

# Re: Definition of "rich"?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-04/msg00485.html>

---

- *From:* [peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Peter Bjørn Perlsø)
  - *Date:* Sun, 23 Apr 2006 13:24:13 +0200
- 

nospam <nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote:

The space race happened after Stalin had been busy purging the USSR population for years. How does that fit in with your "motivation" model?

All that crap was done in secrecy. Stories surfaced of course, but it always take a while until population fully react to a regime. The war ended only 12 years before Sputnik, and first couple years after war the accusations about being saboteur or spy still had credibility with a population facing foreign invasion on the doorsteps. If we subtract first 6 years of post war confusion from the 12 years timespan between end of WWII and Sputnik we get only about 6 years for population to figure out the truth. If you keep in mind that media was strongly controlled, and after war the USSR actually went thru a humongous economic growth and dramatic increase in life level it is perfectly explainable that many scientists and engineers may still had high hopes in 57 when Sputnik blasted off.

Look at the current situation in US. After all that Republican administration did to hurt the working and middle class, after the massive failure in Iraq and all the failures or wrong doings there are still 33% who approve this administration. And we are into the Internet era, where free speech can travel from one corner of the country to another in milliseconds not years. We have (a relative) free media. And there are still 33% approving this administration.

So yeah, I am confident that at that time the ideology was still strongly believed and hopes fueled motivation.

With all that hope, nothing, not even genocide in the millions can stop you!

Ever heard of a tautology?

Re: Definition of "rich"?

In the end it is again about motivation. Free market in itself have absolutely no value at all. Zero.

Strongly disagree.

And your argumentation for this are ..... ?

About the same as yours – none.

If it is just a belief don't be surprised if I don't take it seriously.

Same to you.

What have value is the fact that people engaged in free market can sell their creation for profit, and this motivate them to create more.

This of course includes that people are competitive, and will strive to rise above the neighbour and colleague, and that this is a factor for progress and growth, one which you seek to disqualify.

No. I do not seek to disqualify at all. I am a centrist.  
Yes, we need to maintain competition in order to increase motivation in our society. HOWEVER, we should be smart enough not to use competition into a brain damaged way that is going to hurt our society.

While competition is good, cooperation is good too. Imagine a family where the husband and wife never cooperate but always fight. How long such a family is going to survive ? How do you believe they will raise the children and what education the kids get?

Before the industrial revolution and migration from villages to cities. people used to live in village where a model of family like cooperation appeared and allowed the community to survive. It was always some sort competition between villagers, but what boosted the society and allowed the human kind to survive with almost no technology in hard situations was exactly the balance between competition and cooperation.

## Re: Definition of "rich"?

The idiotic primitive attitude of "greed is good" which is the core belief of libertarians did not evolve until relative recently when the old community links were broken, the technology allowed survival without too much cooperation and a gang of insane primitive minded greedy capitalists grew in cities and needed to justify their antisocial primitive behavior.

So no sir. I do not disqualify at all the need for competition in order to boost motivation but:

- "Primum non nocere", (first do not harm).
- do not be extremist, do not deny the need for cooperation in community
- do not be fanatic, there are things working better as a business and other as a community service. Only a fanatic want all of them into the same pot, regardless how they work best
- reward the one who deserve to be rewarded (the one who created) and not only the one who loot, cheat and lie better (businessman)

So you're painting businessmen as liars and looters. That comparison with be more in place with politicians.

This is also the reason why a completely free market is not going to be functional on long run. Few large corporations will rule the market and motivation is lost.

Only if those corporations are given de jure privileges by the state. When they are not, the free market reigns supreme.

This is a mythology. Go back to some of my postings in this thread where I demonstrated how the monopoly IT IS GOING TO HAPPEN into a unregulated market.

Again, you have some personal beliefs (BTW fundamentally flawed, steaming from an obsolete ideology based on greed) and counteract a logical assertion with propaganda. It is silly.

Look on this thread, I already wrote 2 postings about mass discounts. Ancient word of wisdom: "The priest do not sing twice for a deaf old lady".

So, if the free market would naturally form monopolies, isn't this to be expected in, say the utilities businesses (electricity, gas, water)?

