

Re: von Mises Institute on Henry George

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-09/0067.html>

From: Les Cargill (*lcargill_at_worldnet.att.net*)

Date: 09/01/04

Date: Wed, 01 Sep 2004 04:05:12 GMT

royls@telus.net wrote:

> *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.*

>

>

I can beleive that.

>>>>>> *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 privelege, 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.*
>
>

Bingo! In those cases, the best ability to rapidly shift to wartime footing in production.

<snip>

>> *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.*
>
>

If it isn't it becomes so, soon enough.

<snip>

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

To the extent that they restrict flows below a critical point. I beleive Holland prospered on a system of "tarrifs" (port access fees) in either the 17th or 16th century – post

their Empire phase, anyhow. Really pre Industrial, but in that transitional period. And remember, this'd free up a lot of domestic revenue.

And I'd formed, somehow, the opinion that it was ultimately the inflation and poor circulation of cash that caused most mercantilist woes. That, and poor systems of finance, insurance and simple signals technology.

And there's all that endearing eubellient jingoism to it.

<snip>

>> *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.
>
>*

The cost per car for the CEO is much less than transport costs. "Efficient" meant (means?) a reification of medieval Samurai feudalism in a business suit. The market strategy was to buy market share by long-load debt, effectively, then the cost came due in the '90s.

I like Drucker too, as far as it goes, but I don't hold Japan as the paradigm. It's culture is too insular, even if its business isn't.

American car makers were idiots about making cheap cars, but nothing (short of dealer space) said that could not happen domestically. And it was really Volkswagen that broke that market open, to begin with.

>> *it's not merely "competitive business practice", it's a
>> thinly disguised act of war – a relatively benign strain
>> to be sure, but it's aggressive.
>
>
> Garbage. Do you have any idea how much better American cars are for
> having to compete with Japanese ones?
>
>*

Probably quite a bit. Electronics? Nooooo. Other than Beta and Nakamichi cassette decks, Japanese electronics were, and are very ineven, where until the American consumer electronics industry gradually diappeared, it produced much better stuff.

And both produced unbelievably bad stuff, too. But I'd put some of the old Murkin stuff at the top. If we ignore German electronics...

>>*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.*

And you can probably buy the same lot for the same as a car now, all other things being equal. If the lot is in New York City, nooo, but in someplace at approximately the same growth curve, yup.

In suburban texas lots are commonly going for \$20–50k, last I checked. that is approximately the price of a car.

> *The average labor cost of cars has*
> *been falling for over a century.*
>

As have all labor costs. But \$3500 in the mid '70s is still about 1/8 the cost of a comparable car today. I don't see much economy of scale showing up there – it's slightly worse than inflation. but the cars are different so...

Actually, this is sorta why I started thinking about tarriffs. As the labor component goes to zero...maybe we oughta slow down a bit, or at least "act locally".

<snip>
>>*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
>

If I squint real hard, that quote almost applies :) I'd love to think Locke was that prescient, but 1845 provided a helluva lot more data than 1609.

>
>>*It is not mercantilism because it is still subject to*
>>*market forces.*
>
>
> *You apparently know nothing of mercantilism, either.*
>
>

I believe the gold was the problem, and the distortions in prices due to arbitrary mismanagement of supply and demand.

This is a straight-line bias of the whole system, with some effort expended to not distort. Price signals are there, just a little weaker.

I know, it's heretical, but it might be doable. I think it has advantages that will become apparent in the next few years. There's fear out there and its fear based in the ... fear of loss of identity.

<snip>
>>*It is not protectionism because it does not target any*
>>*specific industry or activity.*
>
>
> *Irrelevant. Protectionism can be general as well as specific.*
>
>

I am unaware that is *has* been so. Can be? Dunno.

>>*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...*

>

>

I think one can generally distinguish between self deception and statesmanship. This is the latter.

>>*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.*

>

>

Then you have a very hard job ahead. I might even agree the opposing view is less rational, but if it is, it is irrational in very deeply held ways.

Dunno – we'll see.

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

>

>

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

>

>

Oooh, that headache again. Yes, I accept that this calculation doable, for purposes of the disussion.

>>>>*Should be relatively cheap to have*

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

>>>>*quality system on their tarrif 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.*

>

sci.econ: Re: von Mises Institute on Henry George

:)

> -- *Roy L*

--

Les Cargill