

PROPERTY RIGHTS AS THE SOURCE AND LIMITATION OF THE RIGHTS OF AN INDIVIDUAL, AND THE FOUNDATION OF A SOCIETY ACCORDING TO MURRAY NEWTON ROTHBARD

Stanisław Puchniewicz*

Abstract

The subject of the article is the concept of political system created by Murray Rothbard. His thought is part of the philosophy called libertarianism, whose representatives recognize the right of private property as the basic and only right for the human person. From this perspective, all problems regarding the limits of individual rights and freedoms are resolved. Based on natural law, Rothbard creates a vision of stateless order in which the individual is completely free from any coercion, as long as it does not violate the freedom of other individuals. Rothbard calls his system of government anarcho-capitalism or market anarchism.

Keywords: *Rothbard, anarchism, libertarianism, legality, law, property rights, political system*

Creating the English-language version of the journal "Zoon Politikon" is financed under contract No. 724/P-DUN/2018 from the funds allocated by the Minister of Science and Higher Education for dissemination of science.



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

* Stanisław Puchniewicz, The Cardinal Wyszyński University, Warsaw, Poland,
e-mail: stanislaw.puchniewicz@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6836-9950>

Disputes over the legality of controversial actions regarding their moral value are a constant element of public debate. The debate concerns such activities as abortion, drug trafficking, prostitution, pornography and involves both a purely moral approach and the legal admissibility of the act. The two planes of the debate are interwoven, as are the different arguments put forward by the participants. Frequently, individual positions on the legality of an action are motivated by a mixture of arguments pertaining to biology, religion, property rights, psychology or social implications, which causes chaos and hinders discussion.

The purpose of this article is to present the concept of property rights as proposed by Murray Newton Rothbard, one of the most prominent representatives of libertarian thought. Libertarianism is a modern political philosophy in which private property is a fundamental value. Accordingly, property rights are considered the only, albeit extremely broad, platform for discussion on the legality of any action. According to the basic libertarian principles, a person owns themselves and no one has the right to violate their property, which is their body, their labor and the goods acquired through it. As long as a given action is not an infringement of foreign property – i.e. is not an aggression, it should be legal, regardless of its moral assessment. Apart from defending against violence, a peaceful individual cannot be forced to do anything, nor can any obligation be imposed on them (see Nozick 1974, p. 123 *et seq.*). Libertarianism is a philosophy which implements the following motto in an absolutely consistent way: “one person’s freedom ends where another’s begins” (Modrzejewska 2010, p. 138).

Despite the common assumption of the primacy of private property, libertarianism is a diverse philosophy. The differences are determined both by the premises from which the foundations of the libertarian theory are derived, and by the extent of radicalism of the philosophy’s representatives. In this article I will present the basic principles of libertarianism and the rationale behind them in Rothbard’s model.

In this paper, I will aim to demonstrate Rothbard's model of libertarianism as a political concept which, due to being based on property rights, can provide the foundation for a broad compromise between the sides of the public debate on many contentious issues. It is possible thanks to the consistency with which Rothbard separates the sphere of political power from the sphere of general ethics.

Libertarianism as a concept

At its core, libertarianism is a very broad concept. The name itself is derived from Latin *liber*, meaning free. The degree to which the representatives express their radicalism, as well as their varied backgrounds, contribute to the diverse nature of this philosophy. Based on Murray Rothbard's ideas, considered to be the most radical and most distinctive, the trend is regarded by many libertarians as the main representation of the libertarian system (Juruś 2012, p. 10-11).

Consistently applying the idea of self-ownership of all human beings, Rothbard further develops his thought to create a vision of a stateless order in which the individual is completely free of any coercion as long as they respect the property rights of others. He described the proposed system as anarcho-capitalism or market-anarchism.

The fact that it is based on the right to property in the traditional understanding of natural law as construed by human nature can be seen as a distinctive feature of Rothbard's libertarianism (Rothbard 2004, p. 50 *et seq.*). This is what separates the American thinker from those libertarians who base property rights on utilitarianism or the social contract. What Rothbard has in common with other libertarians is the perception of man as a self-owned individual (see Staśkiewicz 2015, p. 114), reluctance towards the state and, above all, the assumption that no person (or group of people) has the right to aggressive action against another person and their property. Rothbard refers to this as the "non-

aggression axiom”. According to him, “aggression” is defined as the use or threat of physical violence against an innocent person or their property. To Rothbard, as well as other libertarians, aggression is therefore tantamount to rights violation.

