

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-01/0434.html>

royls_at_telus.net

Date: 01/06/05

Date: Thu, 06 Jan 2005 00:06:57 GMT

On Tue, 04 Jan 2005 09:33:17 GMT, Igor <jjweatherby@houston.rr.com> wrote:

>*royls@telus.net* wrote:

>

>> *Again, you are lying. I am explaining how to estimate economic rents, just as you requested in the first quoted passage at the top of this post.*

>

>*Impossible you still do not understand what economic rent means.*

You have proved that you don't.

>>>*It will still have a sale price because it is a productive asset.*

>>

>> *Nope. It doesn't matter how "productive" it is, if no one wants to use it, the rent is 0. You know: like your understanding of economics*

>

>*Wrong again. People want to use zero rent land it has productive value just less than all other grades.*

No, people will only use 0 rent land if it is marginal land. And it's not just your understanding of economics that is zero, but your understanding of logic, as well. You are affirming the consequent.

>*0 rent does not mean people do not want to use the land.*

Yes, actually, it does. The only 0 rent land people will use at all is marginal land. And even then, they would rather use better land, but they'd have to pay rent for it.

>*The rent on more productive land is derived because people could pay to use the land and still make MORE profits than the 0 economic rent land. This does not mean the 0 economic rent land can not produce only it produces less than land with economic rent.*

Right. Which is why people don't want to use it. Duh.

*>If have a
>piece of land that will give average production and a piece of land that
>due to characteristics will give 20% extra production at the same cost
>then the average production land has 0 rent and the land with 20% extra
>has rent.*

Wrong. You know nothing. It's the relationship with _marginal_ land that determines rent, not _average_ land.

Please try to understand that you are stupid, ignorant, lying garbage, and you know absolutely nothing about land rent.

*>This does not mean I will not want to use the 0 rent land. It
>simply means I could make an offer to a holder 0 rent to use my land for
>a value up to the extra profits from 20% production and he would accept.*

?? Gibberish.

>It does not mean 0 rent land will have no UNIMPROVED price.

Yes, it does.

*>There will
>be a stream of income that can be derived from the land albeit less than
>the land with rent.*

The income stream will be obtained by expending labor and capital, and will not exceed wages and interest. Hence, the land has no value.

*>It will sell for a positive price meaning an X% tax
>will tax more than rent.*

No, it will not sell for a positive price, because the owner will not be able to get any rent for it. He will _only_ be able to get any _income_ from it _by_ expending the _necessary_ _labor_ and _capital_, and his return will consist of wages and interest, not rent. So the land will have no value. I don't know any simpler way to explain this.

>>>The only way no one will build is if 0 economic land is free to settle.

>>

*>> ?? I can't even parse such nonsense. For one thing, there is no such
>> thing as "economic land." And who is talking about building? We're
>> talking about bidding and using. You are just raving incoherently, as
>> usual.*

>

>Building on using what is the difference.

To you, nothing. But then, to you, there is no difference between average land and marginal land...

>I left the word rent out
>between economic and land. The only way ANY land will be free is if
>there is land that can legally be settled at no cost.

Wrong. At no _price_. Of course, being completely ignorant of economics, you do not know the difference between cost and price, either.

>In the earlier
>20th century there was free land. You could sell even a good piece of
>land if there was a piece of land near it that some could claim free of
>charge. There is no more free land.

Then there is no more land where the rent is 0, and your whole argument is stupid, irrelevant, nonsensical garbage.

>Even 0 rent land will have an
>unimproved price because a stream of income can be gained from it.

Nope. That's not what rent is based on.

>0 economic rent just means the stream of income is less than other grades.

No, it means the stream of income is less than or equal to what can be obtained by employing the same labor and capital elsewhere.

>YOU SERIOUSLY NEED TO READ RICARDO AND UNDERSTAND WHAT RENT MEANS.

<yawn> Back atcha, moron boy.

>You
>keep saying you are talking about economic rent but you are talking
>about market prices and market rent.

I am not. You are lying.

>> Why would they? Why would there be no free land available, if there
>> is 0 rent land available?
>
>Where is there free land available?

Where is there 0 rent land?

>The days of simply forging into
>unpopulated territory and staking a claim is over.

No, actually, it isn't. You can still do that in various places.

>ALL land in the US is owned by someone

Most is owned by the US government, which AFAIK still allows homesteading.

>that means even 0 economic rent land will have a price.

Nope. Flat wrong. If land has an unimproved price, the rent is not 0.

