

Re: Technical and Spiritual Development

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005-01/2429.html>

From: Terrell Miller (millerto_at_bellsouth.net)

Date: 01/26/05

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 2005 22:08:16 -0500

William Mook wrote:

>>*Bill, in a very large part of the world (with a huge percentage of*
>
> *the*
>
>>*world's population), birth control is *evil*.*
>
>
> *So? Those people will be less likely to use anti-aging drugs if the*
> *drugs have a built in fertility control. It really doesn't affect the*
> *argument.*

<sigh>

here's a hint for you, sparky: they wouldn't put infertility drugs in
teh antiaging serum to begin with. becuae a lot of the people able to
afford the serum don't believe in any form of birth control.

Got it?

>>*ah, so the reason why a campesino in Guatemala doesn't have wood*
>
> *floors*
>
>>*or running water is because...he *chooses* to?!?*
>
>
> *The reason you believe people in Guatemala are wild primitives have*
> *more to do with your biases than with reality.*

um no, the reason why I think many people in Guatemala (go look up the
term 'campesino', please) live in primitive conditions is because
Guatemala is next door to Honduras. I have *been in* adobe huts in
Honduras with dirt floors, no plumbing, no electricity, no glass in the
windows (and not really any windows, just holes cut into the adobe with
wood shutters over them), and not a paved road within 100 miles.

I kinda doubt that Guatemala is all that different from Honduras, Bill.

What about you, you ever been to the Third World?

> <http://www.viviun.com/AD-14716/>

>

> *Note the hardwood floors and running water – oh, and the address!*

erm, the address of this house is in *Panama*, Bill. Which is, like, a whole other country and stuff.

>>>*Because wealth is created not taken.*

>>

>>*actually, it's both, in that order*

>

>

> *No, if you take something from someone you diminish its value,*

not to the person taking it, nope. To them it *increases* in value because now it's *theirs*.

Real simple concept, sport...

>>*okay Bill, 1) define "the right choices"*

>

>

> *They are different for everyone and change over time. Think about what you're asking. You're asking me to define a course of action for everyone on the planet so that everyone on the planet becomes wealthy simultaneously.*

well, since that is precisely what you think is somehow going to happen, hell yes I want you to define it for us.

> *This is not something any one person can do.*

>

> *Even so, its obvious that given the freedom of action, and knowledge, and time, each person will make those choices for themselves.*

you do realize that one person's efficiency or optimal solution to a problem is often another man's gross waste, yes?

> *Why is this obvious? Because when given the chance undeveloped*

> *economies have grown at double digit rates, doubling wealth in 5 to 7*

> *years, and transforming societies in a generation.*

Bill, do you understand the concept of a nonlinear trend?

> *You have provided absolutely no evidence this cannot occur for the*

> *whole world, if the world's economy is given a cost competitive*

> *alternative to fossil fuels.*

nope, your theory, *you* prove it *will* happen.

See how that works, sport?

>>*and 2) show us one moment in*
>>*the entire history of Man when "everyone" made the right choice...*
>
>
> *The United States is a good example of a nation that has made the right*
> *choice. Europe, Japan, the Asian Tigers – are also good examples.*

ah. Okay, when did *everyone* in teh US make "the right choice"?

>
>>>>*Is there anything in Rwanda or El Salvador that is of value to*
>>>>*anyone?*
>>>
>>>
>>>*Yes. Each other.*
>>
>>*I'm sure that a Rwandan war refugee will be really touched by the*
>>*sentiment, Bill. He might not even kill you to get to your wallet so*
>
> *he*
>
>>*can eat something this week...this time.*
>
>
> *More racist bilge from you, need I reply to such guff?*

ah yes, when an idiot starts getting painted into a corner out comes the smear tactics :(

You might want to read up on the conditions in Rwanda over the last decade or so, Bill. 'Taint pretty.

