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Dialogical Arguments for Libertarian Rights

After publishing articles on my estoppel-based theory of rights\* and Hans-Hermann Hoppe’s “argumentation ethics” defense of libertarian rights† between 1992 and 1996, I published an article surveying estoppel, argumentation ethics, and similar theories in the Journal of Libertarian Studies in 1996, entitled “New Rationalist Directions in Libertarian Rights Theory.” †† An updated version of this article was published as “Dialogical Arguments for Libertarian Rights” in The Dialectics of Liberty in 2019.§ This chapter is based on the latter piece, and is updated still further.\*\*

\* Stephan Kinsella, “Estoppel: A New Justification for Individual Rights,” Reason Papers No. 17 (Fall 1992): 61–74 and the pair of articles that form the basis of “A Libertarian Theory of Punishment and Rights” (ch. 5). See also “How I Became a Libertarian” (ch. 1) and Stephan Kinsella, “The Genesis of Estoppel: My Libertarian Rights Theory,” StephanKinsella.com (March 22, 2016).

† See “The Undeniable Morality of Capitalism” (ch. 22) and Stephan Kinsella, “Book Review: The Economics and Ethics of Private Property: Studies in Political Economy and Philosophy by Hans-Hermann Hoppe,” The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty (November 1994; https://perma.cc/5J2V-R5R6) (each reviewing Hans-Hermann Hoppe, The Economics and Ethics of Private Property: Studies in Political Economy and Philosophy (Auburn, Ala.: Mises Institute, 2006 [1993]; www.hanshoppe.com/eepp)), and “A Libertarian Theory of Punishment and Rights” (ch. 5). See also “Defending Argumentation Ethics” (ch. 7). For more on argumentation ethics, see the references in note 15 to “How We Come to Own Ourselves” (ch. 4).

†† Stephan Kinsella, “New Rationalist Directions in Libertarian Rights Theory,” J. Libertarian Stud. 12, no. 2 (Fall 1996): 313–26. For a recent book-length exploration of some of the arguments discussed in this chapter, see Pavel Slutskiy, Communication and Libertarianism (Springer, 2021).

§ Stephan Kinsella, “Dialogical Arguments for Libertarian Rights,” in Roger Bissell, Chris Sciabarra & Ed Younkins, eds., The Dialectics of Liberty (Lexington Books, 2019).

\*\* The term “dialogical” in my title refers to discourse, or dialogue, which features in many of the theories discussed here, including Hoppe’s discourse or argumentation ethics and many others mentioned in this chapter. As noted in “Defending Argumentation Ethics” (ch. 7) and “The Undeniable Morality of Capitalism” (ch. 22), Hoppe’s discourse ethics was influenced by the discourse ethics of Jürgen Habermas, Hoppe’s PhD advisor, and Karl-Otto Apel. Interestingly, although Rawls says, of his own “original position,” “[l]ike Habermas’s ideal discourse situation, it is a dialogue; indeed, an omnilogue, … Habermas sometimes says that the original position is monological and not dialogical; that is because all the parties have, in effect, the same reasons and so they elect the same principles.” John Rawls, Political Liberalism, expanded ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), p. 383. For our purposes, I think the term dialogue or dialogical suffices.

Classical liberals and libertarians believe that individuals have rights, even if there is debate about just why we have them or how this can be proved. Robert Nozick opened his book *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* with the assertion: “Individuals have rights, and there are things no person or group may do to them (without violating their rights).”[[1]](#footnote-1) Yet, he did not offer a proof of this assertion, for which he has drawn criticism. It is commonly assumed that Nozick’s argument is not *complete* until a proof of rights is offered.[[2]](#footnote-2) Other theorists have offered, over the years, various reasons—utilitarian, natural law, pragmatic, and the like—why we should respect others’ rights, why we should recognize that individuals have certain rights.[[3]](#footnote-3)

For instance, an economic case can be made for respecting the liberty of others. Given that you are a decent person and generally value your fellow man and wish everyone to live a satisfying life, you will tend to be in favor of the free market and liberty, at least if you understand basic economic principles.[[4]](#footnote-4) But the success of arguments such as these depends on other people accepting particular premises, such as valuing the general well-being of others, without which the argument is incomplete. Skeptics can always deny the validity of the premises even if they cannot refute free-market economics.

