

Re: Historical comparisons

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-03/msg00033.html>

- *From:* Fred J. McCall <fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 02 Mar 2006 05:03:53 GMT
-

royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:

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

:

:>royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:

:>

:>:On Sun, 26 Feb 2006 19:45:48 GMT, Fred J. McCall

:>:<fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:>:

:>:>royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:

:>:>

:>:>:On 26 Feb 2006 00:24:32 -0800, "William Mook"

:>:>:<william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> 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.

Oh, I see. Only you know these 'facts' and they are being concealed
by the vast Skull & Bones conspiracy.

Check your tinfoil hat....

Re: Historical comparisons

:>: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
:>: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.

You're confused then. Private individuals can buy, sell, and lease land in Singapore. While all land is State-owned in Hong Kong it is 'leased' by the government for what is essentially the tax value it would bring if it were privately owned, so it amounts to the same thing in practice.

:>:>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.

No, you're just an insulting liar who can't support his own position,
so you spew the preceding sort of tripe instead.

:Please explain specifically how
:someone else could "take over" after someone had invested in capital
:equipment to extract natural resources.

:

:I'm waiting.

Ok, the land with minerals on it is 'leased' to you. You spend all
the up front money to dig the mine so you can start extracting
resources. Then the land gets released out from under you to someone
else, who now has to spend much less to start extraction and you take
a dead loss on your capital investment.

You drill the oil well. Hit oil. Then they take the lease away from
you and give it to someone else.

Re: Historical comparisons

So simple even a child ought to be able to have figured it out.

:>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.

What makes you think a State will be any less capricious?

: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."

Singapore and Hong Kong are anomalies.

http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0254/is_5_59/ai_70738932

:>:"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
:>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.

Well, no, you haven't. You've merely exposed your own ignorance and inability to engage in thought.

:>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.

Sure you have.

:You made a false and indefensible claim.

You're a liar.

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

: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.

I suggest you pull your head out and try thinking for a change.

—

"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

.