




REJOINDER TO NINO ON ZIONISM AND THE CANCEL CULTURE OF THE LIBERTARIAN MOVEMENT

Walter E. Block 

Harold E. Wirth Eminent Scholar Endowed Chair and Professor of Economics, Loyola University
New Orleans, New Orleans, USA
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2215-4791>

ARTICLE INFO



 Open access

JEL Category:
Z0

Keywords:

Zionism
Israel
Genocide
War crimes
Libertarianism.

ABSTRACT

Nino (2025) is an attack on libertarianism in general and on my views in particular. He maintains that it is impossible, without contradiction, to both support this free-market philosophy which is grounded upon the non-aggression principle (NAP), and, also, to defend the recent and previous behavior of Israel. That country, he contends, is a blatant violator not only of libertarian principle, but also of civilized behavior. Further, Israel has also violated the private property rights of the Palestinians. Thus, their actions of October 7, 2023, can be seen as just a retaliation of the injustice previously perpetrated upon them. The Jewish state has stolen lands from the Gazans and other Palestinians. It has turned Gaza itself into "an open-air prison." My defense of the only civilized country in the Middle East, thus, cannot possibly be logically compatible with the principles of libertarianism, he avers. In his diatribe against me, Nino pulls out all the stops. He sees nothing whatsoever of any value in my defense of the Jewish state. The present paper consists of my refutation of each and every one of this author's critical claims. In my view, his screed is not motivated by a search for the truth of the matter. Rather, he wishes to tear down the case in behalf of Israel, and defend that of Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis, and their paymaster and leader, Iran.

1 INTRODUCTION

Nino (2025)¹ is very critical of yours truly. But, they say, there is no such thing as bad publicity, as long as the critic spells your name correctly. This author

does that, I readily acknowledge. He also accurately renders my Jewish, Austrian and libertarian antecedents; how I came to bear all three descriptions. I also thank him for the few compliments he bestows upon me regarding my

¹ All mentions of this author, below, refer to this one essay of his.

Address of the author:
Walter E. Block
 wblock@loyno.edu

Received: 01.11.2025
Revised: 07.11.2025
Accepted: 09.11.2025
Available online: 11.11.2025



Defending and privatization series of books.² But, alas, I fear that this is almost all the material upon which he and I can agree. As for the rest of it, here is my critical response.

In section II of this paper, I discuss my excommunication on the part of several otherwise libertarian organizations. The burden of section III is to address the issues of free association, argument and anti-Semitism. Section IV is devoted to an analysis of my Zionist awakening, V to the Gazan children, VI to ethnic cleansing, VII to Nino as historian, VIII to Hoppe, IX to the assertion that the Jews created libertarianism, and are criminally liable for so doing. I conclude in section X.

2 MY CANCELLATION

Nino's first error is this: "What seemed like an argument over ideas was, at its core, a reckoning of identities no theory could contain. The recent falling out between economist Walter Block and the Ludwig von Mises Institute was not a routine dispute over doctrine. It revealed something far deeper, a reminder that even among those who preach the supremacy of logic and liberty, human nature resists the purity of abstraction."

I must disagree. At least at the outset, where I and the leaders of the Mises Institute (Hans Hoppe, Lew Rockwell, Tom DiLorenzo, Guido Hulsmann, David Gordon, & Ryan McMaken)³ depart concerns an idea, and only an idea: Are the actions of Israel in the war that started in October 7, 2023, and its antecedents, compatible with libertarianism or not? I say they are; my intellectual opponents diverge from this claim of mine.

I also find this problematic: "Intellectual movements, however rational they may appear, remain vulnerable to the same ethnic and cultural

divisions that have divided men for centuries." Yes, libertarianism is, among other things, an "intellectual movement." But the movement as a whole is not "vulnerable" to any such thing. This applies only to those persons, and to several of their organizations, that have excommunicated me from my former relationship with them. Among these I would certainly list the aforementioned Mises Institute in Auburn Alabama.⁴ There is also the Ron Paul Institute, the Libertarian Institute, antiwar.com and the Future of Freedom Foundation which has severed all relationships with me.⁵ But these are only a part, a small part, of the entire libertarian movement.

In attributing differences over how libertarianism applies to Israel, to genetic backgrounds, Nino is committing the ad hominem fallacy in logic. He in effect claims that I support the Israel side of this debate due to the irrelevant fact that I happen to be Jewish. But, as we shall see, there are numerous libertarians who take the side of Hamas, and some of them are Jewish. One cannot deduce truth from genetic background, ethnicity, religion, or any other such phenomenon, contrary to Nino. Ideas, and ideas alone, determine veracity, not personal antecedents.

3 FREE ASSOCIATION, ARGUMENT, ANTI-SEMITISM

According to Libertarian Doctrine, free association is one of its foundational aspects. Thus, these people are legally entitled to never speak to me ever again, as several have chosen to do, despite a warm and friendly relationship of in many cases three and even four decades and more.

However, they also consider themselves as intellectuals. And, here, they fall by the wayside. We libertarians, and also conservatives, properly

² I am grateful to Nino, also, for covering many of the relevant bases; he writes very clearly, which makes refutation all the easier.

³ Libertarians who are mistaken in their support of Hamas vis a vis Israel include Rothbard (1967), Hoppe (2024), DiLorenzo (2024), McMaken (2024), Rectenwald (2024), Joffe (2024), Burgis (2024) and Mosquito (2018, 2023). For refutations of these papers, see, respectively, Block and Futerman (2021) on Rothbard; Block and Futerman (2024) on Hoppe; Block (2024A) on DiLorenzo; Block (2024B) on McMaken; Block (2024C) on Rectenwald; Block (2024D) on Joffe; Block (2024F) on Burgis; Block (2024E), Farber, Block

and Futerman (2018) on Mosquito. See also Gordon and Njoya (2024) and this response to them: Futerman and Block (2024).

⁴ There are almost a dozen Mises Institutes spread all around the world, and this is the only one which has cut most ties with me, but not all of them. I continue to be allowed to publish in their high-profile journal, the Journal of Libertarian Studies. See on this Block (2025).

⁵ They refuse to have anything whatsoever to do with me. They will no longer accept for publication in their respective journals articles of mine wherein we fully agree; e.g., do not touch upon the subjects of Israel, Judaism, antisemitism, etc.



condemn leftists for their cancel culture. If you use the wrong pronouns, or utter such horrid words as “Orientals,” or “cotton,” or spell black in lower case, you are subject to canceling, and consignment to sensitivity “training” e.g., attempted brainwashing. No debate, no nothing, just cancellation, banishment.

Unhappily, as can be seen in the present case, this virus has infected parts of the libertarian movement, to its shame. Thus, the groups and individuals who have excommunicated me are entirely within their legal rights, at least according to libertarian theory. But their much-vaunted claim as intellectuals is much diminished by this decision of theirs. Intellectuals, proper intellectuals, do not shut down intellectual opponents. They debate them.

Hans Hoppe has done important work in exploring the foundation of libertarianism in terms of his argument from argument.⁶ Yet, he, hypocritically, refuses to debate me on issues pertaining to Israel. As a matter of some curiosity, he has never personally debated anyone at all, in an effort to spread libertarianism. He is courageous in writing critically about perceived enemies of liberty. But this does not carry over into personal verbal confrontation.⁷

It is more than passing curiously that the same phenomenon did not contaminate any part of the libertarian movement whatsoever in the case of abortion. Murray Rothbard was unwaveringly pro-choice. Ron Paul, equally adamantly, pro-life.⁸ Yet they were fast friends all during the life of the former. No one else came within a million miles of cancelling either or both of them. But abortion affected many more human lives than were impacted by all the wars participated in by Israel. How to explain this? See below.

