

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE FIRST CONVENTION OF THE  
PROPERTY AND FREEDOM SOCIETY, BODRUM, TURKEY, MAY 2006

[Notes compiled by [Robert Grözinger](#)]

At the beginning of his closing speech, [Hans-Hermann Hoppe](#) states that answering the question “How to win?” means answering the question: how to win over young people?

He admits that he cannot say if we will win, but what society would look like when we win – and this is a vision he believes will win over many young people.

A world of scarcity such as ours means there will be conflicts. Therefore rules must be made as to how to use these resources and thereby resolve these conflicts.

The Rules mankind has recognized from the beginning are :

1. Every person owns himself.
2. Ownership of anything goes to the one who first uses it.
3. He who uses his body to produce owns the product.
4. Voluntary transfer of products changes ownership.

Following these rules leads to wealth and civilized life.

How do we enforce these rules? How to keep those at bay who do not adhere to these rules?

The classical liberal answer: This and only this is the task of the state.

The state has two unique powers: territorial monopolist of decision making, and territorial monopolist of taxation.

It is generally accepted that monopolies are bad for consumers. But hardly anyone addresses the questions: What about the monopoly of decision making and taxation?

The state can produce not only inferior goods, but also "bads". Decisions in its own favor, and at a fixed price.

Result: Expenditure e.g. for defense will continually rise. The state is an expropriating property protector.

The classical liberals allowed this to happen because they aligned themselves with democrats. Because at the time all governments were monarchies. Kings had privileges. Democrats were saying: anybody can become king, president etc. What they did not

realize was that this does not eliminate the privileges. Instead of being personal, they are functional.

Now we have public law and private law.

Things are worse under a democracy. A king considered his country as his private property. A temporary caretaker on the other hand will maximize his income at the expense of capital.

The counter argument is: democracy is competition. However, competition is good when it is applied to the production of goods. But not when applied to the production of "bads", as is the case in a democracy.

Kings come to power by accident of birth, and can be bad. But they might be OK too. But what causes politicians to rise to the top in a democracy is if they are bad, a liar or thief, have a bad character etc.

So what is the alternative?

The alternative must be a private law society.

Such a society would make use of specialized services: insurances, arbitration, and protection. Private defense agencies.

Prices of protection would tend to fall, quality would tend to rise.

There would no longer be overproduction of protection etc.

Insurances indemnify you when something happens to you. This leads to greater efficiency in preventing crime, recovery of stolen goods, and that perpetrators pay the victim.

Private insurance would encourage the carrying of arms by offering lower premiums for those who carry arms.

Insurance companies are by their very nature defensive. They will also insist that their clients adhere to defensive behavior. No vigilante justice.

There would be no "victimless crimes" persecuted as crimes.

There would be no arbitrary one-sided changes of rules.

There will be different systems of law. A convivial order of insurances in which arbitration agencies arbitrate.

Among young people ideas such as these have great appeal.