

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-05/msg00079.html>

- *From:* Mitchell Jones <mjones@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 01 May 2005 01:26:41 EDT
-

In article <Xns96472ACA7C4FWQAHBGMXSZHVspamnote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, bz <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> Mitchell Jones <mjones@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
> news:mjones-223160.01354929042005@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:
>
>> In article <Xns9646861EC47E2WQAHBGMXSZHVspamnote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, >> bz <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>>> Mitchell Jones <mjones@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
>>> news:mjones-72AA33.12394628042005@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:
>>>
>>>> In article <Xns964641AC76568WQAHBGMXSZHVspamnote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, >>>> bz <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> [snip]
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> ***{In a market economy, the measure of when that point has been
>
>>>> in the world, have set up as an obstacle course, to prevent the
>>>> engineers from getting at the oil. --MJ}***
>>>>
>>>> When you must expend 100 Joules of energy to extract oil that will
>>> yield less than 100 Joules of energy, the politics doesn't matter, the
>>> economics doesn't matter. You are at the point where you are better off
>>> to use the 100 Joules directly and not convert it into crude petroleum.
>>>
>>> ***{The only fixed and irreducible energy costs are those imposed by the
>> necessity to lift the oil from its point of origin to its point of use.
>> A typical barrel of oil, back in the old days, had a capacity of 55
>> gallons, and contained about 44 gallons of crude, with the excess space
>> being left to allow for expansion. A run-of-the-mill barrel of Texas
>> crude contains 19,460 Btu's/lb and weighs 7.286 lbs/gal. Therefore its
>> total weight is $(44)(7.286) = 320.6$ lbs, and its total energy content is
>> $(320.6)(19,460) = 6.25 \times 10^6$ Btu's.
>>
>> There is also the cost of cleaning up the environment. That has been
> ignored, up until now. Factor that in, also.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

***{That's just politically required nonsense, not a fixed and irreducible cost. In fact, it is insanity, and can be easily seen as such by any person who grasps the fact that reserves are merely those deposits that can be presently extracted at a profit. Once that simple idea is understood, environmentalist requirements that mines and oil wells taken out of service be filled in, demolished, planted over with forest, etc., stand revealed as lunacy, pure and simple.

A gold mine, for example, will be shut down when all the ore presently extractable at a profit has been removed. That does not mean it does not still contain thousands or millions of ounces of gold in ores that cannot be extracted at a profit with present technology, because it almost certainly does. Thus the shafts and tunnels should *not* be destroyed, filled in, covered over and turned into a park, or any of the other nutty stuff that governments, particularly the U.S. government, routinely require. Instead, the mine should be left intact, as was the standard practice of owners throughout human history, until the environmentalist insanity gripped the planet in the latter part of the 20th century. The reason mines taken out of service should be left intact is that with the advancement of technology and possible increases in the demand for and price of the mineral—gold in this example—the deposits that were submarginal when the mine was closed will almost certainly, at some time in the future, become profitable again.

Given that reality, which applies to all deposits of raw materials everywhere, the requirement of "cleaning up the environment" is nothing more than mindless destructionism. The proper response is to let the owners of the property decide what they do with their property, so long as their decisions respect the property rights of others. That way, when the time comes to reopen a mine or begin pumping an oil well again, prior work will not have to be repeated: the old shafts will still be there; the old drill hole will still be there; etc.

--Mitchell Jones}***

>> The continental crust of the Earth is typically about 30 km thick (see
>> <http://quake.wr.usgs.gov/research/structure/CrustalStructure/>), which is
>> 98,425 ft. Therefore in an extreme case scenario the energy investment
>> to get a barrel of oil to the surface would be $(320.6)(98425) =$
>> 3.16×10^7 ft-lbs. Since each Btu contains 777.9 ft-lbs of energy, it
>> follows that the barrel of oil contains $(777.9)(6.25 \times 10^6) = 4.86 \times 10^9$
>> ft-lbs of energy. That is in excess of two orders of magnitude more
>> energy than its fixed and irreducible costs of extraction, even under
>> these worst case assumptions.
>
> You are assuming that the carbon is in liquid pools rather than scattered as
> grains of carbon scattered in the rocks.