>>*"Hi, my name is Manolo. I am a thirty year old male from San*
>
> *Salvador. I*
>
>>*look fifty, but I'm not. I can't read this sentence, or any other*
>>*sentence. I can write my name down. I know how to split concrete*
>
> *blocks*
>
>>*with my machete. I can slaughter a pig. I have never seen or used a*
>>*computer and I have no idea what one does. I can lift a 100kg bag of*
>>*cement on one shoulder and carry it through sand without dropping the*
>
>
>>*ashes on my cigarette.*

>
>
> *Jesus Terrell, I believe you need your ass kicked. That's the only way*
> *assholes like you learn how to be civil.*

actually, Bill, I just described the job qualifications of a huge percentage of the human race. Do you have a problem with that, sparky?

>
>> *"I would love to have a job in your company, Senor. You can reach me*
>> *at...well, there is no phone within 50km of my village, but I have a*
>> *cousin in Mobile who ha a phone and she will be happy to get me*
>
> *across*
>
>> *the border. Her number is..."*
>
>
> *You're a racist pig, pure and simple.*

no, I've worked in the mud (literally) alongside many Third World residents and underprivileged Americans. Helping them have a little bit better life. Using my pidgin Spanish and their pidgin English to somehow communicate anyway and make friends.

The fuck have *you* ever done for anyone, Bill?

Sheesh.

> *I cannot usefully reply to the garbage in your head. I can only reply*
> *to reality. For your information, you might want to acquaint yourself*
> *with some *real* Salvadorans before making any judgement. Here's a*
> *good place to start:*
>
> <http://www.uca.edu.sv/martires/new/indice.htm>

the way I acquaint myself with people in Latin America, Bill, is to *go there* and *meet them* and *help them*.

Quaint that you think you know someone from reading their website, though.

> *Oh, can't read the language? What are we to make of that?*
>
> *Shithead.*

eh, I speak a little Spanish and a little German, had two years of Latin in high school. Also know about a dozen programming languages.

And you?

sci.space.history: Re: Technical and Spiritual Development

- > *In a world of 8 billion people all consuming products at the same rate*
- > *as the percapita average in America today would require 11x the flow of*
- > *materials throughout the world. Nearly all materials are available in*
- > *sufficient quantity to support this expansion. Five strategic*
- > *materials would be stressed, but there are workarounds for consumer*
- > *products. There is one material that doesn't have a chance of meeting*
- > *this increase – and that material is oil. We need a low–cost*
- > *alternative to oil and we need it now.*

totally agree with you there

- > *Education, training, management – are not really problems.*

Bill, by the time a Third World country is able to scrounge together enough paper to teach their citizens anything, technology has frequently leapfrogged whatever it is they were teaching.

That's why it takes money and qualified managers and teachers *now* to be able to raise a country's standard of living if they ain't got nuthin'.

- > *They pace*
- > *development, and we know from experience that an industrial economy*
- > *supplied with sufficient capital and energy supplied with a stable and*
- > *fair political and legal system in any location throughout the world*
- > *can grow at double digit rates in less developed regions – doubling*
- > *standards of living every 5 to 7 years.*

awful lot of assumptions blithely thrown around in that paragraph...

- >>*Sure, Bill. Which is why when Hurricane Mitch obliterated the*
- >
- > *Honduran*
- >
- >>*banana plantations in 1998, the country had to start cutting down its*
- >
- >
- >>*mahogany trees in greatly increased numbers to compensate for the*
- >
- > *loss*
- >
- >>*in exports.*
- >
- >
- > *Horrific examples of mismanagement abound throughout the world.*

not mismanagement, Bill: *survival*.

The big American fruit companies quickly realized after Mitch that it would take umpteen millions to restore their banana and coffee production in Central America. So they just up and moved to Ecuador instead. Great for the corporation, but that left entire countries

having to somehow handle the loss of their (by far) largest exports.

That's why the sudden increase in production of Honduran mahogany, Bill. They have no choice, the whole country goes further down the toilet if they don't.

> *This*
> *doesn't change the fact that if given sufficient capital, energy and*
> *adequate political and legal stability and fairness – any economy*
> *anywhere can grow at double digit rates.*

sure, just plug all that into Excel and you're good to go.

idiot.

