Twitter Thread by André van Delft■ ■■■



André van Delft■ ■■■
@AndreVanDelft

@RyanDriehuys @joerogan In April 2018 NeonRevolt presented a piece where he named Michael Anton as possibly

@SSBN654_Q @RyanDriehuys @joerogan I found some supporting evidence in this video recording of a lecture by Michael Anton.

From 45:00:
"Too many conservatives say: can we take that principle? No limits on acquisition nor on property rights can be ever set at all because it is a principle."
https://t.co/YurIAQsj9R

@SSBN654_Q @RyanDriehuys @joerogan So Anton made a case for reasonably limiting acquisition and property rights. IMO important and easily overlooked.

Like Q said:

"Wealth (over generations) buys power.
Power (over generations) buys more wealth and control.
More wealth and control buys countries and its people."

@SSBN654_Q @RyanDriehuys @joerogan As @GAP_Great wrote:

"It makes complete sense to limit wealth.

I am a capitalist, but what I call a small market capitalist.
Monopolies, global companies, financial arbitrage, large government agencies, large religious institutions, and royalty are all verboten."

@SSBN654_Q @RyanDriehuys @joerogan @GAP_Great And @MartinGeddis put it succinctly:

'Property rights also protect the proceeds of crime;
so they become "crime rights".

Hence limiting societal ruin risk is OK.'