

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-11/msg00285.html>

- *From:* "ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx" <ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 26 Nov 2006 04:38:04 -0800
-

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote:

ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx <ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote:

ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx <ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote: >
ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx
<ruetheday@xxxxxxxxxxx>
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 been 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

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

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.

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

Right. My bad.

Which premise?

From
the
standpoint
that
coercion
is
principally
bad,
it
follows

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

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.

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.

Re: more electoral defeats for the feudalists

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

Huh? Both the state and the PDA get involved after the crime or breach of contract has taken place. Their purpose is not so much defense or retaliation as it is rectification. They order a judgement. There is no way to _enforce_ that judgement without initiating force, however.