Consider Nino’s comment on what he kindly calls my “1976 masterwork *Defending the Undefendable*.” He writes that this book created “... a framework that embodied Block’s Jewish character of challenging gentile norms wherever possible.” This is more than passing curiously.

What would people say if I wrote that Einstein’s theories challenged “gentile norms.” They would say that I had some sort of weird ax to grind. What we fellow Jews, Einstein did and I did in this book (Block, 1976), had absolutely nothing to do with Judaism or with “gentile norms.” What controlled substance has this man Nino been smoking? Einstein and I did what we did not because we are Jews; we did it qua scientist and economist. Similarly, the contributions of Christian physicists and economists have nothing whatsoever to do with their ethnicity or religion, nor that of thousands of other non-Jewish intellectuals.

Consider this statement: “The Canadian newspaper *Le Devoir* used the anti-Semitic phrase ‘the Jew Einstein.’ According to a review of Mordecai Richler’s book *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* in *The New York Times*, *Le Devoir* wrote that ‘the Jew Einstein made us accept on his word his theory of relativity.’” (Doughty, 2006)

Nino, here, is channeling *Le Devoir*. This sort of thing may have been barely acceptable in polite company at the turn of the last century. Nowadays, hopefully, it is not, Nino to the contrary notwithstanding.

Judaism has absolutely nothing to do with either physics, or economics or just law, the province of libertarianism. True, there is a statistical correlation between people of The Book and all of these disciplines. Jews are disproportionately involved with all intellectual arenas. But that hardly undermines the theories of practitioners of any of these callings merely for being Jewish.

According to this reporter, I have been “... maintaining respectability within academic circles” based on my books on “road privatization, water capitalism, and space economics?”⁹ Not a bit of it. I was not tenured until age 61 due to my adamant support of privatization, private property rights and other accoutrements of free enterprise. I gained tenure at Loyola University New Orleans at that ripe old age mainly due to the fact that the donor of my endowed chair specifically called for a professor who would propound this particular

⁶ Or argumentation ethics. See Block, 2004C, 2011; Gordon, 1988; Hoppe, 1988, 1993, 1995; Kinsella, 1996, 2002; Meng, 2002; Rothbard, 1998.

⁷ In sharp contrast, I have publicly debated perhaps over 100 times.

⁸ Both were wrong; the correct free enterprise view on this is evictionism; see on this Block (2021B).

⁹ My privatization series: Block, 2006, 2019, Block and Nelson, 2015; Nelson, and Block, 2018

economic philosophy of free markets. I would have been fired a dozen times without tenure, and even with that protection, had I refused to undergo sensitivity training.¹⁰ Hey, maybe some or all of those cancelling libertarian establishments will take me back if undergo their sensitivity training which will teach me how wonderful, ethical and magnificent are the Palestinians, the Gazans, Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis, the present Iranian administration.

4 MY ZIONIST AWAKENING

Nino opines: “Yet beneath this impressive scholarly output lay dormant ethnic loyalties that would eventually surface with explosive consequences.” Here, again, is his claim that it only because I am Jewish that I support Israel. This is refuted by the fact that there are many anti-Zionist Jews.

I may be a libertarian, but in this author’s opinion, my Judaism over-rode my adherence to that political philosophy. Nino states:

“The October 7, 2023, Hamas attacks triggered an ethnic awakening within Block that betrayed his libertarian commitment to non-aggression and a non-interventionist foreign policy. In his Wall Street Journal op-ed he penned with Argentine economist Alan Futerman ‘The Moral Duty to Destroy Hamas,’¹¹ Block revealed convictions that had apparently been gestating beneath his libertarian exterior for years.

“His call for ‘total, unrestrictive support’ for Israel represented a complete abandonment of libertarian non-interventionism. Block argued that ‘Hamas needs to be destroyed for the same reason and by the same method that the Nazis were,’ explicitly comparing the conflict to World War II’s total war paradigm. This was not merely policy disagreement but a fundamental rejection of the non-aggression principle that forms libertarianism’s cornerstone.”

Nino takes great umbrage with my and Futerman’s call for “total, unrestricted support for Israel.” What is so wrong, so non-libertarian, about favoring a country, a people, that was so unjustifiably, and viciously, attacked on October 7, 2023? Why is it

a “complete abandonment” of the libertarian philosophy? Nino does not vouchsafe us an answer to that important question. He merely contents himself with parroting this point.

This journalist vociferously objects to Futerman and I placing this despicable Hamas attack in the same moral category as occupied by the Nazis. Were they not both guilty of perpetrating brutal crimes? Of course, there is not any quantitative equation to be made regarding the number of deaths that took place on these two occasions. Mention of the Nazis is rather an analogy, and not an inept one. Apart from the sheer difference in numbers, the two episodes have much in common. Jews were unjustifiably attacked on both occasions. Why is it that to say this constitutes “a fundamental rejection of the non-aggression principle that forms libertarianism’s cornerstone”? Nino, once again, does not say. He limits himself to making yet another unsubstantiated charge. He refuses to enlighten us.

Could it be, perhaps, possibly, that he does not really, fully, understand the libertarian philosophy, to which some of us had contributed over the years? One searches in vain for evidence that Nino has ever before published anything on this perspective.¹²

That concludes his claim that I peeled off what turned out to be a thin veneer of libertarianism, in favor of my more basic, fundamental grounding in Judaism. But this will not do at all. It amounts to mere name calling. Nino maintains that no one who supports Israel’s behavior after that day of infamy, October 7, 2023, can possibly do so based on anything approaching libertarian theory. I do so, only, because I am Jewish, supposedly. If that does not constitute an ad hominem fallacy, there is no such thing as an ad hominem fallacy.

Note, that Nino, like Hoppe (2024) before him, relies, only, on an op ed published in the Wall Street Journal, composed of, merely, several hundred words. Both writers totally ignore a full book length publication of mine (Block, & Futerman, 2021). Futerman and I can only make a small contribution to the argument that Israel may be defended on strict libertarian grounds in

¹⁰ I violated woke strictures mentioned above

¹¹ Block and Futerman (2023)

¹² To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time he has ever written about the “L” word.



the former, we do a more complete job in the latter. Briefly, we trace disputed Israeli land claims some 3000 years ago based on the John Lockean libertarian theory of homesteading;¹³ the Arabs did indeed occupy these contested territories, but only for a matter of a few centuries. Thus, they were trespassers. There is no logical incompatibility between libertarianism and support of Israeli behavior based upon proper ownership of the terrain under dispute. Were Nino more of a scholar, he would at least have tried to refute this argument. In the event, he totally ignores it.

A word about that “triggering.” This implies that I wrote about, studied, spoke publicly, nothing at all concerning Judaism before October 7, 2023. Not so, not so. Au contraire, I have a track record which supports the very opposite conclusion.¹⁴ Nor did my defense of Israel vis a vis its many enemies start on October 8, 2023.¹⁵

Nino maintains that “Block ... betrayed his libertarian commitment to non-aggression...” He is very wide of the mark in this contention of his. I did not at all do any such thing. Rather, I took the position that the NAP and private property rights based upon initial homesteading was all on the side of the Jewish state. It was purely on the defense on the occasion of each and every war it fought; they were all initiated not by it, but by its neighbors who initiated the aggression.

