

Re: query regarding Georgist assertion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2007-04/msg00141.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sat, 07 Apr 2007 06:11:41 GMT
-

On 6 Apr 2007 01:10:16 -0700, w_b_ryan@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Apr 6, 1:16 am, r...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 5 Apr 2007 16:17:12 -0700, w_b_r...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

The link you supplied does not support the assertion that "high" taxes on land are associated with prosperity. Eighteen countries are listed, all European, with the exception of the United States, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and Japan. The countries are ranked from the highest to the lowest in terms of "property tax as a percentage of total tax collected by the country." The United States is ranked the highest at 11.9 percent. Austria is ranked the lowest at 1.3 percent. That is to say, more than ninety percent of taxes collected in those very wealthy industrialized countries come from something other than property tax. Inasmuch as property tax is inclusive of tax on improvements and personal property, the percentage of total taxes collected on the value of land alone would be even lower.

Of course they are not Single Tax countries. The point is to compare the ones near the top of the list with the ones near the bottom. The ones near the top — USA, Switzerland, Japan, Canada, Australia — have generally been more prosperous than those near the bottom. The UK is less prosperous despite its high property tax revenue fraction because its property tax system is very strongly geared to taxing improvements at a higher rate than land.

I notice you ignored all the other evidence I provided of pre-modern examples and the newly prosperous resource-rent countries. That is normal and expected.

Re: query regarding Georgist assertion

But it's really very simple, stupid: would Kuwait, Brunei, etc. be wealthy countries today if they were giving all the economic rent of their resources away to the oil companies for doing nothing, and taxing production to raise revenue?

You have of course chosen to be permanently incapable of answering that question honestly, or even of knowing the answer, because it proves your beliefs are false.

This was the Georgist assertion that I asked for some verifiable data in support:

"...the most prosperous societies usually have high levels of land taxation."

You supplied a link to data from eighteen countries, which demonstrated that more than ninety percent of taxes in those countries were from sources other than taxes on property of all kinds, and that the percentage of taxes from land, being a subset of property of all kinds, would be necessarily lower.

Not really. Some fraction of many other taxes — income taxes, corporate profits taxes, and especially capital gains taxes — consists of land rent, which is one reason such taxes are not as damaging as economic theory would otherwise predict.

You now say "the point is to compare the ones near the top of the list with the ones near the bottom."

No, that is not responsive to my request.

Yes, of course it is. The only possible meaning of "high levels of land taxation" is "high levels of land taxation compared to the levels typically observed." What else could it mean?

Rather than demonstrate that the most prosperous societies usually have high levels of land taxation, the data actually demonstrates that the eighteen very prosperous countries have low levels of land taxation.

No, of course it doesn't. The 18 countries range from almost

Re: query regarding Georgist assertion

Re: query regarding Georgist assertion

nonexistent to high levels of land taxation (though admittedly none are anywhere near as high as the highest levels ever, where the true miracles of economic growth have occurred), and the most prosperous ones were on the high end. In particular, comparing otherwise similar countries from the high and low ends of the scale (Austria and Switzerland, for example) shows that the more prosperous ones have higher land taxation.

In addition, most of the prosperous countries -- especially Japan, the USA, UK, etc. -- have historically become prosperous during periods of relatively high land taxation.

Everything else in your post was additional assertion without supporting evidence.

?? You need some sort of "supporting evidence" to know that Kuwait gets almost all its government revenue from its oil resource??

ROTFL!!! Google could help you learn this stuff, Ryan, if you really wanted to be helped. And until you do, what would be the point of giving you more supporting evidence? You simply refuse to know all facts that disprove your false beliefs.

It is impossible to supply actual empirical evidence to support the Georgist position.

I've supplied lots of it, liar, and so have others. You just refuse to know all facts that prove your beliefs are false.

-- Roy L

.