

# opinion

## Teachers should not carry a firearm

**BEX HUNTER** 

@bexihunt

After the devastating school shooting in Parkland, Fla., President Trump defended the idea to arm teachers in schools via Twitter. Since then, there has been a country-wide debate about the issue. One that goes much further than the usual gun control debate. cause of this whole problem. Why

First of all, guns in schools is the on Earth would it be a good idea to bring the problem into the school? I had this conversation with a friend of mine, and one of her biggest points was, "it isn't like teachers are going to be just holding their gun all the time, students are not going to know which teachers have guns."

This belief is very much underestimating the intelligence of the average student. Not only that, it is underestimating the danger of a situation. If a student who wanted to do harm in a school, either to themselves or someone else, knew there was at least one gun in the school, what is going to stop them from finding it?

Kids are not stupid. They know what teachers are going to have guns. They know that if the school allows teachers to carry guns that they are going to be able to find a gun in the school. You think a student, especially a high school student is not going to be able to figure out who does and does not have a gun? You think someone who is willing to shoot up a school is too far above going through a teacher's personal belongings to find out if they have a gun or not?

The problem does not stop with the students, but continues with the teachers themselves. There was a teacher when I was in middle school who got fired for literally throwing chairs at students when he got angry, imagine if he had a gun. Though I do believe teachers are underappreciated and most of them are incredible, not all teachers are great. Is it really that hard to believe that one could snap and shoot somebody if they were allowed to have a gun?

It is a super dangerous decision that really needs to be thought through. The main argument for arming teachers is that they will be able to protect themselves and their students against school shootings. A hand gun is not going to be much help when up against a person with a semi-automatic rifle. Not only that, but if and when the police come in a situation like that they go for the person with a gun and having so many people with guns is just going to end in a lot of unnecessary confusion and possibly gunfire, making the situation even more dangerous.

Lastly, why do we even expect teachers to go to such ridiculous lengths to protect students? Do not get me wrong, I believe most teachers would do all that they could to protect their students in a dangerous situation, but what gives us the right to expect them to? Teachers are underpaid, underappreciated, and overworked and yet we still expect them to literally take a bullet,

or in this case shoot one, for their students. Teachers have their own families and people who care about them and need them.

They went to college to teach the future generations, not risk their lives for them. It is unfair and unreasonable to expect them to do something that they did not sign

Overall, we learn as children that fighting fire with fire is a bad idea. So stop trying to add to the problem by throwing more guns into the mix. Instead, make it harder to get a gun. Gun violence needs to stop in this country, I think we can all agree on that, so do not try and solve a gun violence problem with more guns, especially in schools. It is counterproductive and danger-

### Teachers should be able to carry

**KAITLYN MOORE** 

@AUCollegian

The amount of school shootings that have happened so far this year s horrendous. Places where children go to learn and grow as peoole should be free from fear of inury and death, and my heart goes out to all of the students, teachers, families, and communities affected by them.

Let me start by saying that I personally am not a huge fan of firearms of any sort. I am small, easly startled by loud noises, and not very strong. Firearms are incredbly intimidating to me.

But I believe teachers should be able to carry a concealed handgun on school grounds.

I think as a society, we keep asking ourselves and each other why this keeps happening, but I think we need to change the questions

Why is it that gun free zones experience the most gun violence?

Because they are just defenseless

That is why shooters go after schools. There are few preventative processes involved with school shootings. Dress codes are more heavily regulated and enforced than more serious, actually life threatening issues like drugs or weapons, but that is partially due to the fact that they are so much easier to enforce.

I believe the solution is to make it easier to enforce.

There are more than 3,000 reguations on guns already but criminals and mass shooters do not care at all about them, we can not all ust stop going to school because of the possibility of a shooting. One of the ways we can make it easier to enforce is allowing teachers to

I am not saying make every teacher carry. I respect those who do not want to handle a firearm, I do not really like them myself. What I am saying is let those who want to do

On February 26, the Pike County school board in Kentucky voted to let teachers conceal carry on school grounds. They did it on a volunteer basis, where school employees would be subject to background and drug tests, mental evaluations, qualification courses and free firearms training lead by the sheriff's office, and re-qualify four times a year to continue as a guard.

On March 3, over 800 Utah school teachers and administrators went to a free conceal carry class in Sandy with 60 instructors.

The key is training and oversight. I have seen and heard so many people complaining about how these teachers were going to be "so safe" because they took a "weekend workshop" on gun safety and use.

Do the research.

Many firearm training courses in Ohio only last three days, some only one, but they are small, 10-person, hands-on intensive training classes that last all day and are taught by ex-military instructors.

People are trained to continue training on their own.

As for Ohio law enforcement, their qualification course of fire has no set amount of training required, as long as officers pass the test at the end of the class.

