

Re: Historical comparisons

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-03/msg00399.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Wed, 15 Mar 2006 16:36:04 GMT
-

On 12 Mar 2006 13:54:29 -0800, "William Mook"
<william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

royls@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On 12 Mar 2006 11:03:54 -0800, "William Mook"
<william.mook@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Any system of privilege requires government sanction to work.

Or those able to can do it themselves: the feudal system.

This is relevant to a modern industrial economy how?

Some modern industrial economies are entirely dependent on natural resources from feudal societies.

The question we have to ask is, the system of privilege beneficial to society or not? Is the system of privilege fair or unfair?

Privilege is unfair by definition,

Your definition!

Oh, learn to read English.

Re: Historical comparisons

How is giving an artist the right to own his art unfair?

It's not. But you are being dishonest here. What you actually mean by "own his art" is "own the contents of other people's minds."

How is giving an inventor the right to own his intellectual property unfair?

It deprives others of the right to develop and use that and "too-similar" inventions — see the recent, outrageous Blackberry case. And "his intellectual property" is nothing but an arbitrary legal privilege.

How is giving a developer the right to own what he develops unfair?

It steals the natural resources he started with from all who are thus deprived of them.

These all involve giving these folks the privilege of controlling a resource.

Equivocation. Art and inventions are not natural resources.

But it denies no one of a resource they currently use,

?? ROTFL!! So if I deny you access to air, except the air you are currently using, that is not unfair??

Give your head a shake.

and
by giving these creators of wealth this privilege, society is made wealthier.

No, it most certainly is not. That is simply a claim, which you repeat and repeat, but for which you have yet to provide even one scintilla of evidence. Economic logic shows that granting monopoly privileges makes society poorer, not wealthier. The intellectual property system was just designed by people who, like you, were ignorant of that fact. But they had the excuse that it had not yet

Re: Historical comparisons

been discovered.

You've defined things pretty consistently. I give you that. I just don't buy your definitions 100% – since they're not consistent with experience.

Yes, actually, they are. They are just not consistent with certain convenient lies in which you happen to have invested.

Your definitions are inconsistent with is our experience!

False.

Our experience is that private property and private enterprise are very good at creating wealthy societies.

Now you are shifting the ground again, from "private property in natural resources and ideas" to "private property and private enterprise." That is a dishonest strawman argument.

Public ownership of property and public enterprises are not.

<sigh> That is just flat false in the case of natural resources. Singapore. Hong Kong. Other historical examples that you have never heard of, but are just as clear. How many times will you refuse to know the facts I identify for you?

so it's hard to see how it can ever benefit society.

When a resource that society never knew existed is brought into society. When a new work of art is made, when a new invention is created, or when a new natural resource is developed.

None of those benefits are facilitated by government issuing monopoly privileges. You just falsely assume they are.

Re: Historical comparisons

And in fact, it doesn't.

Not if by doing so you rob someone else the use of it no.

Robbing others of opportunities they would otherwise have been able to use is inherent in the issuance of monopoly privileges.

Your example of slavery is germane here. Your other examples don't make any sense. They rely on things that are obvious and when I say they're not obvious to me you say I'm an ignoramus! lol. BUT OFFER NO CLEAR CONCISE RATIONALE FOR HOLDING TO THE BELIEFS THAT YOU DO.

Of course I have provided a clear and concise rationale for my views. You just ignored it, and stated your own false beliefs again.

In some theoretical sense if a developer develops a resource that is unknown to society before his arrival, I guess you could say the public is denied this free resource.

Yes. I could say it, because it is true. And apparently for the same reason, you deny it.

But the fact is, without the developer, the public was ALREADY denied this resource because they were ignorant of it and lacked the ability to develop it themselves.

What a load of absolute rubbish. Without that developer, the resource would still be available, and someone else would just discover and develop it. Who on earth do you imagine is fooled by your silly claims, hmmm?

The US patent office grants letters of patent to provide a monopoly for an inventor of a new product or process for a limited period of time. This is a privilege. But I don't judge it to be an unfair one, since it allows the creator of wealth to capture a portion of that wealth for himself.

Re: Historical comparisons

No, that is false. It allows the privilege holder to extort wealth created by others.

Without the invention those others you mention would not be able to create anything. With the invention, they may.

But without the monopoly _privilege_, they would be able to create even more. Google "Blackberry settlement," and make at least a minimal effort to educate yourself. Better yet, Google "Richard Stallman" and start reading.

