

## Re: von Mises Institute on Henry George

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-09/0109.html>

---

*royls\_at\_telus.net*

**Date:** 09/02/04

Date: Thu, 02 Sep 2004 00:53:30 GMT

On Wed, 01 Sep 2004 04:05:12 GMT, Les Cargill  
<lcargill@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>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:

>>>>

>>>>>>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.

So it's completely irrelevant to your proposal to impoverish one's own country with tariffs.

><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.

Only to the extent that the state becomes oppressive and destructive.  
See the War on Drugs.

>>>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.

>

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

No. The main advantage the Dutch had was in making their taxes  
broad-based instead of distortionary.

>- post

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

Not really.

>And I'd formed, somehow, the opinion that it  
>was ultimately the inflation and poor circulation of  
>cash that caused most mercantilist woes.

No.

>That, and  
>poor systems of finance, insurance and simple signals  
>technology.

No.

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

Endearing to the brainless, anyway.

><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.

Sure. But add in all the other overpaid execs, the stock options, blah blah, and it starts to add up. Yes, the overpaid American auto unions cost more than the overpaid CEOs. But there are a lot more union guys benefiting from that overpayment, and they are proportionally far less overpaid than the CEOs.

>"Efficient" meant (means?) a reificaiton of medeval Samuuri  
>feudalism in a business suit.

Japanese companies and the education system cultivate an attitude of "fealty" in workers, but it's not just a modern take on feudalism. It's based on the Japanese desire for strong affiliations, which transcends the business and political worlds.

>The market strategy was  
>to buy market share by long-load debt, effectively, then  
>the cost came due in the '90s.

It was real estate lending that sank the Japanese financial system, not capital spending.

>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.

"Insular"? ROTFL!! The Japanese know about 100 times as much about the USA as Americans know about Japan.

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

>Probably quite a bit. Electronics? Noooooo.

Yesss.

>Other than Beta  
>and Nakamichi cassette decks, Japanese electronics were, and  
>are very ineven,

Nonsense. I was astonished at how much better Japanese appliances and electronics were when I lives there. Ten years ahead of the US products.

>where until the American consumer electronics  
>industry gradually diappeared, it produced much better stuff.

False.

>>>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.

No, you cannot. The lot is now worth about ten times as much as the car.

>If the lot is in New York City,  
>nooo, but in someplace at approximately the same growth curve,  
>yup.

Nope. You are just making this stuff up. Sorry.

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

The cheapest cars are cheaper than that, and that land was likely going for pennies an acre in 1928.

>> The average labor cost of cars has  
>> been falling for over a century.  
>  
>As have all labor costs.

Nope. The labor cost of education, medical care, land and government have all risen over the same period.

>But \$3500 in the mid '70s is still  
>about 1/8 the cost of a comparable car today.

And how is that different from broad inflation?

- >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".

If we want to impoverish ourselves.

- >>>It is not mercantilism because it is still subject to
- >>>market forces.
- >>
- >> You apparently know nothing of mercantilism, either.
- >
- >I beleive the gold was the problem, and the distortions in
- >prices due to arbitrary mismanagement of supply and demand.

Like your tariff idea.

- >I know, it's heretical, but it might be doable.

There's a difference between "doable" and "desirable"

- >I think
- >it has advantages that will become apparent in the next
- >few years.

But you are wrong.

- >There's fear out there and its fear based
- >in the ... fear of loss of identity.

A carefully cultivated fear...

- >>>>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.

Oh, no it ain't.

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

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

>> *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.*

No worthwhile project is easy.

-- Roy L