

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

# Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2007-07/msg00067.html>

---

- *From:* "sinister" <[sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 18 Jul 2007 13:14:38 -0400
- 

"Davinchi" <[mulldrat@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mulldrat@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:469e0d70\\$0\\$31222\\$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:469e0d70$0$31222$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Peter B. P. wrote:

Davinchi <[mulldrat@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mulldrat@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

sinister wrote:

"Peter B. P." <[peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote in message  
<news:1i1ex6h.1oz06i0r53cdiN%peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

sinister  
<[sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote:

"Peter B.  
P."  
<[peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote in  
message  
<news:1i1esgv.154rtt7omnptnN%peter@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

sinister  
<[sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:sinister@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote:

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

The  
LDP  
believes  
the  
ownership

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

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

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

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  
landlords  
and  
tenants  
to  
freely  
negotiate  
the  
terms  
of

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

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

Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

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  
morderate to large LVT, I  
think that I  
fall  
into the G-ist camp.

--

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

"We don't dial 911 – we dial  
.357".

## Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

I just have to chime in.  
It's not that Libertarians are freedom hating per se. It just seems that way when encountering modern society where there are rules to promote and maintain a civil society. 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.

Onl in regards to land. In regards to goods, labor and capital, they are indeed free market advocates.

You say only, so I disagree. On goods, your right. On capital, it's questionable. On labor, I know of a few Libertarians that have are deceitful and use asymmetric information to take advantage of labor.

<snip>

But you miss the fundamental point of Georgist analysis: the reason labor is constrained is because of lack of access to natural resources.

Take, for example, the common decrying of sweatshops in the third world. While it's true that sometimes workers are press ganged into such factories, or that they voluntarily sign up but are later essentially enslaved, there is certainly a large fraction that are not so enslaved.

In what sense, therefore, are the workers "taken advantage of"? They're free at any time to go earn a different living.

The crucial obstacle to economic justice in such countries is that **\*\***(1) they're denied equal access to natural resources (primarily agricultural land), or (2) are not ruled by governments that would on their behalf receive payments from those who "own" the land (for their use of it) and use it to the benefit of the landless (by funding infrastructure, direct compensation, educational opportunities, etc).**\*\***

The conflation of "capitalist" and "landowner" in the minds of so many critics of nominally capitalist economies means that real solutions to these problems will either go unapprehended, or will not receive the emphasis they deserve.

I'm well aware, of course, that the class of people who own capital is often indistinguishable from those that own land, but for economic purposes (as well as the purpose of serving justice), such a distinction must be made. In a word: landowners as landowners are pure parasites, whereas owners of

## Re: More freedom-hating "libertarians"

capital (not including the capitalized value of land) are contributing to socially useful production (minus a discussion, out of scope here, of things like environmental impacts, weapons manufacturers, etc). This is a fundamental, valid distinction that George saw but Marx didn't (or at least didn't want to see).