



Written by [Bob Adelman](#) on August 15, 2020

## New York City's Largest Police Union Endorses Trump

[The endorsement](#) of President Donald Trump for president by the Police Benevolent Association of the City of New York (PBA) on Friday comes just a month after a similar endorsement from the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO).



Said PBA President Patrick Lynch:

I have 36 years in this job, 21 as a president of this fine organization. I cannot remember when we've ever endorsed for the office of president of the United States until now. That's how important this is.

Mr. President, we are fighting for our lives out there. We don't want this to spread to the rest of this country.

Now, many times people say that a union like ours, a law enforcement group, gives endorsements [freely]. Not in the New York City PBA, sir. In the New York City PBA, Mr. President, you earn the endorsement and you've earned this endorsement. I'm proud to give it.

The two police organizations together represent more than 275,000 law-enforcement personnel. What's remarkable is that NAPO endorsed the Obama-Biden ticket in 2008 and in 2012, while the PBA in the past has endorsed anti-gunners Michael Bloomberg for mayor of New York City and Andrew Cuomo for governor.

It's also remarkable that citizens are exercising their Second Amendment rights by buying firearms at record rates. The *Washington Free Beacon*, after analyzing FBI data, reported that July 2020 saw an estimated 1,795,602 gun sales — a new record and an increase of 133 percent over July 2019. It was the fifth straight month of record gun sales.

The Second Amendment also enjoyed a victory with a ruling by a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on Friday that California's ban on "high-capacity" firearms magazines violated it.

Judge Kenneth Lee wrote the majority opinion:

California's near-categorical ban of LCMs strikes at the core of the Second Amendment — the right to armed self-defense. Armed self-defense is a fundamental right rooted in tradition and the text of the Second Amendment.

Indeed, from pre-colonial times to today's post-modern era, the right to defend hearth and home has remained paramount.

California's law imposes a substantial burden on this right to self-defense. The ban makes it criminal for Californians to own magazines that come standard in Glocks, Berettas, and other handguns that are staples of self-defense.

Its scope is so sweeping that half of all magazines in America are now unlawful to own in California.



Written by [Bob Adelman](#) on August 15, 2020

---

Even law-abiding citizens, regardless of their training and track record, must alter or turn over to the state any LCMs that they may have legally owned for years — or face up to a year in jail.

But the Second Amendment overrides California's zeal in banning LCMs:

The Second Amendment limits the state's ability to second-guess a citizen's choice of arms if it imposes a substantial burden on her right to self-defense....

California's almost blanket ban on LCMs goes too far in substantially burdening the people's right to self-defense.

We affirm the [lower] district court's summary judgment, and hold that California Penal Code section 32310's ban on LCMs runs afoul of the Second Amendment.

Lee concluded:

We understand the purpose in passing this law. But even the laudable goal of reducing gun violence must comply with the Constitution.

California's near-categorical ban of LCMs infringes on the fundamental right to self-defense. It criminalizes the possession of half of all magazines in America today. It makes unlawful magazines that are commonly used in handguns by law-abiding citizens for self-defense.

And it substantially burdens the core right of self-defense guaranteed to the people under the Second Amendment. It cannot stand.

We AFFIRM the district court's grant of summary judgment for plaintiffs-appellees.

At this very moment in time enters one of the most rabid anti-gun politicians in the country to run for president of the United States: liberal Democrat Senator Kamala Harris from California. Yes, she's essentially running for president by running as Joe Biden's running-mate. As soon as Biden (should he be elected) abdicates his position as president — expected by many to occur in his first year as president if not even sooner — Harris as president can be expected to roll out a series of anti-gun executive orders that she's been pushing for years.

Back in April she announced one of the most comprehensive anti-gun, anti-Second Amendment and unconstitutional programs ever seen.

She told CBS News:

Upon being elected, I will give the United States Congress 100 days to get their act together and have the courage to pass reasonable gun safety laws and if they fail to do it, then I will take executive action and specifically what I would do is put in a requirement for anyone who sells more than five guns a year, they are required to do background checks when they sell those guns.

I will require for any gun dealer that breaks the law, the ATF take their license.

In addition, she would work to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act passed in 2005 that protects firearms manufacturers and dealers from being held liable when crimes have been committed with their products.

Interestingly, she told CBS News that she would also work to ban "high-capacity" magazines. But the ruling from the Ninth Circuit upsets her apple-cart, along with any plans she has to ban "assault rifles" that require LCMs to function.

Harris, in other words, arrives on the political scene at exactly the wrong place and exactly the wrong



Written by [Bob Adelman](#) on August 15, 2020

---

time. Her aggressive anti-gun stance puts her swimming upstream against an increasing current of citizens exercising and enjoying their Second Amendment rights.

It's also relevant to note that 2.5 million of those purchasing firearms over the last five months have never purchased one before. Here's a rhetorical question: How many of them are likely to vote for a politician who is threatening to take their guns away? As Johnathan Jones wryly noted at the Western Journal, this "could be an indicator of things to come in November."

*Photo of President Trump: AP Images*

*An Ivy League graduate and former investment advisor, Bob is a regular contributor to The New American primarily on economics and politics. He can be reached at [badelman@thenewamerican.com](mailto:badelman@thenewamerican.com).*

*Related articles:*

[Politico Announces Kamala Harris as Biden's VP Pick, Then Scrubs Story With Apology](#)

[Trump's Endorsement by the NRA Was Expected; the One From the NAPO Was Not](#)



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

[Subscribe](#)