

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-10/0252.html>

From: michael price (*nini_pad_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 10/04/04

Date: 3 Oct 2004 22:18:09 -0700

royls@telus.net wrote in message news:<41603b10.8011978@news.telus.net>...

> On 22 Sep 2004 03:26:40 -0700, nini_pad@yahoo.com (michael price)

> wrote:

>

> >royls@telus.net wrote in message news:<413e1339.11504584@news.telus.net>...

> >> On 6 Sep 2004 08:31:39 -0700, nini_pad@yahoo.com (michael price)

> >> wrote:

> >>

> >> >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...

> >> >> >> >>

> >> >> >> >> 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

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

> >> >> *>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.*
> >>
> >> *Access is a matter of liberty. Right is a matter of morality.*
> >>
> > *So the practical difference is zero.*
>
> *That depends on whether you regard the immoral as practical. If the*
> *landowner simply does nothing, the user gets access for free. But he*
> *is then just pocketing the rent in place of the landowner, and while*
> *he is at least contributing something to the community by why of*
> *production, he is not compensating the community for the benefits he*
> *is receiving,*

Which benefits the community did not provide.

> *and thus has no more _right_ than the landowner to deny*
> *others use of the land.*
>
> >> >> *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."*
> >>
> >> *No. The community, through government, administers possession and use*
> >> *of the land in any case, and is thus the ultimate landowner.*
> >
> > *And that means you lied. You claimed producers would not have to pay*
> *and they would.*
>
> ??? *Garbage. You asked for an example of non-producers taking wealth*
> *under the current system. Under the current system, if the landowner*
> *does not demand any money in return for his zero contribution, the*
> *producer gets to use the land for free.*

You have not shown that the landowner did not contribute to gain title to the land. Even if he didn't being able to settle definitively the question of who gets the use of the land is a productive service. If nobody does it the conflict over the land is disruptive and even violent.

>
> >> *The only*
> >> *significant difference between paying rent to a private landowner and*
> >> *paying it to the community is that the services, infrastructure,*
> >> *amenities and opportunities that give the land its rental value are*
> >> *provided by the community, and not by the private landowner.*

> >>
> > *And that's good how?*
>
> *Value for value is just. Some people getting something for nothing*
> *while others get nothing for something is unjust. Justice is better*
> *than injustice.*

And that has nothing to do with the question. What difference does it make if the amenities are provided by the private landowner and he gets the rent?

>
> >> >> *But everyone naturally has access to all natural resources, unless*
> >> >> *they are forcibly denied it.*
> >>
> >> *Why do you choose to call me a liar rather than understand the above?*
> >>
> > *Because you are a liar and I understood it perfectly.*
>
> *You are either a liar, or you still don't understand 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.*
> >>
> >> *Yes, they do.*
> >
> > *My knife says they don't.*
>
> *You had better shut your knife up, before it gets you killed. And if*
> *you do shut it up, that will prove you wrong just as much as your*
> *death would: the community _does_ control access to natural resources.*

So the "community's" rights are based on force and denial of access, so how is that better than a private landowner? And if I can enforce my claim to land that would prove you are wrong and the community doesn't always control access. So would anyone doing it anywhere in the world.

>
> >> *>Those who happen to be there and willing to defend*
> >> *>it control access.*
> >>
> >> *No. They have to also be _able_ to defend it to control access.*
> >> *That's the community.*
> >
> > *So if a single man is able to defend a claim he's a "community"?*
>
> *The community could easily dispossess him.*

Another factless assertion.

- > *His defense of his claim depends on the acquiescence of the*
- > *community -- effectively, the delegation of its authority to him.*

And the communities defense of it's claim depends on his acquiescence.