Natural law according to Rothbard

Considering the fact that Rothbard’s system is based on natural law, it is only appropriate to provide his understanding of it. According to the thinker himself, the law is based on Thomism, as well as the ideas of John Locke and other classical liberals.

Rothbard believed that Thomas Aquinas had a major influence on the spread of the view that natural law can be discovered and analyzed on the basis of reason, without the necessity of recourse to revelation. Although Thomas Aquinas did not express explicit statements concerning the absolute independence of the natural law from God, it was emphasized in the later interpretations of Thomism. Francisco Suárez shares the view of his contemporaries saying that “had God not existed, or had he not judged fairly, or had man been commanded by righteous reason, he would have followed the same nature of law as he does now” (Suarez 1619, citation from: d’Entrèves 1951, p. 71; cf.: Rothbard 2010, p. 77).

The independence of the natural law from God is clearly recognized by Hugo Grotius, who recognizes that the moral law applies even in the absence of God (Grotius 1625, citation from: d’Entrèves 1951, p. 52-53; cf.: Rothbard 2010, p. 113-114). Nor can the Creator, according to Grotius, “make what is inherently evil no longer evil” (Grotius 1625, citation from: d’Entrèves 1951, p. 52-53).

Based on the views mentioned above, Rothbard describes natural law as intrinsic to the logical structure of reality, as a result of the fact

that things are what they are. The nature of things is the manner of their existence, which is neither religious nor mystical (Rothbard 2010, p. 83).

This way, there exists natural law which is equal to the laws of the universe, and the natural ethical law stemming from it. The latter determines that perfect realization of the natural potential of a given creation can be described as good for that creation. Consequently, humans also have their own nature, however in light of ethics based on natural law, good or evil can be determined, depending on the restrictions of human nature (*Ibidem*, p. 86).

Such an understanding of natural law can be used to arrive at the justification of the rights of individuals. According to Rothbard, many natural law theories derived within political contexts, ranging from those of Plato, Aristotle, thomists, and Leo Strauss, were mostly concerned with issues in relation to community, society and the forms of government. There was less emphasis on the rights of the individual, which can be inferred from natural law (see *ibidem*, p. 97).

John Locke was, in Rothbard's opinion, the one who shifted the meaning of natural law to focus on the ideas of natural rights of all men, instead of the applicable forms of government they form (see Rothbard 2006, p. 369). As a result of the fact that men are free beings, striving to satisfy their natural needs, Locke derives the idea of ownership of self, labor, and material property based on the principle of first appropriation¹. Libertarians also, just as John Locke, discuss natural rights derived from natural law (see Rothbard 2010, p. 100-102).

Rothbard's understanding of power is explained by James Sadowsky, a libertarian: "when we say that one has the right to do certain things we mean this and only this, that it would be immoral for another, alone or in combination, to stop him from doing this by the use of physical force or the threat thereof. What is wrong, however, is the

¹ Which means that ownership of something is justified simply by someone seizing it before someone else does. See Rothbard 2010, p. 113.

use of physical force to stop these things from happening” (Sadowsky 2012). The purpose of libertarianism is to determine the legality of an action, not morality (see Rothbard 2010, p. 102). Debating the morality of particular actions is the domain of ethics as such, while political philosophy is concerned with rights, or in other words, the legality or applicable use of violence in human relations.

The Rothbardian analysis of the individual

In order to outline the fundamental rights of an individual, it is necessary to analyze the concept of man as an individual in relation to reality and to themselves. The properties derived through this analysis will act as the basis for the natural rights of the individual. For this purpose, Rothbard uses a methodological tool he called “Robinson Crusoe’s social philosophy” (Rothbard 2010, p. 107). It is a conceptual experiment based on the analysis of a situation, where a single amnesiac is left on a deserted island. The subsequent appearance of “Friday” and other people shows how adding more people affects the situation, and how these relationships create a network – this is how the natural society is created. This analysis concerns the rights of the individual in relation to nature and then the subsequent persons with whom the individual interacts.

