

Re: Eminent Domain Abuse

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-03/1395.html>

royls_at_telus.net

Date: 03/11/05

Date: Fri, 11 Mar 2005 00:12:36 GMT

On Wed, 9 Mar 2005 16:05:03 -0800, "David Schwartz"
<davids@webmaster.com> wrote:

><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?*

Not in your Burger King claims, that's for sure.

>>>> *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.*

Lie.

>>>> *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?*

Too little to be significant, and far too little for justice or economic efficiency.

>Is your argument that none of this can be
>recovered?

I repeat: how much is recovered?

Evasions are not going to cut it this time, David. Answer the question.

>>>>>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".

What else can I say to a bald falsehood supported by nothing whatever?

>>>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.

It is in the case of lottery tickets.

>Second, you are construing
>"interest" extremely narrowly.

Ah. So, now you want to construe people's interest broadly enough to include being robbed for the unearned benefit of landowners?

>>>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.*

?? Of course it is. The terms are identified, and consideration passes both ways. You just don't like the fact that it is a contract, because it refutes you root and branch. So you refuse to know that fact, and pretend it isn't one. But it is. Simple.

And talk about "just saying 'no'..."

>>>>> *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?*

Look, moron: I asked you a question. Look up about 10 lines. Yep. There it is. You responded with a false, repeat, false accusation and made zero, repeat, zero attempt to answer my question.

You need to explain why the community recovering the publicly created, repeat, publicly created value of the land under its authority is somehow a "taking," but a landowner demanding money from others for access to the services and infrastructure government provides, the opportunities and amenities the community provides, and the resources nature provides is somehow not a "taking."

Capisci?

>>> *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.*

Liar. You are trying to take the publicly created rent of land away from the public that creates it, and give it away to privileged private landowners who did not create it, for doing nothing.

>>>> *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?*

Wrong. Cars have value even in the wilds of Africa where there are no roads. In fact, they have about as much value there as anywhere else, because the shortage of roads also means a shortage of cars.

You are destroyed.

>> *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.*

Yes, of course he does. He paid the guys who created the car for creating it. The landowner only paid a previous owner, who did no more, and contributed no more, than any other previous owner, none of whom contributed anything, as the land was already there, with no help from them.

You are destroyed.

David, you started out claiming that our arguments had been refuted many times in this forum, and that no one could make them honestly.

But what has in fact happened?

Every substantive statement you have made on this subject has been false, stupid and/or dishonest.

And I and others have made sure everyone reading this thread knows it.

Do you really want to prolong your humiliation any further? After all, someone you know might be reading this...

— Roy L