

Re: Wages, Inflation and Social Security

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-01/1305.html>

From: The Trucker (*mikcob_at_verizon.net*)

Date: 01/21/05

Date: Thu, 20 Jan 2005 21:58:19 -0800

Socialism is a Mental Disease 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.*

It is really very simple: We/they have the same exact moral claim to use or consume the resource as you. That is the point here. You have no superior moral claim. You seem to want a moral superiority simply because you have staked a claim on some natural resource.

I deleted the rest of the arguments because they simply dwell on the same thing you have refused to know all along.

--

"I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education." - Thomas Jefferson. <http://GreaterVoice.org>