

# Added “Friction” Does Greater Harm to Good People

In my continuing “Scott Adams (is wrong) on guns” series (that’s a new tag), I have looked at many of his “halfpinions” (his word) concerning guns.

Here’s the next installment. Yes, this is something I’ve brought up before, but it bears repeating since he’s still misrepresenting the issue.

When people object to his anti-gun ideas by reasonably pointing out that bad people will still get guns and suicidal people will still kill themselves he likes to say that of course they will, but any new “law” will add “**friction**” to the process, and “*add friction; get less of that behavior (crime/suicide)*”.

Again he’s acting on the faulty premise– the assumption– that guns are bad; that they are the problem; that cutting back on their availability even a little is generally a good thing. They aren’t, and it isn’t. Starting from a flawed premise, he arrives at a dumb “halfpinion” of his own.

Yes, you might “add friction” to a bad guy getting a gun with which to violate innocent people but those aren’t the only people to whom you are adding friction. You also add friction to the good, innocent people looking to get a gun for defense at the same time you add friction to the bad guys looking to violate the innocent. You are adding friction to the girl whose crazy ex is promising to kill her. I lost a friend to this added friction about 26 years ago as she waited for governmental permission to buy and carry a gun for self-defense. Guess who didn’t bother following the friction-causing “laws”.

Who is more accustomed to dealing with added friction on a daily basis?

Who has the connections to do an end-run around your added friction? It’s not usually the good people.

It’s *always* going to affect those who want a gun for self-defense more than it will affect the bad guys who want a gun for offense. Add friction, you get less self-defense.

You might “add friction” to a suicidal person’s attempt to get a gun with which to end his own life. This might save a few lives– the lives of those who don’t have some other method immediately available and who will soon change their mind about committing suicide– but how many innocent lives are you sacrificing in the process? Do you really believe it’s worth the cost to trade one person who *wants* to die for one person who wants to *live*— even if those wants are temporary whims?

He pretends he’s already considering net “gun deaths”, but he *can’t* be. There is no way to

record how many lives are saved with guns, so how can you credibly consider them? Very few of those cases ever get reported- to government or the media. Most cases of self-defense don't result in the gun being fired. And even in the small number which do, unless a shot is fired and you're in a town where the gunshot will attract unwanted attention, who's dumb enough to call the cops on themselves? Even if you are in town, I'd bet in most cases the sound of a gunshot isn't currently pinpointed if no one reports being shot. No one can know even a reasonable estimate of how many lives are saved with a gun, so there is no possible way to calculate the net "gun deaths".

He's only looking at half of the picture and ignoring the inconvenient part- just as he does in all his "gun control" [sic] ideas. This is his definition of a "halfpinion" which he claims everyone else is exhibiting while he's the only one who isn't...while he does it right in front of the world. And it's because he starts with the predetermined assumption that guns must be bad, that guns are a problem, even as he paces gun owners by claiming to be "*pro-gun; pro-Second Amendment*".

If you start with a faulty premise you'll come to dumb conclusions because you're thinking of the topic incorrectly.

I've tried to get his attention, but he ignored my attempts. He probably blocked me if he saw my tweets since I wasn't kind or gentle with my criticism, and yes, I did make it personal because he's *personally* advocating this toxic mindset. I didn't expect to change his mind, anyway, but I want to give you the mental tools to refute the claims of anti-gun bigots whenever they crop up. They are wrong, even if they are popular and believe they are smarter than you and me.