

Just a Thought ...

✘ The NRA is taking a lot of heat for its new ad about the supposed hypocrisy of the Washington elites regarding armed guards in schools.

In the ad, the narrator asks, “Are the president’s kids more important than yours?”

And then goes on to say, “Then why is he ‘skeptical’ about putting armed security in our schools when his kids are protected by armed guards at their schools? Mr. Obama demands the wealthy pay their fair share of taxes, but he’s just another elitist hypocrite when it comes to a fair share of security”

No one ever accused the NRA of being subtle.

The liberals on MSNBC’s Morning Joe, like many other liberals *and more than a few conservatives*, were outraged.

Mike Barnicle called the ad “political pornography.” Donny Deutsch said it’s “one of the grossest things I’ve ever seen in my life.” Joe Scarborough asked Mika Brzezinski “what’s wrong with these people?” Brzezinski replied that some of the people running the NRA are “sick in the head” and that she is “embarrassed for our country.”

But what if the NRA had put it differently? What if the ad had tried to persuade instead of bludgeon. What if the had had said:

“Mr. President, we’re glad your daughters are protected by security people with guns. We understand that they need protection. And we also understand that a president’s children are potentially in more danger than the children of accountants and lawyers and plumbers and hardware store clerks. But can you understand, Mr. President, why we also

want *our* children protected by security guards with guns? Can you understand that we worry about the safety of our children just as you worry about yours? Yes, Mr. President, sadly, your children are potential targets. But so are all our children. Didn't Newtown make that painfully clear?"

Maybe that would have calmed things down. But in our angry, polarized culture, maybe not.