***{No, I'm giving you a hypothetical example, in an attempt to illustrate the fallacy inherent in your idea that any oil deposit,

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

anywhere on earth, is at or near breakeven, when the irreducible energy costs of extraction are compared to the energy contained in the oil. No such deposit exists, anywhere on Earth. There has never been a barrel of oil, anywhere on Earth, that did not contain at least a hundred times as much energy as is required to lift it from its point of origin to its point of use. And that includes oil scattered as grains of hydrocarbon in oil shale or tar sands. The costs of separation of the hydrocarbon from the matrix in which it is embedded is not a fixed cost, but a cost subject to reduction by the ingenuity of engineers. Such problems are solved by figuring out ways to bypass the matrix, and focus solely on the goal itself: the oil. Hundreds of techniques have been developed that serve that purpose, including fracturing the matrix by blasting to allow the entrained oil to flow; the introduction of hot water or superheated steam to float the oil out of the matrix; and so on. Yes, of course, all such techniques have a cost, but the point is that there is no discernible limit to the ability of creative engineers, to come up with ways to solve problems by lowering costs. The situation is **not** static. You cannot cavalierly assume, as you are wont to do, that any oil deposit that is presently submarginal, will remain submarginal forever. --MJ}***

>> I would add that those are truly worst case assumptions, because as soon
>> as a drill bit came anywhere near a pool of oil at that depth, the
>> enormous pressure would spit out all of the casing, the bit, the 30 km
>> of drill stem, and blow the derrick to hell, in a gusher the likes of
>> which the world had never seen! You wouldn't need to invest energy
>> pumping it out of the ground. What you would need to do would be invest
>> energy running like hell, as soon as you heard the sounds of the casing
>> and drill stem blowing back up the hole!
>>
>> To sum up, when you actually run the numbers, when you actually develop
>> a clear grasp of what oil **is**, all worries about getting anywhere near
>> ultimate breakeven stand revealed as pure fantasy. The reality is that
>> sub-marginal reserves are not sub-marginal because there is less energy
>> in the oil than must be invested to lift it out of the ground, but
>> because, AT THE PRESENT TIME, the technology that allows us to get to it
>> and separate it from its impurities is too costly.
>>
>> Bottom line: the politicians are the only thing standing between the
>> engineers and the oil.
>>
>> --Mitchell Jones}***
>>
>>> What about waste heat, you might say. What about heat left over after
>>> you burn fuel to make electricity?
>>>
>>> When you convert heat into useful energy, the amount you can convert
>>> depends on your starting and ending temperatures. When you try to use
>>> the 'waste heat' you decrease the power out of the generator. You can
>>> use *SOME* of the waste heat to do useful things, like recover oil from
>>> oil shale, but I was already considering that in my original statement.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

>>>

>>> Assume we are already making the best possible use of all of our energy
>>> resources, you eventually (and that day is closer than you think) reach
>>> the point where it takes more energy to extract energy than you have
>>> available. Tech improvements will not solve this problem.

>>

>> ***{That "problem" does not exist. See above. ---MJ}***

>>

>>> Again, better to move our industries into space.

>>

>> ***{*All* of our industries?}

>

> Start with the heavy industry.

>

>>That would require the use of massive
>> force, because it would make no economic sense at all, with the
>> consumers and raw materials mostly on Earth, to move the industries into
>> space. And, of course, to persuade Earth's population to leave Earth and
>> stop using raw materials from Earth would require even more massive use
>> of force.

>

> I am not advocating the use of force.

>

>> But why? What goal are we pursuing, that justifies killing so
>> many people? ---MJ}***

>

> The future of the human race.

{First you say you are not advocating the use of force, and then, two sentences further down, you essentially concede that what you are advocating requires the killing of lots of people! Result: I literally have no idea what position you are advocating. If you are merely saying that people should be free to go into space if they can create or purchase the means to do so, and that some of those who do that will be killed, that's fine. But if you have in mind some government program that forces people into space and kills those who do not want to go—as would be necessary to turn the Earth into a park—then we part company in a major way. As for the future of the human race, well, mankind will without a doubt go extinct if we insist on remaining on Earth, whether the ultimate cause is a killer asteroid, or a nearby supernova, or a change in the luminosity of the sun, or something else. Hence as a practical matter the only way any Earth-based life form will avoid extinction will be if man moves into space and takes them with him. That means man is not a threat to other species, as environmentalists believe, but, instead, represents their only hope of avoiding extinction. ---MJ}

>>> There, if you want more

>>> energy, you use a bigger mirror.