- >
- >>> *How can the "community" control something when it*
- >>> *can't even be defined?*
- >>>
- >>> *For the purposes of allocating possession and use of land, the*
- >>> *community is the set of all people living under the same land*
- >>> *allocation authority (geographic sovereign).*
- >>>
- >> *So in other words it's not the community at all it's the*
- >> *residents of a political State which presumably defines*
- >> *itself.*
- >
- > *That is the practical reality of community.*

No it isn't liar. The State is not the community, it is force and fraud.

- > *There are certainly many places where people who live across*
- > *the street from one another are members of different communities,*
- > *and consider themselves so.*
- >
- >>> *What makes one person part of the community*
- >>> *and another not.*
- >>>
- >>> *Whether they live under the same land allocating authority.*
- >>>
- >> *And what makes them under the same land allocating authority?*
- >
- > *Where they live, and the geographic boundaries of the relevant*
- > *authorities.*

Which are defined how? By force and fraud of the State.

- >
- >>>> *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?*
- >>>>
- >>> *The State is somewhat abstract:*
- >>>
- >> *Real guns real murder, not all that abstract.*
- >
- > *Guns and murder don't define states. You are just spouting garbage.*

>
>>> *the community is the set of actual people the state, as an*
>>> *institution, exercises its authority over.*
>>>
>> *And those people vary with time and place.*
>
> *Of course.*
>
>>> *>I mean why would the community behave better than a private landowner?*
>>>
>>> *When the community recovers rent, it is recovering the value of what*
>>> *_it_ provides.*
>>
>> *No it isn't.*

<delete assertion>

>> *God or chance provided the land.*
>
> *And the land had no value until the community came along.*
>
It does if you could grow a single grain of rice or mine a single gram of metal from it.

>>> *When the private landowner captures and retains rent,*
>>> *he is appropriating the value of what the community provides.*
>>> *Community recovery of rent is thus a value-for-value transaction,*
>>> *while private capture of rent is parasitism.*
>>>
>> *So it's "valuable" when a community charges insists on a fee*
>> *by force by not when a landowner does it?*
>
> ?? *No, it's valuable either way, of course. I'm not sure how you are*
> *managing to deceive yourself on this point.*

I'm not, you are. You are claiming that one person doing something is parasitical and another group is providing value for doing the same job.

> *The issue is, who _gets_*
> *that value. Land value is land value no matter whether the community*
> *that creates it or a parasitic landowner gets it, just as blood is*
> *blood, whether it circulates to support the body's own life functions*
> *or is sucked out by a parasite.*
>

But you are not suggesting that the "community that creates it" (even assuming said community exists) gets the value, you are suggesting that the State gets it.

>>> *>Why is*
>>> *>it better that the rent on natural resources go to those who hold a*

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

- > >> > *monopoly of force over the community than people who only control*
- > >> > *those resources?*
- > >>
- > >> *Because the use value of those resources (rent) comes from the*
- > >> *community.*
- > >
- > > *No it doesn't, not if you define "the community" as "the set of*
- > > *all people living under the same land allocation authority*
- > > *(geographic sovereign)."*
- >
- > *Yes, it just flat-out _does_, certainly incomparably more so than it*
- > *comes from the owner.*

space left for evidence to that assertion:

- > *There is admittedly some contribution by other*
- > *communities based on the existence of recognized terms of trade,*
- > *diplomatic resources, a broad industrial infrastructure, etc., but*
- > *such inter-community contributions to land value are partly or wholly*
- > *offset by each local community's spending on foreign embassies, mutual*
- > *defense arrangements, trade dispute resolution mechanisms, etc.*

Then why the hell would the community agree to provide such, if the cost more than the value received from them? If they cost less then why the hell do we need the State to provide them? In any case you idiot you are plain wrong, the land of the land components of exports are a hell of a lot bigger than the cost of foreign embassies etc. even when they contribute to international trade, which government usually doesn't.

- >
- > > *The people who make the land useful*
- > > *may be entirely, partly, or not at all the set of people living*
- > > *under one State. It would be rare indeed for all of the value*
- > > *of Australian agricultural or mining land to come from serving*
- > > *Australians.*
- >
- > *The value does not come from "serving Australians." It is the*
- > *_economic advantage_ conferred by use that determines value.*

And that use is often from selling to foreigners. The advantage is created by people willing to buy the product of the land.