There can be no doubt that a rigorous argument for individual rights would be useful. In recent years, interest has been increasing in rationalist, dialectical, or dialogical rights theories or related theories, some of which promise to provide fruitful and unassailable defenses of individual rights. These arguments typically examine the implicit claims that are necessarily presupposed by action or discourse. They then proceed deductively or conventionally from these core premises, or axioms, to establish certain apodictically true conclusions. Several such arguments are surveyed below.

ARGUMENTATION ETHICS

Let us first discuss Hans-Hermann Hoppe’s pathbreaking “argumentation ethics” defense of libertarian rights.[[5]](#footnote-5) Hoppe shows that basic rights are implied in the activity of argumentation itself, so that anyone asserting any claim about anything necessarily presupposes the validity of rights. Hoppe first notes that any truth at all (including norms such as individual rights to life, liberty, and property) that one would wish to discuss, deny, or affirm will be brought up in the course of an argumentation, that is to say, will be brought up in dialogue. If participants in argumentation necessarily accept particular truths, including norms, in order to engage in argumentation, they could never challenge these norms in an argument without thereby engaging in a performative contradiction. This would establish these norms as literally incontestable truths.

Hoppe establishes self-ownership by pointing out that argumentation, as a form of action, implies the use of the scarce resources of one’s body. One must have control over, or own, this scarce resource in order to engage in meaningful discourse. This is because argumentation is, by its very nature, a *conflict-free* way of interacting, since it is an attempt to find what the truth *is*, to establish truth, to persuade or be persuaded by the force of words alone. If one is threatened into accepting the statements or truth-claims of another, this does not tend to get at the truth, which is undeniably a goal of argumentation or discourse. Thus, anyone engaging in argumentation implicitly presupposes the right of self-ownership of other participants in the argument, for otherwise the other would not be able to consider freely and accept or reject the proposed argument. Only as long as there is at least an implicit recognition of each individual’s property right in his or her own body can true argumentation take place. When this right is not recognized, the activity is no longer argumentation, but threat, mere naked aggression, or plain physical fighting. Thus, anyone who denies that rights exist contradicts himself since, by his very engaging in the cooperative and conflict-free activity of argumentation, he necessarily recognizes the right of his listener to be free to listen, think, and decide. That is, any participant in discourse presupposes the non-aggression principle, the libertarian view that one may not initiate force against others. Thus, according to Hoppe, anyone who would ever deny the ethics underlying the free market is already, by his very engaging in the civilized activity of discourse, presupposing the very ethic that he is challenging. This is a powerful argument because, instead of seeking to persuade someone to accept a new position, it points out to him a position that he already maintains, a position that he *necessarily* maintains. Opponents of liberty undercut their own position as soon as they begin to state it.

Hoppe then extends his case for self-ownership to external resources, to show that property rights in external scarce resources, in addition to self-ownership rights, are also presupposed by discourse. As he argues, “one’s body is indeed the *prototype* of a scarce good for the use of which property rights, that is, rights of exclusive ownership, somehow have to be established, in order to avoid clashes.”[[6]](#footnote-6) As Hoppe explains,

The compatibility of this principle with that of nonaggression can be demonstrated by means of an argumentum a contrario. First, it should be noted that if no one had the right to acquire and control anything except his own body … then we would all cease to exist and the problem of the justification of normative statements … simply would not exist. The existence of this problem is only possible because we are alive, and our existence is due to the fact that we do not, indeed cannot, accept   
a norm outlawing property in other scarce goods next and in addition to that of one’s physical body. Hence, the right to acquire such goods must be assumed to exist.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Next, Hoppe argues that the only ownership rule that is compatible with self-ownership and the presuppositions of discourse is the Lockean original-appropriation rule.[[8]](#footnote-8) Hoppe’s basic point here is that self-ownership rights are established just because one’s body is itself a scarce (conflictable) resource, so other scarce resources must be similarly ownable.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Looked at from another angle, participants in argumentation indisputably need to use and control the scarce resources in the world to survive; otherwise, they would perish. But because their scarcity makes conflict over the uses of resources possible, only norms that determine the proper ownership can avoid conflict over these scarce goods. That such norms are valuable cannot be denied, because anyone who is alive in the world and participating in the practical activity of argumentation cannot deny the value of being able to control scarce resources and the value of avoiding conflicts over such scarce (i.e., conflictable) resources.