The Hebrew nation has been under almost constant initiatory attack ever since its formation in 1948; before that there were pogroms against innocent Jews galore. Libertarianism is not a suicide pact. It is compatible with but does not require pacifism. Stated Benjamin Netanyahu, apropos this point, “If the Arabs put down their weapons today, there would be no more violence. If the Jews put down their weapons today, there would be no more Israel.” (Netanyahu, n.d.) The libertarians do not oppose all war; only offensive war, such as conducted by the enemies of the only

civilized country in the Middle East. The motto of LewRockell.com is “ANTI-STATE•ANTI-WAR•PRO-MARKET.” Antiwar.com bruits itself as a libertarian organization, and in many ways it is. But not in the choice of its very name. But if this is meant to articulate the libertarian vision, the middle claim is mistaken. Even Mr. Libertarian, Murray N. Rothbard, favored at least two wars: the war of secession of the thirteen colonies against Great Britain in 1776, and the war of secession of the South, against the North, in 1861. (Rothbard, 1999) The libertarian, properly, opposes offensive war, but supports defensive war.

Implicit in Nino’s “analysis” is that it is impossible, it is a logical contradiction, to be both a libertarian and a defender of Israel. But he offers not one single word as evidence for that claim. He merely asserts it. Over and over again.

Nino also looks askance at the US “interventionist” foreign policy. In this context, I presume he opposes American foreign aid¹⁶ to Israel. It cannot be denied that Israel receives more government-to-government transfers of US funds than any other single nation. However, when you consider the US monies received by all of the Arab countries put together,¹⁷ that amount given to Israel is dwarfed. Thus, less “interventionism” of this sort would help, not hurt, Israel, at least proportionately, vis a vis its enemies, present and former.

On the other hand, there is nothing in the classical liberal or monarchist versions of libertarianism that precludes US alliances with other countries. And that between it and Israel has a lot to be said in its behalf, and not only in one direction. Rather, it is a two-way street (Block, & Faran, 2025A).

5 THE GAZAN CHILDREN

Nino takes offence with the fact that I had the audacity to write an op ed (Block and Faran, 2025A) directly addressed to the children of Gaza.

¹³ Block, 1990B, 2002A, 2002B; Block and Edelstein, 2012; Block and Nelson, 2015; Block and Yeatts, 1999-2000; Block vs Epstein, 2005; Bylund, 2005, 2012; Gordon, 2019A, 2019B; Grotius, 1625; Hoppe, 1993, 2011; Kinsella, 2003, 2006A, 2006B, 2007, 2009A, 2009B, 2009C; Locke, 1948; McMaken, 2016; Paul, 1987; Pufendorf, 1673; Rothbard, 1969, 1973, 32; Rozeff, 2005; Watner, 1982.

¹⁴ See in this regard Block (1986, 1990A, 1996, 2002C, 2004A, 2005). Nino simply did not do his homework.

¹⁵ Block, Futerman and Farber (2020, 2021); Futerman, Farber and Block (2016).

¹⁶ When using this phrase, I must apologize to Peter Bauer (1981, 1982, 1984, 1991; Bauer, & Yamey, 1957)

¹⁷ Some of them are no longer obvious enemies of Israel since the Abraham Accords, but many of them were, before that

He maintains that my “Open Letter to the Children of Gaza” revealed depths of ethnic passion that stunned even his closest associates.” Yes, indeed, my “closest associates,” not to say decades long friends, were “stunned” and then bitterly angry at me for telling these children that they had their own parents to blame for their plight. They used them, abusively, as shields, by placing rocket launchers in hospitals, playgrounds, schools, residential areas. What is the IDF supposed to do? Sit there and take it? Continue to allow Hamas to rain death down upon Israelis, hidden behind its children? Even the Nazis did not hide behind women’s skirts and use their youngsters as shields.

Nino was offended by this statement of mine to the children of Gaz: “your parents launched a despicable, unwarranted attack on October 7.” He accuses me of “conveniently overlooking the long history of Jewish expropriation of Palestinian lands dating back to the 1880s—a campaign of extermination that the United States government has fully endorsed through its ongoing flow of military aid, economic support, and diplomatic cover. And of course, he (that is, me, the present author) didn’t mention Israel’s oppressive control over Gaza—making Gaza into an open-air prison. Who could live like that?”

Nino continues: “These positions revealed Block not as a consistent libertarian applying universal principles, but as a Jewish intellectual whose ethnic solidarity ultimately trumped philosophical commitments when forced to choose between abstract theory and tribal loyalty.”

These views of his cannot be allowed to stand. First, as before, they reveal an almost complete ignorance of the libertarian philosophy, about which he confidently pontificates. Second, is there some hidden libertarian premise of which only libertarian cognoscenti such as Nino are aware, that prevents authors from directly addressing children? Perhaps this master libertarian can point this out to me. Neophytes in this philosophy, such as I are always willing to learn from masters of this libertarian craft such as this author.

Second, even if this were true,¹⁸ it hardly justifies the massacre of some 1200 innocents. Note,

when Israel engages in assassination, it aims at military targets, including scientists working on nuclear weapons (Block, & Faran, 2025B), not civilians. The latter are impacted when they are used as shields by enemy leaders.

Third, it is not true. Many Gazans worked in Israel, earning higher wages. East Germany, in sharp contrast, was indeed an “open air prison.” When the prisoners tried to emigrate in a westward direction, they were shot. The Jewish state does no such thing regarding those who wish to depart from Gaza.

Fourth, while the East Germans who wished to move to West Germany were innocent of any crimes, the same cannot be said for the Gazans. Their celebrations, dancing in the streets, on October 8, 2023, demonstrate that virtually all of them were aiding and abetting the events of the previous day. Moreover, dozens of them engaging in suicide bombings in Israeli schools, buses, shopping malls, restaurants, etc. It is difficult on libertarian self-defense grounds, to blame the Israelis for limiting the freedom of such persons.

6 ETHNIC CLEANSING

At this point in his essay Nino cites Al Jazeera (2017) to the effect that the Israelis have engaged in “ethnic cleansing” and were responsive for the fact that almost a million “Palestinian refugees had ... been forcefully expelled from their country.” The very opposite is the case.

The reason these people became refugees stemmed not from Jewish expulsion of them. Rather, this came about due to the fact that the five invading armies in 1948, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, ordered them to leave. Why? These civilians would just get in the way. If the Palestinians remained, the invaders would have had to protect them, which would reduce the slaughter of the Jews, their prime goal. (Milestones, n.d.; Marcus, 2024)

The Jews practically begged these folks to stay. According to Golda Meir (1975, pp. 267–268): “Every time I read or hear about how we supposedly treated the Arabs with such cruelty, my blood boils. In April 1948, I myself stood for hours on the shore in Haifa and literally begged

¹⁸ It is not, it is not



the Arabs of that city not to leave. Moreover, it was a scene I don't think I'll ever forget. The Haganah had just taken control of Haifa, and the Arabs began to flee — because their leaders had so convincingly promised them that this was the smartest move, and because the British generously provided them with dozens of trucks. Nothing the Haganah said or did helped — not the loudspeakers mounted on trucks, nor the leaflets we dropped on the Arab neighborhoods of the city ('Don't be afraid,' they said in Arabic and Hebrew. 'If you leave, you will bring poverty and disgrace upon yourselves. Stay in the city, which is yours and ours.') These were signed by the Haifa Workers' Council.

"And this is what British General Sir Hugh Stockwell, then commanding the army there, said: 'The Arab leaders left first, and no one lifted a finger to stop the movement that started in haste and then became a panic-stricken flight.' They were determined to go. Hundreds crossed the border in vehicles. But some went down to the seashore to wait for boats.