- > *And that advantage _does_ come from the Australian people and government.*

No it is merely not denied by them by force.

- >
- > >> >> *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.*

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

> >> >
> >> > *And what community is that? The community of Liechhardt? The*
> >> > *community of Sydney? The community of New South Wales? Or the*
> >> > *community of Australia?*
> >>
> >> *Australia is the sovereign. There is no higher land--allocating*
> >> *authority in Australia, and the land allocating powers exercised by*
> >> *the states, cities and towns are delegated ones.*
> >
> > *Fuck you, Leichhardt independence forever! We will resist the*
> > *tyrannical hell of Canberra!*
>
> *Liar.*

Actually I was kidding, but let's say I was serious. What have you got against Liechhardt Liberty? Why shouldn't Liechhardt be the "land allocating power"?

>
> >> > *Actually Australia is a very export oriented*
> >> > *country so naturally the whole world contributes to it's value.*
> >>
> >> *No. If that were the case, land in places that have no government*
> >> *would be just as valuable as land in plces that do.*
> >
> > *Non sequitur.*
>
> *No, it is a perfectly valid inference. If the whole world was*
> *contributing the value, land in Australia would be worth no more than*
> *land in Somalia.*

I'm sorry but you are plain wrong as the facts show. The whole world is part of the trading system that makes it economic to exploit certain Australian land resources. The whole world therefore contributes to the value of said resources. Land in Australia is more valuable than in Somalia (I believe, I haven't checked but it's your claim).

>
> > *The whole world contributes to the value of Australian*
> > *land by buying things produced with and on it. The presence or absence*
> > *of government has nothing to do with it.*
>
> *That is just stupidity. It is the government that makes it _possible_*
> *to produce the things at all.*

Yes, Pharoah makes the sun shine and the wheat grow.

> *That is why land in Australia is more*
> *productive (and commensurately more valuable) than very similar land*
> *in Somalia, West Africa, etc. where governments are incompetent or*
> *non-existent.*
>

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

> >> *But it isn't. It's worthless.*

> >>

> > *And your evidence for that would be.*

>

> *The actual lack of land value in anarchic places like Somalia, West*

> *Africa, Afghanistan, etc.*

>

None of which are actual anarchies.

> >> >*So basically rent would be a tax paid to a global government.*

> >>

> >> *If there were one, it would be the highest land allocating authority.*

> >>

> > *If there is not one then the "community that creates the value" isn't*

> *getting the rent and that would be wrong...*

>

> *True, recovering land rent in one community does not mitigate the*

> *injustice of landowner privilege elsewhere.*

>

Which has nothing to do with the point.

> >> >> *But in both cases access would be free if not for the*

> >> >> *landowner, public or private.*

> >>

> >> *Please read the above. If you understand it, you will of course*

> >> *retract your false accusation that I lied.*

> >

> > *No you lied.*

>

> *No, actually you are the liar, as I have proved repeatedly.*

>

You have only "proved" things if you take as read other claims
you made that are unproved and indeed, disproved.

> >> >> >> *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.*

> >>

> >> *Yes, it just flat-out _is_.*

> >>

> > *No evidence.*

>

> *The evidence is all around you. You simply refuse to know the facts*

> *that your eyes already perceive.*

>

No you do, see above example of land value in australia.

>>> >What does the right of eminent domain do to make the
>>> >land more attractive?

>>>

>>> *It ensures that needed infrastructure, etc. will not be blocked by the
>>> privileges of private landowners.*

>>

>> *Oh so the violations of private property rights*

>

> *There were no violations of private property rights, lying filth.*

Fuck you, just because you can't make a point there's no need to call me filth. Nor is there any reason to believe I'm a liar just because you don't believe as I do.

