

Re: Historical comparisons

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-03/msg00284.html>

- *From:* "William Mook" <william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 10 Mar 2006 03:35:00 -0800
-

royls@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 9 Mar 2006 15:40:59 -0800, "William Mook"
<william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

[hissy fit deleted]

Translation: you know have been demolished, and have no answers.

NOTE: You just had to have another hissy fit rather than answer the damned question.

Please answer this question with something more than, "I already stated the obvious" or some similar nebulous claim;

If a free and open and diverse and robust market exists in the buying and selling natural resources how can any one person or group in that market be privileged?

As I said before:

Musta missed it! lol.

Everyone who owns them is privileged, because others must pay them for access to what nature provided for free --

This raises some interesting questions...

- 1) How do you figure free,
- 2) And even if it were free, how do you figure it creates privilege?

Re: Historical comparisons

So, I'm not following your logic here.

TO the first point, even if there were gold lying freely on the ground somewhere, there's still the cost of finding it, going out there, picking it up, carrying it securely to market – nothing is ever free – so, I don't know how you figure that anything ever could be.

TO the second point – let's say something were really free – say something like sunlight falling on the Earth. It has value, and with the right equipment that value can be extracted in electrical form, chemical form, biological form. Its not really free that way because it takes land area and time and effort and knowledge to make use of it – but I've already 'demolished' the idea that anything is free already, so to the second point – haha – even if it were free, if anyone can set up a solar collector on any available surface where the sun shined – how would allowing people to do that freely create privilege?

The point is, privilege requires something more than just making use of what is freely available. If anyone can compete there is no privilege created that I can see. So, you need to educate me here..

I mean, I'm as handsome as they come – that was freely given me by my genes. Does that mean I'm privileged? Not really – I compete with all sorts of guys – girls like personality as much as looks! lol. Does my good fortune in the looks department mean I'm privileged? Not really, because everyone can compete. Sure, I might have certain advantage over others – but I'm not privileged. I don't get ALL the girls! lol. So, I don't understand your logic at all. In fact I see no consistent logic. You make a statement about stuff being free and then assume that just because something is free and valuable, that that somehow creates privilege.

and which they have every
right to use, because they have rights to life and liberty.

Everyone has rights to life and liberty. That's a side issue having nothing to do with your first point – which you haven't supported. Nothing is ever free and even if it were, ownership of free things do not necessarily create privilege. You haven't supported your position at all as far as I can see. You're just restating your conclusion – not the facts and the logic you use to arrive at your conclusion.

Re: Historical comparisons

The owners are thus getting something for nothing at the expense of others, the very essence of privilege.

If I found gold lying on the ground somewhere on the bottom of the ocean and picked it up and carried it back to market and sold it for a profit – how am I privileged if any Tom Dick or Harry could do the same thing? Sure, I would profit by bringing something to market. But if I went to the expense to find this resource, figure out a way to recover it, and took the trouble to recover it – it ain't free even if its sitting at the bottom of the ocean – so I would be getting something if this happened – but I'm not getting something for nothing!

Furthermore, if this gold that I found sitting at the bottom of the ocean – if no one else knew about it before I discovered it – know one even suspected its existence – how do you figure my discovery of it is at the expense of everyone else? See, this is where I think you have a socialist bug somewhere in your system. How does my making use of a fortunate event deprive everyone else of something – even if they never knew of it before I came along?

As I already explained (and you deleted unanswered, and apparently unread)

Don't have to be an asshole about it. Hell, I tried to follow your logic, but when it gets too twisted for me to follow, I try to color up the conversation and get back to my main sticking points.

..

the existence of a market in privileges does not mean they are not privileges.

You have to explain that one to me. Like I said, you have to go back to simple examples and stuff for me to see what you're saying. Can you do that? This taking on airs and dissing me because I don't follow your damnable logic wears thin! lol.

I mean take the example of me finding gold at the bottom of the ocean.

It meets your first two criterion on the surface, but when I think about it in detail, your conclusions don't hold any water for me!

That's cause it ain't free for me to find it, to get at it, or to bring it safely back to market and get some value out of it.

When I sell it I can only sell it at market rates.

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

Once sold, I don't have it any more and if I want more value I've got to go get more of the 'free' stuff.

But, anyone can go out and pick up gold at the bottom of the ocean, so if I were a guy who picked up some gold, I wouldn't feel privileged at all even though it meets all your standards of a privileged situation.

