

# Re: Historical comparisons

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-03/msg00010.html>

---

- *From:* [royls@xxxxxxxx](mailto:royls@xxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Wed, 01 Mar 2006 07:08:48 GMT
- 

On Tue, 28 Feb 2006 08:36:21 GMT, Fred J. McCall  
<fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:

:On Sun, 26 Feb 2006 19:45:48 GMT, Fred J. McCall  
:<fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:  
:  
:>royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:  
:>  
:>:On 26 Feb 2006 00:24:32 -0800, "William Mook"  
:>:<william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:  
:>:  
:>:>We would also do well to allow the ownership of space based assets and  
:>:>resources by people and business.  
:>:  
:>:Private ownership of privately created capital equipment is a very  
:>:good policy. But private ownership of natural resources is a very bad  
:>:policy that produces increasing inequality and injustice, and eventual  
:>:economic and societal stagnation and collapse.  
:>  
:>:As opposed to immediate stagnation and collapse because you can't have  
:>:private ownership of natural resources.  
:  
:Such statements only demonstrate your ignorance of both history and  
:economics.

Let's not tell the University, shall we? They might want my degree  
back.

I doubt it. They gave it to you for not knowing (or at least  
pretending not to know) such facts.

:You are of course ignorant of the fact that natural resources in  
:Singapore and HK (two of the least likely places on the planet to  
:experience economic stagnation and collapse) are publicly held, not

## Re: Historical comparisons

:privately owned, and have been for decades. You are ignorant of this  
:fact not because it is obscure or secret, but because it proves your  
:beliefs are false, and you therefore refuse to know it.

:

:Prediction: you will now try to argue that natural resources are  
:privately owned in Singapore and HK, in direct contradiction of the  
:widely known facts, which are not disputed by any knowledgeable  
:person.

What 'natural resources' do Singapore and Hong Kong have?

Land.

:>Why would anyone invest in  
:>the capital equipment to recover such resources when, once the hard  
:>work is done, someone else can take over?

:

:How could someone else "take over"?

Because developing natural resources takes capital.

Ignoratio elenchi. You have made a false and indefensible claim, and are now trying to change the subject. Please explain specifically how someone else could "take over" after someone had invested in capital equipment to extract natural resources.

I'm waiting.

Once the capital  
infrastructure is in place, what's to stop whoever controls the  
resources from just giving them to someone else?

The fact that there is no such capricious private owner in control of the resources.

As I already explained, you are permanently and immutably ignorant of the fact that in Singapore and HK, among many other places, people put capital infrastructure in place on public land all the time, and no one else can "take over."

:>"Ignorance is preferable to error, and he is less remote from the  
:> truth who believes nothing than he who believes what is wrong."

:> -- Thomas Jefferson

:

:Good point. And you need to think about it, long and hard, while

Re: Historical comparisons

:peering intently into a mirror.

I'd suggest you do likewise. Insults and clever repartee may constitute 'argument' on Usenet but they hardly constitute either logic or proof.

Try those last two for a change, why don't you?

I have identified relevant facts of which you are ignorant, and their logical implications.

Oh, and study some economics. You obviously don't know shit about the field.

<yawn> I've been handing "economists" their heads on this particular subject for years. You made a false and indefensible claim. I suggest you retract it rather than make a progressively bigger fool of yourself, because I am going to continue refuting it with facts that are widely known and indisputable. I've had a lot of practice at this, believe me.

-- Roy L

.