

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

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-09/1408.html>

---

**From:** jmh ([j\\_m\\_h\\_at\\_cox.net](mailto:j_m_h_at_cox.net))

**Date:** 09/27/04

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 00:05:49 -0400

royls@telus.net wrote:

> On Sat, 25 Sep 2004 18:20:07 -0400, jmh <[j\\_m\\_h@cox.net](mailto:j_m_h@cox.net)> wrote:

>

>

>>royls@telus.net wrote:

>>

>>>On Sun, 19 Sep 2004 12:27:21 -0400, jmh <[j\\_m\\_h@cox.net](mailto:j_m_h@cox.net)> wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>>royls@telus.net wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>On Sat, 18 Sep 2004 11:03:31 -0400, jmh <[j\\_m\\_h@cox.net](mailto:j_m_h@cox.net)> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>>My claim was that no one can

>>>>>>charge a rent for access to Land if we're taking

>>>>>>a production-based theory of ownership--not the

>>>>>>person and not the community as neighter created

>>>>>>Land.

>>>>>

>>>>>>Wrong. Unlike the private landowner who seeks to own and to charge

>>>>>>others rent for what he never produced, the community does not claim

>>>>>>to own the land. It just administers possession and use thereof.

>>>>

>>>>>That is a distinction without a difference.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>Wrong. There is a real and important difference between an owner and

>>>>>a trustee.

>>>>

>>>>>It's a distinction without a difference to the person who

>>>>>has to pay the access fee to access unused natural

>>>>>resources.

>

>

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

- > ?? *Well, I must say, that comment is consistent with the intellectual*
- > *level of everything else you've "contributed" in this thread: it's*
- > *like saying the distinction between a rightful owner and a thief makes*
- > *no difference to the guy who wants to buy an item they offer for sale.*

So which is the thief, the owner or the trustee? AS far as I can tell and you already conceded this point as well, your position is that no one can own Land or exclude another from using what is available for use--generally meaning not being used by another. You claim that the community or the government gets to charge a fee because it produces security in that use but who is the person being protected from? Members of the community? The government? Some stranger that might show up and not have the same respect of other's and so seeks to take what others are currently using?

- > *Give your head a shake.*

Give your own head a shake.

- >
- >>*That one can distinguish between owners and*
- >>*trustees was not the point or the issue--*
- >
- >
- > *Of course you don't want such facts to be the point or the issue. If*
- > *you are able to evade that distinction, you can evade the knowledge*
- > *that you have been proved wrong.*

Or merely that the distinction has nothing to do with what I was talking about not does that distinction have any weight on your position either as you've already conceded the point that no one can own or charge for simple access to Land:

"Agreed. As land is not produced by labor, no one can possibly have a rightful claim to own it. The rent of land -- the advantage conferred by use -- which cannot rightly go to any one, must therefore rightly go to all who contribute to its creation."

But I wasn't talking about the rent on land and the "advantage conferred by use" may or may not be at all related to the network effect underlying the LVT approach. If no one can own Land and only those who contribute to the production of some benefit can lay claim to it it follows that a person using unused land for purely private purposes cannot be charge any access fee.

sci.econ: Re: Don't Forget Mises -- and Dump the Third Way!

- >
- >> *paying an access*
- >> *fee for using available land was.*
- >
- >
- > *Access fees (rents) are inevitable whenever anyone or any group has*
- > *control over resources they are not personally using. That is a*
- > *\_given\_. So it cannot be the issue, unless you are positing an*
- > *alternative system of free personal use, in which case you need to*
- > *explain how you think it should be determined who gets to use each*
- > *piece of land. You can't just baldly assert that community recovery*
- > *of the land rent it creates violates some utopian notion of unlimited*
- > *personal freedom unless you propose an alternative method of land*
- > *allocation that does not violate it.*
- >
- >
- >>> *Agreed. As land is not produced by labor, no one can possibly have a*
- >>> *rightful claim to own it. The rent of land -- the advantage conferred*
- >>> *by use -- which cannot rightly go to any \_one\_, must therefore rightly*
- >>> *go to all who contribute to its creation.*
- >>
- >> *Which simply gets back to the question of why the*
- >> *community or government can collect any rent for*
- >> *merely using land--*
- >
- >
- > *Because it is the source both of the rent and of the user's security*
- > *of tenure, without which the land would be of no use to him or anyone*
- > *else.*
- >
- >
- >> *note, I'm not talking about using*
- >> *to participate in the local economy but simply use.*
- >
- >
- > *As long as no one else wants to use the same land, there is no fee.*
- > *If more than one person wants to use a parcel of land, how else should*
- > *it be allocated than by payment of a fee? Arm wrestling?*

How about first come first served? If someone is already using something then you should leave it alone.

- >
- >> *Logically one should distinguish between these*
- >> *two aspects which is why I've been saying the*
- >> *issue of Land Value is different than mere*
- >> *use of the land.*
- >
- >
- > *Land has no value if only one person (or no one at all) wants to use*

If one person wants to use the Land it's got value—there might not be a price but it will still have value. The question should be whence the value? If it's a pure use value, consumer value (even if indirect in the sense of a household production model), then what possible claim can the community or the government have on that.

If there is a value to purchasing the protection of government service then let that be a market price and not some implicit ownership right in Land by the government, or abstract community.

If the value derives entire from using the land for production for participating in the local (as narrow or broad as you choose to define it) then the network effects that drive your approach come into force and, given the model and assumptions, some claim on the total value produced makes sense. It also makes some sense to attach this to Land—both supply of and demand (for those wanting to participate in the benefits of the network) for Land is fairly inelastic. But be clear about what the goal is: preventing a existence of a given allocation of property rights producing an unjustified wealth transfer the can occur with Land ownership.

> *it. If more than one person wants to use it, it has value, and that value cannot be separated from the land.*

The value most certainly can be separated from the Land but there will be competition for the use of that specific Land. Bidding for access is, in some cases, a suitable solution and in most cases preferable to fighting over it. What's not clear is that someone can bid for land that another is using and force the person off the Land because they are not using the land in a manner that is suitable for generating market value but has been there much longer than new arrivals who now want a mall and theater rather than the largely self sufficient farm (who might actually have more problems now getting the additional items needed than before the small town 30 miles away grew into a large city).

jmh