

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-04/msg00496.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sun, 23 Apr 2006 17:20:01 GMT
-

On Sat, 22 Apr 2006 23:16:37 +0200, peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
(=?ISO-8859-1?Q?Peter_Bj=F8rn_Perls=F8?=) wrote:

nospam <nospam@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote:

before you laugh. For an economic perspective, his argument is impeccable. History shows us that after 3000 years of economic advance, democracy have set us back by centuries, if not more than a millennium.

Who in the world can be so idiot to claim such a ridiculous crap ? Look at the advancements made in democracy: computers, internet, space ships, satellites, communications and all the technology we got in last 2 hundred years of democracy.

You're invoking the "Post Hoc ergo Propter Hoc" fallacy. Just because somethin came **after** something else does not mean it is **because** of this.

Hoppe commits the same fallacy -- his whole book is built on it.

No computers. internet, satelites, optical fiber, moon landing. Heck we should still believe the Earth it is the center of the universe and the moons and stars are painted on crystal spheres revolving around the flat Earth which float on the ocean on back of 4 gigant turtles.

Actually, democracy has ponly been widespread since World War I.

Re: Definition of "rich"?

But the countries that drove economic progress before that were democracies.

-- Roy L

.