and it's people. So like for a more dire circumstances.
20	The silence of the NRA and other supposed Second Amendment groups when government agents kill people for exercising their Second Amendment rights is damning.

21	Putting historical context aside, I always found it odd the position of the 2A when placed against the other 9 in the Bill of Rights. Every other Amendment offers more freedoms to “the people” and restricts the power the government has over those people. Yet there are those who argue that the 2A does not offer individual people the right to bear arms. It’s the odd one out then? So “the people” need to be in a militia in order to earn more freedom over their government? So it’s the one Amendment with a caveat? In order for X you must have Y?
22	Just how far up the Government's ass is the NRA?
23	Right, so the guy who helped facilitate the executive branch usurping Congress to ***[trade arms to Iran in exchange for hostages] and then cover up for it is a “total warrior” for freedom. Because funding an [actual terrorist organization](The Contras) to overthrow Nicaragua's government is something American gun owners should be associated with. Great. Was there literally no one else?
24	Which, as a government agency, makes sense. Can you imagine the DOJ advocating for a 25% reduction in free speech over the next decade because it determined that words incite violence? Government agencies attacking the Constitution would be chaos
25	I just think it's kind of disingenuous to chastise people for a behavior that you, the government, are forcing them to engage in. Abandoning guns in unlocked cars at all times is one thing, but if you're talking specifically about guns getting stolen out of cars in the parking lot of a football game, it's clear why so many are there in the first place. If the police care so much, maybe they should be posting officers to monitor the parking lots of their gun free zones?
26	Why do people think the declaration of independence has any legal force? And how does a government enforce my right to happiness?
27	Yes. Pro-gun people love training. They just don't want to give the government control over it.
28	They've had gun registry for a long time. I believe the Germans used it to disarm the population once they got the records in World War 2. A gay man called Willem Arondeus blew up some government records to hamper the Germans hunting for Jews, and was executed for it.
29	I'm a progressive as well, but stuff like this is why I hope for an obstructionist government where neither party can get anything done. We need one of the parties to die, or split, or reform. Right now both are terrible to different degrees.
30	He works for the city iirc. That might have some interaction with At Will Employment as he's technically a government employee.

Table A5: /r/progun Comments Containing “crime” Feature

Comment Number	Comment Text
1	Not true if you're buying them legally. ARs are very inexpensive. Buying them illegally, maybe... sure... firearms degrade in value the more crimes they're used in. Since rifles are rarely used, their price doesn't really diminish. Can't intimate into the mind of a mass shooter, but it's not a stretch to assume they pick pistols for concealability and availability. It's harder to walk around with an AR than it is with a pistol tucked in your waistband. That's most likely it. If it were a price issue, they'd go with an AR that costs about as much as a pistol and has even more affordable magazines and sometimes ammunition. But they don't. Because a pistol is just as good at killing people as an AR is.
2	To be fair, I live in NYC. Lawmakers aren't taking them away, people are giving them away. Most of the people I've met here, by and large, want garbage like this. They support, hell even *fight* to get confiscation. It's so interesting hearing one of my neoliberal friends, in one breath, banter about how ridiculous it is to ban marijuana because “people will just get it anyway”, and in the next sentence praise laws that ban cosmetic attachments on firearms seldomly used in crime. Absolutely astounding.
3	"Perpetrators hold the right to life, like all citizens. This bill guarantees them the choice, immediately cease from their violent conduct or crime and submit, or confront a law-abiding citizen with violence, and risk death"
4	How many crimes did he commit with the gun? Or is keeping his service rifle that he used to defend the nation his only "crime"?
5	Rednecks... almost like they don't know the demographics of gun crime.
6	For those not in the know: "swatting" is a crime akin to filing a false police report, and if you spoof your phone number attempting to not get caught; you could be charged with state hacking crimes or federal ones if you call across state lines.
7	If the police department is reviewing a gang assault, a robbery, some type of shooting, they go and do a social media profile investigation,” Adams said. So they openly admit exercising your rights should be treated like a crime.
8	In every state that makes this claim, blaming other states loose gun laws, the fact is that the highest source for crime guns is the state itself. Check the ATF reports. The highest source for crime guns in NY is NY. For Illinois, it's illinois. Blaming other states is demonstrably BS.
9	Nobody really wins in a knife fight, the "winner" is the person who dies last. The idea that the poster has that with some "basic self-defense" someone with a knife is not dangerous is insane. After the U.K. banned guns knife crimes have dropped to zero.
10	Police are not a means of crime prevention. Police are solely a means of crime investigation. When seconds matter the police are minutes away.
11	...has .408 Cheytac been used in a single violent crime, anywhere, ever ?
12	Ok, I'm all for treating replica guns as real guns **when they are used in the course of a violent crime**. But this is completely absurd.
13	You didn't catch the reference to growing up with an absent Swiss father and a black mother, when he was literally born a crime?
14	Disagree, it's a lovely place for crime, it's a terrible place to be law abiding.