"Ben-Gurion called me and said: 'I want you to go to Haifa immediately and make sure the Arabs who remain there are treated properly. I also want you to try to persuade those Arabs on the shore to return. You have to make them understand they have nothing to fear.'

"So, I went immediately. I sat on the shore and begged them to go back to their homes. But I got only one answer: 'We know we have nothing to fear, but we must go. We will return.' I was completely convinced that they left not because they were afraid of us, but because they feared they might be seen as traitors to the Arab cause. In any case, I spoke until I had no strength left, and it did no good."

If it were really true that 'twas the Jews who were responsible for forcing the Palestinians to depart in a bout of "ethnic cleansing," why did hundreds of thousands of them remain? Why were they not, also, banished? And how did the Jewish state treat them and their children? They are doctors, lawyers, professors, engineers, scientists and

politicians. They are even represented in the Knesset with their own political party!

Nino neglects to mention that at around the same time, roughly the same number of Jews were exiled by the nations of the five invading armies. They feared for their lives due to increasing pogroms. Israel integrated them into its society, economy, while the Arab countries mistreated the Palestinian refugees who departed under orders from the five invading armies. They were consigned to refugee camps, where they and their children still suffer. Why? To demonstrate the supposed cruelty of the Israelis.

7 NINO AS HISTORIAN

The 1880s? The 1880s? This is as far back in history that this Middle Eastern expert goes, in his attempt to demonstrate Hebrew perfidy. What about three millennia ago and more, when there is strong evidence that the Jews were there, busily homesteading now disputed land, and thus becoming the legitimate owners of it, at least according to libertarian John Locke.¹⁹ The Muslim trespassers only arrived on the scene several centuries ago and thus cannot be considered proper owners. The most dramatic evidence for this is the that Jewish Second Temple lies below the Al Aqsa Mosque, indicating, definitively, which group of people was there first. There is evidence of Arab presence in contested land, for the first few feet down. But below that, it is turtles all the way down, Jewish turtles.²⁰ Nino ought to read a book on history, or two. Perhaps there is some hidden aspect of libertarianism, known only to world class theoreticians of this discipline such as Nino, but unknown to me, a mere beginner, that precludes going back into history to discern just property titles further than 1880. I beg Nino to instruct me on this matter.

There is such a thing in law as legislated statutes of limitations. If you seek justice after a specific number of years has passed over this limit, you are plain out of luck, legally speaking. The argument in favor of such laws is that people, after a while, want to focus on other things; they need security in their possessions. The view is that the

¹⁹ Likely, Nino has never so much as heard of this father of libertarianism

²⁰ There is archeological evidence that the Jews lived in Israel before the Moslems

past can only have a limited effect on the present, and the future.

But this legislation is incompatible with libertarianism. Suppose grandfather A stole a wristwatch from grandfather B. Grandson A is now in possession of this item. Posit that the time limitations imposed by law is 30 years. Grandson B discovers this long-ago theft 31 years later and goes to court to obtain what he rightfully owns;²¹ the court rules against him. If that is not the height, or the depth of injustice, then nothing is unjust.

The libertarian stance on this matter is called the natural statute of limitations. Possession is nine tenths of the law. The burden of proof always rests with the plaintiff, not the defendant. However, the further back you go into history, the more difficult it is to prove anything. It is my position that the archeological evidence is so overwhelming, even though it harkens back millennia, not mere centuries, that it overcomes this natural statute of limitations, and places proper ownership of contested lands with the Jewish grandson, not the Arab one.

8 HOPPE

Nino now turns for support to my old friend of some four decades Hans-Hermann Hoppe who he characterizes as “The Libertarian Contrarian Who Stood Up to Block.” Hoppe is a master of understatement and moderation who starts off his critique of my views of the Israeli situation by characterizing me as “an unhinged, bloodthirsty monster.” This, based on our disagreement over the application of the doctrine of private property rights and Lockean homesteading to the Middle East.

Just imagine his invective if we disagreed on something even more important. Civilized language might then fully fail him.

A word about this author who “stood up to me” as Nino puts the matter. Hoppe’s sole target was Block and Futerman (2023), a single, solitary Wall Street Journal op ed of a mere several hundred

words. However, as mentioned before and now so again since it is so important, I also co-authored an entire book on this subject (Block, & Futerman, 2021), with this brilliant young economist and libertarian theoretician. Hoppe entirely ignores that full-length treatment. One can be forgiven for wondering if he has ever read it.²²

Second, Futerman and I wrote a scholarly rebuttal of Hoppe (2024). Did the latter reply? To ask this is to answer it: of course not. Why condescend to a person who is “an unhinged, bloodthirsty monster?” Why argue with a person such as I who rejoices in the murder of innocent children, such as I, in his opinion.²³

Third, I have upon several occasions challenged this man to a public debate. A coward, he has refused all such invitations. This is more than passing curiously. Hoppe has done more good work, no, make that excellent work, than any other libertarian on grounding this philosophy on the argument from argument, or argumentation ethics.²⁴ I enthusiastically support him in this splendid effort of his. However, when it comes to putting his money where his mouth is, e.g., acting in accord with his own publications on the importance of argumentation, to actually engage in a debate with me, he is nowhere to be found. Instead, we find him cowering somewhere in Turkey, seemingly afraid of his own shadow. It is upon such an intellectual craven that Nino relies. Is Hoppe afraid that in an open debate the pure logic of the matter will demonstrate the error of his ways on Israel? Enquiring minds want to know. Maybe his buddy Nino can ask Hoppe about this.

Hoppe is in many ways a gifted libertarian theoretician, and Austrian economist. He is good at pontificating; he is personally eloquent. But his advocacy never stretches in the direction of *mano a mano* debates, against a competent intellectual opponent. One looks in vain in google and other such places for his public verbal disputes with anyone, on any subject pertaining to political economy. He ducks not only “unhinged, bloodthirsty monsters” like me, but everyone. In

²¹ We assume that parents pass on what they own to their children.

²² In contrast, when I criticize Hoppe, it is typically based on his journal articles or book length treatment of a subject. See Block, 1998, 2004B, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011A, 2011B, 2021B, 2024B, 2024G; Block and

Barnett, 2010; Block, Barnett and Salerno, 2006; Block and Callahan, 2003; Block and Futerman, 2024; Gregory and Block, 2007.

²³ Several people have told me that this is the reason he gives for his refusal to debate me.

²⁴ See fn. 6, *supra*



contrast, there must be scores if not hundreds of intellectual altercations I have engaged in, with critics of libertarianism. I channel the heroic Charlie Kirk in this matter. The fraidy-cat Hoppe does not.

Nino is entirely correct in saying that I am no longer listed as a senior fellow at the Mises Institute Auburn, and that my many years of writing and speaking for them and defending them have been erased. This relationship has not only been “curtailed,” but ended. This applies to material having nothing to do with Israel, on LewRockwell.com. I deduce that they don’t much like unhinged, bloodthirsty monsters.

With this introduction to this section of Nino’s paper, we now arrive at his account of Hoppe’s (2001) in many ways excellent book.²⁵ How does this publication pertain to the Israeli situation? It has to do with “covenant communities” which have the right to “physically remove” undesirables. Nino quotes Hoppe as follows:

“‘There can be no tolerance toward democrats and communists in a libertarian social order. They will have to be physically separated and expelled from society,’ he declares, extending this principle to ‘advocates of alternative, non-family and kin-centered lifestyles such as, for instance, individual hedonism, parasitism, nature-environment worship, homosexuality, or communism.’” (emphasis added by present author).

