

Re: more anti-Georgist commentary

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2007-05/msg00154.html>

- *From:* royls@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Fri, 11 May 2007 01:28:35 GMT
-

On 10 May 2007 16:48:26 -0700, w_b_ryan@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On May 10, 5:39 pm, r...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

The rent
return to land being *competing* with the return to
other factors of production.

Flat wrong. The problem with this "reasoning" is
that the supply of land is fixed. The only way to
even out the returns to land and capital is by bidding
up the price of land. But the more landowners are
paid for their land, the higher the return they make
by owning land!

But the supply of land is definitely not fixed, as you
have been informed "thousands" of times.

No, the supply of land in the economic sense (natural resources) is
definitely and indisputably fixed, as I have informed you many times
before, and as all economically literate people know.

This
premise to the Georgist argument is false, rendering
everything else in Georgism to be false.

It is indisputably true, by definition, which is one reason the whole
argument is unassailable.

What you are doing is applying a false definition to

Re: more anti-Georgist commentary

"land" in which the surface dimensions and location
of a particular parcel is fixed,

That is irrelevant to both the definition and the argument.

but where its utility is
the product of social development and technology,
which is always increasing.

Utility is not land. The value of land (which is certainly increased
by technology, capital accumulation and social development) is also
not land.

However, as these facts disprove your false beliefs, you refuse to
know them.

Land in this more complete definition is always
being produced.

Oh, certainly land is always being produced... if you use the "most
complete" definition of land, which includes the idiotic, economically
illiterate ravings of a certain notorious Usenet spammer, troll,