

# Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-11/msg00257.html>

---

- *From:* [peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Peter Bjørn Perlsø)
  - *Date:* Sun, 26 Nov 2006 01:16:24 +0100
- 

[ruetheday@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ruetheday@xxxxxxxx) <[ruetheday@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ruetheday@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote:

[ruetheday@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ruetheday@xxxxxxxx) <[ruetheday@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ruetheday@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote: > [ruetheday@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ruetheday@xxxxxxxx)  
<[ruetheday@xxxxxxxx](mailto: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

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

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.

I'm not sure what a "premissis" is, but if you mean "premise", to which  
one are you referring?

Right. My bad.

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

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.

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

You have misunderstood something is 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 not deny.

A few lines up you said that coercion is "principally bad" and that governments are bad because of this. If you acknowledge that PDAs use coercion in the same manner, then it follows that they are bad as well.

Again, my bad. I mean initiation of coercion (force, theft and it's corollary, fraud).

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