>
>> *When they are all gone (takes a while for a 150-foot tree to grow),*
>
> *then*
>
>> *Honduras will have NAGDT.*
>
>
> <http://www.travel-to-honduras.com/>
>
> *Riiight...*

Bill, I've done four mission trips to Honduras. I've seen a lot of the country. It's great for "roughing it" safari-type vacations, like stepping back in time 100 years.

But it's not even remotely a "tourist paradise". Some nice spots and a couple of niceish resorts, that's about it. Not exactly what most people look for in a vacation.

Put it this way: there are only about a dozen paved roads in the whole country once you get out of Tegucigalpa. The main Pan American Highway is unpaved for large stretches, it's just a very wide dirt road.

You ever been there, sport?

>
>>> *What is limited in our industrial world is cheap energy. That's*
>>> *because we have restricted ourselves to fossil fuels extracted from*
>>> *reserves that are limited to around 900 billion barrels.*
>>
>> *oh God, you're not gonna get all SPS on us *again*, are you? :(*
>
>
> *You make very general dismissive statements and don't really provide*
> *any reasoned response to anything. You trot out these images of*

sci.space.history: Re: Technical and Spiritual Development

> *poverty and ignorance that would only appeal to the worst part of*
> *anyone's nature and say what exactly? Nothing.*

no Bill, I've said quite a bit. You just don't pull your head out of
your ass long enough to learn from other people's experience and wisdom.

>
>
>><snip>
>>
>>>Yes, but growth rates in the double digits are possible. This
>
> means a
>
>>>doubling of wealth every 5 to 7 years.
>>
>>okay Bill, give us examples of societies that have seen sustained
>
> growth
>
>>rates like that for more than, oh, three decades.
>
>
> We're talking about the transformation of a society from primitive to
> advanced post-industrial. To transform the world into a global society
> as wealthy as American are today would require only 11x – and at a 10%
> growth rate this can be done in a generation.

okay, specifically how is that achievable worldwide?

> *Three decades of doubling every 5 years would produce a society that*
> *doubled its income 6 times – that's $2^6 = 64x$ That's not what we're*
> *talking about, and you know it.*

you're talking about a pipe dream. I know that.

>
>
>>> *This means transforming a*
>>>*subsistence society into a highly industrial society of great*
>
> *wealth in*
>
>>>*a generation.*
>>
>>show when and where that has been done as well
>
>
> *In the United States following the Civil War. In Europe during the*
> *same period. In Japan in the 20th century.*
>

> <http://www.eh.net/encyclopedia/?article=mosk.japan.final>

ahem:

"Given the relatively poor record of countries outside the European cultural area — few achieving the kind of "catch-up" growth Japan managed between 1880 and 1970 — the question naturally arises: why Japan?"

does that sound like a feasible assumption for an entire planet's economy, Bill? If it was so doable, then why haven't other countries done the same?

>

>

>>> *This is not surprising, Ronald Reagan lived through the*

>

> *transformation*

>

>>> *of his society from a gaslit horse and buggy era to Star Wars.*

>>

>> *And in the nine decades of his life, the wealth of our country didn't*

>

>

>> *double every 5 to 7 years, either.*

>

>

> <http://www.census.gov/statab/hist/HS-25.pdf>

>

> *Well, from 1947 to 1999 average household income grew from \$3,000 to*

> *\$48,000 — which is an increase of 16x in a generation. This is a*

> *doubling every 10 years and sufficient to bring about the change we're*

> *talking about.*

<sigh>

look at the chart again, Bill: teh first section is in current dollars, the second section is in constant 2001 dollars. Constant income only went from \$20,000 to \$52,000 during that time period.

So in 52 years American family income only rose about 160% in real purchasing power. IOW, in wealth. Not quite "doubling every 5 to 7 years", now is it?

> *The higher rates of growth occur early in the growth process and slow*

> *as development proceeds. The period immediately after the Civil War*

> *for example.*

okay, you understand nonlinear growth. You just don't know what it means.

>

>>> *The*

>>>Japanese saw the transformation of their society after World War

>

> II.

>

>>and have been in economic and social stagnation for half a decade now

>

>

> http://www.lm-media.com/j_encyc.html

>

> Might I suggest you learn a thing or two about people before you

> denigrate an entire culture?