## Re: Definition of "rich"?

In the end the regime having the democracy in his side will always win.

The regime ruling by oppression will always lose on the long run.

It is human nature.

Democracy is just another, more popular, kind of oppression.

I showed you a logical demonstration about the advantages of democracy as a motivation booster. And again, you reply with senseless propaganda without a basis. Talibans did the same. Man ....

You've showed me only your personal bias and confidence in democracy.

Democracy offers *\*relative\** freedom compared to the brutal dictatorships or USSR, Cambodia, Chile and so on. But in the long run, these dictatorships are just being replaced by an oligarchy of powerhungry robbers called "elected politicians".

Ever heard of "When a politician promises to take from Peter, to give to Paul, he can always count on the support of Paul"? Well, it's true. Democratic politicians who condone and enforce plunder will always be in the majority.

Word of wisdom: "If 2 people tell you are drunk, better go to sleep". If a majority consider that a way is better for the society chances are that it is better. Of course, accidents happen. A majority can make mistakes. But hopefully they will get corrected in 4 or 8 years.

The only condition is for dramatic decisions to need stronger supervision and oversight. Hitler rose to the power by democratic elections, but it was the lack of oversight allowing him to get dictatorial powers. And when the dictatorial powers were granted there was no democracy anymore.

Therefore, a strong oversight to prevent a president/party to take dramatic actions against democracy it is required as an independent organ. While democracy is not perfect, there is nothing better we are aware of.

You can call it tyranny if you like, but this won't change the reality.

Re: Definition of "rich"?

No, because the reality IS that it is tyranny by the many. The american founding fathers agreed with me.

But it is better than anything else.

Sure, when it comes to the amount of genocides, democracy is better than say, the USSR dictatorship.

When it comes to organised looting of wealth in absolute terms, the democratic welfare state is fucking worse than North Korea!

A democracy rule as the majority wants.

And thus, not what the minority wants.

Correct. But if the society is doing what the minority wants then that is against what the majority wants. We have to select the worst of the worst cases. And that is ..... democracy.

Have you ever heard of "minority protection"?

A majority identify their goals with the goal of government. A majority is motivated to achieve that goal.

Yeah, we all saw where Hitler's motivations too us. He was after all, democratically elected by the majority...

Correct, I also gave the same example above. The democracy need safety rules not to allow anyone to screw it.

Even the Weimar republic has checks and balance, which even Hitler managed to bypass. You can't make an idiot proof political system., the idiots (politicians) will inevitable find a way around it.

Re: Definition of "rich"?

## Re: Definition of "rich"?

Any other form of government will produce a minority of motivated people.

At least, people will know who their oppressors are. Now, most people are oblivious to the fact that their "own politicians" are enslaving and ripping them off.

This is due to the corruption (i.e. political lobby).

So, say, the Green political agenda, which calls for a maximum wage, with associated 100% marginal taxes, is the result of corruption? How about Hillary Clinton's claim that she would take Bush's tax cuts away from people "on behalf of the common good"?

Lobby it is a direct violation of the democratic rules.

How? It's a part of democracy. You get what you want.

How long US allow  
payed political lobby, the US economy will be dysfunctional and people like  
Bush can get their way.

Money power isn't limited to Republicans, like a lot of people like to think. Take a look at this:

<http://www.opensecrets.org/presidential/index.asp>

BOTH of your dominant political parties or up to their ears in campaign contributions. It's your whole fucking political systems, only excluding the Libertarians and Greens.

It is not democracy's fault. At fault it is the violation of democratic rules.

Same thing.

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Since motivation is important into achieving the goals  
it is obvious that a democracy will always achieve the goal  
faster/better  
since they have a majority of motivated people.

It is simple and logical.

Have you been attending any motivational seminars recently? You seem  
very .... preoccupied with the concept.

Nope, I am just interested into a better society.

So am I.

And a better society imply motivated people working toward  
the common goal of a better society.

Who's to decide what those common goals are? You?

--

regards, Peter Bjørn Perlsø

<http://haxor.dk>

<http://liberterran.org>

<http://haxor.dk/fanaticism/>

.