



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on October 19, 2015

The Evil of Gun-free Zones

One thing worse than supporting bad policy is knowingly supporting bad policy.

Worse still is knowingly supporting bad policy and shielding yourself from its destructive effects — while visiting that policy on children.

There has been much debate recently surrounding so-called “gun-free zones,” places such as schools, where law-abiding people won’t carry guns. But really there should be no debate. This is because it’s plain that even the zones’ defenders — liberals — don’t really believe they’re a good idea.



{modulepos inner_text_ad}

For evidence, consider a [largely forgotten video](#) made in 2013 by Project Veritas (PJ) after *The Journal News* in Westchester, N.Y., printed the names and addresses of registered handgun owners in its coverage area. Posing as “Citizens Against Senseless Violence,” PJ operatives visited the homes of Eric Holder and various liberal journalists to ask them if they’d “support the cause” and post on their lawns a sign stating “THIS HOME IS PROUDLY GUN FREE.”

Not one accepted.

At the home of *The Journal News*’ Greg Shillinglaw they were told, “In this neighborhood that nobody puts out stuff like that” (except maybe at the schools?). The person at the Shillinglaw home concluded with, “I do believe in it, but I think I’ll pass on it.”

Translation: he believes in it for others.

Next was the *Journal*’s Mike Meaney. A woman answered the door and tersely said “I’m sorry, I can’t help, but good luck.... I have other reasons [for refusal] I can’t get into right now.” But, hey, they just needed to speak to ol’ Mike personally — I’m sure he’d snatch one of those signs up quicker than Hillary Clinton changes personalities.

The next one, the *Star Ledger*’s Bob Braun, offered tremendous support. Without missing a beat he said, “I agree with you and I am on your side on this, but I’m just wondering if that’s not an invitation to somebody with a gun!” as he emitted a chuckle. His wife chimed in, “I agree with you, but I’m not sure about the sign.” Braun then said moments later, “The problem in this town is, you know, somebody driving around here might think it’s a — seriously — might think it’s an invitation to come barging in.” But Braun did offer this consolation: “Well, if the sign said “Citizens Against Senseless Violence” without “THIS HOME IS PROUDLY GUN FREE,” I would put the sign up.”

Because a Gun-free-zone is a bad idea.

Except at schools.

Because the people who might drive around and barge into Braun’s house in Elizabeth, N.J., could



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on October 19, 2015

never drive around and barge into schools in Elizabeth, N.J.

Or maybe it's that children in Elizabeth, N.J., are bulletproof?

Now, it apparently took Braun — smart liberal that he is — all of two and a half seconds to figure out that putting a gun-free-zone sign on his lawn is a bad idea. Logically translated, it amounts to advertising, "We're defenseless." Yet he presumably supports them "in principle"; after all, he didn't say, "Look, I support gun control, but not these zones." So what's the story here? Was this the first time he pondered the matter for two and a half seconds? When advocating policy, did he consider it for only 4/10ths of a second?

Clearly, these liberals either never thought their policies through or just couldn't care less as long as their laws *only hurt others*. So take your pick: gross negligence or callous disregard.

Delving a bit deeper, we're witnessing a typical leftist phenomenon: style over substance, image over reality. These liberals want to be seen as "good" people in their milieu; they want to appear enlightened in their echo chamber of effiteness. And achieving this has nothing to do with action. All their fellow travelers, that caponhood of hypocrisy, are as two-faced as they are. It's all about what you say — all about posturing.

It's reminiscent of some NYC liberals — in a gentrifying Brooklyn neighborhood fittingly called "Dumbo" — up in arms because "diversity" has come home: they've learned that their kids may be forced to attend school with poor minorities. One Dumbo parent actually [said](#), "It's more complicated when it's about your own children." Yes.

And it's more complicated when it's about your own lawn.

Except that it really isn't. It just seems so when it's the first time in your life the realities of your ideology are brought home to you. Much like the youngster I once heard wonder why problems of poverty couldn't be solved by just making more money, things can seem very simple to a child; they can also seem simple to a childish person, someone content to operate on emotion like a child or too self-centered — like a very young child — to consider how his actions, attitudes and advocacy affect others. This is the way of the overgrown juvenile masquerading as an adult that we euphemistically call a liberal.

But here's the reality. Saying the politically correct thing — such as supporting gun-free-zone policies for schools — when you wouldn't apply the same to your own home because you realize it's a dangerous idea, doesn't at all make you a good person. It makes you scum.

You're willing to imperil American children nationwide just so you can strut around, puff up your chicken-chest and say "Look at me! I have the correct ideology!"

Don't misunderstand me. Eliminating gun-free zones is no panacea. No doubt, maniacal mass murderers who target schools are to a degree motivated by the copycat factor and the maximized media attention attacking schools brings. Yet schools' being gun-free zones does make them more attractive targets. And, no, it's not necessarily because the perpetrators don't have to fear harm, especially since these individuals often accept that their crime will be a suicide mission. But think about it: if your goal is to massacre a large number of people and go out in a blaze of notoriety, you want to ensure you won't be stopped before your deed is done. Gun-free zones virtually guarantee this.

As for the "gun-free-zone for thee but not for me" liberals, I'm firmly convinced that some (not all, of course), on some level, aren't all that troubled by school shootings. After all, it provides a great



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on October 19, 2015

opportunity to beat the gun-control drum for people to whom “the cause” is everything. I mean, if you want to make an omelet, you have to break a few eggs. And what does it matter as long as the egg isn’t the egghead in the mirror, right?

Of course, there’s generally no such thing as being truly insulated from the consequences of your bad decisions. You know those gun-free-zone signs you think are such a bad idea that you wouldn’t put them in front of the home in which your child lives?

They could be in front of the school in which your child studies.

I’m talking about those signs that mean “We’re defenseless. Commit your massacre here. You’ll get 9 or 10 before the guys with guns arrive and stop you.”

Not that this will change many liberal’s hearts (forget the minds). The chances of a given liberal’s only child being killed in a school massacre are extremely slim. But the chances of getting that proud, self-satisfied, warm and fuzzy feeling from mouthing the right position and being accepted by the right people are 100 percent.

But if it does happen, perhaps you can console yourself with the knowledge that you took one for the cause, can rage in the media and maybe even appear in front of Congress. I just wonder, will you think it was all worth it?

As for legislation creating gun-free zones, I’m game. Really. But with one condition written in: any politician voting for the bill must put a “Gun Free Zone” zone sign in front of his home. After all, Mr. Compassionate Liberal, if it’s good enough for America’s children, it’s good enough for you.

[Contact Selwyn Duke](#), [follow him on Twitter](#) or log on to [SelwynDuke.com](#)



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](#)