>>

>> ***{A mirror? At high Earth orbit you would need, at minimum, a square

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

- >> meter of mirror for every 1360 Watts. Let's see: American industrial
- >> power consumption at the end of 2004 was running at about 2.918
- >> quads/month (see
- >
- >> alternatively, we would need for each orbital
- >> factory to have its own, smaller mirror,
- >
- > Exactly.

{If this is all being done without forcing anyone, as you said, then some of these folks—virtually all of them, in fact—are going to opt in favor of using nukes for power, because it will be far simpler and less labor intensive. Can you live with free choice on this matter? —MJ}

- >> its own smaller power plant,
- >> etc., together adding up to the same thing. And we would need to somehow
- >> get raw materials up to the factories,
- >
- > That is easy. Capture the earth busters before they can hit the earth.
- > Turn them into factories and habitats.

{If nobody is being forced, then most people are going to continue living on Earth, continue mining on Earth, and continue manufacturing on Earth. Some of those who opt to live in space may earn their living by mining near-Earth asteroids, of course, but most will pursue other lifestyles. Again, can you live with free choice in such matters? —MJ}

- > Take the factories to the raw materials (the asteroid belt).

{If freedom of choice is respected, such decisions will be made on economic grounds: raw materials from the asteroid belt will only be used if they are competitive with other sources. To be shipped to Earth, for example, they would have to be competitive with Earth based sources. Unfortunately, given the amount of orbital angular momentum that would have to be killed off, it is likely that those costs would be prohibitive. But maybe not: lots of work is being done in celestial mechanics right now, to discover low-cost, long-haul pathways in the solar system, and many surprising discoveries are being made in that area. Perhaps robot ore carriers will someday ferry huge tonnages from the asteroid belt to Earth, taking 10, or 20, or 50 years to make the trip, slipping slowly and imperceptibly, via gravity assists from various solar system objects, to wend their way gradually toward the Earth at essentially zero cost. But if that proves impracticable, and freedom of choice is respected, then asteroid belt raw materials will be utilized only if there is a significant human population near the asteroid belt. And if few people choose to live there, can you accept that? Or would you want to coerce them into doing so? —MJ}

- >> and get the finished goods to
- >> retail outlets and thence to end users who, presumably, would not be on

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

>> Earth. But why would we do all of this?

>

> To ensure the future of the human race.

{Freedom of choice will ensure the future of the human race. We need people spread out as much as possible, into multiple locations, because no particular location is safe. The population living in the asteroid belt might, for example, be wiped out by a supernova; and yet, because of protection afforded by Earth's thick atmosphere, people living on Earth might survive. Or Earth might be wiped out by a comet or an asteroid, while people survived in the asteroid belt. Or people on Mars might survive, while everyone else was wiped out, etc. Thus not merely will Earth not be turned into a park, if people's freedom of choice is respected, but failure to do so will be a *good* thing. Again, can you live with such an outcome, or does your desire to turn Earth into a park mean you would be willing to use force to get your way? --MJ}

>> To turn the Earth into a park? Are we back to that again? For

>> what possible reason would we want to turn the Earth into a

>> park? --MJ}***

>

> Because it would be a nice place to visit.

{If there is enough demand from tourists, lots of wilderness areas on Earth would be preserved and utilized for that purpose. Cities, factories, and a huge indigenous population, however, will remain on Earth so long as freedom of choice is respected. Again, is that outcome acceptable to you, or do you advocate violence to bring about the outcome you desire? --MJ}

>

>>> NO! man would increase the sea level rise by speeding up the melting of

>>> glaciers and the southern ice cap.

>>

>> ***{The CO₂ is rapidly taken up by plant growth. The plant growth is mostly water, and, by eliminating or reducing standing thermals, brings about increased rainfall in the area where it takes place, causing the water table to rise. Result: icemelt that would otherwise have contributed to rising sea levels contributes to increased plant biomass and rising water tables instead. --MJ}***

>

> data?