15	5 years later..."Guess what everyone! Crime rates have changed 0%! But don't we FEEL good?
16	"We're claiming your property and assets as civil forfeiture as they are linked to your crime."
17	I agree with this sentiment. It is a charge that will be added in addition to whatever crimes a resident is originally accused of.
18	So if a Muslim commits an act of terrorism in the name of Islam, we're not supposed to criticize Islam... ... but crimes committed by non-NRA members, and not done in the name of the NRA, should be blamed on the NRA?
19	...that's because suicide, like overall violence rates, is basically not linked to the number of guns in circulation when you truly step back and take a macro view. Both of these problems have more to do with overall wealth, wealth disparity, and other social issues. The reverse is also true: High gun ownership rates don't really have much of an impact on crime in a positive way. However, since this is a _free fucking country_, I don't need to justify owning a goddamned gun, so it _doesn't fucking matter_.
20	The only reason marijuana is still a schedule 1 substance is to put people into profit prisons. At what point is it acceptable/unacceptable for someone to protect themself? Just because you're a criminal (using the term lightly since marijuana is a joke crime) are you not allowed to defend yourself? Once you're a criminal the only option is to call the police and just lie down and die?
21	Private party sellers: 1. are not **allowed** to perform background checks 2. are held liable for any crime committed with the firearm. Which is why most private sales end up going to a LGS ² so a NICS ³ check can be run.
22	I wish the anti-gun folks would just simply say "Hey, we just don't like guns and that's all there is to it." I could at least respect them for their honesty then. But this whole facade they put on about trying to stop crime/murder is ridiculous and not based in reality. A little while ago I dropped the aforementioned stats on a guy who tried saying that this stuff only happens in the U.S. He immediately replied with "well stats can be manipulated" and then continued on with his babbling.
23	I agree we shouldn't use this as it won't help our argument even if causation is properly established. That said, it appears there is evidence of correlation between gun carrying crimes and fatherlessness. However I've not read this study. While OP made no comment, let alone one about race, I'm not sure the comment from [username removed] is relevant. However it appears to be accurate.[source I've not validated data from](
24	Meanwhile, over here the government are trying to ban .50s and MARS-mechanism rifles. Despite there not being a *single instance* of their use in a crime. London and a couple of other major cities have reasonably serious gun and knife crime problems (nothing like, say Chicago, or Baltimore), and any government that can say they 'placed more restrictions on firearms ownership' will have the media spin it as a *major victory against gun crime* , even though it won't change a damn thing.

² In this context, LGS likely stands for "Local Gun Shop."

³ NICS stands for "National Instant Criminal Background Check System," which is designed to prevent individuals with criminal records from purchasing firearms in the U.S.

25	This is fucking ridiculous. This isn't to curb crime. This is to punish gun owners.
26	Oh hey. You're back. Saying something you've said before. I still find it hilarious that you're recognizing you need guns to defend yourself while accusing half of the country of future crimes that they somehow haven't done so far but will magically just start doing without warning.
27	It's not gun violence that you should be concerned with. The gun is just the tool used; without it another will just be used instead. You have to look at all violence to get a fair measurement of anything. When you do this, the U.S. is 4-5 times lower in violent crime rates, while maintaining a very similar murder rate. When you break it down on a smaller scale, the more legal guns in an area, the lower the crime rate is across the board.
28	Whereas when I stop carrying a gun/knife, the risks of being a victim of crime simply disappear? Criminals don't attack unarmed people? It turns out that <u>not</u> having a gun/knife is a magical talisman that prevents me being a victim of crime! Who would've thunk it?
29	And every country that has banned firearms now has 0 shootings, gun crime, or any violent crime at all. It completely solved all the problems.
30	Ah so only LEO ⁴ can have the rights to defend themselves when convenient... Us normies are just left to die. What about domestic abusers who are out for blood? Do their spouses not get the same rights to protect themselves from their stalker exes? I didn't know crime could discriminate...