The existence of a market in slaves did not mean that their owners were not privileged.

There you go, you prove my point. It wasn't the market that created slavery – it was the idea you could own human chattel that created slavery. The very concept of human chattel creates the slave and the slave owner.

You haven't explained in a way I can understand how other forms of chattel, like me claiming I own a chunk of gold I found at the bottom of the ocean, creates privilege. Sure, it creates value for me to make that claim – but I don't see how that denies value to others – especially if they didn't even suspect that gold existed in the first place, and if anyone can go out and pick up a piece for themselves.

The existence of a market in taxi medallions does not mean they are not privileges.

Sure taxi medallions confer some sort of privilege, but that's not the kind of privilege I'm talking about.

We're not talking about privileges we're talking about a fixed privileged class being created by property rights.

Master and slave was created by the concept of human chattel and creates a privileged class of people having unfair power over others. This form of property right DOES create privilege by definition and should be universally banned. That is a form of property right that creates privilege. That I grant you and I agree, we shouldn't be allowed to own one another..

A class of business person – the Taxi operator – is created by the concept of taxi medallions. I grant you that. Does that property right create privilege of the same type as human chattel? lol. Not in a pigs eye! lol.

The privilege to operate a taxi in the streets of NYC is what the medallion confers. Is this the sort of privilege I'm discussing with you? Not really. I'm not a slave to the taxi operator, in the same

Re: Historical comparisons

way I would be a slave if we allowed me to be human chattel. I can walk, take the bus, hire a limo, ride with a friend, drive my own car... so, while you play with words, you're not really letting me understand what the basis of your objection to property rights freely owned is. You've got to try again. Sorry..

So, I'm not following your logic that free stuff in nature being owned by people willing to put the effort to bring that stuff to market is the same as slavery. You've got to explain that to me.

Its a great privilege for me to be with my girlfriend. I wonderful privilege. And its not one that anyone else can share! Very privileged.

This is not the same order of privilege we're talking about here – at least not the one I'm talking about. I'm talking about the sort of privilege that would derive from say a RULE that said I am the only guy that can have sex with anyone. That's the sort of privilege I'm talking about. Human chattel creates a slave class and that's wrong. I give you that. But you haven't shown me in a way I can understand, how ownership of other stuff creates poverty and hardship in the same way as human chattel does.

Just because I claim the right exclusively to my girlfriend's time and attention – and deny others that right – doesn't mean I am denying all men the right to have the time and attention of other women! lol.

The existence of a market in licenses to steal would not mean they were not privileges.

A right to steal? Steal? Steal?

This is nearly the same as human chattel in different words.

Okay, lets think about this – if there is a piece of gold found in my pocket, its mine – and if you took the trouble to find it and liberate it – that would be stealing. That deprives me of the value of the gold and you benefit. The fact that you took the trouble and risk and effort to liberate the gold from my pocket doesn't enter into it. I am unjustly poorer by your theft of my gold. Society is not enriched by your theivery. Therefore, I would have to agree, that licenses to steal another's property would not be a good thing generally. Although penguins steal nesting materials from one another – and it benefits everyone. lol. But we're not penguins with limited nesting material drawn from the ocean.

But this bears little relation in my mind to the situation where I find

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

gold at the bottom of the ocean. Gold in my pocket is in some sense already participating in the market. Gold at the bottom of the ocean is not. So, my discovering it, developing it, bringing it to market – is quite different than someone liberating that gold from my pocket in the streets.

And the existence of a market in private titles to natural resources does not mean they are not privileges.

But they don't create a privileged class the same way human chattel does, or human theft does. In the case of slavery and theft you are taking something that rightfully belongs to someone else.

You assert that natural resources are the property of everyone. But if people don't even suspect that those resources exist and they aren't part of the market and contribute nothing to society – then your claim is highly suspect to my mind. How can someone own something they know nothing about? How can someone claim value in something that contributes no value at all to their lives?

I mean you have a pretty logical argument. You have defined ownership in a way that supports your conclusion logically. But when you think about it in real terms it doesn't make any sense. And it's in those terms I want to understand what you're saying.

If I claim to own a person – I am denying that person the right to live their life as they desire. That's a great cost for any benefit I receive. This is an unfair privilege. So, such claims of ownership are denied by any decent society.

If I claim to own the gold in your pocket – I am denying you the right to the value of that gold. That's an unfair burden for you for any benefit I receive. This is an unfair privilege. So, such claims of ownership are denied by any decent society.