Let us therefore analyze the situation of a single amnesiac on a deserted island. What are the particularities of his situation?

Firstly, as pointed out by Rothbard, he is confronted with the consciousness of his mind and his body. He realizes that, unlike animals, he has no instinctive knowledge forcing him to satisfy his needs and desires. Thus, his life began without prior knowledge. He needs to learn everything from the beginning. In order to survive, and then improve his living conditions, he starts using his mental capacity to observe, to think in abstract terms, and to analyze. Therefore, unlike

animals, he starts to use his reasoning. As Rothbard continues, Crusoe, through introspection into his own consciousness, by discovering the fact of its existence, also arrives at the fact of his own freedom of choice, and thus of his own free will. He also recognizes that it is natural for the mind to control the body and its activity. Crusoe realizes that he owns himself (see *ibidem*, p. 110).

He also notices that he is surrounded by a natural world rich in resources of different kinds and quantities. Finally, Crusoe realizes that he has certain needs and goals to satisfy in order to survive or to obtain a comfortable life; these are both material and spiritual needs. These needs have no limits, because man is never able to reach complete fulfillment. After satisfying the physiological needs, intellectual and spiritual ones emerge. At the same time, we are faced with the scarcity of goods and the limitations of the nature of both the world and man. Sometimes it is not possible to satisfy two desires at the same time (e.g. eating and sleeping) or satisfying them is more complex (than picking fruit from a tree, for example) and involves a transformation of the environment (e.g. to build a house, one needs to cut down a tree and process wood). Therefore, every human being creates a completely subjective scale of needs, their hierarchy, which manifests itself as human action. It is worth noting that Crusoe can independently choose any goal and means to achieve said goal – he is absolutely free to determine his own actions (see Jurecki 2015, p. 24). The limitations of the very nature of man or the world do not alter this fact. Although man does not possess the ability to leap over the ocean, his free will allows him to try, and unlimitedly choose his desires and ideas – in that sense, man is absolutely free.

Thus, through self-control and self-determination of goals, man possesses himself, he is his own property, which constitutes objective reality. Ownership, according to Rothbard, is the actual control,

possession, use and exploitation of an item without third party permission (see Rothbard 2010, pp. 113-114).

Land and goods ownership

Crusoe discovers unowned land on the island. Rothbard, referring to Locke, states that the castaway, by gathering the land's resources, learning how to use them and, above all, turning them into more useful ones, "mixes his labor with the land" (see *ibidem*, p. 113). Therefore, the isolated man takes *de facto* possession of all that and only that which he uses and processes. Man's property is what he produces – he processes with his own effort. With Crusoe being alone, there is no difficulty in defining the limits of his ownership. Ownership, in the case of a rational being, gifted with free will, extends directly to their body and to the goods processed through their labor.

Had we assumed that Crusoe landed not on a small island, but on a new continent, and that, while standing on the shore, he announced that he has taken possession of its entirety, by virtue of his discovery, his declaration would have been void. As long as no other people arrive, his natural property, i.e. what he controls, includes only that which is within his ability. Upon the arrival of other settlers, they would also, in a similar, natural way take possession of the areas transformed by their own labor. Crusoe would only be able to control them by invading their natural property or through exchange or voluntary contribution (Cf. *ibidem*, p. 113 *et seq.*).

The influx of new people on Robinson's island allows for the analysis of core interpersonal relations. Friday can arrive in another part of the island. It appears that production and trade are a prerequisite for human prosperity and survival. Both settlers can perform various activities on their parts of the island, Crusoe might take up fishing and Friday can cultivate grain-crops. Then they will trade some of the goods

with each other; the former will hand over, or rather sell, some of the fish in exchange for wheat. This is how early trade begins. The process of exchange between more and more people makes it possible to move from a primitive existence to a higher level, thus starting a civilization.