Bill, the last "What's new?" stuff on this site was from 1999–2000, and there's no indication that the Japanese material is any more recent. You do the math...

>>>The Chinese and Indian people are transforming their society as

>

> well in

>

>>>a generation.

>>

>>dunno about the Indians, but the Chinese are *raping* their society

>

> for

>

>>short-term gain.

>

>

> http://www.chinaonline.com/refer/ministry_profiles/threegorgesdam.asp

ahem:

"UPDATED: October 3, 2000"

you really need to keep up better, Bill. Oh, and your own website hasn't been updated in a couple years now. Might want to forego the chartered jet next time and use the money to hire a webmaster ;)

> The Three Gorges dam project is modeled after the US TVA project.

> Anything people do on this scale can be picked at. This doesn't change

> the fact that the world could grow to be a wealthy place in a

> generation under the right sort of conditions.

and under the right sort of conditions I would be married to a supermodel and driving my Bentley to the Piedmont Driving Club for dinner every night.

>>AND their economy is poised to tank just like the other

>>Asian antions did back in 97–98.

>

>
> Evidence?

www.wsws.org/articles/2004/may2004/chin-m05.shtml
www.rieti.go.jp/en/china/03122201.html
www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb04-7.pdf
www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2004-06/07/content_337156.htm

that should tide you over

>
>>> *There is absolutely given sufficient energy resources the entire*
>
> world
>
>>> *could not be producing a quadrillion dollars a year or more in*
>
> wealth
>
>>> *(up from \$40 trillion today)*
>>
>> *All your base are belong to us*
>
>
> *Could you rephrase that? It doesn't make any sense the way you've said*
> *it.*

neither did your sentence quoted. Which was the entire point...

>> *Bill, do you have even the remotest clue what "capital flows of the*
>> *international capital markets" means?*
>
>
> *Yes. Do you?*
>
> <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/icm/97icm/icmcon.htm>
> <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/hfs.cgi/00/13920.ctf>

yep, I remember my finance classes from B-school. Quaint that you get all your edumucashun from websites, though.

> *Capital is the money used to build business. Capital flows into*
> *regions where it can do the most good, that is providing the highest*
> *return on investment. This typically is where it can do the most good*
> *for the people in those regions creating jobs – again under the right*
> *conditions.*

Bill, the highest ROI comes from sweatshops where they pay the workers a buck for a 14-hour day of backbreaking labor.

Does that sound like "right conditions" to you?

sci.space.history: Re: Technical and Spiritual Development

> *If the world had sufficient quantities of low-cost energy and a fair
> and stable political and legal system,*

then it wouldn't be the world that we live in. Check that, I have no
clue which particular world *you* live in, Bill :O

> *there is no reason to believe*
> *the entire world could not sustain rates of economic growth that would*
> *allow the average income worldwide to equal that of the average*
> *American income today.*

<sigh>

I'm getting tired of saying the same thing over and over here...

>
>
>>>*Its not the lack of capital that's the problem though. Its the*
>>>*inability of local governments to see the benefits of free capital*
>>>*markets.*
>>
>>*Oh they see it, alright. It means that they won't be able to lord it*
>>*over their countrymen anymore.*
>
>
> *Should I respond to your racist comments? No, I don't think so. You*
> *are beyond hope.*

Bill, you realize that the per capita income of Saudi Arabia is about
\$8000, yes? Here's a hint: the House of Saud does a little better than that.

Same thing for the rest of the world. Lots of extremely rich people,
far more who ain't got nuthin'.

>
>>>*Still, the only thing the world really lacks is sufficient energy*
>
> *to*
>
>>>*support global industrialization on the scale needed.*
>>
>>*All you need is love*
>
>
> *I doubt you'll get any from me. I'd like to kick your ass.*

...