***{Robert Clark asked first. Here is a copy of my response to him.

> I've never heard of a biologist denying that carbon-based life forms need

> carbon, or that they obtain it, ultimately, from CO₂ in the atmosphere, so it

> would be essentially impossible to find a reference to the contrary. However,

> since you ask, here is a good entrance point for such information:

> <http://www.greeningearthsociety.org/Articles/2001/ga7.htm>.

>

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

- > Next, for sheer fascination, try this:
- > <http://www.thekrib.com/Plants/CO2/hurley-co2.html>. This guy will explain to
- > you in vast detail how to maintain lush, beautiful plants in your home
- > aquarium—by bubbling in CO2 at a precisely controlled rate!
- >
- > For those with lots of plants in the home:
- > <http://www.bey-tech.com/CO2Blackbox.html>. This company sells a fuel-cell
- > based CO2 generator which increases ambient CO2 concentrations in the home up
- > to 1500 ppm, to produce lush plant growth.
- >
- > Additionally, a web search on "CO2 fertilization" ought to give you a ton of
- > hits. This is a topic that has been researched for at least a hundred years,
- > and is utterly non-controversial.

—Mitchell Jones}***

- >
- >
- >> That means the ban on DDT kills about 3 million children a
- >> year, and has been doing so since 1972, for a cumulative total, very
- >> conservatively estimated, in excess of 50 million. Should every
- >> environmentalist be executed who, after being apprised of these facts
- >> and allowed time to verify same, continues to support the DDT ban? You
- >> decide. —MJ}***
- >
- > There are better insecticides to use.

***{Nope. An ideal insecticide is one that "persists in the environment," meaning it is highly nonreactive unless in the presence of insects. Rachael Carson and the various environmentalist who campaigned against DDT, however, were too stupid to realize that. They started with their conclusion—that DDT ought to be banned—and then proceeded to label any characteristic it had as "bad" so that they could reach that preordained conclusion. Result: the world has accepted the insanity that an insecticide should *not* persist in the environment—which means: they believe a good insecticide is one that reacts promiscuously with lots of stuff other than insects. And what a thoroughly dumbass notion that is! I used to work with a fellow, many years ago, who was a crop duster. Back in the old days he would spray DDT in fields with lots of workers and livestock present, and think nothing about it, because he knew it only reacted, as a practical matter, with insects. But after the ban of DDT, he no longer could do that, because the new stuff that replaced DDT was deadly to every living thing, precisely *because* it reacted with lots of stuff other than insects. He would talk about how, after people and livestock were cleared from the fields, he would spray crops with parathion, and then circle back and watch rabbits, foxes, coyotes, deer, etc., running in circles, then falling down, kicking for awhile, and then dying on the spot. But, hey, it killed the bugs, right?

Anyway, the new stuff is garbage. It isn't an accident that people are warned to stay indoors even when relatively mild pesticides like

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

malathion are being sprayed, and it isn't an accident that it doesn't work well to control mosquitoes: it reacts promiscuously with lots of stuff other than insects. That's why it doesn't "persist in the environment," and is also why the mosquitos move back in a few days later, when it has chemically degraded and lost its punch.

DDT, however, is harmless to everything but insects. It doesn't degrade, it doesn't lose its punch, and the mosquitos do not come back. They stay the hell away for a very long time, and, because of that, even poor countries can afford to use it to control mosquitoes.

They could, at least, before it was banned by the EPA and global pressure was applied to shut down the factories and to persuade governments elsewhere to ban it. Hell, I can remember those years as if they were yesterday. I read the papers assiduously, and clipped out the stories, as one dumbassed government after another in the malaria belt banned DDT, and the malaria death rate within their borders quickly soared from trivial levels to hundreds of thousands or millions. I have a cardboard box around here somewhere, lost in the clutter, with those clippings in it.

The ban of DDT was mass murder, plain and simple. And the killing continues to this very day.