> *The community's right of eminent domain was an explicit condition of the
> original grant of title to the land.*

No it wasn't and if it was it certainly was not an explicit condition that the State be allowed to take property for any reason whatsoever.

>

<assertion deleted>

>

>> *were solely made to
>> enhance the value of private property rights?*

>

> *There is little doubt that for the most part, exercise of eminent
> domain increases total land value.*

>

>> *Sorry but they aren't.*

<assertion deleted>

>> *"Needed" infrastructure isn't that hard to construct without eminent
>> domain.*

>

> *Yes, actually, it is. You are just wrong.*

>

>> *Railroads were constructed without it and so were sewers etc.*

>

> *Examples? Thought not.*

>

<http://archive.ncsa.uiuc.edu/Cyberia/RiverWeb/Projects/Ambot/SOCIETY/SOC15.htm>

>> *I fail to see how a General Motors plant or a parking lot is either
>> "needed" or "infrastructure".*

>

> *Those are certainly not typical uses of eminent domain.*

The hell they aren't.

> *But they could fall under "etc."*

So "etc." includes anything you can bribe a State to do?

>

> > *But in any case, exercise of*

> > *eminent domain is such a tiny fraction of government activity that it*

> > *is at best misleading to claim that it represents what government*

> > *"generally" does.*

> >>

> > *It is extortion to give stuff to it's friends, that's what*

> > *government generally does.*

>

> *Infantile propaganda.*

>

That you cannot refute.

> > > *In fact it makes it a lot less attractive to*

> > > *own land or to improve it.*

> >>

> > > *Garbage. The infrastructure made possible by exercise of eminent*

> > > *domain adds far more to the value of other land than it takes from the*

> > > *land it is applied to.*

> >

> > *Then private enterprise could simply buy the surrounding land and*

> > *build the infrastructure.*

>

> *Nope. Wrong. Private interests couldn't afford to meet the demands*

> *of all private landowners any more than the community can,*

Then the value of the land is greater in the individual owners and the exercise of eminent domain subtracts from the value of the land more than it adds to the value of other land.

> *and even if they could, without the power to levy a tax on the*

> *resulting increased land value, they would have no way to*

> *recover it.*

Sure they could, they could just buy the rest of the land or form partnerships with the owners of it to buy the land the improvement is made on.

> *Your false and silly claims merely prove your imperviousness*

> *to fact and logic.*

No yet again you fail to understand anything and are impervious to anything but government propaganda.

>

> > > *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?*

> >>

> >> *Well, it is important in the places where the dishonest and
> >> incompetent US government wages it.*

> >

> > *Which is basically the entire world.*

>

> *Garbage. It wages it noticeably in the USA and a few places
> in Latin America.*

And in Europe where US drug policy was urged and still is urged
on their governments and holds sway, and Australia, similiarly.
Where in the world are the drugs America wants to make illegal
not illegal.

>

> >> *But it is not what government per*

> >> *se is about, and is not a major factor in the governments of most
> >> countries.*

> >>

> > *The hell it aint.*

>

> *Your ignorance is showing.*

>

> >> > *The thousands or wars*

> >> > *the State fights are unimportant?*

> >>

> >> *Honest and competent democratic governments do not start wars.*

> >

> > *Yeah right, except with bad people.*

>

> *How many wars has the Australian government started, lying fool?*

>

We're the wimpy one who goes along with the head bully.

> >> > *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!*

> >>

> >> <yawn> *You have already forgotten the context: the reasonably honest*

> >> *and competent governments of democratic countries. Not aggressive*

> >> *dictatorships and despotisms.*

> >

> > *I have not forgotten anything.*

<assertion deleted>

> > *Name these "reasonably honest and*

> > *competent governments of democratic countries" that are so peaceful.*

>

> *The Australian government, for one.*

>

Nope, you may not have noticed but they recently invade a country illegally for no good reason.

> >My bet is you don't live in one.

