

Re: Wages, Inflation and Social Security

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-01/1285.html>

From: Socialism is a Mental Disease (*root_at_localhost.*)

Date: 01/20/05

Date: Thu, 20 Jan 2005 18:56:32 GMT

On Thu, 20 Jan 2005 18:09:34 GMT, New Dark Ages

<nda@ignorance.is.bliss.invalid> wrote:

>

>*root@localhost. wrote...*

>> *On Thu, 20 Jan 2005 06:32:17 GMT, New Dark Ages*

>> <nda@ignorance.is.bliss.invalid> wrote:

>>>

>>> *>root@localhost. wrote...*

>>>> *On Thu, 20 Jan 2005 04:06:39 GMT, New Dark Ages*

>>>> <nda@ignorance.is.bliss.invalid> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>> *>root@localhost. wrote...*

>>>>>> *On Wed, 19 Jan 2005 15:48:44 GMT, New Dark Ages*

>>>>>> <nda@ignorance.is.bliss.invalid> wrote:

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> *It remains for you. For me, it doesn't. For me it's a matter of first*

>>>>>>>> *principles, namely, that I have the following rights: life, liberty*

>>>>>>>> *and property.*

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> *Well, you're certainly entitled to your little ideology.*

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> *It's not an entitlement, it's a right.*

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> *Heck, maybe we agree. How do you define "property" and "liberty" ?*

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>> *Property (strong sense): whatever one creates and does not relinquish*

>>>>>>>>>>>> *control of. Derives from the Principle of Self-ownership.*

>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> *What's the "Principle of Self-ownership" ? The idea that we're the*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *property of ourselves?*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *Yes, the very simple idea that we have full control of ourselves at*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *all times.*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *Property (weak sense): whatever one controls exclusively through the*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *threat of use of force.*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> *Land ownership is immoral, then? (Natural resource, controlled*

>> >exclusively through the [threat of the] use of force?
>>
>> *To be immoral, it would have to violate some principle. For the life
>> of me, I cannot think of one it would.*
>
>*You don't have any principles about when it is moral or immoral to
>use force--i.e., it's always moral to use force? Particularly when
>you're using it to exclude others from something that isn't yours in
>the first place, by your own definitions?*
>

The problem is that it isn't theirs either. Why should it be immoral to exclude others if others have no moral claim to what I am holding? That's why I don't think there is a clear philosophical principle on which to stand for moral guidance here.

>
>*Why don't you just say you don't HAVE any principles! Or, that you
>abandon them for personal gain (which is the same thing as saying you
>don't have any).*
>

Because I **DO** have principles. They simply say nothing about ownership of natural resources.

I deleted the rest of your arguments because they simply dwell on the same thing and I believe I've answered already.

--
"A society that robs an individual of the product of his effort... is... a mob held together by institutionalized gang rule." -- Ayn Rand