

Re: Wages, Inflation and Social Security

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-01/1303.html>

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

Date: 01/21/05

Date: Fri, 21 Jan 2005 01:51:59 GMT

On Thu, 20 Jan 2005 19:59:03 GMT, New Dark Ages

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

>

>root@localhost. wrote...

>> 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.*

>

>*When is it moral to use force? Force is what's being used to exclude
>others from natural resources.*

>

In retaliation and anytime there is a genuine dispute for which no other remedy is available. These are the two cases for which I don't find it immoral to use force.

>> >*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.*

>

>*But there can't be any ownership of natural resources, by your own
>definitions. It's not property, and you didn't claim inherent rights
>to 'life, liberty, property, and all non-property I can forcibly
>exclude others from.'*

>

If you have 100% control over a piece of land, you are the de facto owner, are you not?

>

>*Is it moral or immoral for you to kill me if I try to cross that
>piece of land to get to the river without paying your toll? Why, or
>why not?*

>

If no agreement is found, I believe it is not immoral to engage in war to resolve the issue.

sci.econ: Re: Wages, Inflation and Social Security

--

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