
hello

Posted by Libertarian Joseph - 2008/01/23 22:39

I was in this forum last year. I pretty much got hooked on Ron Paul, so I went to campaign for him, instead of becoming active in this party. Sorry about that. No one probably remembers me anyway lol. Anyway, he still has a chance, but I always wanted to come back and start where I left off in this party. I was supposed to attend your last convention, that was around the time I first started researching Ron Paul. I got hooked on him. :p We had a poll up on the old forum, I was the only "nay" vote against Ron Paul, I thought of him as a traitor to the cause, until I watched some of his videos and was converted to his candidacy. That Ron Paul stuff is addicting, I hope it didn't put much of a dent in the LP?

my prediction: I predict this year will be tough for the LP at the ballots, because of Ron Paul BUT I think Ron Paul woke up a lot of Americans to libertarianism, so I believe the Party WILL grow exponentially this year, especially the next.

I'm not in 100% agreement with Ron Paul, however, I support legalizing competition in currency, Ron Paul wants a gold standard. He should just want to legalize competition, that way, people will have the choice of abandoning the USD when the government debases the currency, not have alternative money confiscated by the US Government. This, IMHO, gives incentive to the government to keep their currency strong.

I also don't think abortion is an issue for the state of NJ, I think it should be left to individuals. I believe Ron Paul would want to criminalize abortion, if he were a state official.

I also think we should leave borders to the states, not the federal government. If the states want to sustain welfare states, why should the government use tax money from other states, in order to clean up an issue that is stemming from the states that have welfarism. However, I think we should open the borders up AFTER we eliminate welfare at the state level, it's a long road.

No, I don't support any NAU :) I just think, if you eliminate the incentives to why we have this overwhelming problem with unhealthy immigration, you will then solve the problem at its core. We never had to be all gung-ho on the borders in the 19th century, why is that? Because it was HEALTHY immigration. Our economy was thriving.

Sorry for my lil ramble, that's what gets me in trouble on other forums lol. I know there are many Libertarians that lean to the right on the issue of immigration, it's just a disagreement in direction. Your anecdote to "illegal immigration" is to utilize the same policy that we use on the failure that is the "War on Drugs." We're trying to only treat the symptoms, without digging in to solve the entire problem.

I DO BELIEVE WE NEED TO SECURE OUR BORDERS but... the eventual goal should be to:

a. eliminate welfare

then, b. ease up on the borders, begin to allow healthy immigration; free trade and travel.

but not right now, of course not.

thanks

any Libertarian Party events coming up? What can I do? I'm bored. :P

Re:hello

Posted by redgar - 2008/01/24 09:38

Welcome back.

The Paul campaign has been amazing. It is the message that we really need to sell, not labels. I think that after the Paul campaign the party will see an large increase in membership. We need to let the meetup groups focus on spreading the libertarian message by spreading the word on Paul's campaign for now. But after super tuesday we must start to reach out to the Paul supporters.

I agree with you on immigration. Most of the Ron Paul supporters don't really understand immigration. I went to the NJ Republican Straw Poll. When another candidates rep stated that legal immigration is good for us and should be encouraged the Ron Paul supporters all booed. The silly thing is that even Ron Paul believes in legal immigration. A free market requires free movement of good AND labor.

I'm not aware of any official events other than our convention that is being planned for March 14th - 16th. Its going be a joint convention with the PA, NJ, and DE parties. Having a large convention will hopefully attract lots of LP presidential candidates so we can make a wise choice at the national convention in May.

We are looking for candidates for the November race. We will need congressional and senate candidates. I'm not sure if we should run someone against Sabrin, however he could possibly lose the primary leaving us with only statists to choose from.

Other ways to get involved is to get involved in your county libertarian organization. If your county isn't organized you can help to organize it.

If you like to write you can always contribute to the website or our monthly newsletter.

Jay

=====

Re:hello

Posted by Libertarian Joseph - 2008/01/24 10:05

Thanks for the reply. Yes, I've been telling Ron Paul supporters that they should become Libertarians if Ron Paul doesn't win. Many, however, are thinking of "taking over" the GOP from the inside. I don't think that's a bad idea but I believe it's time for a third party. Most Libertarians aren't paleoconservatives, so they wouldn't mix well inside a reformed Republican Party. I think there's a big difference between traditional conservatives and libertarians.