So no one could ever deny that norms for determining the ownership of scarce goods are useful for allowing conflict-free exploitation of such resources. But, as Hoppe points out, there are only two fundamental alternatives for acquiring rights in unowned property: (1) by doing something with things with which no one else had ever done anything before, that is, the Lockean concept of mixing of labor, or homesteading; or (2) simply by verbal declaration or decree. However, a rule that allows property to be owned by mere verbal declaration cannot serve to avoid conflicts, since any number of people could at any time assert conflicting claims of ownership over any particular scarce resource. Only the first alternative, that of Lockean homesteading, establishes an objective (or, as Hoppe sometimes calls it, intersubjectively ascertainable) link between a particular person and a particular scarce resource, and thus no one can deny the Lockean right to homestead unowned resources.

*Argumentation Ethics and Natural Rights*

Before closing this section let me emphasize that Hoppe offered his theory as an improvement on traditional natural rights arguments. For one, by focusing on argumentation instead of action,[[10]](#footnote-10) he seeks to avoid one weakness of previous arguments:

It has been a common quarrel with the natural rights position, even on the part of sympathetic readers, that the concept of human nature is far “too diffuse and varied to provide a determinate set of contents of natural law.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

Hoppe is also critical of classical natural rights reasoning insofar as it violates the is-ought gap. As he writes: “[O]ne can readily subscribe to the almost generally accepted view that the gulf between ‘ought’ and ‘is’ is logically unbridgeable.”[[12]](#footnote-12) Argumentation ethics attempts to sidestep this issue by remaining in the realm of is-statements:

Here the praxeological proof of libertarianism has the advantage of offering a completely value-free justification of private property. It remains entirely in the realm of is-statements, and nowhere tries to derive an ought from an is. The structure of the argument is this: (a) justification is propositional justification—a priori true is-statement; (b) argumentation presupposes property in one’s body and the homesteading principle—a priori true is-statement; and (c) then, no deviation from this ethic can be argumentatively justified—a priori true is-statement.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Thus, as Hoppe writes:

The relationship between our approach and a “natural rights” approach can now be described in some detail, too. The natural law or natural rights tradition of philosophic thought holds that universally valid norms can be discerned by means of reason as grounded in the very nature of man. It has been a common quarrel with this position, even on the part of sympathetic readers, that the concept of human nature is far “too diffuse and varied to provide a determinate set of contents of natural law.” … Furthermore, its description of rationality is equally ambiguous in that it does not seem to distinguish between the role of reason in establishing empirical laws of nature on the one hand, and normative laws of human conduct on the other.…

In recognizing the narrower concept of argumentation (instead of the wider one of human nature) as the necessary starting point in deriving an ethic, and in assigning to moral reasoning the status of a priori reasoning, clearly to be distinguished from the role of reason performed in empirical research, our approach not only claims to avoid these difficulties from the outset, but claims thereby to be at once more straightforward and rigorous. Still, to thus dissociate myself from the natural rights tradition is not to say that I could not agree with its critical assessment of most of contemporary ethical theory; indeed I do agree with H. Veatch’s complementary refutation of all desire (teleological, utilitarian) ethics as well as all duty (deontological) ethics…. Nor do I claim that it is impossible to interpret my approach as falling in a “rightly conceived” natural rights tradition after all. What I claim, though, is that the following approach is clearly out of line with what the natural rights approach has actually come to be, and that it owes nothing to this tradition as it stands.[[14]](#footnote-14)

And this, perhaps, part of the reason why Rothbard gave a wholehearted endorsement to Hoppe’s argumentation ethics:

In a dazzling breakthrough for political philosophy in general and for libertarianism in particular, he [Hoppe] has managed to transcend the famous is/ought, fact/value dichotomy that has plagued philosophy since the days of the scholastics, and that had brought modern libertarianism into a tiresome deadlock. Not only that: Hans Hoppe has managed to establish the case for anarcho-capitalist, Lockean rights in an unprecedentedly hard-core manner, one that makes my own natural law/natural rights position seem almost wimpy in comparison.[[15]](#footnote-15)

ESTOPPEL

Another rationalist-oriented justification of rights is an argument I developed based on the common-law concept of estoppel.[[16]](#footnote-16) As one legal treatise explains:

The word *estoppel* means “not permitted to deny.” If A makes a statement of fact that B relies on in some substantial way, A will not be permitted to deny it (that is, A will be estopped), if the effect of A’s denial would be to injure the party who relies on it.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Thus, under the traditional *legal* principle of estoppel, a person may be prevented, or estopped, from maintaining something (for example in court) inconsistent with his previous conduct or statements. For instance, if a father promises his daughter that he will pay her college tuition for her, and the daughter relies on this promise to her detriment, for example by enrolling in college and becoming obligated to the college for her tuition, then she may be able to recover some of her expenses from her father, even if his original promise is not enforceable as a normal contract (for example, because there was no consideration).[[18]](#footnote-18) The father would be estopped from denying that a contract was formed, even though, technically, one was not.

Drawing on this legal terminology and concept, the approach I advance may be termed “dialogical” estoppel, or simply estoppel. The estoppel principle shows that an aggressor contradicts himself if he objects to others’ enforcement of their rights. Thus, unlike Hoppe’s argumentation ethics approach, which focuses on presuppositions of discourse in general, and which shows that any participant in discourse contradicts himself if he denies these presuppositions, the estoppel theory focuses on the discourse between an aggressor and his victim about punishment of the aggressor and seeks to show that the aggressor contradicts himself if he objects to his punishment.

What would it mean to have a right? Whatever else rights might be, certainly it is the case that rights are legitimately enforceable; that is, one who is physically able to enforce his right *may* *not* be prevented from doing so. In short, having a right allows one to legitimately punish the violator of the right or to legitimately use force to prevent another from violating the right. The only way one could be said *not* to have a right would be if the attempt to punish a violator of the right is for some reason unjustifiable. But clearly this problem itself can arise only when the alleged criminal *objects* to being punished, for if criminals consented to punishment, we would not face the problem of justifying punishing them.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The estoppel argument contends that we have rights just because no aggressor could ever meaningfully object to being punished. Thus, if the only potential obstacle to having a legitimately enforceable right is the unconsenting criminal, and if he is estopped from objecting to his punishment, then the right may be said to exist, or be justified, since, in effect, the criminal cannot deny this.

So why is this the case? Why is a criminal estopped in this manner? Consider: if *B* is a violent aggressor, such as a murderer or rapist, how could he *not* consent to any punishment that *A*, the victim (or the victim’s agent), attempts to inflict? To object to his punishment, *B* must engage in discourse with *A*; he must at least temporarily adopt the stance of a peaceful, civilized person trying to persuade *A*, through the use of reason and consistent, universalizable principles, to provide reasons as to why *A* should not punish him. But to do this, *B* must in essence claim that *A* should not use force against him (*B*), and to do this, *B* must claim that it is wrong, or unjustifiable, to use force. But since he *has* initiated force, he has admitted that (he believes that) it is proper to use force, and *B* would contradict himself if he were to claim the opposite. Since contradictions are always false[[20]](#footnote-20) and since an undeniable goal of discourse is to establish truth, such contradictions are ruled out of bounds in discourse, since they cannot tend to establish truth. Thus, *B* is estopped from making this contradictory assertion, and is therefore unable to object to his punishment.

Under the estoppel theory, then, we may enforce our rights against violent aggressors, since they cannot object to the enforcement of rights without self-contradiction.[[21]](#footnote-21)

RIGHTS-SKEPTICISM

A third type of rights argument concerns the very nature of rights themselves and shows how any rights-skeptic contradicts himself whenever he denies that rights exist. It is similar to the estoppel approach outlined above, although the discourse under examination need not involve an aggressor. Instead, this argument focuses on rights-skeptics who deny the existence of rights, rather than on actual criminals who object to being punished in particular instances for a given crime.

