

Re: Land, Labour and Capital Taxation....

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-12/1087.html>

royls_at_telus.net

Date: 12/23/04

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 2004 00:50:02 GMT

On Tue, 21 Dec 2004 19:17:03 GMT, Igor <jjweatherby@houston.rr.com> wrote:

>royls@telus.net wrote:

>> On Wed, 15 Dec 2004 22:40:19 GMT, Igor <jjweatherby@houston.rr.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>>It is only derived

>>>from the base characteristics of the land, that is in the classical

>>>sense.

>>

>> Flat false.

>

>A. Contradiction is not argument.

<yawn> You made a false claim, without support. I don't have to "argue" against it. I just have to identify the fact that it is false and unsupported. You can't impose a burden of proof on me by making unsupported claims. The burden of proof is on you to support them. And you can't.

>B. You *SERIOUSLY NEED TO READ RICARDO AND GEORGE.*

I have. And lots more, besides. What you need to do is understand them. Because you seriously do not.

>The links I have

>provided to the Henry George foundation give a very good example of what

>RENT is.

An example is not a definition.

>You haven't a clue is to what rent is.

No, I have already explained that you do not understand what it is, nor even the material you cite about it.

>>>The reason being is that ANY investor can employ similar capital

>>>*and improvement. ANY investor can build up infrastructure that helps
>>>others.*
>>
>> *?? That is exactly the point. Investment in parcel A helps the owner
>> of parcel B by increasing B's rent.*
>
>*You do not not know the difference between market and economic rent.*

I most certainly do, but *_you_* do not know what economic rent is at all.

>*Market rent has nothing to do with economic rent.*

Yes, it most certainly does. Your claim is idiotic, and you obviously know nothing whatever of the matter.

>*INVESTMENT IS NOT PART
>OF ECONOMIC RENT.*

But it can affect economic rent.

>*AGAIN INVESTMENT IS NOT PART OF ECONOMIC RENT. ONE
>MORE TIME INVESTMENT IS NOT PART OF ECONOMIC RENT. READ RICARDO. READ
>GEORGE.*

<yawn> Chanting and shouting won't make your *_unsupported_* claims true.

>>>*NO ONE can change the intrinsic value of the land.*
>>
>> *There is no such thing as "intrinsic value," but any improvement that
>> does not need maintenance (such as digging a permanent drainage
>> channel, site leveling, rock picking, etc.) permanently changes the
>> land's value.*
>
>*Of course their is.*

No, there is not.

>*Some land is flat making it easy to build.*

That would add value *_if_* the land's most productive use required building on it. *_Get_it_???* It's not intrinsic. It depends on the most productive use, which depends on market conditions. You are just flat wrong, as usual.

>*In
>farming there are different grades of soil WHICH CAN NOT BE CHANGED.*

Flat false. There are even folk sayings about it: "Put clay in sand, money in the hand, put sand in clay, throw money away."

You are, as usual, flat wrong.

>*The*

>*Ukrainian black dirt will ALWAYS produce more than the Sahara EVEN WITH
>EQUAL LEVELS OF IMPROVEMENT.*

Nope. Not more peanuts, which prefer a sandy soil. You are just flat wrong, as usual. Almost everything you say is just flat wrong.

>*This is rent the extra output do TO NATURAL
>CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LAND.*

That is only one component of rent, and
_it_depends_what_the_most_productive_use_is_. The most productive use
in turn depends on market conditions, and thus is _not_intrinsic_.

You are _flat_wrong_. _Get_it_???

>*A flat piece of land will allow more
>capital improvement than a sloped rocky piece. THIS IS A NATURAL
>CHARACTERISTIC THAT GIVES IT INTRINSIC VALUE.*

Nope. It depends what the most productive use is. If the most
productive use is stone quarrying, the flat land may well be inferior
to the sloping, stony land. You are just flat wrong.

>*AGAIN READ RICARDO. ACTUALLY READ GEORGE NOT WHAT SOMEONE ELSE SAYS
>GEORGE SAYS.*

Again, I have, and I have understood it. You either have not, or have
not understood it.

>>>*Actually profit taxes are just as easy.*
>>
>> *No; unlike a land tax, they are unjust and have damaging economic
>> effects.*
>
>*Like what.*

Like attenuation of the incentive to make risky investments in
productive capital, for one.

>*I really want to know*

No, actually you do not want to know. You refuse to know any of the
relevant facts. You prefer to continue being flat wrong in everything
you say, as long as that allows you to maintain your delusional
system.

>*because ECONOMIC THEORY will tell you
>these do not distort short run decisions.*

Yes, well, I'm sure they'd be fine in an economy where everyone died before the effects of the profits tax could be felt...

>*CITE ONE ECONOMIST WHO SAYS THIS.*

Nicolaus Tideman, a close collaborator of Nobel laureate William Vickrey, proves that you are flat wrong, as usual:

<http://www.econ.vt.edu/tideman/rci.pdf>

>*I have a feeling the "effects" you would list are just plain wrong.*

<yawn> Take it up with Professor Tideman. Unfortunately, I doubt that he will find you any more educable than I have.

>*I could show that*

No, actually, you could not.

>*but you would just deny it and call me a liar.*

I only call you a liar when you lie.

>*You need some SERIOUS remedial work.*

I pity your victi^H^H^H^H^Hstudents.

-- Roy L