

## **Methexiology and Libertarianism: the Metaphysics of Freedom**

**Dr. Nicolas Laos**

**Athens, March 30, 2016**



In my book entitled *Methexiology: Philosophical Theology and Theological Philosophy for the Deification of Humanity* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers/Pickwick Publications, 2016), I have clarified the reasons why methexiology leads to and underpins libertarianism. ‘Libertarianism’ is a controversial term: the U.S. approach to libertarianism is essentially equated with laissez-faire economics, but, throughout modern European history, ‘libertarianism’ meant socialist anarchist, that is, an anti-statist, anti-Bolshevik socialist. My approach to libertarianism stems from a metaphysically grounded theory of social unity. Furthermore, I interpret and endorse the principle of maximum liberalization not as a theory of social chaos, but as the thesis that there is no self-justified authority and that the ultimate source of authority is God; hence, the ultimate source of authority transcends any historical or physical necessity and cannot be manipulated by any historical actor. Even though I believe that classical liberalism (which is based on and developed by John Locke, Jean-Baptiste Say, Thomas Malthus, David Ricardo, etc.) is the lesser evil among the three basic political theories of modernity (namely, liberalism, communism, and fascism), and, therefore, I salute liberalism’s victories over communism and fascism, I am not an advocate of classical liberalism, and I counter-propose a metaphysically grounded type of libertarianism.

Liberalism is founded on a political mixture of liberty and equality. Thus, often, in the context of liberalism, the pursuit of equality justifies increased state intervention into the economy and significant restrictions on individual liberties, and it underpins several variants of collectivist policies, such as liberal nationalism, liberal socialism, etc. (liberal nationalism is based on and originated by Max Weber and various “National-Liberal” parties that were formed in Germany and Austria during the nineteenth century; liberal socialism is based on and originated by such political theorists as John Stuart Mill, Eduard Bernstein, Norberto Bobbio, Karl Polanyi, Leonard T. Hobhouse, John M. Keynes, etc.), etc. On the other hand, libertarianism advocates minimizing coercion, and it emphasizes freedom, the individual’s negative rights, and voluntary association. Hence, *from the libertarian perspective, freedom*

*should always take precedence over any other political goal, and every variant of collectivism should be discarded.*

The French Revolution (1789), which gave rise to a bourgeois liberal state, disclosed the intrinsic political risks of liberalism in the most tragic way. In 1794, Maximilien Robespierre (who was one of the leaders of this liberal revolution, an outspoken advocate of the poor and of democratic institutions, and the 2nd President of the Committee of Public Safety, which effectively governed France at the height of the radical phase of the revolution) proclaimed the doctrine of “virtue and terror,” which is the epitome of the ideology on which the liberal French Republic was based. According to Robespierre’s doctrine of “virtue and terror,” the exercise of terror ‘legitimized,’ ‘refined,’ and ‘enveloped’ by the proclamation of virtuous ends and by the institution of codes of virtuous behavior lies at the core of the liberal state as the most fundamental organizing principle of the body politic. In particular, on February 5, 1794, Robespierre, speaking to the French Convention, argued that virtue is “the general motive force of the Republic,” and that “terror is nothing but prompt, severe, inflexible justice; it is therefore an emanation of virtue.”

The combination of the rationalist, the radically secular, the statist, and the egalitarian dimensions of the liberal French Republic that was instituted by the French Revolution gave rise to a refined terrorist state, yet a terrorist state. As George Orwell wrote in a letter to Malcolm Muggeridge (December 4, 1948), published in *Malcolm Muggeridge: A Life* (1980) by Ian Hunter, “the real division is not between conservatives and revolutionaries but between authoritarians and libertarians.” Dean Russell, in his paper “Who Is a Libertarian?” (*The Freeman*, Vol. 5, Issue 5, May 1955, published by the Foundation for Economic Education), argued as follows: “In popular terminology, a libertarian is the opposite of an authoritarian. Strictly speaking, a libertarian is one who rejects the idea of using violence or the threat of violence—legal or illegal—to impose his will or viewpoint upon any peaceful person.”

Libertarianism is neither libertinism nor hedonism. On the contrary, from my perspective, libertarianism gives rise to a society that is founded on maximum personal and socio-economic freedom and on maximum personal moral responsibility. In fact, my methexiology solidifies libertarianism by endowing it with metaphysical underpinnings. In a libertarian society, individuals are not psychically plebeian, that is, selfish or morally irresponsible, but they are psychically noble, that is, their psychic space is big enough to encompass the entire humanity, and they organize their social life on the basis of free and voluntary agreements among free and morally responsible individuals.

Therefore, I discard Ayn Rand’s theory of individualism. Having been raised and trained as a Soviet subject, and having turned into a zealous and superficial advocate of the United States’ system of market capitalism, Ayn Rand (1905–82) never managed to appreciate or understand the wealth and the complexity of humanity’s spiritual life. Thus, the ‘capitalist heroes’ of Ayn Rand’s novels and political essays are neurotic, spiritually shallow, and superficial men who, in essence, are not more free than the members of the Soviet Union’s system of state capitalism (or bureaucratic socialism). In other words, Ayn Rand substituted an one-dimensional man molded by a textbook of American microeconomics for an one-dimensional man molded by a textbook of Leninism, and she thought that, in that way, she discovered the elixir of freedom. On

the other hand, I do not hesitate to support many of David Friedman's laissez-faire economic arguments, since I believe that social unity should be founded on spiritual principles (specifically, on personal moral responsibility, psychic transparency, and spiritual freedom), and not on statism. However, in contrast to David Friedman's indiscriminately anti-statist arguments, which entail a risk of political nihilism, I believe that a free economic market should operate within the context of a strong political regime—precisely, what I call a 'great political hypostasis'—whose strategic purpose and strength should not consist in restricting freedoms, but in protecting society's *a priori* values, specifically, what I call in my *Methexiology* the sacredness of human personhood.

**My methexiology underpins and leads to an ontologically grounded variant of libertarianism and a new theory of justice. Thus, study my book:**

**Methexiology: Philosophical Theology and Theological Philosophy for the Deification of Humanity**, Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers/Pickwick Publications, 2016; <https://wipfandstock.com>