

(no subject)

The Urth list — 21 messages, 6 voices, 20 May 2009

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5445>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

O'Donnell, Tim BOSI — 20 May 2009, 09:10

I agree with you totally here Adam.

How is "theft" defined outside of the idea of "property"?

Given that what is the fundamental basis for assuming that people have a right to property?

Can you clarify your ideas Brunians?

Have you read Rouesseau?

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 13:28 · in reply to O'Donnell, Tim BOSI

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

How many children did Rousseau abandon? What was his justification for that again? How could anyone take such a moral criminal seriously?

.

I agree with you totally here Adam.

How is "theft" defined outside of the idea of "property"?

Given that what is the fundamental basis for assuming that people have a right to property?

Can you clarify your ideas Brunians?

Have you read Rouesseau?

Message: 4

Date: Tue, 19 May 2009 13:26:11 -0500

From: Adam Thornton <adam at io.com>

Subject: Re: (urth) The Devil in a Forest

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>

Message-ID: <ED8C3F46-B419-47B1-ABBE-B96AFC216322 at io.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delp=

On May 19, 2009, at 1:22 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Socialism is criminal.

Socialism is the idea that theft is OK if it's done by the government.

The difference between war and socialism is that war is sometimes necessary.

How do you define "criminal", or "theft", without a legal code against which to define those actions?

How do you enforce a legal code in the absence of a government?

How do you pay for a government?

What does this have to do with Gene Wolfe?

Adam

Find out more about us at www.bankofscotland.ie
<<http://www.bankofscotland.ie>>

The information contained in this message is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. If you have received this message in error or there are any problems please notify the originator immediately. The unauthorised use, disclosure, copying or alteration of this message is strictly forbidden. This mail and any attachments have been scanned for viruses prior to leaving Bank of Scotland Ireland's network.

Bank of Scotland Ireland will not be liable for direct, special, indirect or consequential damages arising from alteration of the contents of this message by a third party or as a result of any virus being passed on. Bank of Scotland (Ireland) reserves the right to monitor and record e-mail messages sent to and from this address for the purposes of investigating or detecting any unauthorised use of its system and ensuring its effective operation.

Bank of Scotland (Ireland) Limited is part of HBOS plc and is regulated by the Financial Regulator. Registered in Ireland Number: 8545. Registered office: Bank of Scotland House, 124-127 St. Stephens Green, Dublin 2

Jeff Wilson — 20 May 2009, 14:25 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

I am so pleased to see you turn out in favor of native title!

How many children did Rousseau abandon? What was his justification for that again? How could anyone take such a moral criminal seriously?

Absolutely. Buddha, Ben Franklin, Grover Cleveland, not a one of them worth listening to.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 16:29 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

I am so pleased to see you turn out in favor of native title!

It is the standard Jeffersonian position:

—
We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal,
^^^^ ^^^^^^^

that they are endowed, by their CREATOR, with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

As I have mentioned, this list is not exclusive, and the original list that Brother Thomas came up with had 'property' instead of 'the pursuit of happiness'. People have argued from that day to this one whether the substitution was felicitous.

I have no idea what you mean by 'native title'. Perhaps you will choose to enlighten me: in any case I wish you joy of your superior knowledge.

.

Jordon Flato — 20 May 2009, 16:35 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Would it relate to Native American Land Rights?

On Wed, May 20, 2009 at 9:29 AM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

I am so pleased to see you turn out in favor of native title!

It is the standard Jeffersonian position:

—
We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal,
^^^^ ^^^^^^^

that they are endowed, by their CREATOR, with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

As I have mentioned, this list is not exclusive, and the original list that Brother Thomas came up with had 'property' instead of 'the pursuit of happiness'. People have argued from that day to this one whether the

substitution was felicitous.

I have no idea what you mean by 'native title'. Perhaps you will choose to enlighten me: in any case I wish you joy of your superior knowledge.

.

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 17:00 · in reply to Jordon Flato

I am absolutely in favor of enforcement of American Indian treaty rights and have been for my whole life. I don't really see any way that the conquest of North America could have been avoided, but it's not something that I think was good or fair.

I'm also, as has been noted, a Confederate sympathizer.

.

Would it relate to Native American Land Rights?

On Wed, May 20, 2009 at 9:29 AM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

I am so pleased to see you turn out in favor of native title!

It is the standard Jeffersonian position:

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal,
^^^^ ^^^^^^^^

that they are endowed, by their CREATOR, with certain unalienable Rights,
that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

As I have mentioned, this list is not exclusive, and the original list that Brother Thomas came up with had 'property' instead of 'the pursuit of happiness'. People have argued from that day to this one whether the substitution was felicitous.

I have no idea what you mean by 'native title'. Perhaps you will choose to enlighten me: in any case I wish you joy of your superior knowledge.