--Mitchell Jones}***

>>> Insects develop immunity and THAT kills more innocents.
>>
>> ***{Insects adapt to threats which appear in their environments, but
>> adaptation does not always involve developing immunity. Flies, for
>> example, have had hundreds of millions of years to develop immunity to
>> being eaten by birds, and have failed miserably to do so. They have,
>> however, adapted to the threat--by becoming adept at dodging, by
>> developing camouflage coloration that renders them difficult to see,
>> etc. And, likewise, mosquitos have adapted to the threat posed by
>> DDT--by fleeing as fast as they can from any area where even the
>> slightest whiff of DDT is in the air. And, since DDT is a perfect
>> pesticide, meaning it reacts only with insects,
>
> False.
> It accumulates in the fatty tissue of mammals and birds.

***{Not false. It is fat soluble, but when something dissolves, that is not a chemical reaction: it is a change of state. Chemically, the dissolved substance is unaltered, and, when it comes out of solution, it will be the same as before. Moreover, it is quite harmless, despite the ravings of environmentalists to the contrary. Most of the population of Europe was herded through vats of the stuff at the end of World War II, to control the spread of typhus. Millions of farm animals, including birds, were routinely dipped and sprayed with it, for decades, with no ill effects. It was routinely sprayed in American cities by men riding

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

gasoline powered foggers, during the mosquito season, for decades, with no ill effects. Children followed those foggers about on their bicycles, accompanied by their dogs, and had a great time riding back and forth through the plumes of DDT, which were so thick you couldn't see two inches past your nose, and they did it with no ill effects. I did it myself, every summer when I was growing up, and so did all of the kids I knew. Hell, there have been cases in which despondent dumbasses who believed environmentalist bullshit tried to commit suicide by drinking the stuff, but it didn't work. I read a story years ago, for example, about a leper in South Africa who had been given a job spraying DDT in an orchard. He was depressed by the ravages of the leprosy on his body, and decided to end it all, so he spun the top off of the spray container, drank about a quart of the stuff, and sat down under a tree to die. And he sat, and sat, and sat, until, finally, he nodded off to sleep. But then, oddly, several hours later he woke back up again, feeling rested and refreshed. And at that point he noticed that the numbness in his fingers, caused by the leprosy, had disappeared! Other than that, there was no effect at all! I even remember a fellow who, years ago, toured the country trying to get people to wake up and realize that DDT was harmless. He would appear on a local TV show, pour himself a cup of DDT, drink it, and discuss its benefits while the audience waited for him to fall over dead. But, of course, he never did. —MJ}***

> You have some in
> your body right now.

{And I'm glad to have it there, and feel privileged to have lived in a world where something so wonderful was once freely available. DDT, you see, is history's greatest saver of human life. And, because of that, the environmentalists who banned it are the greatest mass murderers in human history. —MJ}

> It increases the chance you will die of cancer.

{Bunk. Net effects are all that matter. The tiny, strained, highly arguable correlations that rabid environmentalists have concocted, and which unbiased observers reject, are overwhelmingly overbalanced by the reduction in vulnerability to mosquito borne diseases that routine spraying of DDT brings about. —MJ}

> It causes thinning of birds egg shells.

***{Urban myth. The original study that led to that conclusion was a joke. Birds were raised in low light levels on a calcium deficient diet that contained DDT, with no control group. Lo and behold, those birds produced thin-shelled eggs. Well, duh, shock of shocks. Any run-of-the-mill idiot ought to know that birds kept essentially in the dark and fed on a calcium deficient diet are going to produce thin-shelled eggs, whether they are fed DDT or not. And who, in those times, could fail to know that farmers had routinely dusted their

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

chickens and their coops with DDT for literally decades, without causing them to lay thin-shelled eggs? The answer: anyone who wanted to know the truth about that issue could easily have found it, without doing so much as a shred of research. The fact that environmentalists did *not* find it proves only one thing: environmentalists are very definitely *not* run-of-the-mill idiots. They are, instead, very special idiots. ---MJ}***

> If the use of DDT had continued at the rate it was in use, the world
> would look much different now.

{That's right: graveyards would be much smaller, especially in the third world. ---MJ}

>> it remains in the
>> environment long after being sprayed. That means if you spray a village
>> with DDT, the mosquitos that are there at the time will be killed, and
>> any that come into the vicinity later will avoid that village like the
>> plague. Result: the incidence of malaria in the area will drop, like
>> clockwork, by from 90 to 95%. ---MJ}***

>

>

> BTW, global warming will make tropical diseases available over much more of
> the world and will kill tens of millions more people.