1. I'm not anti-communist, I think communism is a flawed system. I'd still support free trade with a communist nation. Most paleocons HATE communists. It's like the "War on Terror" on communists with them.

2. paleocons tend to be anti-immigrant. I'm not.

3. most paleocons oppose Roe vs Wade because they're anti-abortion. I oppose it because I believe in state's rights, that's the way this country was constructed.

so yea, I think there's a big distinction to be made. Many Ron Paul supporters come from the Constitution Party, ever hear of them? They HATE homosexuals. They're like anti-war neocons lol.

I don't think of libertarians in terms of left and right, that's why I think the LP needs to come out as THE third party, not just a party that could steal votes away from a GOP contender. That's how the media marginalizes us.

libertarians / paleocons - I think there's a difference, do you? I think paleocons are the "old right," I don't see myself as being left or right, I'm fiscally responsible, socially tolerant.

I might be interested in running. How will that work?

Where will the convention be held? I'm probably only old enough for Congress.

I'm also interested in setting up, or joining, a county organization.

Writing? hm. I'm not exactly a columnist, but that sounds interesting :P

thanks

=====

Re:hello

Posted by fastd - 2008/01/25 12:44

:unsure:

Exactly what is the position of the LP on immigration? Is it still for "open" borders? What does "open" mean exactly? If it means that we as a nation cannot make laws to regulate the human traffic across our borders, then this position is ridiculous! Every country regulates immigration to some degree be it more open or more closed than ours. Whatever one's position on the laws that govern immigration, shouldn't we enforce it?

The last I heard we have 12 million illegal immigrants in this country right now. If they are illegal, why are they "entitled" to medical, education and welfare benefits at all? Doesn't this just encourage others to do the same?

It distresses me to see rallies in California and Texas where demonstrators fly the Mexican flag on top of a US flag which has been turned upside down to indicate very clearly in my opinion, where their real loyalties lie.

Please let me know what you think about immigration and please give your suggestions as to what you think our national immigration policy should be. Thanks.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by redgar - 2008/01/25 14:39

fastd wrote:

Exactly what is the position of the LP on immigration?

No they are not for completely open borders. See LP Platform on Immigration. I agree with the platform. We can't have secure borders if our policy is overly restrictive. There are too many holes that can't be filled. Instead we need to encourage legal immigration.

fastd wrote:

Whatever one's position on the laws that govern immigration, shouldn't we enforce it?

I've heard Ron Paul state the same thing. Just because something is the law is not a reason to enforce it. Should we also crack down on those who smoke a joint in the privacy of their own homes? How about sodomy in Georgia?

fastd wrote:

The last I heard we have 12 million illegal immigrants in this country right now. If they are illegal, why are they "entitled" to medical, education and welfare benefits at all? Doesn't this just encourage others to do the same?

Now you are getting to the real problem, runaway welfare programs. Illegal immigration is just a symptom and a smokescreen that keeps us from the real problems.

fastd wrote:

It distresses me to see rallies in California and Texas where demonstrators fly the Mexican flag on top of a US flag which has been turned upside down to indicate very clearly in my opinion, where their real loyalties lie.

This distresses me as well. However I would object strongly against using the government to control anyone who does this. This first amendment protects this behavior.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by fastd - 2008/01/25 14:56

I'm for sodomy in Georgia and smoking pot if that's what people want to do. This analogy doesn't wash. Laws should be enforced and bad laws like the ones you mention should be overturned.

And again, your reply doesn't state what the law should be or how it should be enforced, if at all.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by Libertarian Joseph - 2008/01/25 15:38

The position? The position is to secure the borders and to stop subsidizing unhealthy immigration. I don't think the LP ever advocated an open border policy coupled with a weak economy, that's a recipe for disaster. That's what some members of the other parties want. Democrat pro-open border people want it to create "multiculturalism." Most Republicans that want amnesty are corporate elites that want to exploit cheap labor, they don't care about the American economy.