If any right at all exists, it is a right of *A* to have or do *X* without *B*’s preventing it; and, therefore, *A* can legitimately use force against *B* to en*force* the right.[[22]](#footnote-22) *A* is concerned with the enforceability of his right to *X*, and this enforceability is all that *A* requires in order to be secure in his right to *X*. For a rights-skeptic meaningfully to challenge *A*’s asserted right, the skeptic must challenge the *enforceability* of the right, instead of merely challenging the existence of the right. Nothing less will do. If the skeptic does not deny that *A*’s proposed enforcement of his purported right is legitimate, then the skeptic has not denied *A*’s right to *X*, because what it *means* to have a right is to be able to legitimately enforce it. If the skeptic maintains, then, that *A* has no right to *X*, indeed, no rights at all since there are no rights, the skeptic must also maintain that *A*’s enforcement of his purported right to *X* is not justified.

But the problem faced by the skeptic here is that he assumes that enforcement—that is, the use of force—*requires* justification. *A*, however, cares not that the rights-skeptic merely challenges *A*’s use of force against *B*. The rights-skeptic must do more than express his *preference* that *A* not enforce his right against *B*, for such an expression does not attack the legitimacy of *A*’s enforcing his right against *B*. The only way for the skeptic meaningfully to challenge *A*’s enforcement action is to acknowledge that *B* may use force to prevent *A*’s (illegitimate) enforcement action. And here the rights-skeptic (perversely) undercuts his own position, because by recognizing the legitimacy of *B*’s use of force against *A*, the rights-skeptic effectively attributes rights to *B* himself, the right not to have unjustifiable force used against him. In short, for anyone to meaningfully maintain that *A* has no rights against *B* on the grounds that no rights exist, he must effectively attribute rights to *B* so that *B* may defend himself against *A*’s purportedly unwarranted enforcement action.

More common-sensically, this demonstration points out the inconsistency on the part of a rights-skeptic who engages in discourse about the propriety of rights at all. If there are no rights, then there is no such thing as the justifiable or legitimate use of force, but neither is there such a thing as the unjust use of force. But if there is no unjust use of force, what is it, exactly, that a rights-skeptic is concerned about? If individuals delude themselves into thinking that they have natural rights, and, acting on this assumption, go about enforcing these rights as if they are true, the skeptic has no grounds to complain. To the extent the skeptic complains about people enforcing these illusory rights, he begins to attribute rights to those having force used against them. Any rights-skeptic can only shut up, because he contradicts himself the moment he objects to others’ acting as if they have rights.[[23]](#footnote-23)

OTHER RATIONALIST-RELATED THEORIES

In addition to the three approaches discussed above, other arguments, which also point out the inherent presuppositions of discourse or action, are briefly discussed below.

*G.B. Madison and Argumentation Ethics-Related Theorists*

One approach that is similar to Hoppe’s argumentation ethics is that of philosopher G.B. Madison. Madison argues that

the various values defended by liberalism are not arbitrary, a matter of mere personal preference, nor do they derive from some natural law. … Rather, they are nothing less and nothing more than what could be called the *operative presuppositions* or intrinsic features and demands of communicative rationality itself. In other words, they are values that are implicitly recognized and affirmed by everyone by the very fact of their engaging in communicative reason. This amounts to saying that no one can rationally deny them without at the same time denying reason, without self-contradiction, without in fact abandoning all attempts to persuade the other and to reach agreement.[[24]](#footnote-24)

These implicitly recognized values include a renunciation of the legitimacy of violence. Thus, “it is absolutely impossible for anyone who claims to be rational, which is to say human, outrightly to defend violence.” [[25]](#footnote-25)

Madison continues:

[Paul] Ricoeur writes: “… *violence is the opposite of discourse*.… Violence is always the interruption of discourse: discourse is always the interruption of violence.” That violence is the opposite of discourse means that it can never justify itself—and is therefore not justifiable—for only through discourse can anything be justified. As the theory of rational argumentation and discussion, liberalism amounts, therefore, to a rejection of power politics.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Madison, like Hoppe, argues that the fact-value gap can be bridged by an appeal to the nature of discourse:

the notion of *universal human rights and liberties* is not an … arbitrary value, a matter of mere personal preference.… On the contrary, it is nothing less and nothing more than the operative presupposition or intrinsic feature and demand of communicative rationality itself.[[27]](#footnote-27)

In a sense, notes Madison, Thomas Jefferson was not so far off in calling our rights “self-evident.”