{"Global warming," meaning a human induced global rise in average temperature, is environmentalist hokum. We are moving toward the midpoint of an interglacial. Temperatures are rising very slightly for that reason alone, and the expectation, if the pattern of the prior interglacial is followed, is that sea levels will rise another 5 meters before it is over, flooding most of the great cities of the world. The greening of the Earth, due to fossil fuel burning, however, has the potential to prevent that sea level rise from happening, by sequestering the icemelt in new plant biomass and in rising water tables. And a repeal of the global ban of DDT has the potential of preventing the spread of tropical diseases that will otherwise accompany that greening process. ---MJ}

>>> , which kills an
>>> innocent child somewhere on Earth every 10 seconds, and virtually
>>> every other bovine, drooling stupidity they have perpetrated or
>>> attempted to perpetrate over the years. ---MJ}***

>>>

>>> We will have to agree to disagree on many things.

>>

>> ***{Yup. For example, Hitler

>

> Godwin's Law.

> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Godwin's_law

***{It ought to be called "Godwin's joke." It certainly isn't a law. The

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

reality is this: (1) a thread is over when it's over; (2) everybody wins who adjusts his opinions to fit the facts; and (3) in this case, the comparison to Hitler is quite appropriate. --MJ}***

- > > murdered 6 million Jews, and
- > > environmentalists have murdered more than 50 million children. I say
- > > environmentalists are worse than Hitler, and you, apparently, disagree.
- >
- > Every time you use your computer, you become responsible for the deaths of
- > coal miners, etc.

{Incorrect. If the coal miners voluntarily chose to do the work, they accepted the risks. Result: if they eventually die of black lung, a cave-in, or whatever, the responsibility is theirs. I do not, by using electricity generated by burning their coal, accrue any responsibility for their fate at all. And if I am electrocuted by that electricity, having chose to use it of my own free will, they are not responsible for me. --MJ}

- > You are partaking of the fruits of all the deaths that
- > have taken place in the development of civilization.
- > But you can't avoid that, even by living as a hermit
- > in the wilderness, because you still have the knowledge
- > in your head.

{One person can be responsible for the misfortune of another only if (1) his actions preceded and contributed to the misfortune; and (2) the person experiencing the misfortune did not voluntarily assume the risk of that outcome. Condition (1) ensures that no person can be responsible for misfortunes inflicted before he was born, and condition (2) ensures that no person can be responsible for adverse outcomes due to risks voluntarily assumed by others. --MJ}

- > > --MJ}***
- > >
- > > > Have the best of all possible days. It is a beautiful day to be alive,
- > > > isn't it? Every day.
- > >
- > > ***{Yup, environmentalists murder 8,640 children every day. What is
- > > there not to like about such a day? --MJ}***
- >
- > Environmentalist, anti environmentalists, Luddites and industrialists all
- > share in the blaim.

***{Incorrect. Those environmentalists whose votes and lobbying efforts preceded and contributed to the ban of DDT, as well as those who enacted and enforced it, and those who support and enforce it today, all qualify for responsibility under condition (1). And they also qualify under condition (2), because those who gave up the protection afforded by DDT did not do so voluntarily. On the other hand, those who either did not support or actively opposed the ban and its continuation, are exempted

Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.

from responsibility by failing to meet condition (1). You may not like it, but those who supported the DDT ban or its continuation, and those who enforce it, are guilty of mass murder.

The lesson to be learned from such episodes is this: when you employ force (i.e., violations of property rights), in order to influence the behavior of others, you assume moral responsibility for their fates. Since you are a fallible human being, that means the policy of using force guarantees that, with the passage of time, your moral status becomes that of a murderer, even if you believe you are acting "in the public interest."

Bottom line: the only moral use of force is against persons who have voluntarily accepted the use of force, and hence its risks, by initiating its use against others.

—Mitchell Jones}***

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.**
◇ *From: bz*

- Prev by Date: **Re: The Impossibility of Measuring the Velocity of Light**
- Next by Date: **Re: Uncle Dickhead, So fucking what? LOL**
- Previous by thread: **Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.**
- Next by thread: **Re: High strength fibers for high pressure tubes.**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**