

Re: Historical comparisons

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-03/msg00221.html>

- *From:* "William Mook" <william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Mar 2006 08:51:24 -0800
-

royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On 7 Mar 2006 08:34:04 -0800, "William Mook"
<william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

That you think I am defending privilege says it all. LOL.

Maybe you don't realize that's what you're doing.

Especially since you pulled it out of your ass at the last minute! lol

But I think you do.
The blatant dishonesty of the following convinces me:

I'm calling you a socialist because you are advocating public ownership of property over private ownership of property because in your view private ownership is 'privileged.' Nothing dishonest about that at all.

You're a damned socialist or worse,

Wrong.

You are know by your commentary here – and its socialist.

According to the founder of the US Libertarian Party, I'm a libertarian.

Re: Historical comparisons

The issue isn't what sort of cards you carry with you – the issue is what you are saying! You are saying that public ownership of property is preferred over private ownership of property because in your view private ownership is privileged – THIS IS SOCIALIST!

socialism n. Any of various theories or systems of social organization in which the means of producing and distributing goods is owned collectively

I could challenge you to quote me advocating anything socialistic, but I know you can't, so what's the point?

Your comment – pulled out of your ass – not deriving from any part of what you have talked about previously – your comment that I am defending privilege because I believe people have a right to own private property – marks you off as a socialist.

You didn't say one damned thing about privilege, what it means, how its defined, and how it impacts economic efficiency and all of that. – NOTHING. But there it is, plain as day at the very end!

You're asking me to defend the obvious? And then you have some arcane connection in that black hole you call a mind connecting private ownership of property and privilege – without any discussion any support anything.

This marks you off as a person who has socialist ideals and leanings.

I didn't say that was a bad thing – I just said that's what you are – I don't give a shit what kind of cards you carry with you or what they say – THAT'S NOT THE POINT – and you know it.

and you're arguing out of your ass.

I have refuted all your arguments

No you haven't. And even if you did, you are again dishonestly ducking the issue. WHY THE HELL DO YOU THINK PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY ENTAILS SOME SORT OF PRIVILEGE?

Privilege means only a small number of select people can engage in an activity. If all people can freely buy and sell property in a free and open market unconstrained by restrictive rules – how can private property = privilege? IT CAN'T!!! So, you've got things screwed up in your head on this topic, and your consistent inability to even see the

Re: Historical comparisons

elusive obvious fact that you do— says it all.

by simply identifying facts of
economics that have been known for centuries,

You have not provided support of your implied thesis that private ownership of private property in a modern industrial society is a bad thing. You have not shown that public ownership of property and resources is a good thing. You have airily dismissed unfortunate facts and market realities while holding fast to the brainwashing you received at the hands of socialist tutors at your college so long ago.

and their logical
implications.

Look, I'm open to hearing whatever evidence you have that supports your thesis that public ownership is superior to private ownership of property. However, anything you say in this regard has to answer the findings of the two peer reviewed papers I cited from stanford and the Cato institute.

The fact that you are unaware of those facts

Look, here's a clue bub, what facts are you talking about specifically? You're real good at taking on airs of superiority while accusing me of defending privilege – but whenever you find yourself talking about adjectives rather than what the adjectives refer to, understand you are being hazy.

You have repeated spoken of 'those facts' and 'their logical implications' ad nauseum! **WHAT FACTS ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? WHY DO YOU HOLD THEM TO BE FACTS? WHAT SPECIFIC LOGICAL SEQUENCE ARE YOU USING TO SUPPORT YOUR CONCLUSIONS?**

It seems to me you are dishonestly portraying your views and your argument. You avoid direct discussion of an issue by bringing up other issues to confuse it. You refer to things you don't define or support except in the most general and fuzzy of ways. And you draw conclusions about things so far removed from your topic (i.e. connecting privilege and private property) that it appears to a casual observer you pulled it out of your ass.

and
dislike those implications does not affect the fact that they are

Re: Historical comparisons

accurate.

I don't like or dislike the conclusions. What I dislike is your dishonesty and your abject inability to carry on a rational conversation on this subject. I gave you two peer reviewed references one from Stanford, another from the Cato Institute, that talked about the efficiencies of private enterprise relative and private property in the hands of private enterprise.

YOU HAVE NOT RESPONDED USEFULLY TO ANY OF THESE VERY COGENT AND WELL DOCUMENTED FINDINGS.

You have preferred to lay back on your well worn discussion of generalities and fuzzy thinking.

In the real world private property in the hands of private enterprise
CREATES VAST WEALTH – WHICH WHEN WIDELY PRACTICED IN A FREE MARKET
BRINGS GREAT SOCIAL BENEFIT TO ALL.

It is this fact of history, and of markets, that you elect to IGNORE while spouting the utter bullshit you learned in school supporting an outdated and outmoded way of looking at the world that history shows doesn't work.

If anyone can participate in a free and open market, giving folks the ability to own private property in no way creates privileged castes.

Wrong again.

Not so much! lol

Giving people private property in natural resources does.

Not of ANYONE CAN BUY AND SELL THAT RESOURCE IN A FREE AND OPEN MARKET!
You need to explain how free access to resources in a free market can be seen as a system of privilege.

Always has, always will, by definition.

THIS IS NOT A LOGICAL ARGUMENT!!! THIS IS A STATEMENT OF SOCIALIST FAITH!

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

Look, you can say all you like that private property = privilege. But you have to explain it logically with well documented support. YOU HAVEN'T! Saying that you have when you haven't is dishonest.

If some people own the opportunities, and others must pay them rent for access to those opportunities, equality of opportunity is not even a remote possibility.

This assumes a static unchanging system of ownership. How is this static system of ownership maintained? Its this static system of ownership that creates the potential for privilege.

What about a situation where ownership varies? Where there's a free and competitive market in private property? People who own property and resources one day, sell them to other people who own them the next day Here, there is no opportunity for privilege.

..

And, that you think a working interest spreads risk and that's it, shows you are shuttered in your view of things to protect your flawed socialist paradigm.

ROTFL!! I doubt that you can even define "socialist" accurately.

You say the damndest things, but they're always in the nature of dismissive comments about an argument you have had in your head – but haven't shared with any of us! This makes your comments manipulative and dishonest – and you come off like an arrogant asshole – and it makes people not like you very much!

-- Roy L

Roy, get a does of reality – just because your vaunted commie profs wherever you went to school successfully brainwashed you – doesn't mean those of us who weren't brainwashed are the scum of the Earth. Read the papers I've cited and work out the logic step by step for fools like me – and then maybe you'll convince me – or better yet, maybe you'll actually learn something new – and change your mind to comport with the reality of the world today.

.