

Re: Eminent Domain Abuse

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-03/1288.html>

From: David Schwartz (*davids_at_webmaster.com*)

Date: 03/10/05

Date: Wed, 9 Mar 2005 16:05:03 -0800

<royls@telus.net> wrote in message news:422f7f5e.18957448@news.telus.net...

>> *The difference between the value of the cooking and the value of the
>> something else *is* created by the Burger King cook.*

>

> *No, it is not. Such a claim is nonsensical on its face.*

Again, your argument consists of a pejorative followed by ridicule.
Where's the beef?

>>> *Garbage. The labor that improves land value does so through
>>> externalities that cannot, repeat, _cannot_ be recovered by contracts.*

>>

>> *You keep saying this and everytime it's refuted,*

>

> *It has never yet been refuted, certainly not by you.*

A claim you contradict immediately.

>>you pretend the

>>refutation doesn't matter. You equivocate between whether none of it can

>>be

>>recovered or whether some of it can. (You have yet to take a consistent
>>position.)

>

> *The question is easily resolved by appeal to objective reality: how
> much of it actually _is_ recovered?*

How much are you claiming? Is your argument that none of this can be
recovered?

>>>>Every form of labor creates value

>>>>that other people enjoy and that the laborer cannot extract the true

>>>>value

>>>>of. A sequence of even exchanges leaves everyone better off.

>>

>>> *That has _nothing_ to do with the problem of externalities affecting*

>>> *land value.*
>>
>> *It has everything to do with the problem of externalities.*
>
> *No, it doesn't.*

Again, your argument consists of just saying "no".

>> *People won't*
>> *do things unless it's in their interest.*
>
> *Wrong. They buy lottery tickets.*

First of all, it is not always irrational to engage in a transaction where the expected value is less than the cost. Second, you are construing "interest" extremely narrowly.

>> *If they benefit others in the*
>> *process, they can try to extract the benefit to others by contract. If*
>> *they*
>> *can't, then they're not entitled to it.*
>
> *Fine. Every government-issued land title (i.e., all of them) is a*
> *contract that says the owner will keep the taxes current or give up*
> *the land. So the public that creates the value in land _already_has_*
> *every right to recover it. _By_contract_.*

You know perfectly well this is not a contract.

>>>> *The point is that people have the right to use contracts to extract*
>>>> *as*
>>>> *much of the value of their labor as possible. That they cannot extract*
>>>> *in*
>>>> *this manner, they are not entitled to.*
>>
>>> *?? But the beneficiary is entitled to pocket it? Why?*
>>
>> *I am not trying to defend a taking, you are.*
>
> *No, you are.*

There it is again, a one word argument. Why not just say "that's what you think!" and stop any pretense at reasoning?

>> *One child is born to Bill Gates and another child is born to a*
>> *bum, I don't have to defend one child's entitlement to a life of wealth*
>> *and*
>> *privilege. You, however, would have to defend an attempt to take from one*
>> *to*
>> *give to the other.*
>

> *That is what you have done.*

I am not trying to take anything from anyone. You are.

>>> *And landowners are entitled to bill others for the benefits their*

>>> *taxes already paid for.*

>>

>> *This has what to do with an LVT?!*

>

> *Only everything. Land value _is_ the discounted present value of the*

> *income the owner can get by charging others for the services and*

> *infrastructure government provides, the opportunities and amenities*

> *the community provides, and the resources nature provides.*

And the value of a car is the discounted present value of the use of the road infrastructure the government provides, right?

> *You will notice that conspicuous by its absence from this list is*

> *anything the _landowner_ provides.*

A car owner doesn't provide anything to create the value of a car, qua owner.

DS