.

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 17:21 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Jeff Wilson writes:

How many children did Rousseau abandon? What was his justification for that again? How could anyone take such a moral criminal seriously?

Rousseau sent his infant children to an orphanage and did not check up on them. The death rate in 18th century French orphanages approached 100%.

Absolutely. Buddha,

Left his children in the care of his royally wealthy wife and parents.

Ben Franklin,

Acknowledged and supported one legitimate child, and raised two others with his partner of many years (they never married).

Grover Cleveland,

This is an interesting one. Grover, famously, acknowledged having an illegitimate child during the presidential race. What actually happened was this: he and his law partner, Oscar Folsom, were hanging out with the same lady, who was a widow. She got pregnant. Oscar was married: Grover wasn't, so Grover 'did the right thing'. She named the child Oscar Folsom Cleveland. Many people have speculated that the child was actually Oscar's.

not a one of them
worth listening to.

Sorry, I don't think any of these are examples bolster your argument.

.

Adam Thornton — 20 May 2009, 18:13 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On May 20, 2009, at 8:28 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

Is "intellectual property" identical to real property? Is downloading an MP3 of Stu's music the same as walking into his house and taking his TV?

Adam

Jeff Wilson — 20 May 2009, 18:25 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org wrote:
brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

I am so pleased to see you turn out in favor of native title!

It is the standard Jeffersonian position:

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal,
^^^^ ^^^^^^^^

that they are endowed, by their CREATOR, with certain unalienable Rights,
that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

And yet, he continued to own slaves, to keep men made by that same Creator from their liberty and their pursuit of happiness for *fifty years* after he wrote those words. Who could take such a moral criminal seriously?

As I have mentioned, this list is not exclusive, and the original list that Brother Thomas came up with had 'property' instead of 'the pursuit of happiness'. People have argued from that day to this one whether the substitution was felicitous.

I have no idea what you mean by 'native title'. Perhaps you will choose to enlighten me: in any case I wish you joy of your superior knowledge.

briefly, that native peoples can retain an interest in the land that survives redistribution by colonizing polities.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 18:59 · in reply to Adam Thornton

I don't think it is, personally.

Your mileage may vary.

.

On May 20, 2009, at 8:28 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

Is "intellectual property" identical to real property? Is downloading an MP3 of Stu's music the same as walking into his house and taking his TV?

Adam_____

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 19:04 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

[Jefferson] continued to own slaves, to keep men made by that same Creator from their liberty and their pursuit of happiness for *fifty years* after he wrote those words. Who could take such a moral criminal seriously?

Books have been written about this. All I will say at this time is that I am satisfied that Jefferson's conduct was mediated by necessity.

I have no idea what you mean by 'native title'. Perhaps you will choose to enlighten me: in any case I wish you joy of your superior knowledge.

briefly, that native peoples can retain an interest in the land that survives redistribution by colonizing polities.

I believe that they have treaty rights, which should be enforced.

.

Stuart Hamm — 20 May 2009, 19:08 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

I must old...I can't understand how people don't see file sharing as theft. Even if record companies paid what they agreed to...haha...it's literally pennies on the dollar..and they are soooooooooooooo corrupt. I'd rather pay 99cents on itunes if there's a song I need to learn dammit...Good thing i don;t sell alot of albums!!

having said that...artist permitted free downloads are a great marketing tool and I didn't bat an eye when our drum tech downloaded BSG for me every week on the road last year...but that's rich TV people and I'm just a musician trying to provide food , clothes and shelter for my family right???

Thanks for getting me worked up before my visit from the IRS manana...

?????????-\\~S~/- ? Mobile — (415) 786-3624

???? Skype? stuart.hamm

myspace.com/stuhamm

? ??? stuarthamm.net

--- On Wed, 5/20/09, brunians at brunians.org <brunians at brunians.org> wrote: From: brunians at brunians.org <brunians at brunians.org> Subject: Re: (urth) (no subject) To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net> Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2009, 11:59 AM

I don't think it is, personally.

Your mileage may vary.

.

On May 20, 2009, at 8:28 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't. Attempt to violate mine at your peril.

Is "intellectual property" identical to real property? Is downloading an MP3 of Stu's music the same as walking into his house and taking his TV?

Adam _____

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Jeff Wilson — 20 May 2009, 19:21 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

[Jefferson] continued to own slaves, to keep men made by that same Creator from their liberty and their pursuit of happiness for *fifty years* after he wrote those words. Who could take such a moral criminal

seriously?

Books have been written about this. All I will say at this time is that I am satisfied that Jefferson's conduct was mediated by necessity.