⁴ LEO likely stands for "Law Enforcement Officer."

Table A6: /r/liberalgunowners Comments Containing “crime” Feature

Comment Number	Comment Text
1	You can't just blame other states for why ubcs don't work. According to [this](the majority of guns used in crimes are obtained in-state, both in california and nation-wide. Ubc's also haven't stopped, for example, australia from wanting to ban pump action shotguns.
2	Thought crimes now? Violating a lot of his rights here, 1st, 2nd, 4th and 6th. I mean the guy is a piece of shit when he praises cop killers and the like. But he has every inherent right to say it. So long as he is not directly calling for their murder. That would be incitement of violence and not protected free speech.
3	And yet, somehow, their violent crime rate [seems virtually unaffected](It's almost as if it's not the guns that cause the crime. And yet, I'm a conspiracy theory nut job when I suggest that maybe, *just maybe*, crime isn't the reason guns are being restricted.
4	It's naked victim blaming with financial consequences if your guns get stolen. The legitimate owner will be on the hook for rate increases if a criminal steals their gun and uses it in a crime. Make no mistake: it isn't designed to compensate victims at all, its true purpose is purely to add yet another layer of risk and burden to legal ownership for the sole purpose of further disenfranchising the lower classes from their natural and constitutionally-protected right to bear arms.
5	I'm from Texas. I'd say it's normal to own a gun here, even for liberals. I didn't grow up in the country, but many of my kinfolk used to live in the country, so I grew up used to seeing guns in a non-criminal context. I think being anti-gun is associated with liberalism mainly because so many city folk are liberals, and most city folk have little exposure to guns outside of their use in murders and crime in the big city.
6	There are two schools of thought here: 1) Don't attract undue attention to yourself. 2) Carrying a gun is not a crime, and letting people THINK that carrying a gun is a crime is a quick, narrow path to being disarmed permanently. Both ideas have validity. Regardless, the only thing anti-gun people learn from guys like this, is that open carry is legal and concealed carry requires a license.
7	Any form of gun control normally results in near, or total disarmament. It stopped being a slippery slope a long time ago. From the U.K. registries to now calls for Kitchen Knife bans, the slope is clear. O I love this one, be sure to focus only on gun deaths and ignore crime, murder, rape, burglary, robbery etc. O and be sure to ignore the crime spikes following their gun bans. That's an area I especially love. And be sure to go out of your way to ignore academic studies that contradict what your journalists tell you, and definitely do not use official statistics, those are the devil. Also be sure to ignore other explanations, that is critical, otherwise you might be able to see things from another PoV.
8	For me there is only one organization who should be able to say if a gun should be removed from someone and that is a court of law. Be this by crime, mental health or any other issue. Due process needs to be allowed no matter what. As for what happens when they are removed from someone that