>
>>>>>*That's right, the entire world population will be in*
>>>>>*decline.*

>>>>
>>>>*that's pretty certain to happen in the last half of the century*
>>>>*regardless of what the world's GNP is or isn't.*
>>>
>>>
>>>*Yes. We have a choice. We can see a decline in human numbers due*
>
> *to*
>
>>>*rising living standards and the rising influence of women in the*
>>>*marketplace. Or, we can see a decline in human numbers due to*
>
> *rising*
>
>>>*death rates due to rising poverty and resource limitations.*
>>
>>*Bill, the reason why the population growth rate will drop in teh next*
>
>
>>*fifty years has nothing to do with human rights or economic*
>
> *prosperity.*
>
>>*It's because in the fast-growing areas of the world there's nowhere*
>
> *to*
>
>>*cram more people.*
>
>
> *What is your evidence?*
>
>
>>*China has 1.25 billion people. China is slightly smaller than the US.*

that's a starting point.

>
> *This is true, it doesn't prove your point. Please provide me with*
> *papers from respected sources that project the sorts of things you are*
> *saying.*

www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_housing/documents/page/odpm_house_033737.hcsp
www.globalaging.org/ruralaging/world/villages.htm
www.population-security.org/05-POST.html

>>*there won't *be* any publicly accessible patents, Bill.*
>
>
> *I cannot respond usefully to you when you just make stuff up out of*
> *whole cloth.*

- >
- > *Drug companies routinely file for patent protection for new drugs. Why*
- > *would this drug be different? The answer is, it wouldn't.*
- >
- > <http://www.ktuu.com/CMS/anmviewer.asp?a=16&z=5>

umm...you're quoting a TV station in Alaska?

hint: companies that develop "black works" technology don't file public patent applications. Kind adefeats the whole point, eh?

- > *Drug companies value patents so highly they do ANYTHING to obtain them!*
- > *Now, you are saying drug companies will avoid patents. Please, give*
- > *me a break and shut your pie hole – because nothing useful is coming*
- > *out of it.*
- >
- >
- >>*Does the term "skunk works" mean anything at all to you?*
- >
- >
- > *Sure. Lockheed had a division that quickly developed all sorts of*
- > *advanced aircraft. This has to do with drug company policy toward*
- > *patents how?*

we'll try to focus Bill's wandering attention on the point he was trying to make: some day soon a drug company will develop an effective antiaging medicine.

That medicine will be *classified*, Bill.

- >
- >>>*After that time they will be generic drugs, and cheap.*
- >>>
- >>>*But you bring up an important point. We face a choice in how the*
- >>>*decline in human numbers will be brought about. If we raise living*
- >>>*standards, there will be a general easing of international tension*
- >
- > *and*
- >
- >>>*a large diverse population will be the result.*
- >>
- >>*rising standards of living*
- >>*large diverse population*
- >>*easing of international tension*
- >>
- >>*Pick any two.*
- >
- >
- > *Ever hear of false choice? This is precisely that. We can have all*
- > *three, and more besides.*

how?

>

>

>>> *If we allow a decline*

>>> *in living standards, there will be increasing tension and a small*

>>> *narrow population will be the result.*

>>

>> *short of an asteroid impact, there won't be any decline in living*

>> *standards.*

>

>

> *Wait a minute, didn't you just say that China was raping its people? I*

> *guess consistency isn't your strong suit Terrel.*

ironic, considering that I told you once already that you misspell my name (which is at the top and bottom of every post).

China is doing that. Their "standard of living" is increasing *right now*. Even considering the environmental and health consequences. That growth will not be sustainable for China itself, but the rest of the world will keep on chugging along.

> *Fact is, without appropriate capital investment all societies face the*

> *prospect of falling living standards.*

>

> <http://countrystudies.us/russia/29.htm>

ahem:

"Experts have identified a number of general demographic trends that are likely to prevail between 1996 and 2005."

the article you cite is over ten years old, Bill.

> <http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/News/Roberts/NewsPCR111704.html>

this one is recent, but it's talking strictly about our trade deficit with China.

> <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/chinaenv.html>

this one is both recent (2003) *and* it says precisely what I have been saying about CHina, to wit:

"While solar and wind power provide significant renewable energy potential, China's growth in renewables will in the next decade will be dominated by hydropower, particularly with completion of the 18.2-gigawatt Three Gorges Dam project in 2009. Although the Three Gorges Dam is seen as both an important source of energy for China's growing electricity consumption needs and a means of taming the Yangtze

River, notorious for its disastrous floods, the controversial dam also could prove to be an environmental disaster. Thus far, few attempts have been made to address concerns regarding the accumulation of toxic materials and other pollutants from industrial sites that will be inundated after construction of the dam."

