

# Re: Detecting CPUs and cores

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2007-08/msg00808.html>

---

- *From:* Twisted <[twisted0n3@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:twisted0n3@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 07 Aug 2007 20:46:18 -0000
- 

On Aug 7, 2:58 pm, Roedy Green <[see\\_webs...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:see_webs...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

The argument is should I base the price on MY cost or the VALUE the customer gets from my work? Capitalist theory says you should raise your price to the point you start making less money because of the lower sales.

You also omit to mention that capitalist theory says that in a competitive market you won't be able to raise it very much above your marginal costs.

You also omit to mention that capitalist theory says that an uncompetitive market is a Bad Thing(tm).

SO it seems logical if you can find a way to charge A more than B, you are going to earn more money

You neglect to note that doing so is underhanded and dishonest. Advocating discriminatory pricing? Shame on you! How consumer-hostile. And again a properly competitive market won't let you get away with shit like that. If you offer the same thing to B at a lower price B can turn right around and sell it to A for a penny more, turn a profit, and you quit being able to sell to A at a high price as he buys from B instead of from you. Of course, you have to raise the price for B somewhat to make up for this, but instead of charging \$50 to B and \$150 to A you charge \$100 to everyone, more-or-less exactly as it should be modulo the other effects that should apply to your pricing.

The only way you can stop this is by doing something truly dirty, like using legal bludgeons or gratuitous technical "features" to make the thing you sell to B non-transferrable to A.

But capitalist theory says that owning one's private property,

## Re: Detecting CPUs and cores

including being able to resell it or otherwise dispose of it as one sees fit, is a good thing.

So what you're contemplating is bad. Naughty, naughty Roedy!

This partly why I suggest using rental and an service as the basic mechanism for delivering computation. The more hours per month, the more seats, the more the customer should pay. They are getting more value.

It will never fly unless you force it somehow, because customers will always pay less in the long run by buying a copy than by renting a copy, and will pay even less by using a FOSS program instead of paying anyone anything.

So you would have to outlaw FOSS and ownership of copies of software in order to get your way. So much for being a capitalist; a capitalist must accept the existence of such competition, including competition that undercuts your price, or sells people an eternally functional copy of some software that does the same thing you'd charge them monthly to do.

Too bad, so sad.

You cannot be allowed to have your way or it is the end of the 21st century "knowledge economy"; people like you, given the chance, would strangle it in the cradle to ensure their own profits at everyone else's expense. Make all my software much buggier and more expensive will you?! Over my dead body! You can have my personally-owned and eternally functional software when you pry it from my cold, dead fingers! Plentiful, cheap, commodity software is a feature, not a bug!

Any scheme is arbitrary.

Until the market applies corrections to prices. Your get-rich-quick scheme hinges on it not doing so, and therefore on some pretty nasty coercion. May you fail spectacularly.

The schemes that makes the creator the most money and keeps the customers happiest and gets the programs most used are the ones I would prefer to use.

Then why do you suggest the schemes that make the creator the same amount of money as before\*\*, make the customers saddest\*, and gets the programs least used\*\* then?

## Re: Detecting CPUs and cores

\* Because you steal their software and rent it back to them, and they must pay lots more for the same benefits, and must give up some of their software because the costs have shot up so dramatically, plus you hold their data hostage, and they have lost more of their property rights in their things.

\*\* Because people have a certain total budget for spending on software. The more expensive it is on average, the less it gets sold. So in fact software makers don't make any more money than before. They make that same amount, only they do so while providing less software. OK maybe their costs go down so they do show a small profit relative to before, but it won't actually work to get rich quick; sorry to burst your bubble there. And software will be much less used. In fact, if usage is metered people will severely ration their usage.

Your suggestion makes the whole world poorer. The whole world! Even YOU!

Customers are poorer because they must pay more for the same stuff, and since they only have so much money they actually have to pay the same amount for less stuff. So they have less stuff.

Worse, stuff they could just pay for and then own they now are forced to pay over and over again for. Would you like it if your household furniture could not, through some legal artifice, be yours, and had to be rented by law? You couldn't buy chairs or tables or a desk; you had to rent them. After a while the rental adds up to much more than the price of buying one and still you have to keep paying or they repossess your chairs and tables and desk. I don't think you'd like that would you?

Plus there's the intrusive and gratuitous enforcement scheme. Given it's designed to prevent the software from working some of the times, this DRM will make the software especially prone to the worst category of bugs, showstopper bugs. Also there's an incentive to hold the user's data hostage to force them to keep paying you for the privilege of being able to access it; this you'll spin as an "anti-piracy" measure to stop people cracking the software for indefinite use, while neglecting to point out how it also creates a lock-in that will let you jack up prices until you bleed everyone dry. And even then there's really only so much money to go around, and the end result is you end up no richer and everyone else ends up poorer.

Oh yeah, and you also end up poorer. First, because of all the software YOU use whose costs have shot through the roof, both directly in price-tag terms and in terms of showstopper bugs introduced by all that evil DRM. Second, because the whole WORLD ends up poorer, and the sinking tide drops all boats, including yours.

I wish you bad luck with this scheme, I really do.

.