**Civil rights expert on Texas shooting:**

**Pam Geller’s hate group got ‘the response they were seeking’**

**by David Edwards of Raw Story**

***Mark Potok, a senior fellow at the Southern Poverty Law Center SPLC, said that he was not surprised that Pam Geller’s anti-Muslim group had been targeted by gunmen in Texas because she seemed to be trying to provoke that response.***

**Dave, have you noticed how homophobes go nuts when their bigotry is compared to racism in the 1950's?**

**It's because the analogy is accurate and they have no defense, so their only hope is to convince everyone that the analogy is false. Now watch this Dave:**

**I'll bet Mark isn't surprised when a good-looking young woman, who is dressed sexily, is raped, huh? She provoked it, right?**

**That's the analogy that applies to what Mark said above. He is blaming the victim. Naturally, Muslim apologists will go nuts because the analogy is dead on, and like the Homophobes, they must convince the audience to reject the analogy.**

**Dave, think about how utterly stupid, Mark's statement is: according to him, Geller wanted to provoke 2 violent men, armed with assault rifles, to attempt to murder the people she invited to the event.**

***"she seemed to be trying to provoke that response."***

**Think about that one, Dave.**

***On Sunday, two attackers with assault-style rifles reportedly opened fire at an event where people were drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, which is prohibited by Islam.***

**Dave, if it is prohibited by Islam, then Muslims should not do it. But it is not prohibited outside of Islam. Muslims believe they can come to other countries, like America, and dictate to us that their Islamic beliefs trump our laws. Like Christians, Muslims constantly try to force others to submit to their domination.**

**THAT is why we are having this conflict.**

***The event was sponsored by the American Freedom Defense Initiative (AFDI), which was co-founded by Geller. Both AFDI and Geller’s Stop Islamization of America (SIOA) organization have been labeled hate groups by the SPLC.***

**Dave, I'm not so much interested in the labeling as I am in the evidence they offer to support that label. What evidence does the SPLC offer that AFDI is a hate group?**

**And Dave, why isn't Islam labeled as a hate group? I could give you evidence from their own holy book if you had a few weeks to kill. Why doesn't the SPLC label Christianity as a hate group? Their own Bible authorizes the murder of homosexuals.**

**I'll answer those questions for you Dave - it is because the SPLC are gutless cowards. They will attack Geller's group which does not advocate violence, but will defend major religions who do.**

***Potok told CNN on Monday that the shooting would “give a little boost to Geller and her friends.”***

**Dave, had they not protected themselves by spending a small fortune on security, the shooting would not have given a little boost to Geller and her friends ... but a row of coffins.**

***“Absolutely nothing justifies this attack,” he pointed out.***

**Dave, what Mark just said is called a disclaimer. It always precedes the "but ..." or "that said ...."**

***“That said, Pam Geller, to describe her as anti-Islam and her groups as anti-Islam barely covers it.”***

**Dave, notice how Mark attacks Geller and her groups, but says nothing against the terrorists? Were they anti-infidel? Were their groups anti-infidel?**

**(Dave, let me give you a hint: I would go with "yes" on those last two)**

***Potok noted that he and the SPLC were both defenders of the First Amendment,***

**Dave, no they're not. That's another disclaimer that he has to say so he won't sound unamerican. But every word he speaks, says otherwise. If he were defending the First Amendment he would be attacking those who attacked people who were exercising their first Amendment rights. But he's not.**

**A few months back at this same venue, Muslims held a "Stand With The Prophet" conference.**

[**http://www.dallasnews.com/news/community-news/garland-mesquite/headlines/20150118-protesters-picket-islamic-conference-in-garland.ece**](http://www.dallasnews.com/news/community-news/garland-mesquite/headlines/20150118-protesters-picket-islamic-conference-in-garland.ece)

**The difference?**

**Muslims complained about hateful protesters; while this conference had to deal with semi-automatic weapons.**

***“but Pam Geller and her organization is a hate group today just as they were day before yesterday.”***

***According to Potok, Geller’s stunt in Texas was similar to Florida Pastor Terry Jones burning Korans.***

**Dave, do you think Mark would refer to the Muslim's event 4 months ago as "a stunt?"**

***“Certainly that was protected activity under the First Amendment, but it also led fairly directly to the killing of 10 or 15 people abroad,” he recalled.***

**Dave, Mark continues to avoid placing blame where it belongs: it doesn't belong on the nutjob who exercised his First Amendment rights - it belongs on the violent nutjobs who used it as an excuse to kill innocent people.**

***“These are provocations that are aimed at stirring the pot, and it doesn’t seem terribly surprising that, in fact, that they get the response that they — in a sense — they are seeking.”***

**Dave, ask Mark why the "Stand With The Prophet" event wasn't a provocation?**

**It certainly drew enough protesters. How come Mark only starts recording ... when Geller's group holds an event? Why didn't Mark start recording provocations when the Muslims held theirs?**

***“The fact that Pamela Geller and her friends have the right — the absolute right — to make these kinds of presentations and speeches, to hold contests lampooning the Prophet Muhammad and so on is not a contradiction of the principle of free speech.***

**Dave, Mark's statement is self-contradictory. He states that Geller has the right to do everything she did, which is true according to the First Amendment, then he says that doing so is NOT a contradiction of free speech. Well, of course it isn't a contradiction of free speech ... it is an example of freedom of speech.**

***It’s essentially the cost of democracy.”***

**Dave, Mark got that one wrong too. Democracy and freedom of speech are separate concepts that do not necessarily require each other. You can have either ... without the other.**

[**http://www.rawstory.com/2015/05/civil-rights-expert-on-texas-shooting-pam-gellers-hate-group-got-the-response-they-were-seeking/**](http://www.rawstory.com/2015/05/civil-rights-expert-on-texas-shooting-pam-gellers-hate-group-got-the-response-they-were-seeking/)