>>*There could very well be a flattening of the growth curve*
>>*(rich 100-year-olds don't need a new Lexus).*
>
>
> *More racist bilge.*

?!?

Do you even know what the word 'racist' means, Bill? Here's a hint: it doesn't mean "making fun of 100-year-olds"...

> *A person chronologically 100 years old, but*
> *possessing the youthful vitality of a 23 year old, may very well desire*
> *a wide range of exciting vehicles.*

sure, sport

>
>>>>*The folks who can afford*
>>>
>>>*somec/boosterspice/whatever-Spinrad-called-it*
>>>
>>>
>>>>*will have an enormous competitive advantage over those who can't.*
>>>
>>>
>>>*What you call a competitive advantage is actually a productivity*
>>>*advantage.*
>>
>>*that's one type of competitive advantage, yes. There are others.*
>
>
> *But we're talking about anti-aging treatments and their impact on*
> *society. Please try to keep up!*

IOW, if your analogy doesn't support your own argument, it's somehow a case of me not keeping up. Ah.

>>> *Clearly everyone is better off if everyone is more*
>>>*productive. Limiting the ability of people to be productive is*
>>>*foolishness.*
>>
>>*ROTFLMAO.*
>
>

- > *You do that quite frequently for no reason don't you?*
- >
- >
- >>*You have never spent a day working for a large organization, Bill.*
- >>*Increased productivity in one area starts *wars*.*
- >
- >
- > *Have you ever managed a new technology?*

yep, I've worked for a startup computer vendor and for a dotcom.

- > *Those battles are fought and*
- > *won by companies that are growing. When all companies grow, society*
- > *grows. That's the point.*

All companies (and all countries) do **not** grow, Bill. Never have, never will.

Good example: there are ten times more people on the Internet than there were during the dotcom bubble days of the late '90s.

But how many thousands of small firms went belly-up and aren't around to enjoy that growth?

- > *There will be battle to fight, no doubt. That won't stop the eventual*
- > *widespread use of anti-aging treatments when they become available.*
- >
- > *You can't see the forest for the trees.*

the proper analogy is "I know bullshit when I smell it"

- >>>*think about things. Wealth and power are unlimited.*
- >>
- >>*yeah, just look at how equitably Saddam or the House of Saud or the*
- >
- > *Kali*
- >
- >>*cartel share their immense wealth.*
- >
- >
- > *We're talking about free markets and free societies, not despots backed*
- > *by US intelligence to keep the owners of oil reserves at each other's*
- > *throats for the purposes of depressing the price of oil for the US.*
- >
- > *Please try to keep up.*

please explain how "free markets and free societies" are going to suddenly emerge the world over to enable the widespread usufruct of this wonderful new tonic you are peddling, Bill...

>>> *The more people think and behave in ways that lead to wealth and*
>
> *power,*
>
>>> *the more wealth and power there is.*
>>
>> *wanna buy a dotcom?*
>
> *At the right price, there are plenty I'd buy.*

okay, I'll sell you my options in Global Food Exchange. Which went out of business four years ago. I'll give you cousin rates!

>> *you're forgetting one thing, Bill: the longer your competitors live*
>
> *and*
>
>> *the healthier they are, the more opportunities they have to take away*
>
>
>> *your own wealth.*
>
>
> *You wrongly assume wealth is created by theft. It is not. Wealth is*
> *created the same way art is created – by the creative acts of*
> *individuals.*

that's how it is created. That is not remotely always how wealth is *acquired* by the wealthy. That's where stealing comes into play.

>>> *Yes they do. All companies want to maximize their profits.*
>>
>> *Not true. All companies seek to maximize their *investment*.*
>
>
> *If you don't take maximum profit your investment isn't worth what it*
> *could be. If you cannot take maximum profit, then you sell your*
> *investment to someone who can.*

again, Bill: maximizing your profits is *one way* to maximize your investment, but it's not the only way, and may not even be the most common way.