>

> You lose. I'm Canadian.

>

> >> >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.

> >>

> >> True, unlike fantasized libertarian utopias, no state is perfect;

> >

> > The low standards of statist, sigh...

>

> Unlike you, I do not refuse to know how much better my life is than

> the lives of people living in libertarian utopias like Somalia, West

> Africa, Afghanistan, etc.

Unlike you I don't pretend that Somalia, West Africa and Afghanistan are or were libertarian utopias.

>

> >> and

> >> not everything the state does enhances land value. But the great

> >> bulk of state activity does increase land value, as proved by the

> >> vastly higher land values where there is a state than where there

> >> isn't.

> >

> > And where is there not a State?

>

> Many areas on the southern fringe of the Sahara have no effective

> government, and the "states" there are little more than lines on a

> map.

And in those areas there are those that exercise the monopoly of force and are States in effect. They merely change every alternate thursday. In any case the influence of States in these areas is well documented and profoundly negative.

>

> >Nowhere, and if the lack of a State

> >was threatened a State would jump in immediately with violence.

>

> States (especially neighboring ones) "jump in immediately with

> violence" where there is no state because of the danger anarchy poses

> to their own citizens.

Actually no, there was for instance no evidence that the floating libertarian experiments posed any threat to anybody.

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

- > *When rival gangs are constantly shooting it*
- > *out, innocent bystanders are going to get hit.*

That is an argument against States not anarchies.

- >
- >>> *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!*
- >>>
- >>> *?? Doesn't what?*
- >>
- >> *Make land less valuable.*

<assertion deleted>

- >
- >>> *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.*
- >>>
- >>> *Yes, of course there are. Your ignorance is showing.*
- >>>
- >> *No there is no anarchic areas of Somalia or Western Sahara,*

<assertion deleted>

- >> *there*
- >> *are areas where the State in charge changes daily, but no true anarchies.*
- >
- > *Where the gang in charge changes daily, that is true anarchy. There*
- > *is no other way to have anarchy.*

Your profound ignorance is showing, learn something about anarchy before you post about it.

- >
- >> *In any case paid agents of the State are daily committing violence there.*
- >
- > *?? You think anarchy means no one will accept money for doing*
- > *violence?*

No but to blame violence on anarchy when it is largely paid for by States is, well, about your standard.

- >
- >>> *Governments intrude in those countries all the time and where they*
- >>> *don't terrorists backed by governments do.*
- >>>
- >>> *That is what anarchy is: the rule of a thousand tyrants.*
- >>

> > *He claims without evidence.*

>

> *ROTFL!! The evidence of all human history is unanimous:*

> *no government = too many would-be governors.*

>

Actually it's not. Medieval Iceland is a counterexample. In fact

I can't find any example of what you claim is universal.

> > > *An _intrusion_ by government or government-backed thugs is not*

> > > *_establishment_ of government.*

> >

> > *What else is it?*

>

> *State power applied outside the state.*

And thereby establishing a State.

>

> > > *A power that hasn't the power to allocate land within a given*

> > > *geographic area over a period of years is not a government.*

> > >

> > *Killing people is a fairly easy way to reallocate the land.*

>

> *But if you can't make that reallocation stick, you haven't established*

> *a government.*

The former claimants are dead. The violence backed claim wins. In any case under your "eminent domain" nobody can make their claim stick.

> *All you've done is add to the anarchy.*

>

Learn what the word means.

> > > > > > *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.*

> > >

> > > *?? ROTFL!! What is your claim but bald assertion?*

> >

> > *I have backed that claim up repeatedly.*

>

<assertion deleted>

>

>>>> >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.*

>>>>

>>>> *No. No one can possibly contribute natural resources because they are there without any help, and do not originate with anyone. They can only be allocated, not contributed.*

>>>>

>>>> *But if someone owns them they can contribute them, whether or not they created them.*

>>>>

>>>> *No. The owner does not contribute a natural resource to production, any more than a government bureaucrat "contributes" to construction by granting a building permit.*

Ok, then contributes the legitimate right to use them, which is the same thing.

