

Re: Wages Vs Prices

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-05/msg00055.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sat, 07 May 2005 08:15:10 GMT
-

On Mon, 02 May 2005 01:55:52 GMT, Les Cargill <INOCargill@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>royls@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

>> On Sun, 01 May 2005 15:14:57 GMT, Les Cargill <INOCargill@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

><snip>

>>

>> And your evidence that no scientist working on unpatentable research

>> has never been paid is....?

>>

>> Thought not.

>

>We're not talking about academicians.

<yawn> Is that why you snipped the context? So you could claim we're talking about something else? How... predictable.

>We're talking

>about people who do product research.

And your evidence that no such people have ever been paid except out of patent royalties is...?

Thought not.

>Scientists are either paid by endowments/universities,

>or they're paid as part of R&D for a corporation. Or

>both, in many cases.

Or they're paid by government, or anyone else who has a problem they want solved.

>Salary as a professor is not compensation for

>research.

Garbage.

>It's compensation as a cog in the

>academic wheel. It involves publishing, which is

Re: Wages Vs Prices

>not research which is funded to develop products
>directly.

Irrelevant claptrap.

>>>>>So what, it becomes "open source"?

>>>>

>>>>That's science. Duh.

>>>

>>>No, that's not particularly "science".

>>

>> Yes, it most particularly is science. Science requires research

>> findings to be publicly accessible.

>

>If someone uses the scientific method for research

>that's not publically accessible, it's still science.

Nope. As long as that research is not publicly available, it can't be checked. Science can be checked.

>Science is a method, and nothing else.

That method requires sharing of results so they can be checked.

>>>>The Edison paradigm for technology development

>>>>hasn't been much improved on, beyond

>>>>integration into modern finance.

>>>

>>> Maybe because the institutions it was designed to suit haven't been

>>> much improved on?

>>>

>>> Mostly because they haven't needed to be improved on.

Sez you.

>It's

>always possible it's a coincidence, but the output of the

>scientific sector went up a bit since that model was

>developed.

Post hoc fallacy.

>When science was nothing but English lairds jacking

>about in labs, there wasn't much progress.

Actually, there was.

>After Edison, much progress.

Garbage. Compared to an "English laird" like Newton, Edison wasn't even a scientist at all, and contributed almost nothing. He was

Re: Wages Vs Prices

Re: Wages Vs Prices

little more than a tinkerer with a good business model who mainly worked at fencing off technologies others were developing as well, by dint of getting to the patent office before they did.

>I detect a pattern here. I suppose the story of the
>Board of Longitude and John Harrison clearly
>stands as the very best that can be done?

That or the Manhattan Project...?

>>>>Um, anything worth doing is worth doing for
>>>>money. The all but utter failure of "open
>>>>source" as a business model proves it.
>>
>> Garbage. That's like claiming the all but utter financial failure of
>> non-slave plantations in the antebellum South proved abolition of
>> slavery could not work.
>
>Strawman.

Garbage.

>Slave plantations themselves weren't economically viable
>at the beginning of the Civil War. The "open source" model
>is gasping for air as we speak.

Hehe. That might have something to do with the property rights in suffocation machines that have been discussed on this ng before...

>But if you want to ignore a small mountain range of
>empirical evidence, that's just fine.

The empirical evidence is that English lairds, considering how few they were and the fact that they weren't doing science to make a living, did pretty damn well at it.

>The **fact** remains
>that if investors in a corporation wanna fund research
>on condition that it remain closed, they can do so.

Sure. As can government, with military research. So?

>>>>>>Capital is attracted to profit opportunities. If people can be cured
>>>>>>of cancer by taking a single 10-cent pill, of course no capital is
>>>>>>going to be attracted. But make those pills cost \$10 each, and reduce
>>>>>>the potency so you need a couple a day for a few years before your
>>>>>>cancer is cured, and suddenly, capital is going to be, like, _so_
>>>>>>attracted....

>>>>>
>>>>>>Cancer is a Big Problem. The diseases cured by antibiotics
>>>>>>were Big Problems, and antibiotics were considerably more

Re: Wages Vs Prices

>>>>>than \$0.10 pills. IOW, it Doesn't Seem Likely.
>>>>
>>>>With a rent-seeking model of medical science, it is Downright
>>>>Impossible.
>>>>
>>>>But that was the model under which antibiotics came.
>>
>> ?? Nope. Flat false. Penicillin was an entirely serendipitous
>> discovery. Most others were derived from government-funded research.
>
>I mean post-penicillin. That was big pharma. Of course, it's
>a hybrid model, but there's a closed portion of the business,
>too. We have finely grained canons of medical ethics
>which cover all this.

ROTFL!! With all the recent news stories about killer
painkillers....?

>The provision of government research is in the spirit and
>practice of patent law, and all IP law.

Nonsense.

>It's there to stimulate
>the production of new medicines. Clearly, that's a public good.

The goal is perfectly fine. It's the assumption that there is no
other way to achieve it than by granting private monopolies that is
bogus.

>>>>>The marginal
>>>>>utility of a cure for cancer is *considerably* more
>>>>>than a dime. The traffic'll bear it.
>>>>>
>>>>>So cancer patients should be robbed to support the lavish lifestyles
>>>>>of rent seeking millionaire patent lawyers and pharmaceutical company
>>>>>executives and shareholders???
>>>>>
>>>>>Cancer patients can certainly pay for treatment just
>>>>>like everybody else.
>>>>>
>>>>> Treatment, yes. But not economic rent.
>>>>>
>>>>>Old saying, boyee – no bucks, no Buck Rogers.

?? There are other sources of bucks than economic rents. Duh.

>>>>>But I suppose research scientists
>>>>>can work as greeters at Wally World to support the
>>>>>research. It's science! It's immune to the laws of
>>>>>economics.

Re: Wages Vs Prices

>>

>> No, but you certainly seem to be.

>

>No, I understand how property works.

No, you don't.

— Roy L

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: Wages Vs Prices*

◇ *From:* Les Cargill

• *References:*

◆ *Re: Wages Vs Prices*

◇ *From:* Les Cargill

◆ *Re: Wages Vs Prices*

◇ *From:* royls

◆ *Re: Wages Vs Prices*

◇ *From:* Les Cargill

• Prev by Date: *Re: Capital and Mark Monson's Land*

• Next by Date: *Interesting Economics Questions*

• Previous by thread: *Re: Wages Vs Prices*

• Next by thread: *Re: Wages Vs Prices*

• Index(es):

◆ *Date*

◆ *Thread*