

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2007-07/msg00066.html>

- *From:* "sinister" <sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 18 Jul 2007 13:04:33 -0400
-

"Davinchi" <mulldrat@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:469da9c4\\$0\\$31202\\$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:469da9c4$0$31202$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

sinister wrote:

"Peter B. P." <peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:li1ex6h.1oz06i0r53cdiN%peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

sinister <sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Peter B. P." <peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
<news:li1esgv.154rtt7omnptnN%peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

sinister
<sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

<http://www.ldap.org.au/federal/policies/propertyRights.html>

The LDP
believes the
ownership
of property
is a
fundamental
right
that
precedes the
power of
government.
Widespread
private
ownership
of property
is also a

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

significantly
preferable
alternative
to either
collective
ownership
or
ownership
by a
privileged
elite.

The LDP
supports the
right of
'eminent
domain' of
property
owners
over
their
property. It
believes
neither the
State nor
other
members of
society
should
be able to
limit or
interfere
with the
right to
enjoy
property so
long as
such
enjoyment
does not
involve
coercion of
others.

Specific
LPD
policies:

The LDP
supports the
right of

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

landlords
and tenants
to freely
negotiate
the
terms of
tenancies,
free from
state rules
and
restrictions.

snip

Sinister, i agree with you on
this point, but to generalize
from one
point to claim that one
group of people are
"freedom-hating" is
spurious
and unnecessary polemical.

I'm implicitly making a _statistical_
generalization, which I claim
stands.

That doesn't detract from my admiration (if
not complete agreement
with)
geolibertarians and Georgists and yourself (I
assume you essentially
fall
into those camps).

Thank you*. However, back to the point: Does the LDP of
Australia
mention anything about land value taxation?

Not on that page, but I think a reasonable inference given what they
wrote in the linked text would imply they're against LVT. Certainly,
they appear to have no understanding that there's no natural right to use
landed property in any way the "owner" sees fit, given that the owner
cannot naturally, rightfully exclude others from the property.

*) Since I am in favor of a moderate to large LVT, I think
that I fall
into the G-ist camp.

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

regards , Peter B. P.

<http://titancity.com/blog> , <http://macplanet.dk>

"We don't dial 911 – we dial .357".

I just have to chime in.

It's not that Libertarians are freedom hating per se. It

Yes, it is. When a libertarian scoffs at the notion that exclusive use of a natural resource should be paired with a payment to the State or to others for their loss of access to that resource, we can conclude one or both of the following:

- (1) They despise freedom and liberty, and/or
- (2) They have no understanding of economics.

just seems that way when encountering modern society where there are rules to promote and maintain a civil society.

It's much more fundamental than that.

Left-wing critiques of (right-wing) libertarianism (as distinguished from left-libertarianism) often focus their attacks on the libertarians refusal to abide by some purported social contract.

While these attacks can be useful and accurate, they are not as fundamental as (unless they include) the following two points, which comprise the true soft underbelly of libertarian theory:

- (1) Without government, it's an empirical fact that humans devolve into a war of all against all. (There might be exceptions when e.g. the ratio of humans to natural resources is extremely low; see commenter royls in this group for intelligent discussion.)
- (2) Any system of political economy whereby certain privileged individuals get access to natural resources without compensating those denied access is fundamentally unjust and, indeed, a tyranny.

Hence, they don't abide by any regulation in support of the commons or agree to any idea of public goods. In modern times, Libertarians are not free market promoters, but free rider opportunist. I've seen it so many times it hurts, but they simply won't agree to anything that limit their choice even when they demand equal access to the commons and benefit from societies organization and infrastructure.

Look at a libertarian, and I'll bet you odds you will find most of the characteristics of Narcissistic Personality Disorder – a sociopathic

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

mental illness.

Again, I don't disagree, but such attacks are far stronger if their made with the land economics argument in mind, because it's not refutable. Arguments based on vague notions of the "common good" can be refuted in ways not inconsistent with fundamental notions of justice, fairness, and social order, on the other hand.

IMHO the fact that so many liberals (in the American sense, not British sense) and leftists are unwilling or unable to adopt major portions (if not the entirety) of the Georgist viewpoint is an unfortunate state of affairs. To what extent it stems from an inability to understand economics versus an unfortunate state of being wed to Marxist delusions is not clear to me.

Cheers.

"If Tyranny and Oppression come to this land, it will be in the guise of fighting a foreign enemy." — James Madison

.....