>

>>>> *If no one owns them then allocation is violently chaotic.*

>>>>

>>>> *Only if there is no government.*

No, even if there's government, hell especially if there's government.

>

>>>> *Otherwise whoever grabs it first gets it and is in effect the proprietor.*

>>>>

>>>> *But still not the contributor. It should be obvious (but of course is not, at least to you) that simply grabbing something that was already there does not make one a contributor to production.*

>>>>

>>>> *It's not obvious because the act of grabbing means that you get to decide what to contribute it to, and that's valuable because it ends violent dispute over it.*

>>>>

>>>> *?? Nonsense. Grabbing doesn't end violent disputes.*

It does if you hold on hard enough.

> *It's just one more instance of violence. It's only when the grab is legitimized by government and the community that the violent disputes end.*

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

But being "legitimised by government" is only another form of grabbing and as such has no more power to end violence than any other grab.

- > *But of course, that legitimation is a contribution by the*
- > *community, not the grabber, so the grabber still contributes*
- > *nothing.*

Then why give the money to the State if the community does the work?

- >
- > > > *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,*
- > > >
- > > > *No. That is why economists do not recognize debts and such as factors*
- > > > *of production: if A agrees to pay B \$x in the future, it does nothing*
- > > > *to increase production. He could just as well agree to pay \$10x, and*
- > > > *the effect on production would be the same. So you are just wrong.*
- > >
- > > *Learn to read, they are stored value.*
- >
- > *Learn to think: that is irrelevant. A diamond necklace is also stored*
- > *value. Is it a factor of production?*

If you pawn it to buy capital, yes. Without the stored value in the necklace you wouldn't have been able to invest.

- >
- > > *Such value is required to produce.*
- >
- > *No, it just flat isn't.*

So you can invest without stored value? Neat trick, teach me it sometime.

<http://www.mises.org/fullstory.aspx?control=1596>

- >
- > > > *it is therefore capital, the means of*
- > > > *production.*
- > > >
- > > > *No. That is definitely false. Paper money is not a store of wealth*
- > > > *and does nothing to increase production. And "the means of*
- > > > *production" includes both capital and land.*
- > > >
- > > *The value that backs paper money is a store of wealth,*
- >
- > *No, it most definitely is not. The value of paper money is based on*
- > *legal tender laws and taxation, not any sort of "store of wealth."*
- >

No it isn't. It is the capacity of people to produce, not government

fiat that creates the value. If nobody who produced something valuable accepted fiat money then it would be worthless.

> >otherwise why would you want the paper money?

>

> Ultimately, just to pay taxes with.

>

Then they would want as little as possible. If the only use for paper is to bribe thugs you'll want to invest as little as possible in such an unproductive form.

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

> >> >> capital,

> >> >

> >> > But it is a necessary first step.

> >>

> >> No, the necessary first step is production of the capital by labor.

> >>

> > Ok, then a necessary second step, but a step necessary and prior to

> >contributing capital.

> >

> >> >Those who own it contribute it

> >> >because they have the authority to make the decision.

> >>

> >> No. Having power over a production factor does not make one a

> >> contributor to production. It makes one a rent seeker.

> >>

> > Yes it does make you a contributor to production because someone

> >has to make the decision.

>

> Wrong. By that "logic" a government bureaucrat who issues a building

> permit is just as much a contributor to production as the guy who

> pounds the nails. Such claims are self-evidently false and

> ridiculous.

But nobody has to issue a building certificate and somebody has to grant permission to use the land, that's the difference.

>

> >> >> 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?

> >>

> >> ??? How should I know? Ask the seller.

> >

> > The answer kinda destroys your point.

>

> No, it proves that you have no point.

