

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-11/msg00242.html>

- *From:* "ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxx" <ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Nov 2006 05:50:44 -0800
-

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Fri, 24 Nov 2006 20:18:09 +0100, peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
(=?ISO-8859-1?Q?Peter_Bj=F8rn_Perls=F8?=) wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Tue, 21 Nov 2006 23:47:24 +0100,
peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
(=?ISO-8859-1?Q?Peter_Bj=F8rn_Perls=F8?=)
wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sun, 19
Nov 2006
16:05:09
-0500, Bob
Kolker
<nowhere@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Peter
Bjørn
Perlsø
wrote:

Michael
Scheltgen
<mjs818@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

wrote:

And
it
is
the
Government
(aka
society)

Government
is
NOT
EQUAL
TO
SOCIETY!!!

This
is
a
common
error
among
the
Statist
and
the
pinko
stinko
liberal
commies.
They
see
society
and
government
as
one
and
inseperable.

Strawman. I
doubt you
can quote
anyone at
all making
such a

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

statement.
You are just
making
\$#!+ up
again.

No, Roy, in this case he is
right. Socialists and
collectivists
typically do not know the
difference between state and
society, and they
ultimately want them to be
completely overlapping and
united.

Unless you can provide some sort of direct,
verbatim, in-context
quotes to that effect, you are just pulling the
same old strawman \$#!+
Bob pulls.

I cant quote *every* conversation I have ever had with state
socialists
here.

Can you quote any that supports your claim? The quote at the top of
this post does not support it, because it has clearly been taken out
of context: Michael meant that government acts_for society, not that
it actually is society (i.e., he probably meant "IOW," not "aka,"
and was just being a bit sloppy), because without government, society
lacks effective means to act in its collective interest (which of
course by no means implies that government always does act in
society's interest).

Consider the analogy of a man using a hammer to drive a nail. When
describing the process, we might say "the hammer (IOW the man) drives
the nail." The man of course does not hit the nail with his fist, and
can't drive the nail without using a hammer. Likewise, without the
man, the hammer does nothing; but that doesn't mean a description of a
man's use of a hammer to drive a nail mistakes the man for his hammer.
And continuing the above analogy, just because a man needs a hammer to
drive a nail doesn't mean he will never hit his thumb with it.

You are going out of your way to rationalize what is at best sloppy
thinking.

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Not really. I'm not sure how anyone could seriously suggest that government IS society as opposed to an AGENT of society. Clearly there are members of society who are not members of the government, so the two cannot be equivalent.

"Government is a necessary institution, the means to make the social system of cooperation work smoothly without being disturbed by violent acts on the part of gangsters whether of domestic or of foreign origin. Government is not, as some people like to say, a necessary evil; it is not an evil, but a means, the only means available to make peaceful human coexistence possible."

--Ludwig von Mises

.