>
>> *Profit is*
>> *one way to do that, but it's not the only way and often isn't even an*
>
>
>> *option.*
>
>

- > *Well, well, that's true – what a refreshing thing. Terrel actually*
- > *saying something coherent.*
- >
- > *Yes, when market and/or technology conditions change you've got to*
- > *modify your investments to maintain highest profitability.*
- >
- > *But this is a secondary concern. Profit drives business and business*
- > *value. Period.*

not true

- > *If you cannot make maximal profit for whatever reason (and there may be*
- > *plenty) then you sell your investment off to focus resources on those*
- > *things you can make maximal profit in.*

or you just wait for a bigger fool, or you jiggle the tax writeoffs, or...

- >
- >
- >>*Case in point: professional sports franchises. They make more money*
- >
- > *than*
- >
- >>*they claim, but the real incentive in operating a sports team isn't*
- >
- > *to*
- >
- >>*make a tidy profit, it's *franchise appreciation*.*
- >
- >
- > *Aw, gawd, a moment of sanity and then the bullshit again.*
- >
- > *Even you know this is a special case. Or are you saying that the free*
- > *market operates like a sports franchise always? What a crock.*

what I am saying is that there is a lot less "free market" in the world than you seem to think, Bill.

- >
- >>*IOW, buy the team for \$300 million, hold on to it and amortize the*
- >
- > *tax*
- >
- >>*breaks for a decade, then sell the team for \$650 million.*
- >
- >
- > *How about buying a beach house in South Carolina and renting it out,*
- > *using the rents to pay all the costs and then selling the house?*
- > *Hopefully it will appreciate.*
- >
- > *Doesn't make much sense except in the case where you really like the*

- > *beach and use the house yourself some of the time.*
- >
- > *Same with the team. There are other benefits, like advertising or PR*
- > *benefits, that accrue from this exercise.*

they all get rolled into the team's bottom line while you own it. ANd that bottom line isn't why you bought the team, it's so someone will buy it from you for twice the price five or ten years from now.

- > *Generally speaking businesses operate in the free market to maximize*
- > *their investments by engaging in activities that sell products and*
- > *services at the greatest profits possible.*

which free market, Bill?

- >
- >>*And there are plenty of "shell" coprtorations that exist strictly as*
- >
- > *a*
- >
- >>*tax writeoff.*
- >
- >
- > *Yes. Regulations create special conditions that lead to special*
- > *situations. These are all about conserving wealth. We're talking*
- > *about creating wealth. Please try to keep up.*

what we are talking about is the reasons why companies exist.

- >
- >>*They're not supposed to earn a profit, they'r esupposed to*
- >>*generate paper losses that can be used to offset the earnings of the*
- >>*parent corporation.*
- >
- >
- > *Yes. Please understand the difference between conserving wealth under*
- > *confiscatory tax laws and creating wealth from whole cloth.*

yes sir

- >
- >>*Other companies exist strictly to launder money from criminal*
- >>*activities. They aren't supposed to maximize their profit either,*
- >
- > *since*
- >
- >>*that draws more public and legal attention.*
- >
- >
- > *Another special condition based on breaking the law. This is a way to*
- > *convert illegal profits, not CREATE WEALTH – so, it doesn't really*

> *apply to what we're talking about here.*

well, the illegal business created quite a bit of wealth, all of it tax-free, yes?

> *People that live longer and are more vital are people that will CREATE
> MORE WEALTH – and so by this reason anti-aging treatments of the type
> we're discussing will make society wealthier.*

now you're in full circular reasoning mode, Bill.

>>*assuming that there are competitors who know of the existence of the
>>product *and can develop their own competing brand*.
>
>
> The moment you sell something the market knows about it. That's what
> advertising is all about.*

<sigh>

you don't advertise "black" products, Bill.

>>*BA in economics, MBA in international business. Five years as a
>>marketing analyst at Coke.
>
>
> Really? And you still work there? Or did they fire your ass for
> incompetence? Just wondering.*

no, I got a 60% raise from the dotcom for doing the same work, then I got another nice little raise from teh consulting firm that recruited me away from the dotcom right before it crashed.