Due to the increasing complexity of early trade, one particular product is introduced on the market as a means of exchange – money. It allows for both saving and accumulating wealth with the intention of spending it in the future. It is also beneficial (for both sides) that person A, instead of selling a good to person B, pays them for the service of processing the good, which is then sold. Person A benefits from the opportunity to increase production and person B is not exposed to the risk of a higher or lower return on sales – they obtain a fixed rate. Thus, labor – which is controlled and owned by the laborer – can be sold as a specific commodity. From this perspective, illegal exploitation does not occur as long as the contract for the sale of one's work is concluded without coercion or aggression by either party.

The result is a complex network of relations called the free market and a natural, civilized and free society. In a free society, there are two ways of acquiring any kind of property: firstly, by transforming natural resources, that is, by production, and secondly, by exchange (including monetary exchange and labor) or donation, whereby exchange and donation are logically reduced to production, which, after all, initiates the chain of exchange. Ultimately, everything comes down to the ownership of self and the transformed land (see Rothbard 2010, p. 115-122). Like Locke, Rothbard calls the natural appropriation of ownerless property the original appropriation.

Rightfulness of ownership

In light of the above, Rothbard construes the natural rights of a human being. The first is being the owner of oneself, i.e. self-ownership. It is

based on the fact that “each individual person must, in order to act, choose his own ends and employ his own means in order to attain them. Possessing no automatic instincts, each man must learn about himself and the world, use his mind to select values, learn about cause and effect, and act purposively to maintain himself and advance his life. Since men can think, feel, evaluate, and act only as individuals, it becomes vitally necessary for each man’s survival and prosperity that he be free to learn, choose, develop his faculties, and act upon his knowledge and values. This is the necessary path of human nature” (Rothbard 2006, p. 33).

Rothbard seeks to justify the fairness of the world as described above on the basis of indirect evidence, arguing that the denial of man’s absolute right to himself and the legally appropriated goods inevitably leads to contradictions. According to the American thinker, if we try to establish an ethical system for man, it must be applicable for all people in order for it to be valid and effective, regardless of their location in time or space, because only in this way can an ethical natural law become universal law.

The following situation should be considered: if the right to their own identity and body is not granted to person A, thus destroying the natural state described above, we are faced with two logical models. Either person B would have to be considered the owner of person A, or all persons, A and B (and subsequent) must be considered co-owners of all bodies. The first instance is an example of slavery and a system of governance of one class over another. Different laws apply to each class of people, A and B, and the theory must be disqualified, because it does not meet the requirement of universality, and therefore of fairness – of equality before the law (see Hoppe 2010, p. 16).

The latter instance constitutes the communist model of “Universal and Equal Other-ownership” (Rothbard 2010, p. 127). Here, the postulate of universality is, admittedly, fulfilled, however, another

obstacle emerges. No one has a complete right to their body, but everyone has a right to everyone else. In this case, the use of one's own body in any way must be met with the permission of others. Apart from the physical impossibility of asking every human being for permission, it cannot be given nor requested because it requires further action, and yet no one is the sole owner of their body (or their vocal cords). So, it is obvious that no human being would be able to do anything, which would lead to the extinction of the human race. Thus, the only possible model of ethics is the one based on natural self-ownership (see *ibidem*, p. 129). In consequence – due to the fact of original appropriation, described in the previous subsection, the property rights extend to the exploited land and goods extracted from therein.

Rothbard's analysis is further elaborated by his student and academic successor Hans-Hermann Hoppe. He addresses the principles of formulating arguments in debate. He states that "you cannot argue against arguing" because argumentation is inherently an argument, therefore claiming that one cannot argue is contradictory. Note that argumentation is inherent in using one's own body. This entails a different matter: by opposing self-ownership we also contradict one another, because in order to put forward an argument one needs to use one's own body. This means that one has to assume "mutual recognition of the exclusive control of each person over their own bodies as long as the argument persists" and, therefore, "the norm in the argumentation is that everyone has the right to exclusive control over their own body as an instrument of action and cognition" (*Ibidem*, p. 329 *et seq.*). Therefore, a person who makes any argument in favor of any norm has, in fact, previously implicitly assumed the validity of a norm that can be expressed by saying: "I alone am entitled to command my own body". Property rights are therefore the basis on which ethics are established. Any ethical theory incompatible with the property rights will be impossible to justify rationally.