Nino, oblivious to the niceties of libertarianism, does not realize what a hot potato he has uncovered herein. He makes much of the fact that since the owners of a condominium association, private store, private library and other such enterprises are entirely justified in excluding from their premises people they regard as “undesirable,” then the groups and people who have cut all ties with me are also, and equally, entitled to do so. Yes, indeed, that is true. But it is also uncontroversial. I do not claim, nor have I ever done so, that these cancellations violate libertarian law.

In my view, however, these exclusions are incompatible with the previously undeniable claim of these organizations to be scholarly; to be thought of as intellectual think tanks. Those who

wish to be thought of in that way do not embrace the leftist cancel culture. Rather, they adhere to the view that “sunlight is the best disinfectant.”

Note, Hoppe is urging that the “deplorables” be excluded not from cooperatives, condos, covenant communities and other private voluntary groups, but rather from “society” as a whole. If this means anything, it means total banishment! The logical implication here is that were the Hoppe who wrote these words in charge, gays, commies, etc., would have their properties stolen from them and forced to vacate their homes and offices. That is what banishment means; nothing more and nothing less!

If that is not a violation of libertarian principles, then nothing is a violation of libertarian principles. Nino may not recognize this, but Hoppe certainly could, would, or at least, should. Nino, who is so intent to point out incompatibilities with libertarian principles in my writings, completely misses this one written by Hoppe. During the many years when we were friends, I several times pleaded with Hoppe to not say any such thing. Banishing non-criminals from “society” is simply not on, from the libertarian perspective. In my communication with Hoppe, I characterized this statement of his as a verbal slip, similar to a typographical error. He never changed; certainly, he did not apologize for what I thought then and still think now was but a mere inadvertent error. But he did not implement my advice, from which I infer he really meant to say this. How else can we rationally interpret his refusal?

Consider what this would mean for just one of the groups that Hoppe regards as beyond the pale, homosexuals. Here is a list of eminent libertarians who also just happen to be gay: Dave Boaz, Roy Childs, Ron Hamowy, John Hospers, Chase Oliver, Tom Palmer, Jim Peron, Ralph Raico, Justin Raimondo, Will Smith, Starchild, Peter Thiel, Richard Winger.

No libertarian can doubt that these gentlemen have all made important contributions to our political economic philosophy. Here is what Rockwell (2004) had to say about one of them: “December marks the eighth anniversary of the passing of Ralph Raico, one of Murray Rothbard’s

²⁵ For my review of it, see Block (2002)

closest friends and the greatest twentieth-century historian of classical liberalism and a great libertarian theorist as well.” No words were better or more truly said. However, in uttering them, Rockwell thus places himself in an awkward position. He was the Grand Inquisitor of the Mises Institute Auburn, in excommunicating me from the organization that he founded. He did so largely based on Hoppe (2024). He very properly praises Raico to the skies. But Hoppe (2024) would banish Raico not from his own condominium residential complex, but from all of “society.” Rockwell thus has a lot of “splaining” to do. If Rockwell wants to cancel someone from his organization for taking a non-libertarian position, it should be Hoppe, not me.

Why, by the way, am I called an unhinged bloodthirsty monster?²⁶ Presumably, it is because I revel in the slaughter of innocent Gazans, particularly their women and children. That is to say, I am a supporter of Israeli war crimes and genocide on the part of the Hebrew state.

According to the always reliable of absolutely truthful statistics supplied by Hamas, the IDF has slain some 65,000 Gazans.²⁷ Let us accept this number, arguendo. The Israeli military, the fourth most powerful in the entire world,²⁸ conquered Egypt in the 1967 war. If this colossus of power really wanted to destroy all two million Gazans, how long would it have taken them? Six hours? Maybe six minutes? Instead, the IDF acts in the exact opposite manner. Before bombing a Gazan hospital used as a cover by Hamas, it sends warning leaflets in an attempt not to destroy innocent lives, but to preserve them. The average army kills nine civilians for every enemy soldier dispatched. The IDF ratio? A startling one to one point five (Block, 2024H). They preserve the lives of Gazan non-combatants even at the cost of shedding the blood of their own warriors. The IDF has a significant advantage over Hamas troops on the ground, dealing with booby-trapped tunnels and buildings. But the former has a gigantic, not to say infinite comparative advantage over the latter from the air. Nevertheless, they all too often engage in house-to-house fighting, in an effort to

save Gazan lives. That is “unhinged?” That is “bloodthirsty?” That is “monstrous?”

Who is responsible for the deaths of the Gazans, especially their children? There are only two candidates, and three possibilities: 1. Hamas; 2. Israel; 3. Both are guilty and they share the blame.

Superficially, Israel seems most vulnerable to this charge. After all, it was the bullets and bombs of the IDF that ended the lives of these innocents. But this is a superficial analysis. Suppose a madman straps his two infants to his chest and comes running at you, knife raised, blood in his eye, yelling the threat that he is going to kill you and your family, who are sheltering behind you. You have a gun and could kill him in self-defense. But if you do so, you, his totally innocent babies will also die. You have two choices. One, allow him to murder you and your own children. This of course would be suicidal for you and your family. Even an expert libertarian such as Nino might not accept this course of action as required by this philosophy. Two, shoot him to death and his youngsters also die. If you chose the latter course of action, who is at fault for these deaths? You? He? Both are blameworthy?

Obviously, this crazy person bears full and sole responsibility for his own death and that of his progeny. He, not you, used them as a shield.

But Hamas is guilty of precisely this sort of behavior. By placing rocket and drone launchers in hospitals, schools, Mosques, residential areas, children’s playgrounds, they are the only ones responsible for, and guilty of, the demise of Gazan children. Nino should see this, even if Hoppe does not.

A picture tells a thousand words. One of the best cartoon illustrations of this situation features an Israeli and a Palestinian aiming a gun at each other. But the former is placed in front of a Jewish baby carriage, which the latter occupies space behind an Arab baby carriage. (Dershowitz, 2013)

²⁶ True confession. I like that phrase. It is even more apt at the time of this writing, during Halloween. It evinces a keen appreciation of the human condition on the part of Hoppe.

²⁷ They do not distinguish between combatants and non-combatants.

²⁸ Staff (2023). Per capita, Israel has the strongest military, bar none.



9 THE JEWS CREATED LIBERTARIANISM, AND ARE CRIMINALLY LIABLE FOR SO DOING

Saith Nino, "It's no secret that libertarian movement's development has been profoundly shaped by Jewish intellectual leadership. This pattern extends from the movement's Austrian School foundations through its contemporary institutional structure." He mentions in this regard those libertarians who were indeed Jewish. But the Austrian School was founded by Carl Menger, a non-Jew. Eugen von Bohm-Bawerk, another guy, also preceded the Jewish Mises. Nino moves too fast to Murray N. Rothbard, who was indeed Jewish, but ignores Friedrich A. Hayek, an earlier Austrian. My critic then says: "Curiously, Rothbard had more of a populist turn toward the end of his life, where he advocated for a strategy of "right-wing populism" that endorsed the presidential campaigns of David Duke and Pat Buchanan." But this mentor and friend of mine took these positions far longer than merely "toward the end of his life."

Nino mentions several Jewish libertarians who were indeed foundational for the modern movement ²⁹ such as Rothbard, Milton Friedman and Ayn Rand.³⁰ In so doing, he is trying to convert libertarianism into a quintessentially pro-Israel philosophy. Yes, the latter two were both libertarians and both pro-Israel, but the former (Rothbard, 1967) was a bitter critic of the Jewish state. Then, too, there is a whole host of non-Jewish libertarian leaders many of whom had nothing whatsoever to say about the only civilized country in the Middle East or were strong critics of this country. Ron Paul is certainly an example of the latter.

