

# Re: Don't Forget Mises -- and Dump the Third Way!

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-09/0271.html>

---

**From:** michael price (*nini\_pad\_at\_yahoo.com*)

**Date:** 09/06/04

Date: 6 Sep 2004 08:31:39 -0700

royls@telus.net wrote in message news:<4134e19a.19476988@news.telus.net>...

> On 31 Aug 2004 03:40:54 -0700, nini\_pad@yahoo.com (michael price)

> wrote:

>

> >royls@telus.net wrote in message news:<412e3cca.9637554@news.telus.net>...

> >> On Thu, 26 Aug 2004 10:29:40 -0700, "Michael Price"

> >> <nini\_pad@yahoo.com> wrote:

> >>>

> >>> >"Ron Allen" <rallen2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message

> >>> >news:eYOWc.18310\$cx.15800@bignews4.bellsouth.net...

> >>> >> Brandon Berg wrote:

> >>> >> > In other words, I don't mind paying the

> >>> >> > associated costs. It's the disassociated costs

> >>> >> > that I find intolerable. Again, the fact that

> >>> >> > the government does provide some useful services

> >>> >> > does not give it license to seize and

> >>> >> > redistribute wealth as it sees fit.

> >>>>

> >>>> Albert wrote:

> >>>> > Redistribution is unnecessary when the initial

> >>>> > distribution is fair.

> >>>>>

> >>>>> Ron Allen answers:

> >>>>> > In my opinion, the initial distribution of wealth

> >>>>> > is itself a redistribution scheme, because those

> >>>>> > who produce wealth are not the one's the wealth is

> >>>>> > being distributed to.

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> > Then you should be able to show an instance of people actually taking the

> >>>>>> > wealth away, and you can't.

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> > I certainly can: landowners demand wealth from producers in return for

> >>>>>>> > access to what the producers would have had access to for free were it

> >>>>>>> > not for the landowners.

> >>>>>>>>

> > Absolute rot,

- >
- > *It is fact.*
- >
- > *>nobody has the right to use whatever natural resources*
- > *>they want to without payment.*

- >
- > *Access to is not the same as right to use.*

> I fail the difference between access and right to use.

- > *People can obtain the \_right\_ to use natural resources by compensating*
- > *the community for the lost opportunity.*

So in other words you lied when you claimed that: "landowners demand wealth from producers in return for access to what the producers would have had access to for free were it not for the landowners."

- > *But everyone naturally has access to all natural resources, unless*
- > *they are forcibly denied it.*
- >
- > *>Even if you are a dedicated Georgist*
- > *>the user of natural resources still has to pay.*
- >
- > *The community always controls access to local resources as a matter of*
- > *fact.*

No they don't. Those who happen to be there and willing to defend it control access. How can the "community" control something when it can't even be defined? What makes one person part of the community and another not.

- > *In a Georgist community, that control is exercised in the*
- > *community's interest, making the community in effect the landowner*
- > *that exacts payment from resource users (producers and consumers*
- > *both).*

And how is this "community" different from the State? I mean why would the community behave better than a private landowner? Why is it better that the rent on natural resources go to those who hold a monopoly of force over the community than people who only control those resources? And don't kid yourself the "community"

- > *In the current system that control is exercised, at taxpayer*
- > *expense, for the unearned benefit of private landowners who exact the*
- > *payments. The user in a Georgist community has to pay the community*
- > *that gives the resource its value, not a parasite who contributes*
- > *nothing.*

And what community is that? The community of Liechhardt? The community of Sydney? The community of New South Wales? Or the community of Australia? Actually Australia is a very export oriented

country so naturally the whole world contributes to it's value. So basically rent would be a tax paid to a global government.

- > *But in both cases access would be free if not for the*
- > *landowner, public or private.*
- >
- >>> *And then government takes wealth from the producers and spends it*
- >>> *in ways that make the land more desirable, so the productive have*
- >>> *to pay the landowners even more for doing nothing.*
- >>
- >> *That's not what the government generally does.*
- >
- > *Yes, of course it is, at least the reasonably honest and competent*
- > *governments of democratic countries.*

No it isn't. What does the right of eminent domain do to make the land more attractive? In fact it makes it a lot less attractive to own land or to improve it.

- > *There are exceptions, like the War on Drugs and foreign military*
- > *adventures, but they are few and generally unimportant.*

The war on drugs is generally unimportant? The thousands or wars the State fights are unimportant? That is such a fucking insult to the millions who died in them I can't begin to think how to answer it politely, dickweed! As you see I didn't bother. In fact the State does lots of things that make land less valuable like protectionism, arbitrary arrest, censorship, racial laws prohibiting people from certain professions or trade and many others.

- > *However, you are correct in that extremely corrupt and tyrannical*
- > *governments may not make the land within their borders more desirable*
- > *than land where there is no government, but that is a rare case*
- > *indeed.*

Then name a government that doesn't!

- > *Is land in North Korea, Myanmar or Zimbabwe really worth less than*
- > *land in the anarchic areas of Somalia, Western Sahara, etc.?*

There are no anarchic areas of Somalia or Western Sahara. Governments intrude in those countries all the time and where they don't terrorists backed by governments do.

- > *I don't know. It's certainly worth very little in all those places.*
- >
- >>>> *Instead, the producers do all the producing, and the proprietors*
- >>>> *do the all the appropriating.*
- >>>>
- >>> *Proprietors are producers Ron, there is such a thing as indirect*
- >>> *production.*

- > >>
- > >> *Some proprietors are producers. Some do nothing.*
- > >
- > > *All proprietors are producers*
- >
- > *Like your other claims, that is just flat false.*

Assertion is not evidence.

- >
- > >*because contributing capital to production*
- > >*is productive*
- >
- > *Land and other natural resources are not capital in the economic*
- > *sense, and are not contributed by the proprietor because they would*
- > *have been there, just the same, even had neither the proprietor nor*
- > *any previous proprietor ever existed.*

But someone would have to decide to contribute them or not.  
Otherwise whoever grabs it first gets it and is in effect the proprietor.

- >
- > *Claims such as money, stocks, and debt instruments are also not*
- > *capital;*

They are stored value and the value was produced, such value is one thing needed to produced, it is therefore capital, the means of production.

- > *and in any case, owning capital is not the same as contributing*
- > *capital,*

But it is a necessary first step. Those who own it contribute it because they have the authority to make the decision.

- > *especially if the capital is already productively employed when*
- > *the proprietor comes into ownership of it:*

If it was then why did they sell it?

- > *that capital has already been contributed, with no help from the new*
- > *owner.*

But buying capital makes it more profitable to produce capital and thus contributes to the production of both capital and consumer goods. Contributing capital is an expensive process and therefore workers might not want to do it, particularly if someone else can do it cheaper. This is quite likely if that person buys the capital. In any case the use they are putting it to might not be the most productive use. A proprietor is necessary to make the change.

- >
- > >*and to do that you need someone who owns capital.*

- >
- > *Normally, that would be the capital's producer or someone who paid him*
- > *for producing it.*

Yes and what of it?

- > *Does a thief or landowner who got the capital in return for no*
- > *contribution also count as a "productive proprietor" in your world?*
- >

And who says that landowner got anything in return for no contribution? The act of establishing rights to a natural resources is a contribution because it makes it possible for those resources to be used in the most useful way rather than the first way that's convenient, regardless of whether it's the best use.

- > -- Roy L