No it proves that the value they sold the capital for is more use to them than the capital itself. If this is the case the

the buyer is contributing value because the previous owners get the difference between what they value the capital at and what they got for it. IOW What they would have sold for and what they did. This increase in value not only benefits them but anyone who buys capital because they know they can sell it.

>
>>> *Or maybe there was no seller, and the capital was a gift or bequest.*
>>
>> *Fine then the reciever contributes by not changing the capital use*
>> *to a less useful productive path.*
>
> ?? *He contributes by not getting in the way? Then how is he doing*
> *any more than the bureaucrat issuing the permit?*

Because you don't need a beaurcrat and you do need an owner.

>
>> *Avoiding this decision is valuable,*
>> *and someone has to do it because someone has to have the power to decide*
>> *how the capital is used.*
>
> <snicker> *Don't look now, but you just said that government*
> *bureaucrats who tell people what to do with their capital are just as*
> *productive as the owners.*
>

Nope, because they don't have the right incentives and in any case they don't do anything the owner doesn't already do better, and the owner is actually necessary.

>>>> *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.*
>>>>
>>>> *The inheritor of capital does nothing to make capital either more*
>>>> *abundant or more productive.*
>>
>> *Sure he does, he continues exercising the power to decide how to use*
>> *it, without which it's useless.*
>
> *Lie. The people who are using it are already exercising that power.*

No they aren't because they never had the power to say what to do with it. They didn't put in the stored value necessary to take on that role.

> *He is just a parasite, demanding payment for fulfilling an entirely*
> *spurious role.*
>
>>> *Indeed, it takes an act of willful*

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

> >> *refusal to prevent oneself from knowing that inherited capital is very
> >> often promptly misallocated by its new owners, _reducing_ total
> >> production.*

> >

> > *Very often meaning of course that you heard it happened at least
> >twice.*

>

> *I appreciate your admission that you do refuse to know any of the
> facts that prove you wrong.*

>

You are not god you piece of slime and your proclamations are therefore not fact.

> >> > *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.*

> >>>

> >> > > *???* *A new proprietor might just as easily allocate the capital to a
> >> less productive use. Why should he be rewarded for that?*

> >>>

> > *He isn't fool, he's punished with lower profits.*

>

> *?? That is a lie. He isn't punished. He loses nothing.*

He loses a significant proportion of what he was contributed.

> *He still gets money for what he does, just less than if he had
> continued to do nothing.*

He gets negative money for contributing capital.

>

> >> >> *>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?*

> >>>

> >> *Sometimes it isn't.*

> >

> > *So if he stole arrest him.*

>

> *You're refusing to know the facts again. The owner of land is _never_
> the land's producer or someone who paid its producer, because no one
> produced it. That is very much the point.*

And if we were discussing land at this point you lying slimebad, you'd have a point.

>

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

> >> >> *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?*
> >>
> >> *I say he got capital in return for no contribution. He charged rent
> >> for use of resources that would have been there anyway,
> >*
> > *But without a landowner nobody could use it exclusively and thus
> >more usefully than in hunter/gatherer mode.*

<assertion deleted>

> *The landowner doesn't secure the tenant's tenure. Government does.*

Says who? The fact is that original land title was often acquired by just sitting on it. The government had nothing to do with that.

> *The landowner is just a pure parasite.*
>
> >> *and used it to
> >> buy capital that would have been used productively anyway.
> >*
> > *If he had not bought it would as much capital have been produced?
>*
> *Probably more, as the money would have been left in the hands of
> producers instead of being appropriated by a parasite.*

Assumes that someone would have been able to produce on that land.

> *The point is,
> the landowner who devotes money to buying capital is no more
> productive than the thief who does so. Both are parasites who take
> money from producers; and producers are most certainly more likely to
> use that money productively than are thieves or landowners.*

But even assuming that someone stole every penny they originally invested they still contribute value by investing, just less than they took in the first place.

>
> >> *contributed exactly nothing, but got something. That means others who
> >> were contribu*