Libertarianism is no more "Jewish" than physics or mathematics are "Jewish," even though the Chosen People are disproportionately represented in all three callings.

Nino continues: "Block's passionate Zionism ultimately proved incompatible with libertarian anti-interventionism, leading him to walk away

from the intellectual community he had contributed to for over four decades."

Hey, waitasec. I did not at all "walk away" from any of the several libertarian organizations with whom I had long been associated. Rather, the very opposite is the case: they "walked away" from me. No, that is not correct. Instead, they "ran away" from me, as if I were a hot potato. Take the case of Ron Paul. I have been a friend and admirer of his for more years than either of us would like to contemplate. I am now persona non grata with his institute. But at least he will still communicate with me. Not so for many of the leaders of the other groups which have cancelled me.

Last but far from least, consider this parting shot of Nino's: "Like archaeologists uncovering layers of forgotten civilizations, the Block-Hoppe schism reveals that beneath every high-minded intellectual movement lies the bedrock of tribal identity, waiting to reassert itself when abstract principles collide with the eternal reality of us versus them."

Do you know what the favorite sport, hobby, is, in the United States? It is football. In Canada, hockey. In most of the rest of the world, it is soccer. Do you know what it is in Israel? It is archeology. The nerds in that country, along with guests from other nations, are forever digging up their soil and categorizing what they find there. In the first few feet beneath the surface, they find evidence of Arab occupation. That is to be expected, since such folks have indeed lived in the disputed territories for hundreds of years. But when they dig deeper, they uncover evidence of Jewish presence. This is due to the undeniable fact that Hebrews have occupied these lands for millennia! Perhaps the most dramatic example of this phenomenon is that the Al Aqsa Mosque lies above the Jewish Second Temple, and the first one is found even below that. This indicates as nothing else quite can, that the Jews were there first! If so, then according to the homesteading views of the libertarian John Locke (1948)³¹, the

²⁹ However, according to Rothbard, the ancient Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu was "the first libertarian intellectual." (Rothbard, 2014)

³⁰ She rejected that label, preferring Objectivist, but Nino is correct in his categorization. Curiously, Nino overlooks the Jewish Robert Nozick.

³¹ No Jew, he!

Jews, not the Palestinians or any other Arabs, are the rightful owners of the terrain under dispute.

10 CONCLUSION

Yes, condominium associations and private think tanks, have every right to ban anyone they wish from their electronic or physical premises; to disassociate themselves from anyone they wish. However, these organizations fashion themselves in addition to property rights holders, in addition to bearing the rights of free association, also as intellectual enterprises. We have all rejected the left's cancel culture, for using the wrong pronouns, etc. But now we find these groups adopting a similar policy. No. Intellectuals do not cancel anyone. Anyone at all. They debate them.

The list below is that of individuals (some of whom would not have attached the word 'Libertarian' to themselves – because the term had not yet been invented in their era), but who nevertheless espoused philosophies and foreign (and economic) policy beliefs that aligned word perfect with today's Ron Paul Libertarianism and could thus be labelled the 'Founding Fathers of Libertarianism':

Adam Smith, John Locke, Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Frédéric Bastiat, Lysander Spooner, Henry David Thoreau, Alexis de Tocqueville, Carl Menger, Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk, Friedrich von

How to cite this article?

WORKS CITED

- Al Jazeera. (2017, May 23). *The Nakba did not start or end in 1948: Key facts and figures on the ethnic cleansing of Palestine*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2017/5/23/the-nakba-did-not-start-or-end-in-1948>
- Bauer, P. T. (1981). *Equality, the Third World, and economic delusion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bauer, P. T. (1982). Ecclesiastical economics is envy exalted. *This World*, 1(Winter/Spring), 56–69.
- Bauer, P. T. (1984). *Reality and rhetoric: Studies in the economics of development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bauer, P. T. (1991). *The development frontier: Essays in applied economics*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Bauer, P. T., & Yamey, B. S. (1957). *The economics of under-developed countries*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wieser, Joseph Schumpeter, Friedrich Hayek, Hans-Hermann Hoppe. Lew Rockwell and countless others.

As you can see, there is NOT a single Jew among them.³²

Yes, Jews at 2% of the US population are wildly overrepresented amongst libertarians, but the same is true of pretty much any other intellectual discipline: physicists, chemists, doctors, dentists, lawyers, mathematicians, chess grandmasters, Nobel Prize Winners, etc. Nino's strange attempt to paint libertarianism as a quintessentially Jewish enterprise is thus highly problematic. But I give him credit for one thing: creativity. His is the first attempt to do any such thing of which I am aware.

Methinks this quote from Golda Meir is very appropriate to Mr. Nino. She said: "When peace comes we will perhaps in time be able to forgive the Arabs for killing our sons, but it will be harder for us to forgive them for having forced us to kill their sons. Peace will come when the Arabs will love their children more than they hate us." (Meir, 1973)

In like manner, I say of this critic of mine, his hatred of Jews, Israel, and me as a spokesman for both, has overcome his love of truth, if he ever had any of the latter in the first place, that is.

³² Source: comment section: (Nino, 2025A)



- Block, W. E. (1986). Comment on Meir Tamari's "Judaism and the market mechanism." In W. E. Block & I. Hexham (Eds.), *Religion, economics and social thought* (pp. 430–449). Vancouver, Canada: The Fraser Institute.
- Block, W. E. (1990a). Jewish economics in the light of Maimonides. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 17(3), 60–68.
- Block, W. E. (1990b). Earning happiness through homesteading unowned land: A comment on "Buying misery with federal land" by Richard Stroup. *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, 15(2), 237–253.
- Block, W. E. (1996). The Mishnah and Jewish dirigisme. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 23(2), 35–44. <http://www.mises.org/etexts/Mishnah.pdf>
- Block, W. E. (1998). A libertarian case for free immigration. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 13(2), 167–186.
- Block, W. E. (2002). Book review of Hoppe, Hans-Hermann, *Democracy: The God that failed*. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 61(3), 747–750.
- Block, W. E. (2002a). Homesteading city streets: An exercise in managerial theory. *Planning and Markets*, 5(1), 18–23. <http://www.pam.usc.edu/>
- Block, W. E. (2002b). On reparations to Blacks for slavery. *Human Rights Review*, 3(4), 53–73.
- Block, W. E. (2002c). Ona'ah. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 29(9), 722–729.
- Block, W. E. (2004a). The Jews and capitalism: A love-hate enigma. *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, 29(3), 305–326. <http://tinyurl.com/2zgs5s>
- Block, W. E. (2004b). The state was a mistake [Review of the book *Democracy: The God that failed*, by H.-H. Hoppe]. *Mises Institute*. <http://www.mises.org/fullstory.asp?control=1522>
- Block, W. E. (2004c). Are alienability and the a priori of argument logically incompatible? *Dialogue*, 1(1). <http://www.uni-svishtov.bg/dialog/2004/256gord6.pdf>
- Block, W. E. (2005). The Jews and capitalism: A love-hate relationship. In N. Capaldi (Ed.), *Business and religion: A clash of civilizations?* (pp. 65–79). Salem, MA: M&M Scrivener Press.
- Block, W. E. (2006). *The privatization of roads and highways: Human and economic factors*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Block, W. E. (2007). Plumb line libertarianism: A critique of Hoppe. *Reason Papers*, 29, 151–163. https://reasonpapers.com/pdf/29/rp_29_10.pdf
- Block, W. E. (2009). Rejoinder to Hoppe on indifference. *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 12(1), 52–59.
- Block, W. E. (2010). Libertarianism is unique; it belongs neither to the right nor the left. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 22, 127–170.
- Block, W. E. (2011). Rejoinder to Murphy and Callahan on Hoppe's argumentation ethics. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 22, 631–639.
- Block, W. E. (2011a). Hoppe, Kinsella and Rothbard II on immigration: A critique. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 22(1), 593–623.
- Block, W. E. (2011b). Rejoinder to Hoppe on immigration. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 22(1), 771–792.
- Block, W. E. (2019). *Property rights: The argument for privatization*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://www.palgrave.com/in/book/9783030283520>