	is a good question. I would say they get sold with the owner getting the money
9	The liberal base is urban. Urban people mostly experience guns through the lens of violent crime. The conservative base is, or at least wishes it was, rural. Rural people usually encounter guns in the context of recreation or utility. That's pretty much the entire story. It's a reflection of Americas Rural/urban divide.
10	It's gonna be funny when they try to call the cops on a bunch of people not breaking any laws, and then the cops have to explain to them that being black while wearing a red bandana is not a crime.
11	Uhh clearly you weren't paying attention to the song. If you take guns away from police and criminals, nobody dies apparently. Crime just stops. All the murders committed with knives/clubs/bear hands etc. will be a thing of the past.
12	Just remember: The modern world is more peaceful than ever. Schools are safer today as compared to the 80s and 90s. America has experienced a more than two decade long trend of decline in the homicide and violent crime rates bringing us to near 40 year record lows. Don't like the fear mongering for ad revenue get you down!
13	I mentioned cheap guns being a contributor to crime when talking to a sheriff long ago. I strongly inferred that cheap guns should be banned; or taxes levied to make them harder to come by; and he schooled me with his answer: "Do you think poor people shouldn't have the ability to defend themselves?" I thought for a few seconds, and said "Yes. You have a good point there." He changed my mind on the spot.
14	The gun debate is interesting because the Dem party has gotten nearly every point that they repeat wrong: * They think that gun owners are a small group of Americans, and that the rate of ownership is decreasing. * They think that the NRA is an industry lobbyist and that its power comes from directly bribing politicians. * They think that assault weapons are uncommon in legal use and prevalent in violent crime. * They think that concealed/open carry increases crime. Still. * They think that polls showing support for gun control mean actual votes for gun control.
15	I always find it ironic when British try to tell Americans they do something wrong. Do you even remember why the United States is a sovereign country? Still don't understand why? There's no **need** to remove guns from America overnight. Or over centuries. Okay, that's fine. We're a free country, you may have you opinion and not own one. Ever heard about violent crimes? That's the point.
16	So you mean there are criminals who are doing crimes with U_S_ guns? Somebody ought to enforce the law. Good thing we're locking babies in cages so they don't try to smuggle guns into Mexico.
17	Mother Jones excludes shooting connected with other crimes.
18	Such activism has been going on for a long time. Over a century ago, we had the temperance movement in which battered women and abused children believe criminalizing alcohol would lead to a better society. Instead, it lead to the largest increase in crime in our history.
19	Getting convicted of a violent crime would get him denied, I guess.
20	This exactly. Handguns are the weapon used in *over 90% of all gun crime* in the U.S. according to FBI statistics. Meanwhile, so-called "assault

	<p>weapons", as an example, are used in *less than 5%*. Anyone who genuinely cares about gun crime and saving lives should theoretically be almost entirely focused on handguns, yet there is much more of a push to ban "assault weapons". Why? Handguns mostly kill poor and brown people. General violence doesn't really affect well-off white people so much, so politicians don't care about it. "Assault weapons" look *scary* to many those same well-off white people, though, so they care about those... even though they contribute *almost nothing* to gun violence in general.</p>
21	<p>A threat is assault under the law everywhere I've looked in the US. The crimes of assault, assault and battery, and aggravated assault all involve intentional harm inflicted on one person by another. Any crime involving a physical attack (**or even the threat of an attack**) is usually classified as an assault, a battery, or both. So the question is where do you draw the line, then? At what point are you ok with the state revoking someone's civil rights without due process having been followed? Even the ACLU is against these red flag laws -</p>
22	<p>Good. Crime rates are lower now than they have been in 40 or 50 years. The danger posed by guns is vastly overrated.</p>
23	<p>Especially since those who **might** even have a propensity to commit crime (APDs/psychopaths/NPDS/BPDS) NEVER GET DIAGNOSED ANYWAY AS THEY AVOID DIAGNOSIS AS A PART OF THEIR DISORDER, AND THUS THE RARE FEW THAT ACTUALLY SEEK TREATMENT WOULD BE EVEN LESS LIKELY TOO.</p>
24	<p>Yes. You would have committed a crime and you *could* be prosecuted.</p>
25	<p>Possessing knowledge of "military tactics" is not a crime.</p>
26	<p>What could the criminal have done to not arm himself? Maybe start with "not breaking into cars". There is literally no difference between your argument and blaming a rape victim for "asking for it". The proper response is not to demand the victim answer for why they didn't stop the criminal. I don't understand why people apply this magical thinking to firearms. If someone gets their TV stolen, we don't order them to explain why they allowed it to be stolen. But guns are magic so we're expected to magically divine the intentions of criminals and stop them so we don't get blamed for their crimes. Got a problem with gun theft? Take it up with the assholes thieving guns.</p>
27	<p>Strange, most Republicans don't support gay and transgender rights, religious freedom (Muslims and atheists included), open borders, greatly cutting military spending, increased funding for public schools, a complete and immediate end on the war on drugs, including legalizing and decriminalizing all drugs and releasing every single person convicted of a drug crime, an end of all wars in the middle east, an increased budget for NASA, abolishing all torture practices and capital punishment, sanctioning Russia for tampering with U_S_ elections, invading Ukraine, and generally just being a massive dick, but since I'm pro-gun and don't think all cops should die, I'm basically an alt-right neo-Nazi. Makes sense.</p>
28	<p>What stats are you finding? Made up statistics from anti-gun groups or those from a valid source such as the FBI? Most stats showing crime statistics including gun violence are showing a downward trend, even in Chicago. I will have to dig up sources later.</p>