The general thrust of Madison’s argument seems sound, although it is not as consistent or fully developed as Hoppe’s argumentation ethics. While Hoppe shows that the nonaggression principle (i.e., self-ownership plus the right to homestead external resources) itself is directly implied by any discourse or argumentation, Madison’s train of logic seems more muddled. For instance, he argues that, because discourse has “priority” over violence, this validates the Kantian claim that people ought to be treated as ends rather than means, which is the principle of human dignity. The principle of freedom from coercion then follows from the principle of human dignity. Madison does not specify in any more detail than this the libertarian principles that can be derived from such an approach,[[28]](#footnote-28) although, to be fair, Madison stresses that his remarks are intended only “to indicate the way in which liberalism must seek to” defend the values it advocates.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Frank van Dun similarly suggests that part of “the ethics of dialogue” is that we ought to respect the “dialogical rights of others—their right to speak or not to speak, to listen or not to listen, to use their own judgment.”[[30]](#footnote-30) Van Dun argues that “principles of private property and uncoerced exchange” are also presupposed by participants in discourse and later defended Hoppe’s argumentation ethics.[[31]](#footnote-31) Jeremy Shearmur also proposes[[32]](#footnote-32) that a Habermasian argument may be developed to justify individual property rights and other classical liberal principles, although this argument is different in approach from that of Hoppe, Madison, and Van Dun, and is, in my view, much weaker than Hoppe’s approach.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Other theories that are briefly worth mentioning here include Paul Chevigny’s theory that the nature of discourse may be used to defend the right to free speech[[34]](#footnote-34) and Tibor Machan’s view that discourse in general and political dialogue in particular rest on individualist prerequisites or presuppositions.[[35]](#footnote-35)

Murray Rothbard, who was very enthusiastic about Hoppe’s argumentation ethics, was also hopeful that Hoppe’s argumentation ethics or axiomatic approach could be further extended. As Rothbard stated:

A future research program for Hoppe and other libertarian philosophers would be (a) to see how far axiomatics can be extended into other spheres of ethics, or (b) to see if and how this axiomatic could be integrated into the standard natural law approach.[[36]](#footnote-36)

The various perspectives of Hoppe, Madison, Van Dun, and others on a similar theme indicate that Rothbard may indeed be correct that this type of rationalist thinking can be further extended in libertarian or ethical theory.[[37]](#footnote-37)

*Crocker’s Moral Estoppel Theory*

In a theory bearing some resemblance to the estoppel theory discussed above, law professor Lawrence Crocker proposes the use of “moral estoppel” in preventing a criminal from asserting the unfairness of being punished in certain situations. Crocker’s theory, while interesting, is not rigorous, and Crocker does not seem to realize the implications of estoppel for justifying only the *libertarian* conception of rights. Rather than focusing on the reciprocity between the force used in punishment and the force of an aggressive act by a wrongdoer, Crocker claims that a person who has “treated another person or the society at large in a fashion that the criminal law prohibits” is “morally estopped” from asserting that his punishment would be unfair.[[38]](#footnote-38) However, Crocker’s use of estoppel is too vague and imprecise, and relies on a legal positivist conception of law, for just because one has violated a criminal law does not mean that one has committed the aggression that is necessary to estop him from complaining about punishment. A breached law must first be legitimate (just) for Crocker’s assumption to hold, but as the estoppel theory indicates, a law is legitimate only if it prohibits aggression. Crocker’s theory seems to assume that any law is valid, even those that do not prohibit the initiation of force.

