

Re: The robot economy (AKA how robots will steal your jobs)

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-07/1966.html>

royls_at_telus.net

Date: 07/27/04

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 2004 16:57:35 GMT

On Mon, 26 Jul 2004 21:31:39 -0500, "smithaa02" <asdf@asdf.net> wrote:

>*Mark Monson <m_monson@ztech.com> wrote in message*

>*news:SsiNc.45164\$Yw3.19115@bignews3.bellsouth.net...*

>>

>>*You correctly grasp*

>*that the*

>>*landowner has superior bargaining power over workers, but then you lump*

>*land in with*

>>*capital at the end.*

>

>*But both capital and land are means of production.*

This bogus conflation of two unlike concepts is the same error made by both Marx and the neo-classical economists. Marx did it to rationalize public appropriation of privately created value, the neo-classicals (who took the error one step further, and just called land capital) to rationalize private appropriation of publicly created value.

>>*Land ownership is the primary monopoly. Workers who enjoy*

>>*equal access to land can produce capital (tools) of their own.*

>

>*But only by paying monopoly land rent.*

Land is a canonical example of monopoly, and there is by definition nothing to be done about "monopoly land rent" short of not allocating land at all, and returning to a pre-agricultural economy. Given that option is not desirable, the only question is, who gets the monopoly land rent? If the publicly created land rent is recovered for public purposes rather than given away to private landowners for doing nothing, the people do.

— Roy L