Now, if I claim to own a natural resource that is undeveloped, and in fact, unknown to society before I arrived on the scene – I am denying no one any rights to anything in a practical sense. Sure, in some theoretical sense you could argue people are denied – but if they didn't even know the resource existed until I came along and took the trouble to find it? I am denying no one any rights. If I am granted the privilege of developing this resource and benefitting by bringing it to market – everyone is better off, and I deny no one else the right to develop other resources found elsewhere. This is a fair and equitable privilege. So, such claims of ownership enrich society and any decent society recognizes them.

If I'm wrong tell me where I've made a mistake. If not, then your whole concept falls on its face.

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

Answer this fully and honestly with peer reviewed references and I will take back all the bad things I said and thought about you! lol.

?? "Peer-reviewed references"? LOL!

So, you won't provide any peer reviewed references? Why not?

Are you really unable to understand the self-evident

Oh boy, here we go with the hissy fit again... sheez.

This is the point. Its not self evident to me. I'm asking you quite honestly and plainly, what is the basis of your belief?

You know Newton discovered his three laws of motion hundreds of years ago. Anyone who knows anything about physics, or science, or engineering, knows about Newton's laws of motion. Even so, if someone were to ask me or anyone who knows, about the three laws and why those laws are believed to work the way they do... people can point to accepted reference works, and even peer reviewed documentation of those laws. Any decent person wouldn't laugh at a newbies question, or make fun of his ignorant notions. Any decent person would clearly state the three laws, the observational basis for those laws, and the step by step logical connection between those observations and the three laws of motion. They would do it with far less verbiage than you have spewed forth here.

The only people who couldn't explain the three laws in this way are those who really didn't understand it in the first place.

If someone asked me about force and acceleration – I could answer their questions – in a clear and cogent way. That's because I understand about force and acceleration. I wouldn't tell them its self evident or attack them because they didn't know.

I am asking you to explain yourself to me in a way I can understand. You have not done so. You have taken every opportunity to attack me and demean me and dismiss the question.

This doesn't say anything about me. It says a lot about you and the level of knowledge you have, and the shallowness of your beliefs.

and indisputable facts

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

What indisputable facts exactly? Do you have a list?

I identified above

You mean your two points? Well they're not self evident to me. Sure, if you define property rights in the way you have and follow the logic of slavery and theivery, you can say quite logically that private ownership of resources is a form of theivery. But I don't understand your definition. Why do you hold it? Where does it come from?

I dispute your indisputable facts. Not because I think about it logically. But because I think about it practically. If I take a piece of gold no one anywhere knew existed its not the same as me taking a gold coin out of your pocket. So, I don't see the fact the way you do, so I dispute it – and ask you to explain and support your view of that fact.

unless they appear in a peer-reviewed journal? Which peer-reviewed journals do you think focus on research into what's privilege and what isn't?

I don't know. You're the one making all the big claims. Again, lets reframe this a little. If you were making statements about how objects fell that I could see were at variance with Newton's laws, I would say dude, what you say doesn't make sense. If you then asked me why I said what I did, I would explain the laws of motion. If you asked me what is the basis of those laws, I would point you to an accepted reference on the subject of Newton's laws. I would not demean you and say what journals do you think focus on research into Newtonian motion – because it was me who told you that you were wrong and its up to me to prove it.

Similarly, you keep talking about indisputable facts and things people have known for a long time. So, I ask you, what is the basis of those facts, and where can I read up on it.

Hell, I gave you the Stanford paper on the efficiencies of private versus public ownership. I gave you the Cato Institute paper on the benefits accrued by society by private ownership of property and resources.

You dismissed the Cato Institute stuff in a very general way making broad statements, but not supporting any of it with details and your thoughts – so your comments were to my mind just asinine, and didn't convince me at all.

Re: Historical comparisons

I'm asking you for something very simple – clear convincing logic based on clear convincing facts – that support your grand statements. You have yet to produce anything approaching that.

I accept that slavery and theivery involve forms of property rights that create a sort of privilege we shouldn't have in society. I do not accept your logic that extends that to property rights over natural resources – particularly if those resources are not known to exist prior to the involvement of a developer. I understand that your logic is impeccable, but I do not accept your indisputable fact that defines the public's rights over natural resources in the way you have. That definition was made to support the conclusion you wanted – it did not derive naturally from clear thinking about what is really going on in the world when people take the trouble to develop a resource.

.