

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-11/msg00248.html>

- *From:* peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Peter Bjørn Perlsø)
 - *Date:* Sat, 25 Nov 2006 19:23:31 +0100
-

ruetheday@xxxxxxxx <ruetheday@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote: > ruetheday@xxxxxxxx <ruetheday@xxxxxxxx>
wrote: >>>>>>>> "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 >>>>>> That must be in the
early years of Mises. :=) >>>> It's from Liberty and Property, 1958.
Von Mises was never an >> anarcho-capitalist, he always vigorously
asserted the absolute need for >> government. In today's nomenclature,
he was a minarchist. Hayek >> actually went quite a bit further than
that in laying out the >> legitimate functions of the state.
Anarcho-capitalism didn't really >> come onto the scene until the early
1970's with Rothbard's publication >> of For A New Liberty and David
Friedman's, The Machinery of Freedom. >> It largely hit a dead end at
that point, for reasons elaborated in >> Nozick's ASU. >> Nozick's own
reasoning is spurious, as Rothbard has also demonstrated. > His
"immaculate conception" of the state apparatus is false.

Nozick's reasoning of how private mutual protection agencies would devolve
into de facto states is impeccable. Rothbard is the one who couldn't
string together a sentence without committing at least one logical error.

Red herring. Even if it was true, it doesn't change that Nozick's
premissis is false.

From the standpoint that coercion is
principally bad, it follows
that government is also bad.

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Nonsense. Enforcing property rights and contracts requires coercion, regardless of who's doing it – the modern state, the night watchman state, or the private mutual protection agency.

You have misunderstood something if you think that PDA is equivalent to a state.

The astute reader will note that you completely avoided my point. I'll repeat it. Enforcing property rights and contracts requires coercion, regardless of who's doing it.

And you are avoiding my point if you think that PDA's and states are the same because they both use coercion, the latter which I don't deny.

— regards , Peter B. P. – <http://titancity.com/blog>
<http://markedspartiet.dk>, <http://macplanet.dk> <http://siad.dk>