Your whole argument rests on the self-evidently and indisputably _false_ assumption that without government-issued and -enforced monopoly privileges, people would not invent things, or create art, or develop resources. But does the lack of IP monopolies on scientific discoveries stop people from doing science? What nonsense! You claim patents are what have stimulated the explosion of invention in the last 200 years, but the explosion of scientific research that does _not_ get any IP monopoly privilege has been even greater over the same time period! _Hello_?

Does the fact that the Bible is in the public domain stop publishers from printing Bibles? Don't be ridiculous. Does the fact that oil resources in almost every country in the world are publicly owned stop people from developing them? Give your head a shake.

And here's the clincher: does the fact that vitamins, plant extracts and other natural nutrients cannot be patented stop people from manufacturing and selling nutrient and herbal supplements? Of course not. But the fact that _patents_ are available for expensive, ineffective and toxic _drugs_ _stops_ people from doing POTENTIALLY MUCH MORE BENEFICIAL research on _nutrients_ --- research that could well have yielded safer and more effective (as well as far cheaper) treatments than the drugs!!

Do you understand? You are defending a flat-out _evil_ system that very expensively _kills_ millions of people every year!

Lets look at this in more detail. An inventor creates something. Say a new kind of Cash Register. Okay? So, He gets a patent and organizes labor, and equipment, and so forth – and builds and sells cash registers. Hey pays for his labor, he pays for his equipment, the same way an artist pays for his stuff. Who is denied anything?

Others are denied their right to produce the monopolized item. And it seems entirely to have escaped your notice that the patent is

Re: Historical comparisons

superfluous to production of the cash register. Do you think there are no entrepreneurs making shovels or abacuses, just because they cannot be patented (yet)? Give your head a shake.

Those people wouldn't be employed making anything if the inventor sat on his ass and did nothing.

?? What are you talking about? Are you now claiming that no one ever produces anything that is not patented? Or are you claiming no one has ever invented or would ever invent anything without a patent?

Such claims are self-evidently and indisputably false. Why advance them? Why must you be so dishonest?

Never mind. I know very well why: it is the only way privilege can ever be defended.

So, he makes a cash register and sells it at market rates, which hopefully exceeds the cost of production lol. He pockets the profit.

And a patent is necessary to this process how, exactly? Are you claiming that no unpatented cash registers have ever been produced? Such claims are self-evidently false and absurd. Yet you continue to make them, over and over again, despite never being able to offer one scintilla of evidence for them.

You don't think the inventor would be hurt if someone else reverse engineered his invention and began making copies?

Depends what you mean by "hurt." Competition always makes things more difficult for those who must compete, but it certainly doesn't violate their rights. Competition is what stimulates efficiency and excellence. Is a publisher of Bibles "hurt" by the presence of other Bible publishers in "his" market? Of course he is! If he had a monopoly on the Bible, he could make orders of magnitude more profit!

Funny how the defenders of privilege think competition is so great when working people are the ones whose rewards are driven down by competition, but as soon as anyone suggests that the privileged should compete too, it's Oh No! Don't even think it! It will reduce wealth creation if we don't pay the privileged extortion money for not stopping others from creating wealth!

What a load of crap.

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

Here this inventor
did all the hard work and now someone else steals his invention.

?? What? Stop lying, William. Copying is not stealing. That is just a flat-out lie that defenders of privilege like to tell. And independently inventing something sure as hell isn't stealing it! Why lie about it?

Never mind. I know very well why. And so do you.

Don't
you think he has some rights for creating something wonderful?

Absolutely. He has the right to own what he created. But not a right to stop anyone else from creating it, too.

This benefits society because this encourages people to create new things that enrich our lives.

That is often claimed, but has never been demonstrated.

??? Talk about me being ignorant of obvious facts! lol!!

Unfortunately, what you claim is not only not obvious, it is not a fact. And you will not be able to offer any evidence for it, because no such evidence exists.

Look, millions of patents are issued each year, billions of dollars are created each year, without a system of intellectual property rights, what do you think would happen to this rate of innovation? It would plummet.

No, it most certainly would not. You have offered -- and can offer -- no credible evidence for any such effect. None. If anything, the patent system has become a barrier to innovation, as corporate control of whole areas of technology stops other people from finding new ways to use them.

Your position is based on zero, repeat, zero factual or logical evidence. Zero. I'm not sure there is any clearer way to say that.

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

And part of obtaining a patent is the requirement to teach. You must tell posterity how the heck you are doing what you're doing to get a monopoly on it. What do you think would happen without patent rights?

A lot of rent seekers would be seeking productive employment instead.

People would rightfully be very secretive, and the way in which things were done would be hidden, so the rate of innovation would again plummet.