- Block, W. E. (2021a). A critical evaluation of Hoppe's "Getting libertarianism right." *Estudios Libertarios*, 4, 32–66.
- Block, W. E. (2021b). *Evictionism: The compromise solution to the pro-life pro-choice debate controversy*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Block, W. E. (2024a). From friend and co-author to mad critic. *MEST Journal*. https://www.meste.org/mest/M/a_m.html
- Block, W. E. (2024b). Micro and macro libertarianism: Rejoinder to McMaken. *MEST Journal*. https://www.meste.org/mest/M/a_m.html
- Block, W. E. (2024c). Rejoinder to Rectenwald on supposed Israeli war crimes. *MEST Journal*. https://www.meste.org/mest/M/a_m.html
- Block, W. E. (2024d). Rejoinder to Joffe on the compatibility of libertarianism and Zionism. *MEST Journal*. https://www.meste.org/mest/MEST_Najava/XXV_Block.v.Joffe.pdf
- Block, W. E. (2024e). Rejoinder to Bionic Mosquito on Israel. *MEST Journal*. https://mest.meste.org/MEST_Najava/XXV_Block_v_Mosquito.pdf
- Block, W. E. (2024f, July 6). Why I stand by relocation: A rejoinder to Ben Burgis. *Merion West*. <https://merionwest.com/2024/07/06/why-i-stand-by-relocation-a-rejoinder-to-ben-burgis/>
- Block, W. E. (2024g, December 19). Block on Hoppe on Milei on decentralism, isolationism and Israel. *Israpundit*. <https://www.israpundit.org/block-on-hoppe-on-milei-on-decentralism-isolationism-and-israel/>
- Block, W. E. (2024h, December 21). Israel has the lowest proportion of civilians killed in war compared to soldiers; Is it time for a change? *Israpundit*. <https://www.israpundit.org/israel-has-the-lowest-proportion-of-civilians-killed-in-war-compared-to-soldiers-is-it-time-for-a-change/>
- Block, W. E. (2025). Rejoinder to Slenzok on Covid once again. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 29(1), 210–223.
- Block, W. E., & Barnett, W. II. (2010). Rejoinder to Hoppe on indifference, once again. *Reason Papers*, 32, 141–154. http://reasonpapers.com/pdf/32/rp_32_9.pdf
- Block, W. E., Barnett, W. II, & Salerno, J. (2006). Relationship between wealth or income and time preference is empirical, not apodictic: Critique of Rothbard and Hoppe. *Review of Austrian Economics*, 19(2), 69–80.
- Block, W. E., & Callahan, G. (2003). Is there a right to immigration? A libertarian perspective. *Human Rights Review*, 5(1), 46–71.
- Block, W. E., & Edelstein, M. R. (2012). Popsicle sticks and homesteading land for nature preserves. *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, 7(1), 7–13. <http://www.rebe.rau.ro/REBE%207%201.pdf>
- Block, W. E., & Epstein, R. (2005). Debate on eminent domain. *NYU Journal of Law & Liberty*, 1(3), 1144–1169.
- Block, W. E., & Faran, O. J. K. (2025a, October 21). Should the U.S. continue to ally with Israel? Yes! *Israpundit*. <https://www.israpundit.org/should-the-u-s-continue-to-ally-with-israel-yes/>
- Block, W. E., & Faran, O. J. K. (2025b, October 28). Does Israel have the moral justification to target Iran's weapons scientists? *Wingate News*. <https://wingatenews.com/israel-moral-justification-targeting-iranian-scientists/>
- Block, W. E., & Futerman, A. (2021). *The classical liberal case for Israel*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.



- Block, W. E., & Futerman, A. G. (2023, October 12). The moral duty to destroy Hamas. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Block, W. E., & Futerman, A. G. (2024). Rejoinder to Hoppe on Israel versus Hamas. *MEST Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.12709/mest.12.12.SE.04>
- Block, W. E., Futerman, A. G., & Farber, R. (2021, June 16). Anti-Zionist tautology: Israel is evil or there is no good. *Jerusalem Post*. <https://www.jpost.com/opinion/anti-zionist-tautology-israel-is-evil-or-there-is-no-good-opinion-671226>
- Block, W. E., & Nelson, P. L. (2015). *Water capitalism: The case for privatizing oceans, rivers, lakes, and aquifers*. New York, NY: Lexington Books/Rowman & Littlefield.
- Block, W., & Yeatts, G. (1999–2000). The economics and ethics of land reform: A critique of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace's "Toward a better distribution of land: The challenge of agrarian reform." *Journal of Natural Resources and Environmental Law*, 15(1), 37–69.
- Burgis, B. (2024, June 10). In reply to Walter Block: Relocation must be off the table. *Merion West*. <https://merionwest.com/2024/06/10/in-reply-to-walter-block-relocation-should-be-off-the-table/>
- Bylund, P. (2005). *Man and matter: A philosophical inquiry into the justification of ownership in land from the basis of self-ownership* (Master's thesis). Lund University. <http://www.uppsatser.se/uppsats/a7eb17de8f/>
- Bylund, P. (2012). Man and matter: How the former gains ownership of the latter. *Libertarian Papers*, 4(1). <http://libertarianpapers.org/articles/2012/lp-4-1-5.pdf>
- DiLorenzo, T. (2024, June 1). From mad (social) scientist to mad Zionist. *LewRockwell.com*. <https://www.lewrockwell.com/2024/06/thomas-dilorenzo/from-mad-social-scientist-to-mad-zionist/>
- Doughty, H. A. (2006). Critical Thinking vs. Critical Consciousness. *College Quarterly*, 2, 54. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ835402>
- Futerman, A., Farber, R., & Block, W. E. (2016, October 13). The libertarian case for Israel. *The Forward*. <https://forward.com/subscribe/351957/tk-tk/>
- Futerman, A., Block, W. E., & Farber, R. (2020, March 15). The true nature of the BDS movement. *Jerusalem Post*. <https://m.jpost.com/Opinion/The-true-nature-of-the-BDS-movement-620988>
- Futerman, A. G., & Block, W. E. (2024). Rejoinder to Gordon and Njoya on Israel and libertarianism. *MEST Journal*. <https://www.meste.org/ojs/index.php/mest/article/view/1401>
- Gordon, D. (1988, November). Radical & quasi-Kantian. *Liberty*, 46–47.
- Gordon, D. (2019a, November 8). Locke vs. Cohen vs. Rothbard on homesteading. *Mises Wire*. <https://mises.org/wire/locke-vs-cohen-vs-rothbard-homesteading>
- Gordon, D. (2019b, December 13). Violence, homesteading, and the origins of private property. *Mises Wire*. <https://mises.org/wire/violence-homesteading-and-origins-private-property>
- Gregory, A., & Block, W. E. (2007). On immigration: Reply to Hoppe. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 21(3), 25–42.
- Grotius, H. (1625/1814). *The law of war and peace (De jure belli ac pacis)* (A. C. Campbell, Trans.). London: [Original work published 1625].
- Hoppe, H.-H. (1988, November). Utilitarians and Randians vs. reason. *Liberty*, 53–54.
- Hoppe, H.-H. (1993). *The economics and ethics of private property: Studies in political economy and philosophy*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic.