> *Based on what you've said here, I'd
> take your MBA away from you.*

see whawt I said about people stealing wealth, Bill? Now you're threatening it too <g>

<snip the econ 101 lesson>

> *And your point is? What? Please recall that we were talking about
> creating wealth, not preserving monopolies, etc., and the impact of
> longevity treatment to the wealth of the world.*

the point is that the profit-maximizing model you described is a very general-case that does not apply in RL. Which is why economists of the last 250 years have ahd to make all those other models of how pricing decisions are actually made in RL.

sci.space.history: Re: Technical and Spiritual Development

- > *You and others maintain that practical longevity treatments would*
- > *impoverish the world.*

no no no, I'm saying that they would have *no widespread effect at all*.

Because only a very few people would ever get them in the first place.

- > *I on the other hand am arguing that practical*
- > *longevity treatments will create vast new populations of highly*
- > *productive people and as a consequence create huge quantities of new*
- > *wealth.*
- >
- > *You have yet to offer one single point of fact in support of your*
- > *position.*

ROTFL

your theory, sparky, *your* responsibility to prove it. See how that works?

- >> *Like five cents per kiloWatt hour, eh Bill? ;)*
- >
- >
- > *Yes. DC electricity derived from inconstant solar sources have a peak*
- > *price point (given my cost of production) of around 5 cents in most*
- > *place in the US. So what?*

so how much of it has Mook Industries sold?

- >>> *Which means there is huge unfilled demand beckoning competitors to*
- >>> *enter the market to fulfill it.*
- >>
- >> *not if they never know about it and can't do anything about it, Bill.*
- >
- >
- > *You really should reign in your fantasy.*
- >
- > *Company X offers a drug for sale that extends life indefinitely.*

not on the open market, they don't

- > *People take the drug and their life is extended. The business*
- > *community knows about this and some consider the business potential of*
- > *this new development and look for opportunities to make a profit for*
- > *themselves in this business.*
- >
- > *Now, even if the drug is for sale very quietly to people worth \$50*
- > *million or more – SO WHAT? You are saying NONE of the 250,000 or so*
- > *people who are taking the drug at this price point will EVER consider*
- > *the business potential of this development.*

so how do they make it?

- > *Hell, those worth \$50*
- > *million or more will be PRECISELY the people who will look into the*
- > *business side of things.*

I'm saying that an immortality serum is a secret that the inventors (and the government they pay taxes to) will be more than willing to commit murder to protect.

- >> *Why did J.P. Morgan, already rich beyond avarice, start snapping up*
- >
- > *all*
- >
- >> *the steamship lines he could get his hands on?*
- >
- >
- > *Because he could. So what? We're talking about markets, not the*
- > *avarice of individuals.*

you might want to read up on International Mercantile Marine...

- > *Please try to keep up.*
- >
- >
- >> *Why do Microsoft and Coca-Cola and Intel continue to ruthlessly*
- >
- > *gather*
- >
- >> *market share?*
- >
- >
- > *Because they think its important to maintain and improve their value.*

Exactly. They won't say "we've got enough, we'll let the other guy have his share".

Getting the picture, Bill?

- > *HP just decided last week to maximize its profit not market share*
- > *against Dell as a way to grow in value.*
- >
- > *So what?*

you must have missed the part where HP's senior leadership has seen mass defections over the last few months. Their stock price is down 66% since Carly took over. Their earning are down teh toilet (they get most of their revenue from...wait for it...printer cartridges).

- > *It doesn't change the fact that widespread use of longevity treatment*
- > *along the lines we've already discussed would dramatically increase the*

sci.space.history: Re: Technical and Spiritual Development

> *wealth of any society that used it.*

nomatter how many times you sling the same old shit, Bill, it still sticks to your hands.

>

> *[snip]*

>

> *Well, this was fun, but clearly, I've shown that once again, you have*

> *missed the mark and not kept up with what we're talking about. So, I*

> *must go and do something more useful today than attempt to educate you.*

> *Cheers.*

yeah, you do that hotshot

--

Terrell Miller

millerto@bellsouth.net

"Every gardener knows nature's random cruelty"

-Paul Simon RE: George Harrison