*Pilon and Gewirth on the Principle of Generic Consistency*

Another rights theory that bears mention here is that of Roger Pilon. Pilon has developed a libertarian version of the theory propounded by his teacher Alan Gewirth.[[39]](#footnote-39) Although he disagrees with the non-libertarian conclusions that Gewirth draws from his own rights theory, Pilon builds “upon much of the justificatory groundwork he [Gewirth] has established, for I believe he has located, drawn together, and solved some of the most basic problems in the theory of rights.”[[40]](#footnote-40)

To determine what rights we have, Pilon (following Gewirth) focuses on “what it is we necessarily claim about ourselves, if only implicitly, when we act.”[[41]](#footnote-41) Pilon argues that all action is *conative*, that is, an agent acts voluntarily and for purposes which seem good to him. Pilon argues that the prerequisites of successful action are “voluntariness and purposiveness,” the so-called generic features that characterize all action. Thus, an agent cannot help valuing these generic features and even making a rights-claim to them, according to Pilon/Gewirth. From this conclusion, it is argued that all agents also necessarily claim rights against coercion and harm. And since it would be inconsistent to maintain that one has rights for these reasons without also admitting that others have these rights too (since the reasoning concerning the nature of action applies equally to all purposive actors), such rights-claims must be universalizable.[[42]](#footnote-42) As Gewirth writes, the

voluntariness and purposiveness which every agent necessarily has in acting, and which he necessarily claims as rights for himself on the ground that he is a prospective agent who wants to fulfill his purposes, he must also, on pain of self-contradiction, admit to be rights of his recipient.[[43]](#footnote-43)

Thus, an agent in any action makes a rights-claim to be free from coercion and harm, since such rights are necessary to provide for the generic features of action, which an agent also necessarily values, and the agent also necessarily grants these rights to others because of the universalizability requirement.

From this point, Pilon/Gewirth develops a sort of modern categorical imperative, which is called the “Principle of Generic Consistency” (PGC). The PGC is: “Act in accord with the generic rights of your recipients as well as of yourself,” and “Recipients are those who stand opposite agents, who are ‘affected by’ or ‘recipients of’ their actions.”[[44]](#footnote-44) Under Pilon’s libertarian working of the PGC:

[T]he PGC does not require anyone to *do* anything. It is addressed to agents, but it does not require anyone to be an agent who has recipients. An individual can “do nothing” if he chooses, spending his life in idle contemplation. Provided there are no recipients of this behavior, he is at perfect liberty to perform it. And if there are recipients, the PGC requires only that he act in accord with the generic rights of those recipients, *i.e.*, that he not coerce or harm them.[[45]](#footnote-45)

Pilon extends his reasoning and works the PGC to flesh out more fully just what (primarily libertarian) rights we do have.

All this is well done, except for one crucial error. As Hoppe points out, it is *argumentation*, not action, that is the appropriate starting point for such an analysis, because:

[F]rom the correctly stated fact that in action an agent must, by necessity, presuppose the existence of certain values or goods, it does not follow that such goods then are universalizable and hence should be respected by others as the agent’s goods by right.… Rather, the idea of truth, or of universalizable rights or goods only emerges with argumentation as a special subclass of actions, but not with action as such, as is clearly revealed by the fact that Gewirth, too, is not engaged simply in action, but more specifically in argumentation when he wants to convince us of the necessary truth of his ethical system.[[46]](#footnote-46)

It is possible that, despite this error, much of Pilon’s work is salvageable by, in effect, moving it to an argumentation context, such as is done in the estoppel approach where an aggressor must engage in argumentation to object to his punishment and is therefore subject to the unique constraints of argumentation. In other words, the weak link in Pilon’s PGC chain may be able to be repaired by considering claims made *about* prior actions when the agent later objects to punishment, for an objection to being punished requires the agent to enter into the special subclass action of argumentation, to which criteria such as universalizability do apply.

CONCLUSION

Under the three theories outlined above—argumentation ethics, estoppel theory, and the self-contradictions of rights-skeptics—we can see that the relevant participant in discourse cannot deny the validity of individual rights. These rationalist-oriented theories offer very good defenses of individual rights, defenses that are more powerful than many other approaches, because they show that the opponent of individual rights, whether criminal, skeptic, or socialist, presupposes that they are true. Critics must enter the cathedral of libertarianism even to deny that it exists. This makes criticism of libertarian beliefs hollow: for if someone asks why we believe in individual rights, we can tell them to look in the mirror and find the answer there.
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