Why can you take Jefferson's word seriously enough to determine that his necessity was valid, but dismiss Rosseau out of hand? If Rosseau came out and admitted later that he had no good reason to get rid of the babies, and it was a bad bad thing, acknowledging the moral crime, he's still unworthy of credence? Isn't that a double standard piled atop a perverse moral incentive?

I have no idea what you mean by 'native title'. Perhaps you will choose to enlighten me: in any case I wish you joy of your superior knowledge.

briefly, that native peoples can retain an interest in the land that survives redistribution by colonizing polities.

I believe that they have treaty rights, which should be enforced.

What about the ones that were driven off their land without the pretense of a treaty?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >

Jeff Wilson — 20 May 2009, 19:27 · in reply to Stuart Hamm

Stuart Hamm wrote:

I must old...I can't understand how people don't see file sharing as theft.

I won't say it's not bad, but it's not the same as theft, and when people say it is they lose credibility.

Do you consider letting people watch your TV to be theft?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 19:30 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

[Jefferson] continued to own slaves, to keep men made by that same Creator from their liberty and their pursuit of happiness for *fifty years* after he wrote those words. Who could take such a moral criminal seriously?

Books have been written about this. All I will say at this time is that
^^^ ^ ^^^^ ^^ ^^^ ^^^^

"this time" taken to include the present and near future.

I am satisfied that Jefferson's conduct was mediated by necessity.

Why can you take Jefferson's word seriously enough to determine that his necessity was valid, but dismiss Rosseau out of hand?

I have examined the case to my satisfaction. See above.

I believe that they have treaty rights, which should be enforced.

What about the ones that were driven off their land without the pretense of a treaty?

Homo Sapiens Out Of Northern Europe!

Neanderthal Power!

.

Jeff Wilson — 20 May 2009, 19:38 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

[Jefferson] continued to own slaves, to keep men made by that same Creator from their liberty and their pursuit of happiness for *fifty years* after he wrote those words. Who could take such a moral criminal seriously?

Books have been written about this. All I will say at this time is that

^^^ ^ ^^^^ ^^ ^^ ^^^^ ^^^^

"this time" taken to include the present and near future.

I am satisfied that Jefferson's conduct was mediated by necessity.

Why can you take Jefferson's word seriously enough to determine that his necessity was valid, but dismiss Rousseau out of hand?

I have examined the case to my satisfaction. See above.

Not able to explain the discrepancy works for me.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com

< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >

Jeff Wilson — 20 May 2009, 19:42 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

I believe that they have treaty rights, which should be enforced.

What about the ones that were driven off their land without the pretense of a treaty?

Homo Sapiens Out Of Northern Europe!

Neanderthal Power!

"Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't."

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com

< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 21:28 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

My God, I am crushed. You cruel man. However will I repair the tattered shreds of my self-esteem?

.

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

I believe that they have treaty rights, which should be enforced.

What about the ones that were driven off their land without the pretense of a treaty?

Homo Sapiens Out Of Northern Europe!

Neanderthal Power!

"Property rights are sacred, unalienable and a matter of faith.

You believe in them or you don't."

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com

< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >

Adam Thornton — 20 May 2009, 21:31 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On May 20, 2009, at 4:28 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

My God, I am crushed. You cruel man. However will I repair the
tattered
shreds of my self-esteem?

Oooh, ooh, I've just--as a Southerner myself--*got* to take a crack at this one:

"Frankly, my dear, I don't give a damn."

Adam

brunians at brunians.org — 20 May 2009, 21:41 · in reply to Adam Thornton

On May 20, 2009, at 4:28 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

My God, I am crushed. You cruel man. However will I repair the
tattered
shreds of my self-esteem?

Oooh, ooh, I've just--as a Southerner myself--*got* to take a crack at
this one:

"Frankly, my dear, I don't give a damn."

And again I must rely upon the kindness of strangers.

- (collapses into the arms of the ambulance attendants).

.

Jeff Wilson — 21 May 2009, 11:30 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Jeff Wilson writes:

How many children did Rousseau abandon? What was his justification for
that again? How could anyone take such a moral criminal seriously?

Rousseau sent his infant children to an orphanage and did not check up on
them. The death rate in 18th century French orphanages approached 100%.

Sources differ. Supposedly he did check up years later, but records were not well kept if at all.
Infant mortality was upwards of 50% all-round in part due to elective wet nursing compounding
the septic practices of the age - and against which he later spoke against, encouraging parents
who did take such a moral criminal seriously to keep infants home and saving thousands of tiny
lives.

Absolutely. Buddha,

Left his children in the care of his royally wealthy wife and parents.

The child he called one more chain to bind him down, and left in the grip of an absolute, slave-keeping tyrant, a situation he found intolerable, but he did have time to liberate his childhood chum.

Jeff Wilson - [jwilson at io.com](mailto:jwilson@io.com)

< <http://www.io.com/~jwilson> >