> > *Have you never looked down from an airplane
>> and seen unused land? Why are you as stupid as a bag of hammers?*
>
>*Of course but SOMEONE OWNS THAT LAND.*

Like the US government?

>*It is not free to stake a claim as
>you tried to imply earlier.*

Do you have a source for that claim?

>*A high enough land tax COULD MEAN MORE
>UNUSED LAND.*

Certainly as the efficiency of use increased on the best land, the worst land would be abandoned as inefficient.

>*Do you think that the tax could not be tacked on to make up
>at least part of the market rent?*

Nope. That has been known for nearly 200 years.

>*If so you have zero understanding of
>how a tax works.*

You have zero understanding of how rent works.

>*The landowner and capitalist will both pay the tax
>unless the supply is perfectly inelastic or the demand is perfectly
>inelastic. Neither will be the case.*

Wrong. The supply of land is perfectly inelastic.

>*Land may be in "fixed" supply in
>your terms but this misunderstands economic principles.*

No, you do.

>*Not all land
>will be sold at ANY price. The price has to be high enough for the land
>owner to WANT to sell. As price rises more landowners are willing to
>sell.*

Except that that is the *_exact_opposite_* of what is actually observed in practice: as land prices rise, *_fewer_* landowners are willing to sell, just as expected in a collectible market with perfectly inelastic supply. You clearly know *_absolutely_nothing_* about this issue. *_Nothing_*.

>*This means quantity supplied is responsive to price and land is not in perfectly inelastic supply.*

You are misusing the term, "quantity supplied," and it in fact is *_not_* responsive to price.

>>>>*Multiply the \$0 bid by the X%*

>>>>*land tax rate.*

>>>

>>>*No one is giving away free land anymore.*

>>

>> *<sigh> You asked me how to implement a system. I am telling you how.*

>> *You now claim that the simple fact no one is doing as I propose right*

>> *now somehow proves that no one ever could.*

>

>*Are you suggesting taking away all land and just letting people stake a*

>*claim to it?*

?? No.

Are you suggesting you are *_so_stupid_* that you think something I wrote implied that?

>> *Please understand that because you are stupid, ignorant, lying*

>> *garbage, I feel somehow contaminated after I respond to your evil,*

>> *dishonest, swinish rants. And I definitely feel my precious time has*

>> *been wasted.*

>

>*Perfect you are running out of arguments*

Nope. Only patience.

>*maybe soon you will realize you*

>*do not know everything and pick up a book and learn something other than*

>*this conspiracy theory Neo-Nazi propoganda you are spouting.*

?? An idiotic lie.

>*I am always*

>*a little reluctant to agree with people who talk about removing all*

>*labor taxes and putting a land tax because it is WAS A PLANK IN THE*

>*NSDAP PLATFORM.*

?? So were old-age pensions. So? Do you think because Stalin, Pol

Pot and Kim Il Sung all agreed that $2 + 2 = 4$, it can't be right?

>It is still a plank in Neo-Nazi group platforms.

You very obviously know more about that than I.

>After

>the comments that landowners run the media and run the government,
>somewhat reminiscent of the Nazi claim that the Jews ran the media and
>infiltrated the government

Only to an idiot.

Oh, and btw: by Godwin's Law, you just lost the debate.

>and your quick anger and movement toward
>insult, especially at being lumped with Marx,

I'm not supposed to object when you repeatedly lie about what I have plainly written?

>I am really starting to

>believe you may have read more Neo-Nazi propoganda than economics.

You have apparently read more of the former than I. And definitely understood less of the latter.

>I am not saying just because Hitler supported a land tax it is bad. The
>Nazi party actually did a few good things for Germany, not as many as
>they did bad. The bad Nazi party did definitely outweighed the very few
>good things they did. That does not mean say for instance building a
>national highway system for the purpose of national defense is evil just
>because Hitler did so. I just seriously question your true motivation
>for the argument and suspect by your anger and need to throw insults
>that it may come from support for and propoganda fed by a Neo-Nazi movement.

Outrageous and disgraceful.

>>>This only works if there is

>>>unsettled low grade land that I can move to and claim.

>>

>> More stupid, nonsensical garbage from Mr Stupid Nonsensical Garbage

>> himself. If land has 0 rent, you can use it for free. I don't know

>> any clearer way to explain it.

>

>Trying to explain landowners are not the root of all evil will get this

>response.

The system they profit by is the root of most evil, including the evils of fascism and socialism.

-- Roy L