More of the same ridiculous garbage. The results of scientific research are not patentable. They get no intellectual property privilege at all. Yet people still do an enormous amount of such research, and publish it as fast as they can, in direct contradiction of your false and idiotic claims.

Its sort of like granting an artist the right to own his artwork, which can be worth far more than the time and material put into it.

No, it is not. An artist owns his work because he produced it, so he does not thereby deprive others of it by owning it.

So him owning a copyright of the artwork to keep others from copying it without paying him for the right to do so is okay by you?

?? No, of course not. What are you talking about? You said "own his artwork," not "own a government-issued and -enforced monopoly privilege that gives him control of the contents of other people's minds."

But then, you knew that, didn't you? You knew that a copyright is not an artwork, yet you dishonestly tried to substitute "copyright" for "artwork" in the argument. Why do you think you always need to pull such dishonest tricks, William, hmmm? Could it be because you know very well that there is no other way to defend unjust privileges?

And its okay for a novelist to obtain a copyright on his work too?

Re: Historical comparisons

?? You appear to have become confused. A novel is not a copyright. An artwork is not a copyright. A copyright is a legal privilege. A novel or artwork is a product of labor. Try to keep your dishonest substitutions to a minimum.

Oh, right, I forgot: without them, you have no argument.

We are not deprived of an artwork because of who owns it.
If the artist doesn't produce his artwork in the first place, then we are deprived of it.

Right. But if others are deprived of their right to make additional copies of an artwork, we are denied those copies. I've never been able to figure out how people prevent themselves from knowing such self-evident and indisputable facts of objective reality, but I know you are doing it somehow.

An inventor produces an invention.
A developer brings resources to market.

Wrong. An owner is not a developer, and products are not resources. Stop trying to substitute one thing for something quite different. Products are brought to market just fine by people who do not own the natural resources they were made from. Got it?

If an inventor does not produce an invention, then we are deprived of it.

No, because something must exist in the first place for us to be deprived of it. You can't claim to be deprived of everything that does not exist. What you refuse to know is the fact that we are deprived of an invention when others are denied the right to invent and produce it. We were deprived of Elisha Gray's superior telephone by Bell's telephone patent. That is a fact, conspicuously unlike all your false and unsupported claims.

If a developer does not develop a resource then we are deprived of it.

Garbage. It is still there, ready to be used. Whoever develops a resource is by definition "a developer," so of course only "a developer" can develop a resource. But that does not mean they have to own the resource they are developing, and it does not mean that

Re: Historical comparisons

undeveloped resources cannot be developed, made into products and brought to market by someone else.

Don't you ever get tired of making so many patently false claims?

We are not deprived of an invention because the inventor claims intellectual property rights.

Yes, of course we are. We are deprived of all the too-similar inventions, like Elisha Gray's superior telephone system. You are just making more false claims again.

We are not deprived of an undeveloped resource because the developer claims ownership rights once developed.

?? Of course we are. Who do you think is fooled by such nonsense? A developer goes to an undeveloped tropical island and builds a hotel on it, claiming not just the hotel but the whole island. We are thus deprived of the island, because we now cannot go there, use it, enjoy it, etc. without paying him tribute. Duh.

How on earth do you prevent yourself from knowing such self-evident and indisputable facts of objective reality?

I understand you believe the public is deprived by virtue of your overly broad definition of public rights to unknown and undeveloped natural resources.

I have said numerous times that natural resources should be free to use as long as at most one person is willing to pay to use them. The public is just all the people who have the right to use natural resources. How can someone claim he has a right to use them, but others don't? That is privilege by definition.

A patent deprives
others of the right to produce a certain item _themselves_,
_even_if_they_invent_it_themselves_.

??? If someone invents something, someone else can't invent it later.

That is of course a flat-out falsehood, as proved by Gray and Bell, Newton and Leibniz, etc., etc.

Re: Historical comparisons

Re: Historical comparisons

So, that's confusing for me that you said that.

It is not confusing for me that you would deny such self-evident and indisputable facts. It is completely expected. In fact, when you undertake to defend privilege, it is mandatory.

The problem I'm addressing isn't multiple claims of ownership of intellectual property. The problem I'm addressing is lack of innovation, lack of development.

That is not a problem you are addressing. It is a problem you are fabricating out of whole cloth. There is no evidence that it exists, or would exist in the absence of patents. You have offered no evidence whatever for such a problem -- _zero_ -- and you will not be offering any such evidence, because none exists.

Slavery is an example of an unfair system of privilege, where those who benefit from the privilege of slave ownership do so at a tremendous cost to those who are enslaved. This is an unfair privilege and actually impoverishes society since the creativity and productivity of those enslaved are so diminished.

The same is true of all privileges.