The description of the emergence of a complex network of relations between individuals and the rationale behind private ownership shows that the ideal, pure free market society is a society which is natural and fair, formed through a peaceful process of production and exchange of goods.

Since Rothbard believed that the right to self-ownership and the right to own property are the only rights a person has, all other rights are a consequence of these two. They have a negative meaning, and so they imply the prohibition of violating someone else's property. All "human rights" presented outside the context of property rights become vague and intrinsically contradictory, leading to numerous abuses and manipulations (see Rothbard 2010, p. 210). Libertarians claim that the "right to freedom of expression" does not exist in a vacuum. However, one has a right to rent a private lecture hall to make a speech. The "right to live" is also non-existent. There is only the right to not be killed and the right to sign a voluntary purchase agreement for medication or a private insurance policy.

The issue of aggression

The aforementioned free society and free market could have developed successfully and without any obstacles, creating universal prosperity, if not for the fact that people are able to exceed their rights and violate someone else's property, depriving their owners of control. This is what libertarians refer to as aggression.

Actions which result in a direct invasion are, for the majority of people, rather easy to define as an aggression. Its most extreme example is murder, but it also includes rape, battery, torture, kidnapping, restraint, imprisonment, slavery, or intimidation. The threat of aggression must be evident and direct, forcing the victim to act involuntarily and thus restrict their personal freedom. Theft and fraud,

which are its “discreet” form, also constitute violations (Rothbard 2010, p. 166). If the delivered goods are not in conformity with the agreement or are not delivered at all, then the seller is not entitled to the money or other goods transferred to them in exchange and thus appropriates them illegally.

Intrusion or trespassing on private property or failure to comply with the laws applicable therein is also a violation of property. The landowner has the right to establish any laws, has the right to refuse entry, has the right to ask anyone to leave, or in case of resistance (or apparent malicious intent), expel intruder out by force.

The right to defend property

Libertarianism is not a pacifist philosophy, despite its endorsement of individual freedom and the non-aggression principle. Aggression is, according to Rothbard, merely an illegal use of violence, while property rights also imply the right to maintain and defend the property (see *ibidem*, p. 163 *et seq.*).

For this purpose, an individual has the right to use physical force to repel an attack on their property. They can hire or accept help from other people who want to provide them with such a service (see *ibidem*, p. 164 *et seq.*). He can claim compensation from the perpetrator for the damages incurred. Justice, as the right to recover lost property (or its equivalent), is always dependent on the victim of the crime. For libertarians, the right to self-defense and the right to punish the culprits are an extension of the individual’s right to self-ownership.

Of course, the right to self-defense has its limitations. First of all, it is limited to the application of violence. The use of force to break up a protest or a strike is not permitted as long as the participants do not engage in aggressive behavior. Second of all, self-defense can only be used in the case of a direct attack or a direct and obvious threat.

Otherwise, any attack could be excused as “defense”. Finally, it has its own limits of degree and intensity. It is limited by the property rights of others (see *ibidem*, pp. 164, 168-169). If they are exceeded, the defense turns into criminal counter-aggression. In such a case, the perpetrator loses their freedom or property proportionately to the damage they caused (or threatened to cause) (see *ibidem*, pp. 164-165, 168-169). Rothbard and other libertarians call this principle the rule of proportionality.

The libertarian theory of punishment

The libertarian theory of punishment is also based on the rule of proportionality. The right to pursue one’s claims in court or to bring the offender to justice is an extension of the right to self-defense and, therefore, a logical consequence of the right to property, because by denying the right to compensation, the victim is also denied the right to defend their property (see *ibidem*, pp. 173, 179 *et seq.*). Thus, the right to property itself is denied. Another justification refers to the principles of argumentation: an offender who violates the rights of others cannot demand the same rights for themselves. Otherwise, it results in a contradiction (see Kinsella 1997, pp. 612-617, 631-636).

