

## Re: Definition of "rich"?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-04/msg00270.html>

---

- *From:* "ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxx" <ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 20 Apr 2006 14:44:17 -0700
- 

Ever read Locke?

Ever hear of the Lockean Provison? Even Locke recognized that the homesteading of land is only justified as long as there is "as much and as good left for others", which in reality is never, since the quantity of land in existence is fixed.

When I homestead a piece of land, and perform work on it, I mix my work with the land, and it thus becomes mine. Thanks to \*MY\* work, the land gives off useful resources, be it grain or valuable resources; metal, oil, coal, gas, lumber, whatever.

The entire concept of "mixing" labor with land is nonsense. Even if such a thing were possible, how does mixing something you own with something you do not own confer ownership of the whole?

Robert Nozick demolished the idiotic labor-mixing claim in Anarchy, State, and Utopia by asking, "if I pour some tomato juice I own into the ocean, do I now own the ocean or did I just waste my tomato juice?" He is a libertarian, BTW.

He also asked an interesting question about homesteading – "does the first private astronaut to land on Mars get to claim the patch of ground his ship landed on, the whole planet, or the entire uninhabited universe?"

There is no logically coherent way to provide a moral defense of private property rights in land and unproduced natural resources. None.

Possession of natural resources is a natural relationship arising between humans and the land/resources. Nothing untoward about that.

Utter nonsense.

Re: Definition of "rich"?