
National LP Platform

Posted by Ken Kaplan - 2008/04/01 17:15

I just received the results of the survey conducted by our national party regarding platform changes. The new proposed language weakens the party's stance on the issue of a woman's right to choose. The new proposed plank 1.4 is a step back from the current I.8. The new plank needs to continue, "Neither shall government prohibit abortion. We believe that government should be kept out of the matter, leaving the question to each person for their conscientious consideration." Or just keep the old plank.

I respect and don't mind recognizing the rights of pro lifers, but not at the cost of abandoning pro choicers.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by RickSp - 2008/04/16 13:39

If the LP no longer supports choice in its platform it will be another step towards becoming just another right wing Republican Party camp follower.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/05/09 06:55

I agree with you totally, Ken. The platform position was fine the way it was. We need to be very clear that as a party we are neither for nor against any sort of personal medical or moral decisions.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by big eddie - 2008/05/14 00:39

The right to life is the most important right of all. Even Ron Paul is a pro-lifer. How can the lp stand up for other rights but not the right to life. Without life what else is important? Abortion is an assault upon the individual rights of a human being. The lp is against violence so it should be against abortion.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by redgar - 2008/05/14 11:36

Abortion is one of those issues where several values collide. I understand and often agree with both sides of the issue. A moral libertarian case can be made from both the pro-choice and pro-life points of view.

It would be a mistake for the LP to add either anti-choice language OR pro-abortion language to its platform.

I believe that abortion is horrible, but government meddling in the issue will make things even worse.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by big eddie - 2008/05/18 23:53

Maybe the lp should go on record as not opposing or favoring anything. Abortion is not a medical decision, it is not like taking out an appendix. If the right to be born is not important enough to stand up for what is? Without life there are no rights. Which is more important the right to vote or the right to life? Which would you rather have?

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by Ken Kaplan - 2008/05/19 00:43

Eddie, The point is that when "human life" begins is a matter that people disagree on. Traditionally, in our current platform and in previous ones, that disagreement was always recognized by a plank that recognized this was a moral/philosophical/religious decision that had to be made by individual women and their doctors, not by the government. I want our party to continue supporting that position.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/05/19 06:08

The Libertarian Party is a political entity that supports the freedom of choice in all areas of life, and opposes government control over personal moral issues. I find the practice of abortion completely abhorrent, but as a libertarian I do not feel I have the right to tell anyone that they should think, feel, and behave like me. Abortion is a personal decision to be resolved by individuals, not bureaucrats. The party platform should remain neutral on the subject.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by big eddie - 2008/05/26 16:08

The right to be born is a civil right. I cannot understand how someone can be passionate about the gold standard, or the federal reserve and not about the right to be born. The LP is supposed to be the party of principle but shows no principle on this issue. If the LP were around in the 1850s they would not have taken a stand against slavery or the right of women to vote later on. I guess the LP would have left the decision up to the states. This is the issue that prevents me from becoming a member of the LP. There is no compromise. Neither Michael Cloud nor Mary Ruwart could change my mind.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by RickSp - 2008/05/26 16:26

When human life begins is a matter of religious belief. The traditional church doctrine for two millennia is that the soul is ensconced at the quickening or about 5 months. The modern anti-abortionists who believe that life begins at conception, claim the right to force their religious views on others. I do not claim that right. Neither should the Libertarian Party.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by big eddie - 2008/05/27 19:10

I guess that means you would have no opinion concerning slavery, voting rights or Jim Crow laws. The pro-death crowd is pushing its views on people of faith. They want hospitals and doctors to be forced to perform abortions against their will. They also want the tax payers to pay for it. They want to take away our freedom of choice.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/05/27 19:36

Just want to point out that the "they"s you reference in your post are not libertarians. We want to enhance our freedom of choice. Unfortunately we cannot pick and choose which freedoms are "good" or "bad", so the best way is to let everyone choose for themselves. As much as we would stop the religious right from imposing its view on abortion upon everyone else, so to would we stop the ultra-liberals, the pro-death crowd, or any other interest group from imposing their will on the populace.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by big eddie - 2008/06/04 15:00

We should also allow states to decide on gun control,same sex unionsas well as well as abortion.We could also put loitering up for a vote. what about smoking and gambling? if the voters decide against an issue than it is stopped. Let the voters decide, if you have the courage.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by Derek - 2008/06/04 17:12

Mixed pro-life and pro-choice.

How will that make our party look??

Not firm,, Divided.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/06/04 20:00

I agree with you on that big eddie, we should let the voters decide on as many issues as possible. That's a pure democracy. As for being divided, you are mistaken, Derek. We are united in the belief that the government should not be used to enforce morality. What you do with yourself is your business, not mine.

=====

Re:Democracy

Posted by Jay Edgar - 2008/06/04 20:39

Pure democracy sucks and is exactly what our founders sought to avoid.

"it may be concluded that a pure democracy...can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction... there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths." - the Federalist Papers

In a pure democracy the rights of the minority are trampled by the rights of the majority. In a democratic Iraq the Shia shall enslave the Sunni majority. A democratic Germany gave rise to the Nazi's. Democracy in our school districts have the majority sucking more and more money out of the minority.

Alexis de Tocqueville's Democracy in America does a good job describing the problems with democracy.

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by Kevin Ferrizzi - 2008/06/05 22:11

Good point, Jay, and one that should not be forgotten. The question we are faced with now though is a case of the lesser of two evils. Which is worse, a pure democracy where the individual's rights are stripped by the might of the mob, or a republic where the individual's rights are slowly usurped by the social elite?

=====

Re:National LP Platform

Posted by big eddie - 2008/06/22 00:04

There is no such thing as a pure democracy. That is an ideal that can never be attained. Since man is flawed anything he designs is also flawed. The imperfect can never achieve the perfect. I could never put my trust in any man or group, They can never succeed. When someone asks me to put my faith and trust in him or his party, that is something I cannot do. I could never put my hope, trust or faith in an individual, group or idea.

=====