No it isn't.

Yes, it just flat-out _is_.

Just not as visibly or egregiously

Not at all...

You just refuse to know the relevant facts.

Re: Historical comparisons

as in the case of slavery.

Slavery denies a human being the right to live as he desires to benefit another human being. This is clearly wrong.

Right. And that is the exact same thing IP monopoly privileges and private ownership of natural resources do. _Hello_?

Ownership of a thing denies another who may wish to claim ownership.

But if the thing is a product owned by the producer, his ownership of it does not deprive anyone else, because it did not exist before he produced it.

This is a sort of privilege.

No, but owning what would otherwise be accessible to others certainly is.

But if the thing owned was created by the person owning it, and would not have been created otherwise, then people are actually better off because the thing was created.

Right. But you simply _assume_, with _zero_evidence_, that nothing would ever be created or invented, no resource would ever be developed, if people didn't get monopoly privileges. But all of history shows that assumption is just flat false.

When an artist creates an artwork, when an inventor creates an innovation, when a developer develops an undeveloped resource – we all benefit by these creations – and those who created these new and valuable things enrich society and justly deserve to reap the benefits of their creation.

Right. The benefits _of_their_creation_. Not the benefits of violating others' rights to create similar things.

Patent rights, copyrights, and property rights are one way this is achieved.

Re: Historical comparisons

False. Property rights in the products of labor are the way this is achieved. Patents, copyrights, and property in natural resources are artificial and unjust _privileges_ that steal from others for the unearned benefit of the privilege holders.

Granting rights of ownership of resources to those who discover and develop new resources unknown prior to their discovery and development
– works the way patent law works.

It's actually worse, but we'll let that go for the moment.

Why not now?

Because you haven't show any willingness to know the basics, let alone anything more complex than that.

I can see an argument being made that these should be limited in time to 20 years or so – but granting ownership rights to those who take the trouble to discover and develop resources seems to me to be a fair granting of rights.

Developing resources is productive: it adds to the total wealth in existence, and therefore does not deprive others of the wealth thus added.

Thank you.

Then you will agree that those who develop off world resources have a right to the resources they add to the total wealth in existence.

But that is just another of your dishonest substitutions of "resources" for "products." They _do_not_ add natural resources to the total wealth in existence, only the products they produce from such resources. The resources were already there, with no help from the developer. I'm not sure how you prevent yourself from knowing these facts... but I definitely know _why_ you do.

Re: Historical comparisons

By contrast, discovering resources adds nothing to the total wealth in existence, it merely changes the discoverer's own state of knowledge.

If those who discover resources don't have rights to the knowledge they create then there is no incentive to go out and develop that knowledge.

Oh, they have rights to the knowledge, all right. But not to the resources the knowledge is about. And your claim that there is no incentive to go out and develop knowledge unless one can prevent others from using it is refuted a thousand times a day by releases of scientific research into the public domain.

Give your head a shake.

I'm not so worried about who owns something no one knows about. I'm worried about never knowing something that is very useful.

Then you have never heard of publishing scientific or scholarly research without any intellectual property protection? Amazing!

Also, what about innovation? I mean, I can imagine NASA developing all sorts of knowledge about resources in the solar system. I can imagine developers wanting to lease sites across the solar system to develop resources from that knowledge.

What about the guy who looks at this data and interprets it in an innovative way to discover something no one else knows about? What does he deserve for creating this innovation?

That's not an innovation. It's a discovery. And it gets no IP monopoly privilege. You are again trying to substitute other, tendentious terms because the facts do not support your claims.

What would motivate someone for **developing** this knowledge?

Lots of things: status, curiosity, pleasure, professional advancement, etc. Of course, you could also just rob people and offer the loot to those who develop the knowledge...

It seems to me that knowledge is damned important.

Re: Historical comparisons

Then why do you refuse to accept any of the knowledge I offer _you_?

Just as a patent effectively deprives others of the right to invent and use the thing themselves,

If its already invented, society doesn't need it invented again.

?? What? Give your head a shake. In the first place, society likely never "needed" it invented at all. In the second place, society may well be better off with the second or even a later version of it (Elisha Gray's telephone was better than Bell's). And in the third place, it has nothing to do with what society "needs" in the first place: depriving others of the liberty to invent, use and produce something violates their _rights_. It is a moral _crime_. It is _injustice_, _tyranny_, _oppression_. It is _evil_.

granting ownership of resources effectively deprives others of the right to discover and use them themselves.

For a period of time yes, provided the first inventor teaches the invention and puts it in the public domain.

Stop trying to change the subject, which was natural resources.

How would you reward inventors, novelists, artists, discoverers, developers?