29	I think when we're talking about rights, we should be asking \"why not\" rather than \"why\". If you can find evidence that suggests that legal carry on campus is connected to violent crime or some other negative effect, that would be a more meaningful start to a conversation
30	That's nonsense. Our rights aren't contingent upon a fraction of a fraction of a percent of crazy people who commit crimes. By that standard are you ok with your phone being tapped and your emails and instant messages being read because it'll deter terrorist attacks? It's a shitty argument used by authoritarians to get people to relinquish their rights out of fear. I'm not playing this game.

Table A7: /r/liberalgunowners Comments Containing “nra” Feature

Comment Number	Comment Text
1	Think of the long game, once the NRA becomes a total joke so will the only organization capable of defending the 2nd amendment. Putting all your eggs in one mentally ill basket isn't very safe.
2	"NRA MEMEBER TAKES ON HIS OWN ORGANIZATION IN HOPES OF CHANGE FOR MORE GUN CONTROL!"
3	"And where's the NRA outrage on this? *crickets*"
4	Also the Russians, don't forget them. I think people are assuming that their members are drying up because they are seeing the light on gun control, not because they are fed up with the NRA and going to other organizations.
5	I appreciate any mention of Peterson. Some of his ideas are a little far out but he is helping so many people take control of their lives again. As for Colion Noir, there was a post on this sub last night that featured a few of his videos. I hope he stays more sensible and becomes one of the new top voices in the NRA elite which can help foster change in that organization's tactics and image.
6	Pretty spot on. The public at large, ESPECIALLY the anti-gun public, has no clue what's going on with gun culture right now internally. We are splintered and moving away from the NRA for exactly the reason you stated above; they aren't pro-gun enough and they have become a GOP mouthpiece for unrelated matters. I think this was either lazily done and can be chalked up to incompetence or it was done intentionally. With this huge, simultaneous , coordinated push by all the mainstream media to brainwash uninformed people to being against AR-15's I'm not too sure this was not done on purpose.
7	It's curious that Russia, notorious for being Anti Gun, would pursue a pro gun organization (the NRA). Did they just feel it was a divisive target to sow division...?
8	The NRA of today is tonedeaf, overwhelming and fanatically involved in conservative issues outside of their mandate, etc...However, they are also very different than the NRA of the mulford act. It was a bipartisan bill that made it through a democratically controlled house. There was tons of racists blame to go around in the 60s.
9	While I would prefer the ACLU not become as partisan as the NRA has, it's hard when the President is openly contemptuous of many civil liberties.
10	I don't think the NRA is racist, necessarily. As others have pointed out in the past, they will not side with gun owners of any race when its a police shooting. What good is a guns rights organization that is entirely on the side of LE over gun owners? I agree with you 1000% they are boot lickers.
11	...except the NRA's power structure doesn't work like that. And oh look, another article about guns that calls gun owners rightwing terrorists. How productive!
12	Nobody on the left “forced” them to make the crazy fucking ad seen here calling for a soft civil war on journalists and colleges. These aren't typical pitfalls. This is lunacy. These are people who gave a “courage award” to Ajit Pai and made known traitor Oliver North. To me this says the NRA would trade the First Amendment for the Second and only care about free speech