- Hoppe, H.-H. (1995). *Economic science and the Austrian method*. Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute. <https://mises.org/library/economic-science-and-austrian-method>
- Hoppe, H.-H. (2001). *Democracy: The god that failed*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Hoppe, H.-H. (2011). Of private, common, and public property and the rationale for total privatization. *Libertarian Papers*, 3(1), 1–13. <http://libertarianpapers.org/2011/1-hoppe-private-common-and-public-property/>
- Hoppe, H.-H. (2024, January 31). An open letter to Walter E. Block. *LewRockwell.com*. <https://www.lewrockwell.com/2024/01/hans-hermann-hoppe/breaking-up-is-hard-to-do-but-sometimes-necessary/>
- Kinsella, S. (1996). New rationalist directions in libertarian rights theory. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 12(12), 323–338.
- Kinsella, N. S. (2002, September 19). Defending argumentation ethics: Reply to Murphy & Callahan. *Anti-state.com*.
- Kinsella, S. N. (2003). A libertarian theory of contract: Title transfer, binding promises, and inalienability. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 17(2), 11–37. http://www.mises.org/journals/jls/17_2/17_2_2.pdf
- Kinsella, S. N. (2006a, May 26). Thoughts on intellectual property, scarcity, labor-ownership, metaphors, and Lockean homesteading. *Mises Wire*. <https://mises.org/wire/thoughts-intellectual-property-scarcity-labor-ownership-metaphors-and-lockean-homesteading>
- Kinsella, S. N. (2006b, September 7). How we come to own ourselves. *Mises Institute*. <https://mises.org/library/how-we-come-own-ourselves>
- Kinsella, S. N. (2007, August 15). Thoughts on the latecomer and homesteading ideas. *Mises Wire*. <https://mises.org/wire/thoughts-latecomer-and-homesteading-ideas-or-why-very-idea-ownership-implies-only-libertarian>
- Kinsella, S. N. (2009a, August 21). What libertarianism is. *Mises Institute*. <https://mises.org/library/what-libertarianism>
- Kinsella, S. N. (2009b). What libertarianism is. In J. G. Hülsmann & S. N. Kinsella (Eds.), *Property, freedom, and society: Essays in honor of Hans-Hermann Hoppe*. Auburn, AL: Mises Institute.
- Kinsella, S. N. (2009c, May 22). Homesteading, abandonment, and unowned land in the civil law. *Mises Blog*. <http://blog.mises.org/10004/homesteading-abandonment-and-unowned-land-in-the-civil-law/>
- Locke, J. (1948). An essay concerning the true origin, extent and end of civil government. In E. Barker (Ed.), *Social contract* (pp. 17–19). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McMaken, R. (2016, October 19). How the Feds botched the frontier Homestead Acts. *Mises Wire*. <https://mises.org/wire/how-feds-botched-frontier-homestead-acts>
- Meir, G. (1973). *A land of our own: An oral autobiography* (M. Syrkin, Ed.). Putnam. (Original work published 1969)
- Meir, G. (1975). *My life*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Meng, J. C. S. (2002). Hopp(e)ing onto new ground: A Rothbardian proposal for Thomistic natural law as the basis for Hans-Hermann Hoppe's praxeological defense of private property. *Mises Institute Working Paper*. <http://www.mises.org/journals/scholar/meng.pdf>
- Nelson, P. L., & Block, W. E. (2018). *Space capitalism: The case for privatizing space travel and colonization*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Nino, J. A. (2025, October 17). How rabid Zionism split the libertarian world. *The Occidental Observer*.
<https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2025/10/17/how-rabid-zionism-split-the-libertarian-world/>
- Paul, E. F. (1987). *Property rights and eminent domain*. Livingston, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Pufendorf, S. (1673/1927a). *Natural law and the law of nations (De officio hominis et civis juxta legem naturalem libri duo)* (Vols. 1–2). Buffalo, NJ: Hein. (Reprint of Oxford University Press, 1927).
- Rockwell, L. H., Jr. (2004, December 23). The great Ralph Raico. *LewRockwell.com*.
<https://www.lewrockwell.com/2024/12/lew-rockwell/the-great-ralph-raico/>
- Rozeff, M. S. (2005, September 1). Original appropriation and its critics. *LewRockwell.com*.
<http://www.lewrockwell.com/rozeff/rozeff18.html>
- Rothbard, M. N. (1967). War guilt in the Middle East. *Left and Right*, 3(3), 4.
http://mises.org/journals/lar/pdfs/3_3/3_3_4.pdf
- Rothbard, M. N. (1969, June 15). Confiscation and the homestead principle. *The Libertarian Forum*, 1(6). <https://www.panarchy.org/rothbard/confiscation.html>
- Rothbard, M. N. (1973). *For a new liberty*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
<http://mises.org/rothbard/newlibertywhole.asp>
- Rothbard, M. (1988, November). Beyond is and ought. *Liberty*, 44–45.
- Rothbard, M. N. (1998 [1982]). *The ethics of liberty*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
<https://cdn.mises.org/The%20Ethics%20of%20Liberty%2020191108.pdf>
- Rothbard, M. N. (1999). America's Two Just Wars: 1775 and 1861. In T. C. War, *The Costs of War* (p. 15). Routledge.
- Rothbard, M. N. (2014, November 19). *The first libertarian intellectuals*. *LewRockwell.com*.
<https://www.lewrockwell.com/2014/11/murray-n-rothbard/the-first-libertarian-intellectuals/>
- Staff, T. (2023, January). Israel ranks among 10 most powerful countries in annual list; 4th strongest military. *The Times of Israel*. <https://www.timesofisrael.com/israel-among-10-most-powerful-countries-in-the-world-in-annual-list/>
- Watner, C. (1982). The proprietary theory of justice in the libertarian tradition. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 6(3–4), 289–316. http://mises.org/journals/jls/6_3/6_3_6.pdf

Style – **APA Seventh Edition:**

Block, W. E. (2026, January 15). Rejoinder to Nino on Zionism and the cancel culture of the libertarian movement. *MEST Journal*, 14(1), 54-71. <https://doi.org/10.12709/mest.14.14.01.05>

Style – **Chicago 17th Edition:**

Block, Walter E. " Rejoinder to Nino on Zionism and the cancel culture of the libertarian movement." *MEST Journal (MESTE)* 14, no. 1 (January 2026): 54-71. <https://doi.org/10.12709/mest.14.14.01.05>.

Style – **GOST R 7.0.100-2018, Name Sort:**

Block W. E. Rejoinder to Nino on Zionism and the cancel culture of the libertarian movement // *MEST Journal* / ed. Z. Čekerevac. – Belgrade – Toronto : MESTE, 15 Jan. 2026. – Vol. 14, No. 1. – pp. 54-71. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12709/mest.14.14.01.05>.

Style – **Harvard** *Anglia Ruskin*:

Block, W. E., 2026. Rejoinder to Nino on Zionism and the cancel culture of the libertarian movement. *MEST Journal*, 14(1), pp. 54-71. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.12709/mest.14.14.01.05> [Accessed dd Month yyyy].

Style – **ISO 690** *Numerical Reference*:

Block, W. E. Rejoinder to Nino on Zionism and the cancel culture of the libertarian movement. *MEST Journal*. 2026 Jan 15; 14(1): 54-71. DOI: 10.12709/mest.14.14.01.05