In a free society, the main purpose of punishment is to compensate the victim, to the extent in which aggressor has deprived the innocent individual of their rights (Rothbard 2010, p. 173-175). The libertarian concept of punishment is, therefore, based on the rule of proportionality and *lex talionis* (see *ibidem*, p. 181, 188). The perpetrator must return what they took from the victim, including court fees and lost potential profits. They also lose the property rights they violated. The punishment could thus be said to be double. First, the equivalent of the stolen property must be returned, and then the violation of the victim’s rights must be compensated for.

According to Rothbard, every crime can ultimately be reduced to a type of theft, which deprives someone of their property. The rule of proportionality states that property seized as a result of a criminal offense must be returned. For material possessions, this is achieved in a quite simple manner, on the basis of the aforementioned principle. A thief, having stolen 100 dollars from a victim, must return 100 dollars, plus another 100 dollars in damages (Wozinski 2012, pp. 65-68).

As far as personal injury is concerned, the offender must “return” the property by losing their own rights accordingly. Thus, in a libertarian society, the death penalty would be present, although it would be limited to murder. The murderer must give up their right to live. A victim of battery, in turn, has the right to violent action towards the perpetrator – to the same extent; and to hire people to do so. However, the rule of proportionality only sets the upper limit for the punishment. The victim’s rights in relation to the offender are not obligations (Rothbard 2010, p. 173-174). The victim, as the injured party, can also take pity on the offender, reduce their punishment, accept payment in exchange for a reduction or cancellation of the punishment or forgive them altogether (see *ibidem*, p. 174).

In the system proposed by Rothbard, there are only two parties to the conflict: the perpetrator and the victim, or the defendant and the plaintiff. There is no room for crime against, as Rothbard emphasizes, the misdefined plaintiff called “society”, and, therefore, there would also be no prosecutor to determine the charges against the alleged offender *ex officio*, i.e. independently of the will of the victim (see *ibidem*, p. 173 *et seq.*). This leads to the conclusion that in the libertarian vision of the world, the victim has the right to either “take justice into their own hands” (in the anarcho-capitalist system) or have a significant influence on the offender’s punishment, which can only be enforced after the injured party has filed for court proceedings and requested said punishment (in a minarchist system) (Wozinski 2012, p.

71). Without a victim, a physically injured person, who has been deprived of property – no action is, according to libertarians, a crime.

The victim may punish the offender personally, within the boundaries set by the rule of proportionality. But if this authority is exceeded or the wrong person is punished, they can rightly be prosecuted for that, which is why in the libertarian vision it is more profitable to delegate justice to (private) police and courts (Rothbard 2010, p. 179-181).

Conclusion

Libertarians recognize that their views are commonly practiced in private relations among individuals. Hoppe wrote that people “in their everyday lives intuitively recognize the ethics of private property and act accordingly” (Hoppe 2011, p. 402). However, libertarians are extremely consistent with their ethics.

This radical consistency in the use of property rights as the sole criterion determining the limits of human rights is a characteristic feature of libertarianism, especially in Murray Rothbard’s interpretation. Gradually, from the analysis of the right of the individual, the American thinker arrives at the vision of a complete system based on the axiomatic assumption of self-ownership. According to Rothbard, the introduction of any other criterion determining the limitations of individual rights and liberties leads to ethical relativism in which a certain group of people, in the name of so-called justice, will demand goods owned by others.

Therefore, a characteristic feature of Rothbard’s views is radical universalism. In the context of his theories, taxes are theft, forced education and conscription are slavery, and the state monopoly on services is aggression. However, neither drug trafficking nor prostitution or refusal to provide assistance to the victim constitute a criminal offense.

Therefore, a Rothbardian society includes a deontological aspect, where the most important principle is the inviolability of someone's property (Barentczewicz 2010, p. 70.; Rothbard 2010p. 135-138, 258-260).

As long as the individual does not infringe upon the property of others, they have the right to manage their life and property in any way they wish. No one may infringe on property, whether by claiming social support or prohibiting any activity.

For Rothbard, the reason for separating the law from individual morality is neither moral relativism nor a vacuum-suspended right to freedom of conscience, which sets him apart from modern representatives of liberal thought (Błaszczuk 2018, p. 212-216). The objectively existing ethical natural law is the basis of Rothbard's libertarian system. Every person is granted irrevocable self-ownership, limited only by the property of other people. Freedom of conscience is the consequence of the absolute right to self-ownership, and does not exist on its own (*Ibidem*, p. 285-287). Because of the principle of self-ownership, it would be morally wrong to prohibit activities that do not constitute aggression. The right to do certain things is not tantamount to their moral approval. It means that it would be immoral on the part of others to stop an individual from doing these things through violence or the threat of violence.