	that works to their benefit. To me this says the NRA would rather stir up controversy and appoint criminals to gain support than to argue for the Second Amendment in good faith.
13	This is entirely false. The NRA is not the sole gun rights lobbying organization in America. They're just the biggest and loudest. Edit: loving the mobile goalposts in these replies
14	You forgot Daniel Shaver - The ugly truth is that the NRA doesn't speak out about these abuses. The only time the NRA comments on shootings is when it is Police Officers on the wrong end such as in Dallas. They really don't seem to care about the rest of us peons.
15	We all ask: why doesn't the NRA say anything about police shooting incidents? Well, now they did: to announce that the police should shoot people in their own homes. Not a peep otherwise. Not even from Colion Noir. They're nothing but an Alt-Right lobby group. Just blatant Alt-Right. I will never give them a dime and I will do anything I can to convince others to stop supporting them.
16	I never liked the way LaPierre ran things and finally left when the us vs them attack ad came out a few years ago. Putting in fuckin' Ollie North as his successor reinforced my decision to the point I travel 4 hours to the nearest non-NRA range these days for range time. Don't know about Kansas, but try finding ranges that are on leased federal lands rather than privately owned it seems most of those do not require NRA membership to utilize.
17	The largest gun rights organization is calling people and starting the conversation by supporting trump and whining about hillary clinton and george soros. What a shame. The 2nd amendment should be non partisan and the NRA is not helping.
18	Obligatory fuck the NRA, etc, but I'm afraid this whole narrative is pretty BS on all counts: 1. [The NRA isn't against 3D printed guns](1. [The NRA gets most of its money from individual contributors and membership dues](not manufacturers. And [it gets almost all of its clout from the voting bloc those individuals represents, not the money it donates to politicians](
19	When the NRA needed an expert at laundering money from a hostile foreign power, they knew who to turn to.
20	Our club required NRA membership to join - but there is no requirement to remain a member once you have joined. What has amazed me is the number of mailings I've received from the NRA through the years. The cost involved in sending all that paper begging for money is appalling. And then those changes to the By-Laws of the NRA regarding electing Board members - that was just too much for me. My money goes to support other 2A groups.
21	This. The NRA Twitter account may have acted incendiary but that was the whole point. On this social experiment, I agree with the NRA 100 percent (never thought I'd say those words lol)
22	I swear I saw a rather anti-gun video on YouTube from him. EDIT: it was NRA hate
23	When people started trying to ban guns. The NFA didn't really set it off because it affected what at the time were very niche categories of gun owners. But the 1968 GCA created the FFL system and affected every gun buyer in the country. The NRA entered into political advocacy shortly after that law.

24	Shoutout to governor Ronald Reagan passing gun control in California at the behest of the NRA to curb the gun rights of the Black Panther Party in case you were wondering if the NRA and the Republican Party's support for blanket gun ownership should be taken at face value.
25	Boy, way to strawman the ever-loving shit out of everyone but you! So would most of us but you might have noticed there's approximately *zero* willingness on their part to work with us. Hell, they won't even acknowledge we exist! Opposition to their anti-gun agenda is always chalked up to "the gun lobby," of the NRA, or Russian trolls.
26	You're right, I don't dispute this. But I still maintain the NRA as an unwitting stooge as opposed to a treasonous organization.
27	Yeah Hillary lost the election because she said some dumb stuff about taking away coal jobs weeks before the election when the most important swing states this time around rely on coal mining. Even without Bernie, Comey, and the Russians it would have turned out the same. At least the republicans didn't want Trump to begin with, the democrats found the one person on earth who could lose to him. I feel like the DNC is more responsible for Trump than the Russians or the NRA.
28	The silence of the NRA and other supposed Second Amendment groups when government agents kill people for exercising their Second Amendment rights is damning.
29	posted the kiro7 link a few days ago. its not just the NRA suing. Its also the local 2A group SAF.
30	This is something I have been worried about. It will be used against every pro-gun argument and anyone who espouses pro-gun positions. From the article/Senator Wyden's letter to the NRA: While I don't know the extent as to what they have been doing since the election, which is where/when I thought most of this was going down based on previous reports, now the argument will be, "If you disagree with the March for Lives, you are a Russian shill." It also already falls into line with the criticism that myself and many other gun owners have levied against the NRA: that they have become more concerned with being the National Republican Association and less concerned with being the National Rifle Association.