

Re: Historical comparisons

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-03/msg00046.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Thu, 02 Mar 2006 18:19:34 GMT
-

On Thu, 02 Mar 2006 05:03:53 GMT, Fred J. McCall
<fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:

:On Tue, 28 Feb 2006 08:36:21 GMT, Fred J. McCall
:<fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
:
:>royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:
:>
:>:On Sun, 26 Feb 2006 19:45:48 GMT, Fred J. McCall
:>:<fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
:>:
:>:>royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:
:>:>
:>:>:On 26 Feb 2006 00:24:32 -0800, "William Mook"
:>:>:<william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> 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.

Re: Historical comparisons

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

A lot of people know them. Even some economists do. Just not you.

:>: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.

No, you are misinformed.

Private individuals can buy, sell, and lease
land in Singapore.

Not much of it. As your own source reveals, "In 1960, the state owned 44 percent of the land in Singapore. By 1985, the proportion of land under state ownership had increased to 76 percent."

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

Notice that this period of rapid land nationalization in Singapore was also a period of during which the country rapidly became more prosperous. Which contradicts your claim, above, that lack of private ownership of natural resources means stagnation and collapse.

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.

Re: Historical comparisons

No, it does not, which is very much the point. HK probably recovers more land rent than any other jurisdiction of comparable or greater size in the world. And it proves that your claim, above — "immediate stagnation and collapse because you can't have private ownership of natural resources" — is just flat false.

:>:>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.

I am supporting my position just fine. You, by contrast, have still not explained how "developing natural resources takes capital" allows someone else to "take over" publicly owned natural resources that someone has invested in capital equipment to extract.

And you won't, because there is no logical relationship between them.

: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,

?? How? How could public land be "released" any more than privately owned land? Do you think a public landowner can just ignore lease terms, while private landowners must honor them? Do you think oil leases on public land, broadcast spectrum leases, etc. can just be "released" any time the government feels like it, ignoring the legal rights of the leaseholders? What is your evidence for such silly claims? Give your head a shake.

Re: Historical comparisons

who now has to spend much less to start extraction and you take a dead loss on your capital investment.

You also haven't explained why anyone would make such an investment without first making sure they had sufficiently secure tenure to make it pay.

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

How can they "take the lease away from you" any more than a private landowner can "take away" an oil lease?

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

ROTFL!! Even a child can figure out that you are just spewing ridiculous lies, as I knew you would. Do Singapore and HK just "take away" land leases from private leaseholders? Does the US government just "take away" and "release" oil leases on public land or spectrum leases? No? Then why do you claim that all other public owners of natural resources would?

:>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?

The fact that it wants to obtain revenue from the resources, which will not happen if users cannot get secure tenure in return for their lease payments. As even a child ought to be able to figure out, but you apparently cannot.

: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.

Re: Historical comparisons

Indeed. They are anomalously _prosperous_, because they recover more publicly created rent of natural resources for the purposes and benefit of the public that creates it, rather than giving it away to idle private owners of those resources for doing nothing.

:>>"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.

Well, yes, I have, liar. Such as the fact that land is publicly owned in Singapore and HK, two of the most _anomalously_prosperous_ jurisdictions in the world. And the logical implication thereof: that your claim of "immediate stagnation and collapse if you can't have private ownership of natural resources" is flat false.

You've merely exposed your own ignorance and inability to engage in thought.

<yawn> See above. By contrast to the refutation I have provided by the examples of Singapore and HK (and there are others, less well known), have you provided _any_ facts or logic to support your claims?

:>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.

Re: Historical comparisons

Heh. See above.

:You made a false and indefensible claim.

You're a liar.

Does this sound familiar? "Immediate stagnation and collapse because you can't have private ownership of natural resources."

HK proves that claim is flat false, and you have certainly offered nothing to suggest it is defensible.

: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.

Back atcha, pal.

— Roy L

.