One can therefore conclude that the sphere of morality and the sphere of rights are separated by metaethics. According to the American thinker, we are faced with a metathesis affirming the moral legitimacy of property rights, put forward in order to conclude the necessity of separating ethics and political philosophy. For Rothbard, this approach to the relation between morality and law guarantees consistency and correctness of the conclusions drawn during subsequent analyses of individual rights. In the opinion of the American philosopher, the very distinction between law and morality is consistently captured only in libertarianism. However, in contemporary liberal thought this division

is absent, despite all appearances. Declarations of equality of rights and open-mindedness are meaningless, because today's understanding of tolerance itself is connected with the imposition of moral norms. Forcing acceptance and non-discrimination does not separate the aforementioned planes, but imposes one's own idea of morality (Błaszczyk 2018, pp. 194-195, 213-215, 285-287).

Rothbard's idea of self-ownership, made into an axiom dividing the two spheres, allows for a broad compromise between the parties in the public debate on many contentious issues. It is not based on relativism, but on the recognition that everyone has the right to take any action that does not infringe upon the property of others. Rothbard's libertarianism, as a political philosophy, is a part of ethics that can be linked to many ethical systems and can become a philosophy that is consistent with both moral or social conservatism, as well as liberalism in their peaceful interpretations. Based on property rights, it also reduces the planes of discussion, which rearranges the ongoing argumentative chaos. The public debate is hindered by the fact that the discussion is based on completely different ethical approaches and all sides argue in accordance with their own systems of belief. From a libertarian perspective, the ethics of private property, even without adopting Rothbard's ideas in general, might provide a platform for discussion and mutual understanding between the proponents of various approaches.

References

- Barentczewicz M. (2010), *Etyka wolności Murraya N. Rothbarda*, (in:) M.N. Rothbard, *Etyka wolności*, Fijorr Publishing, Warszawa
- Błaszczyk C. (2018), *Amerykańska myśl wolnościowa: od liberalizmu do libertarianizmu*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa

- d'Entrèves A.P. (1951), *Natural Law*, Hutchinson University Library, London
- Hoppe H.-H. (2011), *Ekonomia i etyka własności prywatnej*, Fijorr Publishing, Warszawa
- Hoppe H.-H. (2010), *Wstęp do wydania amerykańskiego*, (in:) Rothbard M., *Etyka wolności*, Fijorr Publishing, Warszawa
- Jurecki P. (2015), *Legitymizacja państwa i prawa a filozofia libertariańska*, Wyd. UW, Wrocław
- Juruś D. (2012), *W poszukiwaniu podstaw libertarianizmu. W perspektywie rothbardowskiej koncepcji własności*, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków
- Kinsella S. (1997), *A Libertarian Theory of Punishment and Rights*, "Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review" Vol. 30
- Modrzejewska M. (2010), *Libertariańskie koncepcje jednostki i państwa*, WUJ, Kraków
- Nozick R. (1999), *Anarchia, państwo, utopia*, Aletheia, Warszawa
- Rothbard M.N. (2010), *Etyka wolności*, Fijorr Publishing, Warszawa
- Rothbard M. (2006), *An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic Thought*, Vol. 1: *Economic Thought Before Adam Smith*, Ludwig von Mises Institute, Auburn
- Rothbard M.N. (2004), *O nową wolność. Manifest libertariański*, Fundacja Odpowiedzialność Obywatelska, Warszawa
- Sadowsky J.A. (2012), *Private Property and Collective Ownership*, "Mises Daily", <https://mises.org/library/private-property-and-collective-ownership> [25.05.2018]
- Staśkiewicz H. (2015), *Rozumienie libertarianizmu*, "Analiza i Egzystencja" No 30
- Wozinski J. (2012), *A priori sprawiedliwości. Libertariańska teoria prawa*, (self-publishing), Poznań