

Re: von Mises Institute on Henry George

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-09/0044.html>

royls_at_telus.net

Date: 08/31/04

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 20:17:46 GMT

On Tue, 31 Aug 2004 08:34:43 GMT, Les Cargill
<lcargill@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>royls@telus.net wrote:

>

>> *On Mon, 30 Aug 2004 02:47:06 GMT, Les Cargill*

>> *<lcargill@worldnet.att.net> wrote:*

>

>>> *And I'm still skeptical that this works as well as claimed :)*

>>

>> *The fraction of rent recovered for public purposes is one of the most
>> reliable predictors of freedom, justice and prosperity, except for
>> socialist countries. Local and state property taxation in the USA
>> recovers a larger fraction of land rent than most countries do, which
>> is why the USA continues to be consistently more prosperous than most
>> countries.*

>

> *I did not realize this at all – I thought the U.S. used actually
> *less* land tax than other places. Is Canada comparable? Moreso?
> Less so?*

I believe Canada recovers slightly more, but the question is very complex.

>>>> *It is charging those who wish to have access to markets
>>>> for the privilege.*

>>>>

>>>> *That is not a privilege. The privileged are those who are permitted
>>>> access when others are denied it. Please try to remember that words
>>>> have specific meanings. And charging those on one side who wish to
>>>> deal with those on the other also charges those on the other.*

>>>>

>>>> *Sure it's a privilege, and that is the point.*

>>>>

>>>> *No, it most certainly is not, and that _is_ the point.*

>>>>

>>>> *And here is where we vigorously diverge.*

>>>>

>I think the lesson of the Civil War, of WWI and WWII is
>that the competing state in war which can produce *in times
>of war* wins. This means less, not more interdependence on
>other nations.

??? Garbage. The winners in every one of those cases were the ones that had the biggest economies, whether they had more trade or not.

>This also mitigates the principal cause of all the
>Tim McVeigh/Bin Laden ... things we see out there –
>loss of identity. If production is more a
>local thing (to the extent that is possible), then
>people have a better sense of identity.

Nonsense.

>Gee, I'd love it if it really was all one world, and we
>could trade unfettered. But I do not see it. When I ship
>stuff across the world, I change the strategic balance of
>power, and that is the business of the State.

It's not the business of the state to punish you for benefiting its citizens.

>the State
>should therefore finance itself through regulation of that
>activity.

My nominee for Non Sequitur of the Month....

>>>Only those who
>>>cooperate fully with the existing regime can be allowed to trade.
>>
>> Garbage. People want to trade. Allowing some to trade and forcibly
>> preventing others privileges the former at the expense of the latter.
>
>unfortunately, I think the privelege is already there, and
>that this is just an efficient means of reusing that
>mechanism for the purpose of "generating" revenue.

Possibly. But there are always rationalizations.

>>>You land
>>>goods our shores, you pay a tax.
>>
>> ??? Let me get this straight: if you try to benefit our people by
>> providing them with better goods at lower prices than they can get
>> domestically, we are going to rob you so you won't want to even try to
>> provide us with those benefits? Oh, yeah, that sure makes a lot of
>> sense.
>>

>> *Not.*

>

>*If there is a comparative advantage, the vendor will be
>able to pay the freight.*

Not if you plan to finance a government that way. You know, it's not like internal tariffs have not been proven, without exception, to be a quick route to stagnation and poverty.

>*Waving hands at "economies of scale"
>is nonsense.*

I didn't wave hands. I identified the facts of objective reality that prove you are wrong.

>*When *a* Japan decides to lose trillions
>of dollars over decades to predate on the American auto industry,*

What nonsense. The Japanese car makers are just more efficient. The fact that US auto company CEOs are paid about a zillion times as much as Japanese auto company CEOs for doing a very inferior job might have something to do with that.

>*it's not merely "comeptitive business practice", it's a
>thinly disguised act of war – a relatively benign strain
>to be sure, but it's agressive.*

Garbage. Do you have any idea how much better American cars are for having to compete with Japanese ones?

>*The result is that cars cost more and last longer. But
>they still cost more.*

Garbage. In 1928 you could buy a typical residential lot for the same price as the _cheapest_ new car. The average labor cost of cars has been falling for over a century.

>>>*This is *not* protectionism, and it is *not* mercantilism.*

>>

>> *Yes, it just damn well _is_.*

>

>*Bosh. you asked "who shoud pay for government", and I answered.*

Wrongly.

>*Gummint is a protection racket by its very essence, and
>should be funded accordingly.*

Flat wrong. As long as you believe such idiotic anarcho-moron crap, you will never understand anything of the matter. A protection racket has only two kinds of participants: offenders and victims. The state

is based on three kinds of participants: potential offenders, potential victims, and a security apparatus that stops the former from victimizing the latter.

"The preservation of property is the end of government, and that for which men enter into society. It is true governments cannot be supported without great charge, and it is fit everyone who enjoys his share of that protection should pay out of his estate his proportion for the maintenance of it."

— John Locke, Second Treatise on Government, 1690

>*It is not mercantilism because it is still subject to market forces.*

You apparently know nothing of mercantilism, either.

>**The design goal of the system is revenue, not competitive territorialism on other people's lands*.*

It is a ridiculous and self-defeating way even of obtaining revenue.

>*It is not protectionism because it does not target any specific industry or activity.*

Irrelevant. Protectionism can be general as well as specific.

>*It is not strategic.*

It is also not remotely defensible.

>>>*The whole system is ultimately laissez faire, except for this single instange of vig.*

>>

>> *I.e., it's laissez faire except that it's actually robbery. Right.*

>

>*It's minimalist robbery of a Jungian Other, which is the most psychologically acceptable form.*

Maybe to those who are adept at self-deception...

>*And your alternate is to trade away the very meaning of property?*

No, to refine it, clarify it, eliminate the poisonous contaminants in the current version, and establish it on the only sound and defensible basis possible.

>*No, we get to keep it, just not its value...*

You get to keep the value *_you_create_*, not the value others create.

>>>*Should be relatively cheap to have*

>>>*"gold member" trading partners that have an ISO900x type*

>>>*quality system on their tariff paying, to reduce admin costs.*

>>

>> *Yes, well, it would be relatively cheap to just transfer money out of*

>> *your bank account and into the bank accounts of criminals, too.*

>

>*And this is different from the IRS how? :)*

It would be cheaper, anyway.

-- Roy L