Other states have different standards, some better and some worse, but already the Ohio civilian conceal carry courses are doing better training wise than our own law enforcement.

There is an argument that a handgun is not as powerful as a semiautomatic rifle, but most handguns are actually semiautomatic themselves.

By the U.S. department of defense legal definition, a semiautomatic rifle is a firearm with a stock and barrel with a length of 16 inches or longer. Their caliber, the diameter of the bullet in inches, ranges from .17 to .50, and the only thing that makes it semiautomatic is the automatic cycling of a spent bullet for a new one, not the firing speed of the bullets. One trigger pull, one bullet fired. Any more than that, and you have a fully automatic firearm, a machine gun, which are military use only.

Within a school setting, a handgun is the better weapon than the rifle. Handgun bullets are larger and carry more energy within those small ranges.

A handgun is more powerful and effective in that setting than an AR-15, a firearm many people incorrectly call an assault weapon. Assault weapons are firearms of intermediate caliber that have the capability to switch between semiautomatic fire and completely automatic fire, and have no ability to fire manually (like a handgun).

For comparison purposes, the AR-15 has a caliber of .223, and most deer hunters use rifles with a caliber of .30 or larger. A double-A battery is .53 inches. There is a call to ban the AR-15, but what about deer hunting rifles?

Also, the Ruger Mini-14 is a wood rifle that functions exactly the same way an AR15 does, the same caliber and everything. Why not ban that "assault weapon" too?

Read more at AU-Live.com

#### Letter to the editor In response to the article titled, "A Different Kind of Romance:

St. Valentine's Day Experiences in the LGBT+ Community."

#### **SUBMITTED BY BEN MCCLAY**

First of all, I wanted to acknowledge that the LGBT+ community is a community that embraces love and acceptance. These are two values that we all should strive to embody on a day to day basis. However, the type of acceptance that the community accepts is detrimental. I have several problems with the article's overall moral basis as well as the movement as a whole. If you read this letter and disagree with me, that is your right. By no means am I attempting to be "hateful," or am trying to scream bigotry. However, there are three main reasons, biological, legal and moral, as to why acceptance of this movement is detrimental to society.

The ninth paragraph of the article: "A Different Kind of Romance: St. Valentine's Day Experiences in the LGBT+ Community.",, reads: "... there's something about gifts and things at stores becoming so heteronormative."

The term heteronormative is defined by Mariam Webster's online dictionary as: "of, relating to, or based on the attitude that heterosexuality is the only normal and natural expression of sexuality." The article implies that this so called "heteronormacy," is a problem, and that stores should not act in ways that violate nature. In nature, in order to procreate, there has to be sperm and an egg to reproduce a new child. Without one or the other, a new generation of offspring cannot form. Natural procreation has occurred all throughout history in animals, plants, and humans. Therefore,

this "heteronormacy," is the way that things always have naturally been, and will continue to be as long as natural reproduction exists. In ethics, we say that this violates a condition met under the second law of the Conservative natural law theory, which states that something is "immoral," if it violates procreation.

Although this article does not exclusively push for the equality in marriage between homosexual couples and heterosexual couples, the advances in legality between homosexual couples have obviously progressed throughout the past decade. According to CNN.com, gay marriage was first legalized in Massachusetts in 2004. During the summer of 2015 same-sex marriage became legal in all fifty

The main argument that progressives and other supporters of the LGBT+ community present is that two consenting individuals ought to be married to WHO-EVER they want, regardless of

The moral precept that a person ought to be married to WHOEV-ER they want, due to sexual orientation implies that they ought to be able to be married to a man and a woman if bisexual. This would be considered polygamy which most consider to be impractical and im-

However, the pushing of the LGBT+ rights, implies that these types of rights can advance more throughout the next decade if ideologies progress as fast as they have been.

Read more at AU-Live.com

#### **EDITOR'S NOTE**

The views expressed in the columns do not necessarily reflect the views of The Collegian or Ashland University.

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Every letter must be signed and include contact information. The Collegian reserves the right to edit any letter for content, grammar or length. The Collegian prints letters for university and public interest. Please send letters to:

> The Collegian 137 Center for the Arts

**EDITORIAL STAFF** 

**NOAH CLOONAN** 

Managing Editor **BEX HUNTER** 

**News Editor BREE GANNON** 

**Sports Editor KAITLYN MOORE** 

Features Editor **RENÉE BORCAS** 

Media Content Editor

**MAGGIE COGAR** Faculty Adviser

**SAM DIDION Assistant Editor** 

The Collegian © 2012 Ashland University Collegian All Rights Reserved

The Collegian is a student-run paper, published bimonthly.

The Collegian is printed by the Wooster Republican Printing Company.

www.ashlandcollegian.com

401 College Avenue Ashland, Ohio 44805 137 Center for the Arts (419) 289-5310 collegian@ashland.edu @AUCollegian