Unlike you, I would leave it up to the free market to reward them, and not presume to violate others' rights on the basis of false beliefs by issuing monopoly privileges.

It also seems to me since it encourages people to go out and develop resources that otherwise wouldn't be developed efficiently, it seems to me to be a good thing for society. So, I support it.

But you are just wrong, because you wrongly assume that without such

Re: Historical comparisons

privileges the resources would not be developed efficiently.

That's right – but I'm not wrong.

Yes, you just flat-out are wrong, as I have proved over and over again. There is no justification in economics for your assumption. None. And there is plenty of economic logic proving that monopoly privileges are inherently a very inefficient way to implement an incentive, which is all IP privileges were ever intended to do.

In actual fact, resource ownership privileges provoke both unproductive hoarding and wasteful speculation.

References?

"The most comfortable, but also the the most unproductive, way for a capitalist to increase his fortune is to put all his monies in sites and await that point in time when a society, hungry for land, has to pay his price." — Andrew Carnegie

Economic efficiency is optimized and incentives most accurate when resource users must pay the market rent to those they deprive of the resource.

I don't know what this means. Please explain it in simpler terms.

The market rent of a resource is what the owner can get for doing nothing. To the extent that he is allowed to just pocket it, his incentive to engage in any productive activity or make any beneficial capital investment is attenuated. Likewise, when others are deprived of access to a resource, they have no choice but to accept less effective opportunities to apply their capital and labor. Production is thus greatest when all opportunities are allocated according to who is willing to pay the most for access to them, and no one gets something for nothing.

So, I think if there were an international body set up to grant ownership rights to off-world resources, you would see lots of money flowing into off-world development and ultimately, you would see goods

Re: Historical comparisons

and materials flowing down from the skies to enrich all life on Earth.

Flat false.

That's why we see interplanetary development such a hot investment today? lol.

There are many reasons why interplanetary development is not currently feasible, but lack of private ownership of celestial bodies is not one of them. Some ancient rulers claimed to own the sun. Did that stimulate development of the solar energy flux?

After all, what stops any private venture from just going out and developing off-earth resources? No one is going to confiscate any products they bring back. No one is going to go out and confiscate their production equipment. They can't.

You would see more development and a greater flow of wealth if those who wanted to exclude others from using those resources had to pay the market rent to those they wished to exclude.

If the UN were to lease exploration and production rights to companies and they took the rent out as a royalty interest against production, as well as charging a small annual fee to maintain its exploration and discovery rights, and where the corporation obtained the balance in the form of working interest – I don't see why this wouldn't work.

It wouldn't work as well as just charging exclusive users the market rent. But the UN currently lacks the authority to do either, AFAIK.

The current restriction on ownership of celestial bodies has blocked this sort of development and I think it should change sooner rather than later.

Again, you are just assuming that lack of ownership rights is what is blocking development of off-earth resources. That is just false.

References?

Re: Historical comparisons

Singapore. Hong Kong.

In fact, development would be most efficient if those who wanted to use the resources paid the market rent to those they wish to exclude from using them.

Ownership even by nations is not permitted under current law. I would be happy if the UN set up a system of planetary and space leasing allowing companies to pay rents for the right to explore and develop resources off-world.

?? Well then, why are you arguing against it?

Think about it: if you own a resource, you can just sit on it and hope for a speculative gain,

Yes, that's how it worked in Ohio when it was an unexplored territory. Folks in England bought rights to large tracts of land, and that money was used to build ships and attract settlers and the property was settled.

You are greatly oversimplifying the process, and ignoring the many cases where such investments were not made. See Carnegie, above.

the exact same way the owners of the 11,000 vacant lots in NYC do.

NYC is not a frontier like the surface of Mars. (Or the Ohio territory in the 17th cent)

All the more reason why it should not have 11,000 vacant lots. But it does.

But if you are paying the market rent for it, you are going to do something to earn that money back.

If a market rent exists – okay.

Re: Historical comparisons

Right. But if it doesn't, you get to use the resource for free until it does.

But what market rent would you apply to Mars?

?? I'm not the market. Whatever people are willing to pay is the market rent.

I notice
when I push you up against your definitions you are totally incapable of stretching your mind enough to even speak of your definitions in other terms. This is a mark of a truly ignorant person.

No, it's a mark of someone who understands how important consistent definitions are to understanding and the progress of knowledge.

I don't know how to tell you to become more mentally flexible.

I know you want to be able to change definitions in order to be able to evade the facts, just as you have repeatedly tried to substitute one term for another in the discussion above. Sorry, but I decline to cooperate in your self-deception.

— Roy L

.