My position is to secure the borders (it's the law) and start to chip away at the incentives. Libertarianism is a big tent philosophy, so don't get discouraged if you ever do come across pro-open border libertarians, they simply approach the issue in a different light. I do not support any sort of open border policy in this economic environment, we need to

strengthen the economy before we can ever begin to consider that. Our economy is weak, thank the Republicans.

This is like subsidizing corn when there is no demand for corn. The only time I differ with many paleocons is in that I don't think closing the border is the goal, I think that's just what this country needs right now. We have a weak economy, our jobs are going overseas, we are losing our manufacturing base, so I think America needs to secure the borders. Then we can begin to deregulate and cut taxes, so that we can get the jobs back and THEN once our economy is booming we can become more generous with new immigrants. We can't sustain the status-quo, I agree with you, however, I don't think a wall is necessary.

Do you?

You don't have to abandon the party just because of a disagreement with another member on one issue. What counts is what the bylaws of the party are, every member has a say on what the bylaws are. I think right now we need to secure the borders. Not because I'm some kind of anti-immigrant, just because it's the right thing to do at this time. A LP ran by brainless radicals will never win anything, instead, it's ideal to solve problems with libertarian solutions. Followin the law in securing the borders sounds about right.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by fastd - 2008/01/25 15:49

No wall necessary. It would be a hinderence to mass deportation anyway.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by Libertarian Joseph - 2008/01/25 15:57

ok. Are you a member of the LP? I'm well aware of Ron Paul's belief on immigration, is that the one you believe in? It's about economics. Did we have all this unhealthy immigration in the 19th century? No. Why not? Mexicans were still there. We are subsidizing it!

=====

Re:hello

Posted by redgar - 2008/01/25 16:10

The LP may say one thing, but not all libertarians agree on immigration.

How do you expect to have the government tell illegal immigrants from citizens? Do you advocate a national ID card? The only way I see that we can crack down on immigration is:
build a wall so big that will make the Berlin wall look like a picket fence.
enact a national ID card. Otherwise you can't tell an illegal from a citizen.
give the government much more oversight over employers and who they employee. This way they can stop under the table employment (of illegals and citizens alike)
Its either that or else keep on spending government money like we are so that our economy is in such shambles that Mexico wants a wall to keep us out. :dry:

I'd rather remove the incentives than give government enough power to stop illegal immigration.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by Libertarian Joseph - 2008/01/25 16:11

redgar wrote:
The LP may say one thing, but not all libertarians agree on immigration.

How do you expect to have the government tell illegal immigrants from citizens? Do you advocate a national ID card?

The only way I see that we can crack down on immigration is:
build a wall so big that will make the Berlin wall look like a picket fence.
enact a national ID card. Otherwise you can't tell an illegal from a citizen.
give the government much more oversight over employers and who they employ. This way they can stop under the table employment (of illegals and citizens alike)
Its either that or else keep on spending government money like we are so that our economy is in such shambles that Mexico wants a wall to keep us out. :dry:

I'd rather remove the incentives than give government enough power to stop illegal immigration.

Nope. My belief is that we should just physically restrict immigration at this time. Then we can fix the problem.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by fastd - 2008/01/25 16:24

That is like an ostrich burying their head in the sand. What are you going to do with the 12 million that already here? Controlling our borders IS one of the limited powers granted the Federal Government in the Constitution. If it takes ID cards, so be it.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by big eddie - 2008/07/06 17:38

It is very difficult to encourage legal immigration when we are offering so much to illegals. In some states illegals can get a drivers license, welfare, health care housing and education. Why should they want to be legal, there is no incentive. We must make it harder to enter illegally. We must add more incentives to come into this country legally.

=====

Re:hello

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/07/08 21:17

One of the problems with the immigration issue is that so many people equate it to homeland security. Most of the 12 million immigrants we've spoken of have come here to work menial jobs and earn a living for their families. It's the white collar work and student visas that are a threat to our national security. The Government Accountability Office couldn't even find out how many of them the Federal Government has issued, nevertheless who they all went to. Stop handing out welfare and reduce the restrictions on Mexicans. They are already here, we need to help them assimilate into our culture. They don't want to blow us up, they want to wash cars, mow lawns, and pick fruit. They want to own homes and cars and raise families. Who would be against that?

=====